

INDIGENOUS DIPLOMACIES

Edited by
J. Marshall Beier



Indigenous Diplomacies

This page intentionally left blank

Indigenous Diplomacies

Edited by J. Marshall Beier

palgrave
macmillan



INDIGENOUS DIPLOMACIES

Copyright © J. Marshall Beier, 2009, selection and editorial matter;
individual chapters, the authors.

All rights reserved.

First published in 2009 by PALGRAVE MACMILLAN® in the United States—a division of St. Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Where this book is distributed in the UK, Europe, and the rest of the world, this is by Palgrave Macmillan, a division of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN: 978-0-230-61307-2

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Indigenous diplomacies / edited by J. Marshall Beier.

p. cm.

ISBN 978-0-230-61307-2 (alk. paper)

1. Indigenous peoples—Politics and government. 2. Indigenous peoples—Government relations. 3. International relations—International cooperation. 4. Globalization—Political aspects. 5. Culture and globalization. I. Beier, J. Marshall.

GN380.I522 2009

327.1089—dc22

2009018337

A catalogue record of the book is available from the British Library.

Design by Scribe Inc.

First edition: December 2009

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America.

For Kaelyn

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Notes on Contributors	ix
Acknowledgments	xv
Introduction: <i>Indigenous</i> Diplomacies as Indigenous <i>Diplomacies</i> <i>J. Marshall Beier</i>	1
1 Forgetting, Remembering, and Finding Indigenous Peoples in International Relations <i>J. Marshall Beier</i>	11
2 Communication/Excommunication: Transversal Indigenous Diplomacies in Global Politics <i>Nevzat Soguk</i>	29
3 The Political Stakes of Indigenous Diplomacies: Questions of Difference <i>Mark F. N. Franke</i>	47
4 Indigenous Diplomacies before the Nation-State <i>Ravi de Costa</i>	61
5 A “Revolution within a Revolution”: Indigenous Women’s Diplomacies <i>Laura Parisi and Jeff Corntassel</i>	79
6 Achievements of Indigenous Self-Determination: The Case of Sami Parliaments in Finland and Norway <i>Rauna Kuokkanen</i>	97
7 Coming in from the Cold: Inuit Diplomacy and Global Citizenship <i>Frances Abele and Thierry Rodon</i>	115

8	Between the Leader of Virtù and the Good Savage: Indigenous Struggles and Life Projects in the Amazon Basin <i>Marcela Vecchione Gonçalves</i>	133
9	Aboriginal Diplomacy: The Queen Comes to Canada and Coyote Goes to London <i>Keith Thor Carlson</i>	155
10	Inuit Transnational Activism: Cooperation and Resistance in the Face of Global Change <i>Heather A. Smith and Gary N. Wilson</i>	171
11	Where You Stand Depends on Where You Sit: Beginning an Indigenous-Settler Reconciliation Dialogue <i>Franke Wilmer</i>	187
12	Responding to a Deeply Bifurcated World: Indigenous Diplomacies in the Twenty-First Century <i>Makere Stewart-Harawira</i>	207
	Bibliography	225
	Index	253

Contributors

Frances Abele is Professor of Public Policy and Administration and Academic Director of the Centre for Community Innovation at Carleton University. During 1992–94, she was seconded to the research directorate of Canada's Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. She has worked with the National Centre on First Nations Governance on projects related to governance reform and the Indian Act. Her current activities include professional development teaching with community leaders at the Aboriginal Leadership Institute in Winnipeg, participation in a community-university research alliance on Dene culture, health, and environment in the Northwest Territories, and, with Michael J. Prince at the University of Victoria, research on the reforms necessary in federalism to enable the full implementation of various forms of Aboriginal self-government in Canada. She has published extensively on Indigenous peoples and the North.

J. Marshall Beier is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at McMaster University. His research and teaching interests are in the areas of Indigenous global politics, critical security studies, Canadian foreign policy, and postcolonial and feminist theory. He is the author of *International Relations in Uncommon Places: Indigeneity, Cosmology, and the Limits of International Theory* (Palgrave, 2005, 2009), was guest editor of a special issue of *Canadian Foreign Policy* on *Indigenous Diplomacies* (2007), and is coeditor of a forthcoming edited volume entitled *Canadian Foreign Policy in Critical Perspective* (Oxford). His articles have appeared in *Contemporary Security Policy*, *Global Governance*, *International Politics*, *International Studies Review*, *Security Dialogue*, and *Third World Quarterly*. He is a recipient of the Government of Ontario's Leadership in Faculty Teaching (LIFT) Award.

Keith Thor Carlson is Associate Professor in the History Department at the University of Saskatchewan. He has authored and edited six books and numerous articles and book chapters pertaining to the Salish people of British Columbia, including most recently, *The Power of Place, the*

Problem of Time: Aboriginal Identity in a Changing World (University of Toronto Press, forthcoming 2010); *Orality and Literacy: Reflections across Disciplines*, coeditor with K. Fagan and N. Khanenko-Freisen (University of Toronto Press, forthcoming 2009); “*Call Me Hank*”: *A Stó:lō Man’s Reflections on Logging, Living, and Growing Old*, coeditor with K. Fagan (University of Toronto Press, 2006), and “Precedent and the Aboriginal Response to Global Incursions: Smallpox and Identity Reformation Among the Coast Salish,” *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* (2008). His research continues to focus on the Canadian Aboriginal west coast, where he is in the process of completing a book that examines Salish historical consciousness.

Jeff Corntassel is Tsalagi (Cherokee Nation) and Associate Professor in the School of Indigenous Governance at the University of Victoria. His first book, entitled *Forced Federalism: Contemporary Challenges to Indigenous Nationhood* (University of Oklahoma Press, 2008), examines how Indigenous nations in the United States have mobilized politically as they encounter new threats to their governance from state policymakers. His next book is a coedited volume (with Professor Tom Holm), entitled *The Power of Peoplehood: Regenerating Indigenous Nations* (University of Texas Press, forthcoming), which brings together Native scholars from Canada and the United States to discuss contemporary strategies for revitalizing Indigenous communities. His research has been published in *Alternatives*, *American Indian Quarterly*, *Human Rights Quarterly*, *Nationalism and Ethnic Studies*, and *Social Science Journal*. He lives on WSANEC territory with his wife and daughter.

Ravi de Costa is Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Environmental Studies at York University. He previously held an appointment at Trent University and a Postdoctoral Fellowship in the Institute on Globalization and the Human Condition at McMaster University. His research and teaching interests are in comparative and global approaches to the study of relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. He has published on a range of topics, including reconciliation processes and apologies, the treaty-process in British Columbia, and Indigenous politicization strategies. He is the author of *A Higher Authority: Indigenous Transnationalism and Australia* (University of New South Wales Press, 2006), a history of Australian Aborigines’ internationalization of their struggle for recognition and rights. While his work has mainly focused on Canada and Australia, he has been awarded a Shastri Institute Research Fellowship for work on political devolution and the Scheduled Tribes in India.

Mark F. N. Franke is Associate Professor of Global Studies at Huron University College and is a core graduate faculty member in The Centre for the Study of Theory and Criticism at the University of Western Ontario. He received his PhD in Political Science at The Johns Hopkins University in 1998 and has taught previously in the Department of Political Science at the University of Victoria and in the International Studies Program at the University of Northern British Columbia. He is the author of *Global Limits: Immanuel Kant, International Relations, and Critique of World Politics* (SUNY, 2001) and has published journal articles and book chapters on problems regarding international ethics, colonial interests at work in modern theories and politics of rights, and the spatial and temporal politics of human rights discourse and law.

Rauna Kuokkanen is Assistant Professor in Political Science and Aboriginal Studies at the University of Toronto. She is the author of *Reshaping the University: Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes and the Logic of the Gift* (UBC Press, 2007) and *Boaris dego eana: Eamiálbmogiid diehtu, filosofijjat ja dutkan* (*As Old as the Earth: Indigenous Knowledge, Philosophies and Research*, 2009) and editor of the anthology on contemporary Sami literature *Juoga mii geasuha* (2001). She has published articles on Indigenous research paradigms and philosophies, education and critical theory, Indigenous literatures, the gift paradigm, and globalization and Indigenous women. Her current research interests include political economy of Indigenous women and autonomy, Indigenous feminisms and Indigenous philosophy. She is a Sami woman from Northern Finland and has long been involved in the public life of Sami society.

Laura Parisi is Assistant Professor in the Department of Women's Studies at the University of Victoria, in British Columbia, Canada. She has published in the areas of gender and human rights, development, globalization, transnational feminism, and methodology. Her forthcoming publications include "The Numbers Do(n't) Always Add Up: Dilemmas in Using Quantitative Research Methods in Feminist International Relations Scholarship" in *Politics & Gender*; "Reclaiming Spaces of Resistance: Women's Human Rights and Global Restructuring," in Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan, eds., *Beyond Gender and Global Restructuring* (Routledge, forthcoming 2010); and, "Feminist Perspectives on Human Rights" in the *International Studies Association Compendia Project*, edited by Robert A. Denemark et al. (Wiley-Blackwell).

Thierry Rodon is an adjunct Professor in the School of Public Policy and Administration at Carleton University as well as in the Political Science

Department at Université Laval and a board member of the Centre interuniversitaire d'études et de recherches autochtones (CIÉRA). His research interests involve Northern governance, Aboriginal policies, comanagement of natural resources and Aboriginal education. He has been an editor in a series of life stories of Nunavut leaders and has published on Nunavut, Nunatsiavut, and Nunavik. He has participated in the development of a BA program in Public Administration for Nunavut and regularly teaches in Nunavut. He is also involved in the development of the Nunavik Regional Government.

Heather A. Smith is Associate Professor in International Studies at the University of Northern British Columbia. A former Chair of International Studies and former Acting Director of the UNBC Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology, Heather is also a 3M National Teaching Fellow. Her primary areas of research are Canadian climate change policy, gender and Canadian foreign policy, and most recently Indigenous perspectives on climate change. Recent publications include: "Independence or Indifference: Canadian Ratification of the Kyoto Protocol" in Brian Bow and Patrick Lennox, eds., *An Independent Foreign Policy for Canada: 40th Anniversary Review* (University of Toronto Press, 2008); "Teaching Canadian Foreign Policy to and From Rural and Remote Locations" in *Canadian Foreign Policy* (Winter 2007); and "Disrupting the Global Discourse of Climate Change: The Case of Indigenous Voices" in Mary Pettenger ed., *The Social Construction of Climate Change* (Ashgate, 2007).

Nevzat Soguk is Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, specializing in International Relations theory, international organizations, and comparative politics. Most broadly, his research is guided by an interest in critical International Relations theory, especially those aspects centering on the state, the global, and transnational processes of governance, economic, political, and cultural identity constructions and international migration. He is the author of *States and Strangers* (University of Minnesota Press, 1999). His numerous articles have appeared in diverse journals such as *Alternatives*, *Global Society*, *International Politics*, *Theory and Event*, *Review of International Affairs*, *Millennium*, and *New Political Science*. He is currently completing a book manuscript entitled *Globalization and Islamism* slated for publication in 2009 from Rowman and Littlefield.

Makere Stewart-Harawira is Associate Professor at the University of Alberta. Her research focuses on Indigenous peoples with particular regard to Indigenous ontologies, global governance, global citizenship, postimperialism, and the multiple crises of governance and

biodiversity. Recent publications include *The New Imperial Order: Indigenous Responses to Globalization* (Zed Books; Huia Publishers, 2005); "A Two-edged Sword: A perspective from Indigenous peoples," in Paul Bowles and Henry Veltmeyer, eds., *National Perspectives on Globalization: A Critical Reader* (Palgrave, 2007); "Globalization, Work and Indigenous Knowledge in the Global Marketplace: The New Zealand Experience," in Lesley Farrell and Tara Fenwick, eds., *Educating the Global Workforce: Knowledge, Knowledge Work, and Knowledge Workers* (Kogan Page, 2007); "Traditional Peoples and Citizenship in the New Imperial Order," in Ali Abdi and Lynette Schultz, eds., *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship* (SUNY, 2007); "Practicing Indigenous Feminism: Resistance to Imperialism," in Joyce Green, ed., *Claiming Space for Aboriginal Feminism* (Fernwood, 2007).

Marcela Vecchione Gonçalves is a doctoral candidate in International Relations in the Department of Political Science at McMaster University. Her current research focuses on the strategies Indigenous peoples in deep Brazil, especially at the borders, are carrying on for the construction of political subjectivities aligned with acts of global citizenship. She has worked as a consultant to Brazilian NGOs on Latin American issues as well as with the Brazilian Federal Attorneys (*Ministerio Publico*) on recent debates regarding citizenship and Indigenous peoples at the Brazilian borders. She holds an MA from the Institute of International Relations at the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio).

Franke Wilmer received a PhD from the University of Maryland in 1990 and is a Professor at Montana State University. She has published two books on very different subjects, but both pertaining to human rights and the problem of political violence. The first, *The Indigenous Voice in World Politics* (Sage, 1993), examines the mobilization of international activism among Indigenous peoples from the perspective of Indigenous peoples. It argues that the marginalization of Indigenous peoples is rationalized by an ideology of "Western progress" that is produced and reproduced within master narratives of modernity and development in both settler and postcolonial states. She has also published journal articles and book chapters on the themes of identity, conflict, moral exclusion, feminism, and political theory. She has just completed *International Human Rights: An Introduction* to be published by Lynne Rienner Publishers. She is currently serving her second term in the Montana State House of Representatives.

Gary N. Wilson is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Northern British Columbia in Prince George, British Columbia. He was awarded a PhD in Political Science from the University of Toronto in 2000, and also holds an MA in Russian and East European Studies from the University of Toronto and a BA in Political Science from Carleton University. His research focuses on politics and governance in the circumpolar north. His most recent research examines the emergence of autonomous Inuit regions in the Canadian provincial and territorial norths. His articles have appeared in the *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, *Europe-Asia Studies*, *Canadian Foreign Policy*, *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, *Polar Geography* and *Post-Soviet Affairs*.

Acknowledgments

The foremost enticement toward working to produce an edited volume is the opportunity for intellectual collaboration around an area of shared interest with a group of sometimes far-flung colleagues. It is as if to mutually found a new collegium and, when it goes well, the task of the editor seems less aptly described as work than as personal indulgence. This volume has occasioned just such an experience for me and I cannot well enough express my gratitude to each of the contributors for making it so. All have in important ways influenced my own thinking about the issues that are the focus of the volume. Individually and in sum, they have also made a significant contribution to the literature that will continue to be influential in my own future work and, I am quite certain, that of others.

Like all projects of this sort, many others, too numerous to mention, have also lent their intellectual energies along the way. We all who have contributed directly to the volume are grateful to those who have offered thoughts and insights on our work in progress and who have supported and encouraged us. From my own perspective as editor, a few who commented on the project and provided input at its formative stage bear special mention: Samantha L. Arnold, P. Whitney Lackenbauer (who also referred one of the contributors to the volume), Wayne Lord, Dawn Martin-Hill, and David Mutimer. The work of two outstanding research assistants, Anna Piekarczywski and Laura LeBel, helped me to frame the original proposal and I am grateful also for the support of a Standard Research Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada through which I was able to involve them. A special debt of gratitude is owed to Roger Epp, who, more than a decade ago, first encouraged me to think in terms of Indigenous “diplomacies” specifically. It is to my conversations with him at the ISA convention in Toronto in 1997 that the impetus to produce this volume can be traced.

I am also very fortunate to be part of an uncommonly close and supportive collegial environment in the Department of Political Science at McMaster University. In particular, I would like to thank my colleagues in the International Relations field, Will Coleman, Peter Nyers, Robert

O'Brien, Tony Porter, Richard Stubbs, and Lana Wylie. Throughout this project and in all other endeavors, I have benefited and continue to benefit immensely from their generosity with their experience, their insights, and their encouragement. Likewise, I am both dependent upon and grateful for the superb administrative support tirelessly provided by Gerald Bierling, Manuela Dozzi, Kathleen Hannan, and Rose Mason. Not to be forgotten, of course, the many excellent undergraduate and graduate students it is my privilege to work with also contribute indispensably both to my own thinking and to the broader intellectual environment.

I would also like to express my thanks to Maureen Molot and Sarah Geddes who encouraged the aims of this project in its early stages by devoting a special issue of the journal *Canadian Foreign Policy* to "Indigenous Diplomacies" in 2007. The chapter by Ravi de Costa in this volume was previously published in that special issue, as were parts of the chapters by Laura Parisi and Jeff Corntassel, Frances Abele and Thierry Rodon, and Heather A. Smith and Gary Wilson. Permission to include revised versions of the above in this volume is gratefully acknowledged.

At Palgrave, Toby Wahl saw the project through the proposal and review process and provided helpful suggestions on preparation of the manuscript. Subsequently, Farideh Koochi-Kamali and Robyn Curtis shepherded it through the production process. I offer my thanks to them and to all others who have worked to produce the final printed product.

Finally, all intellectual endeavors and their success are dependent upon the wider networks of relationships that nurture and sustain us. For this reason I am grateful to friends, once again too numerous to mention, whose generosity and good humor continuously reenergizes me. Likewise, I owe much to the love and support of my family, Carole and Ron Beier, Jeff Beier, and Myra Hurst. And last, but most certainly not least, I am deeply indebted to my daughter, Kaelyn Beier, who keeps me grounded and who, in her six years thus far, has already firmly established herself as my most important teacher.

Introduction

Indigenous Diplomacies as Indigenous Diplomacies

J. Marshall Beier

On September 13, 2007, the United Nations General Assembly voted to adopt the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, a historic development more than two decades in the making. Though its genealogy is complicated, the origins of the Declaration can be traced at least to the 1982 founding of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP) through the UN Economic and Social Council. The process was, by any measure, a slow one. Even after it was approved by the UN Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities in 1994, twelve more years passed before the then-“Draft” Declaration was adopted by the UN Human Rights Council in June 2006, a step necessary before it could be put before the General Assembly for ratification. In the end, a clear majority of member states voted for adoption of the Declaration. While eleven of those with representatives present for the vote abstained, more noteworthy was the circumstance that the only four votes cast against adoption came from settler states with large Indigenous populations: Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States. Notwithstanding this, however, the Declaration is widely regarded as a watershed development signaling a qualitative change in the fraught history of relations between Indigenous peoples and states at the global level.

As these historic events have been unfolding in recent years, disciplinary International Relations, the academic field most self-consciously devoted to the study of global politics, has seen an emergent body of work engaging and seeking to begin redress of its own silence on Indigenous peoples. These contributions join a small but growing scholarly

literature on the global political practices of Indigenous peoples by international legal theorists, historians, and others that is increasingly drawing the interest of students and researchers persuaded that an important part of the story of historic and contemporary international diplomacies has been missed with inattention to those that have been practiced by Indigenous peoples before and throughout the colonial/advanced colonial era. Arising in a field whose traditional focus has turned principally on international relations between states, much of this work has been inwardly preoccupied with broad conceptual questions raised by the “discovery” of Indigenous peoples as increasingly important global political actors—questions made all the more urgent by the sudden recognition that Indigenous diplomacies are not at all new, but merely newly noticed.

The result has been the opening of an as yet small but growing conceptual space which would seem, in the first instance, to invite more focused consideration of increasingly important intersections between Indigenous diplomacies and the foreign policies of states. Proceeding from the opening interventions of recent years, then, the focus of this volume moves from the disciplinary implications of Indigenous diplomacies to consider more directly the character and effect of those diplomacies themselves. Through the chapters that follow, a diverse group of contributors working from a range of perspectives ask what is unique about Indigenous diplomacies, what accounts for their coming into currency and their increasing influence in various global political fora and across a range of international issues in recent years, and what, if anything, these developments tell us about changes in the extant international system and the operant principle of state sovereignty. More than this, though, they also challenge us to think much more broadly about Indigenous diplomacies than the long-established preoccupations of disciplinary International Relations might incline us to do. That is to say, they engage these diplomacies as meaningful in themselves and on the terms of their own founding, not merely for their having come finally and belatedly to be taken seriously by states (and, even more belatedly, by disciplinary International Relations). Accordingly, they find Indigenous diplomacies much more broadly sited, far more nuanced and complex, and more wholly *sui generis* than a focus on recent developments at the UN alone might reveal them to be.

The upshot of this is that those of us working from a disciplinary standpoint in International Relations are very quickly disabused of any pretension we might harbor toward somehow supplementing well rehearsed notions and narratives of what diplomacy is, where it is practiced, how it may operate, and who its practitioners may be. These are not stories

untold, but stories unheard in International Relations and long silenced in hegemonic fora of global governance because they frequently will not be reconciled with dominant concepts and categories, to say nothing of power circulations. Being many and varied, they manifest as counterpoints to state-centric definitions of diplomacy and, by extension, to a body of academic work that persists in centering the state, though it may show an increasing willingness to populate the margins more heterogeneously.

Though growing, the International Relations literature on Indigenous peoples remains quite sparse. As noted above, much of this work has been concerned with the disciplinary implications of (in)attention to Indigenous peoples and what this tells us about how we theorize the international, security, and other established foci of the field (see, for example, Bedford and Workman 1997; Beier 2005; Crawford 1994; Epp 2001; Shaw 2002; Wilmer 1996). Of course, this owes to the necessity of opening a space by challenging the field's silence on and exclusion of Indigenous peoples from narratives of global politics. It is also important that there be sustained introspection on the manner of this opening inasmuch as even the most benignly conceived designs and emancipatory hopes are not immune to working unintended violences of their own. It is important to recognize, however, that as indispensable as all of this is, it is still fundamentally about International Relations more so than about Indigenous peoples and global politics. There remains precious little that is centrally concerned with Indigenous peoples' diplomacies in themselves.

Somewhat closer to the focus of this volume are texts engaging Indigenous peoples' movements in global political contexts. Of these, Franke Wilmer (1993) opens inquiry into Indigenous peoples' historical interactions with and through the states system. In an Australian context, Ravi de Costa (2006b) examines a particular tradition of Indigenous transnationalism. A growing literature, including several book-length contributions, is explicitly concerned with Indigenous peoples' responses to globalization (see, for example, Blaser et al., forthcoming; Brysk 2000; Smith and Ward 2000; Stewart-Harawira 2005). Ronald Niezen (2003) makes an important contribution with specific reference to human rights, while Paul Keal (2003) explores the emancipatory possibilities of political theory and international law, and Sharon Helen Venne (1998) examines evolving international law on Indigenous rights.

The present volume joins this growing body of work dedicated to and arising from the new awareness of Indigenous peoples as global actors. The central focus, though tackled from a variety of sites and perspectives, is on Indigenous peoples' own diplomacies—not for what they mean to or tell us about states, but as meaningful in themselves. Far from being an “add

on” or “supplement” to the notions and narratives of diplomacy that have dominated International Relations, they recommend an inversion of that inclination. That is, in their profusion, their uniqueness, their complexity, and their nuance, they suggest that the understandings of diplomacy that dominate International Relations and the hegemonic institutions and arrangements of global governance might themselves much more fruitfully be understood to “supplement” a vaster constellation of possibilities in human global interaction (of which multifarious Indigenous diplomatic traditions already comprise far and away the greater part).

Why Indigenous Diplomacies?

Despite the attention quite rightly drawn by developments at the UN through the last couple of decades, it is important to acknowledge that these developments have not arisen in that time because Indigenous peoples have only in the same span moved to assert global political agency. As a number of the chapters in this volume remind us, Indigenous peoples the world over have rich *sui generis* diplomatic traditions that long predate the onset of European colonialism. Nor, it is equally important to stress, do the developments at the UN stand as sole expressions of the sum and substance of contemporary Indigenous diplomacies. As is also clear from the chapters that follow, the UN and other hegemonic fora of global governance constitute but one sphere in which Indigenous peoples sustain external relations with other groups, including but by no means limited to states.

Still, many groups interact globally and some, like Indigenous peoples, have even achieved a degree of standing at the UN. What, then, marks Indigenous peoples apart such that it is appropriate to speak of Indigenous diplomacies rather than to subsume the global political agency this describes under existing rubrics such as, for example, “social movements” or “global civil society?” It is important to bear in mind here that Indigenous histories are notable for long historical grievances originating in Europe’s conquest of the non-European world. In many places, these endure in the imposition of the state as the presumed highest form of political community and that which need not claim its global political agency, finding it confirmed already in performances of sovereignty. Even formal “decolonization” consequently fails to undo enduring legacies of colonialism, among which is often counted the postcolonial state itself. At the same time, indigeneity is characterized by a visceral connection to land that is very much in tension with both the logics of the territorial state (not least in border areas) and

the conversion of land into property, juridical rights to which are typically enforced by the state. The goals of self-determination and the land claims that animate many Indigenous people's political struggles are simultaneously profoundly at odds with the territorial state's monopoly on sovereignty and its role in upholding property rights, obviating the possibility that it might be enlisted as an agent of change. This effectively forecloses strategies open to civil society-based movements which frequently invest considerable energies in swaying states to ally with them on the particular politics they seek to advance.

Not finding their interests well represented by the states that map demarcated claims to sovereign authority over their environs, Indigenous peoples reside in what Kevin Bruyneel (2007) calls a "third space of sovereignty," neither fully inside nor fully outside the state. Their claims are thus addressed both to and against the state in a manner that disturbs the operant assumption of the state as guarantor of rights. The disjuncture is all the more pronounced for the collective rights claims that are frustrated most fundamentally by the very imposition of the (advanced) colonial state itself. In the context of such claims, therefore, the state ceases to be the guarantor of rights and is revealed instead to be a bearer of opposing rights. The state, in these circumstances, cannot be the arbiter of claims that unsettle its own foundations and is thus determined by its own logics to become the object of resistance. For these and other reasons, Indigenous peoples' global political engagements evince particular characteristics that set them apart from those of other nonstate actors who, though they might oppose the policies of states, do not necessarily find themselves irreconcilable with their inherent logics.

Even quite apart from whatever the practical taxonomic considerations may be, however, there is more to recommend engaging Indigenous diplomacies as *diplomacies*. Though this begins with the observation that just one of many varied sets of human diplomatic practices has come to define "diplomacy," it is not simply a matter of broadening the boundaries of an academic subject matter or of a category of global political practice. Rather, and once again inverting the matter at hand, it is to ask why mainstream definitions and frameworks should be permitted to define other diplomacies out of existence when, as the contributors to this volume show, they have proved every bit as able to sustain relations between peoples, facilitating exchange and managing conflict. It is to bear in mind that contemporary diplomacy encloses a set of privileged practices, performed in exclusive spaces, well-resourced and imbued with power.

Explicitly recognizing that inter-national diplomacy has long involved many more actors and a much wider array of practices and possibilities

than our disciplinary conventions have acknowledged or the hegemonic institutions of global governance have permitted, is thus also a counter-hegemonic move inasmuch as it refuses to allow “diplomacy” as foreign policy to definitionally deny the validity of other diplomacies. It is to refuse hegemonic pronouncements upon whom or what counts as a legitimate actor in global politics and what may count as meaningful diplomatic practice. It is a rejection of a conservative politics and status quo circulations of power that would have us forfeit agency in global politics to states alone while reducing Indigenous peoples to an issue area. And in this sense, it comes once again to be “about” International Relations for the simple and important reason that International Relations *is* about Indigenous diplomacies: that is, it is about what they may and may not be allowed to be. In various ways, the contributors to this volume all deny and defy those disciplinary pronouncements as, together, they trace a path from the opening chapters that consider some of the challenges to both the study and the practice of Indigenous diplomacies, through examinations of a series of different Indigenous diplomatic traditions and how they variously negotiate and/or succumb to these challenges, and to the final chapters in which more prescriptive calls are made in terms of both the study and the practice of Indigenous diplomacies.

Organization of the Volume

Chapter 1 addresses the advanced colonial complicities of disciplinary International Relations, weighing some of the problems and the promise inherent in “forgetting,” “remembering,” and “finding” Indigenous peoples in the discipline. International Relations has not only internalized many of the enabling narratives of colonial domination, but remains very much a part and producer of the requisite knowledges of advanced colonialism. As such, it is a disciplinary terrain fraught with dangers for even the most benignly conceived attempts to engage Indigenous diplomacies. And yet, it is argued, refusing to abide these dangers offers no respite from the dilemma given that “knowledges” about Indigenous peoples are already at work. The point, then, is not to counsel against engaging Indigenous diplomacies in International Relations but to insist upon the affirmation of their independent ontological significance and that of the knowledges that underwrite them. The chapter ends with a call to resist academic conventions that would authorize Indigenous knowledges and to seek ways to open conversations that recognize the authority with which they are already spoken.

In Chapter 2, Nevzat Soguk traces the “taming” of transversality and the territoriality that became the basis for “excommunicating” Indigenous peoples of the Americas from politics, most particularly in the international sphere. Suppressing the performance of alternative epistemologies that would resist territorialization, an interactive dynamic of Europe as “rule” and America as “exception” underwrote a “radical eclipse of Indigenous agency” effectively denying Indigenous peoples a place in the international sphere and forcing them into relations of “ban,” as elaborated by Giorgio Agamben (1995). Following Armond Mattelart (2008), however, indigeneity may yet be recommunicating itself through “resurgent transversal instincts” that reopen the possibility of activating new forms of resistance that could yet radically alter Indigenous peoples’ traces on “the conqueror’s map.”

In Chapter 3, Mark F. N. Franke argues that such possibilities will not easily be realized in the interactions between Indigenous peoples and states. From a position of indigeneity, Indigenous peoples’ possible subject(ed) positions (“pre-political, sub-political, or anti-political”) have already been marked out for them in the mutually recognitive performances of sovereignty according to which states “accept each other’s credentials as valid” and defend “each other’s right to subordinate all other social and political groupings as legitimately subject to themselves or one another.” Indigenous diplomacies of the sort that have been instrumental in the historic developments at the UN in recent years have turned vitally on an Indigenous identity with which peoples find they must ultimately “contract” in order to be recognized. The challenge is to construct a “neither-here-nor-there” politics that resists the straight-jacket of ascriptions which too easily become the price of recognition in contemporary global diplomatic practice.

In a manner of taking up this challenge, in Chapter 4 Ravi de Costa finds contemporary Indigenous diplomacies rooted in classical Indigenous traditions founded upon distinctly non-Western cosmologies that urge us to rethink the boundaries of hegemonic understandings of diplomacy as well as what constitutes bona fide diplomatic practice. Often unsettling and exceeding the conventions of conduct established in modern systems of international governance, the diplomatic practices of Indigenous Australian peoples signal that to invoke Indigenous diplomacies is not to speak merely of borrowings from European traditions and practices or of a wholesale insertion into those traditions. Though the colonial encounter will undoubtedly have left its marks to greater or lesser extents in different cases, what are revealed here are practices deeply rooted in *sui generis* diplomatic traditions that have proved

themselves every bit equal to facilitating and regulating peaceful interaction and interchange between peoples.

In Chapter 5, Laura Parisi and Jeff Corntassel show how the inherent complexity of diplomacies that cannot be severed from spirituality and which are enacted through the multiple roles of Indigenous women raise a thoroughgoing challenge to state-based diplomatic conventions. Through examination of cases such as the Haudenosaunee reoccupation of lands in Caledonia, Ontario, it is argued that a politics of intersectionality and multilayered citizenship practices suggest not only more complex but also more deeply rooted and resilient diplomacies than those sustained by the habits and institutions of the states system. Denying hegemonic understandings of diplomacy, Indigenous women's diplomacies are inseparable from spiritual, familial, and community relationships. Simultaneously in pursuit of individual rights (as women) and collective rights (as Indigenous peoples) unique diplomacies have been "mobilized to ensure that the Indigenous male experience is not read as the only Indigenous experience at all levels of governance" and in ways that "reveal the limitations of traditional definitions of state-based diplomacy, as well as a purely collective rights understanding of Indigenous self-determination."

Drawing in part on her own involvement in the work of the Sami Council, in Chapter 6 Rauna Kuokkanen reflects on Sami political organization and attendant diplomacies that have worked to differing effects toward the achievement of self-determination in Finland, Norway, and Sweden. Here, linked to an enviably high degree of international influence and recognition seems to be a relatively conservative outlook that is self-consciously juxtaposed to what are perceived to be more "militant, radical, and adversarial ways of Indigenous peoples in North America." This is not simplistically reducible to something akin to a comprador mentality, however, given claims to a tradition in which "Sami strategies have always been adaptation and withdrawal." Nevertheless, it "has led to framing equality as sameness, minimizing differences and emphasizing similarities," which "takes place in the framework of individualism in which there is very little, if any, attention paid to structural relations of power."

In Chapter 7, Frances Abele and Thierry Rodon argue that Inuit have succeeded in transforming the colonial logic in the Arctic and have done so by relying upon long traditions of peaceful external relations. A tradition of free movement, for instance, is brought to contemporary effect in concert with "a sophisticated elaboration of earlier diplomatic techniques" for avoiding unnecessary direct confrontation with particular nation-states. These complex and multilayered Inuit diplomacies have proved remarkably successful both within and without the hegemonic

circuits of global governance. Without losing sight of their uniqueness, it is argued that a core of political Realism is here bound up with what might be a more sustainable approach to engaging other communities than that given us by European diplomatic tradition.

In Chapter 8, Marcela Vecchione Gonçalves looks to the diplomacies practiced by Indigenous peoples in the border areas of the Brazilian Amazon rain forest. The chapter is offered as a counter-narrative to prevailing accounts about Indigenous peoples in the region, taking up “how their idea of being Indigenous, how their explanations about indigeneity, counters the discourse of sovereignty and the political attributes of the state performed by the practice, concealment, and denial of citizenship.” Disturbing dominant ideas about sovereignty and citizenship, the concept of relationality finds Indigenous peoples of the Brazilian Amazon in a situation in which, in perennial negotiations of identity which take place in the “interstices of broader negotiations of Brazilian sovereignty,” they “are never political, they are constantly becoming political.”

Challenging dominant academic and juridical conventions aimed at regulating knowledge and author-izing the veracity of documentary sources, in Chapter 9 Keith Thor Carlson foregrounds hybridity and other (than Western) ways of knowing in a discussion of differing Indigenous and Euro-Canadian accounts of defining diplomatic encounters. Though the Indigenous accounts are marginalized for not conforming to dominant standards of reliable evidence and objective reportage, the prescience of the truths they impart is not understood or appreciated and, consequently, is lost. The implications of this go well beyond the details of the particular “facts” in dispute since, “to dismiss such stories is to close the door on another way of knowing—and to the possibility of building future respectful relations built upon the foundations of past ones.”

In Chapter 10, Heather A. Smith and Gary N. Wilson elaborate the complex and multivalent relations conducted with states, with and through intergovernmental organizations, and between Inuit groups within the Inuit Circumpolar Council. The multiple and varied articulations of Inuit forging links within states, across state boundaries, and within institutions of global governance disrupts dominant ideas of citizenship. Leaders of the ICC “situate their citizenship in multiple locations, challenging the traditional construction of citizen/state.” In so doing, they enact not only unique diplomacies, but unique and multi-sited citizenship practices as well. Similarly, they reframe sovereignty as a relationship to the land as opposed to ownership over it.

In Chapter 11, Franke Wilmer places the contemporary political struggles and justice demands of Indigenous peoples in settler states

within the context of recent postcolonial theory and narratives. A series of requisites of justice identified by Indigenous activists and leaders as an ideal set of conditions that would enable Indigenous peoples and settler states to make progress in reconciliation is reviewed. This points toward possibilities for a progressive social justice in settler states like the United States, where greater gains have been made in terms of women's issues, children's rights, and protection of racial minorities, while "social justice for Native Americans lags far behind the other emancipatory struggles that define progress in American democracy." Read in the context of diplomacies, we are reminded that it was the four settler states considered in this chapter that voted against UN General Assembly adoption of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Finally, in Chapter 12, Makere Stewart-Harawira explores "the intersection of particular global and local interests" that are "redefining Indigenous diplomacies and ontologies in ways that have important political and ethical consequences" manifesting "bifurcations": between economic interests and self-determination, between Indigenous politics and Indigenous philosophies and ontologies. At a time of major systemic politico-economic crisis and its attendant dislocations, "at the end of empire," Indigenous political practice must more urgently than ever proceed from a "re-embedding of Indigenous philosophies and ontologies." This is not an appeal in the ethnographic present to an idealized pristine tradition, but an imperative call to recapture and sustain vital survivances in present practice.

Together, these chapters offer a modest call to further scholarly inquiry on a vast and varied terrain of Indigenous diplomacies whose richness and significance has thus far been better sensed by foreign policy practitioners than by academics and analysts. But they also raise cautions and caveats that, among other important considerations, care should be taken to engage Indigenous diplomacies as meaningful on their own terms, as practices of the present rather than artifacts of the past, and without succumbing to the pretension to re-render what might be regarded as nominally familiar in terms of hegemonic founding. As much as on these diplomacies themselves, interest and inquiry should look always to the circulations of power that variously frustrate, enable, and remake them.

Forgetting, Remembering, and Finding Indigenous Peoples in International Relations

J. Marshall Beier

Introduction

Perhaps more than any other area of academic inquiry, disciplinary International Relations is deeply invested in the project of understanding historical and contemporary diplomatic practices both in themselves and as grist for the conceptual mill. It seems somewhat counterintuitive, then, that Indigenous diplomacies would not figure prominently in International Relations, even if only as a counterpoint to the state-centrism of conventional treatments of diplomacy that seldom exceed the narrow confines of foreign policy analysis. And yet, the field has been almost completely silent on Indigenous peoples, their diplomacies, and the distinctly non-Western cosmologies that underwrite and enable them. An interesting and important development in recent years, however, has been the emergence of a small body of literature inquiring into precisely this silence. While some of these prefatory engagements have been made on matters of empirical interest, most have sought to glean some sort of conceptual insight from particular Indigenous knowledges or ways of knowing. Promising to unsettle hegemonic state-centric renderings of politics and the international, the latter offerings have been welcomed by a range of critical voices that have long decried the field's rigid statism, its tightly bounded subject matter, and its exceedingly parochial conceptual terrain.

But as laudable as these interventions may be, any call to scholars of International Relations, diplomatic history, or associated fields and

disciplines to inform their work with reference to Indigenous traditions bespeaks appropriation and raises the specter of violences of ascription, erasure, or both. Most fundamentally, the problem here is in the framing of the project—that is, in the hope that our existing conceptions of diplomacy or theorizations of the international might unproblematically draw on Indigenous knowledges. The distinctive worldviews and ways of knowing of many Indigenous traditionalisms, for example, do not at all lend well to any of the field’s existing discourses on security, the good life or, more broadly, the global. The result is that the attempt to make Indigenous knowledges present in International Relations paradoxically marks an absence of the voices that have spoken them. An important caveat is thus in order before, as is one aim of this volume, calling on International Relations scholars to engage seriously with Indigenous diplomacies: the essays that follow do not merely offer up novel cases to be rendered intelligible on our disciplines’ own accustomed terms; rather, they unsettle those very terms in a variety of ways, not least by problematizing the apparent ease of their exclusion.

Two main lines of pathology are immediately discernible in attempts to “bring in” Indigenous knowledges: first, the terrain of possibility marked out by the operant cosmology of Western academic discourse works violences upon commitments and ideas “otherwise constituted” when they defy its confines; and, the authority of scholarly voice is reconfirmed, even as it exceeds its competencies, while Indigenous peoples are reduced to repositories of knowledge whose speaking positions can only audibly be those of credentialed surrogates. Even sincere emancipatory designs are implicated in this to the extent that they evince a sense of ethical responsibility *for* rather than *to* the Others of mainstream academic discourse, speaking them into the discipline more than affirming their independent authority. Moreover, it turns out that Indigenous peoples have never really been absent from our theorizing after all—essential knowledges about them are bound up in and consequently reproduced by orthodox and critical approaches alike. The indeterminacy of these knowledges invites much more in the way of critical reflection, revealing that while knowledges *about* Indigenous peoples have always been an integral part of international theory, the same cannot be said of Indigenous peoples’ *own* knowledges. Inquiring into how the field has forgotten, remembered, and still not found Indigenous peoples, this chapter will explore these issues and suggest a rethinking of our accustomed ways of author-izing knowledge that might begin to make more audible in International Relations the voices of Indigenous people(s) already audible in international relations.¹

Forgetting Indigenous Peoples in International Relations

That International Relations has shown little interest in Indigenous peoples may seem odd to readers who know something of the many well-documented histories of Indigenous diplomacies enacted both within and without the colonial encounter. Long predating the arrival of Europeans in the Americas and elsewhere, networks of exchange and interaction existed, wars were fought, and conflicts were resolved in the routine course of relations between Indigenous peoples. For two centuries, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, to take but one example, stood as a paragon of peaceful relations between erstwhile antagonists—a concord still unmatched in profundity and resilience by even the most celebrated of Europe's diplomatic triumphs.² Today, the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues builds on an earlier history of global diplomacy that included delegations to the royal courts of Europe and, later, efforts to gain formal standing at the League of Nations. No less significant, *sui generis* global networks and organizations connecting Indigenous peoples on every continent are prominent on global political terrains that exceed and yet are increasingly felt along the established circuits of international diplomacy. It might be surprising, then, that the multiple and varied inter-national practices of Indigenous peoples should have garnered almost no attention from the field of academic inquiry most readily identified with global political interaction. But for students of International Relations, properly acquainted with the field's own origins account, the omission is far from bewildering.

Founded in the immediate aftermath of World War I, International Relations in its naissane turned vitally on the problematic of interstate war. True to these disciplinary origins, International Relations has been characterized by relative consensus as to the appropriate objects of study: in the main, states. Less settled, however, are the conceptual commitments by dint of which the centrality of the state has been upheld. The broad disciplinary outlook initially turned on a liberal-inspired faith in the progressive development of better institutions of global governance with the aim and expectation of harnessing a presumed human predisposition toward peaceful and cooperative social relations. Thus, liberal principles and prescriptions of the sort embodied most famously in then-U.S. President Woodrow Wilson's "Fourteen Points" were proposed as the basis of a more "rational" international political order than that which had been fashioned by adherence to the *realpolitik* of balance of power thinking and alliance commitments. But when deference to this advice failed to prevent the outbreak of another catastrophic war

in Europe, disillusionment with the field's founding perspective saw its near-complete abandonment as a majority of International Relations scholars moved to embrace political Realism instead. What was to become the most influential current of this new theoretical movement drew on the work of the seventeenth century English political philosopher Thomas Hobbes to underwrite an account of conflict as the inevitable outcome of zero-sum competition between egoistic states under conditions of anarchy. Analogous to Hobbes' account of "rational man" in the state of nature (Hobbes 1968, 183–88), states were characterized as rational gains maximizers motivated by the imperative of survival in a self-help system lacking the moderating influence of a leviathan—hardened into ontology, this bleak outlook would become the basis for a positivist science of international politics (see Morgenthau 1985, 3–17).

From its earliest days, then, International Relations has taken interactions between states as its primary focus, while interstate war has been the central problematic upon which debate has turned. Realism, in one form or another, has cast a large shadow over the theoretical terrain of the field since the mid-twentieth century, though that is not to say that it has been uncontested. In particular, a range of approaches having clear affinities with the field's founding liberal ideals have grown increasingly influential since the early 1990s as the end of the Cold War and growing attentiveness to globalization diminished the cachet of *realpolitik*. Importantly, however, Realist- and liberal-inspired approaches alike have privileged the state as expression of authentic political community. Though many have questioned the continued centrality of the state in contemporary and emergent global politics, liberals have not fundamentally challenged the orthodox rendering of it as the quintessential embodiment and highest existing form of sociopolitical organization. While ontologized claims about intractable interstate conflict leave Realists unable to imagine political community expressed otherwise than through the state, the liberally inclined are bound by a faith in hierarchical-linear historical "progress" that can only admit of transcendence to a "higher" form. For Realists, therefore, Indigenous peoples are not constitutive of polities meaningful to global politics, and for liberals they can be marginal at best. Both formulations consequently situate Indigenous peoples beyond the pale of disciplinary International Relations and are unable to conceive their global political practices as diplomacies.

More recently and at the margins, a range of critical interventions by feminists, poststructuralists, and others have worked to unsettle mainstream commitments by laying bare the often problematic assumptions

and knowledges that sustain them. In so doing, they have done much to reveal violences of erasure issuing from Realist and liberal approaches alike. In a broad disciplinary sense, however, these remain “dissident” (Ashley and Walker 1990) voices and, as such, have been all too easily ignored by the mainstream. In any event, few have addressed themselves directly to the matter of International Relations’ inattention to Indigenous peoples and, were they to, a host of new problems arising from their own underinterrogated commitments would threaten to subvert their best intentions. In various ways, all belong quite decidedly to modernity—either as its heirs or as its critiques of itself—traces of which can work violences upon outlooks and lifeways constituted, to borrow Homi Bhabha’s memorable phrase, “otherwise than modernity” (Bhabha 1994, 6). And though many of these approaches are explicitly oriented toward the emancipation of the socially and/or politically marginalized, even sincere emancipatory hopes and designs evince a disquietingly “missionary” flavor to the extent that they presume to dictate terms of emancipation that might not be generalizable beyond their own immediate contexts (see Beier 2005b). No less than the conspicuous erasures of mainstream theories, then, critical approaches enact violences of their own and are likewise complicit in the inaudibility of Indigenous voices in International Relations.³

In light of all of this, could it be that International Relations simply is not a disciplinary context within which it makes sense to raise questions about Indigenous peoples, even as global political actors? Perhaps it is enough for scholars working in this area to maintain and refine their engagement with the issues and ideas that have preoccupied them until now, leaving Indigenous diplomacies to others. After all, the dominant Realist perspective is entirely unable to accommodate curiosities that would decenter the state and *realpolitik*, while liberals and those working from a range of “dissident” critical perspectives turn out to be implicated in erasures of their own. International Relations, it seems, encloses a body of knowledge that is parochial even as it is hegemonic—and, as Mattei Dogan has observed, it is also among the most insular and self-referential fields of scholarly endeavor in the contemporary academy (Dogan 1997, 432). Still, to forfeit this disciplinary terrain is not to escape these dilemmas. Rather, it is to accept and to become complicit with the unequal power relations of ongoing advanced colonialism that sustain the inaudibility of Indigenous voices in their interpolative play through International Relations as a site of hegemonic authority, discipline, and knowing.

Site of Authority

Insular though it may be, International Relations is nevertheless a site of considerable discursive authority over both the theory and practice of global politics, imparting its knowledges to students, policy makers, and occasionally an attentive public, backed by all the weight customarily conferred upon the credentialed expert. It is also an important social force in its own right, being part of what Laurie Anne Whitt has described as the knowledge system of hegemonic Western discourse. As Whitt, drawing on Stephen A. Marglin (1990), describes it, a knowledge system can be defined in terms of four characteristics: epistemology, a theory of knowledge giving an account of what counts as knowledge and how we know what we know; transmission, dealing with how knowledge is conveyed or acquired, with how it is learned and taught; power, both external (how knowledge communities relate to other knowledge communities) and internal (how members of a given knowledge community relate to one another); and innovation, how what counts as knowledge may be changed or modified. The systemic nature of knowledge is due to the reciprocal influence of these four characteristics upon one another: how we know, how we learn and teach, how we innovate, and how power figures in this are linked (Whitt 1995, 231).

International Relations exhibits all of these characteristics in ways that underscore its congenital rootedness in the dominating knowledge system of which it is simultaneously product and productive. In particular, it is a realm delineated by and reproductive of ontological and epistemological possibilities consonant with modernity and its operant cosmology. This, in turn, implies an abbreviated hierarchy of theoretical approaches, all of which are derived from a shared cosmologically defined knowledge system. Reproduction of Western cosmological commitments not only invalidates marginal politics and/or sociopolitical possibilities but extends even to the repudiation of alternative—that is, non-Western—cartographies of existence that are the very basis upon which peoples' estimations of their own being and of their relationship to the cosmos are predicated. From beyond the reach of critique (or, at least, beyond where critique has been made to reach), these uninterrogated commitments are arbiters of what it is "reasonable" to imagine and of the "common senses" according to which those things deemed imaginable are weighed. And as Steve Smith reminds us, "defining common sense is . . . the ultimate act of power" (Smith 1996, 13).

Constituted through the practices by which certain voices are authorized according to the strictures of the Western academy, International

Relations is engaged in the regulation of both knowledge and authority over knowledge. It is this regulative function that sustains the many cross-cutting erasures perpetrated by both mainstream and “critical” international theory. Even as these various erasures have marked off a limited terrain upon which we can find issues and subjects of relevance to the study of global politics, they have been productive of the discipline as a particular set of practices and possibilities, defined as much by what it is not permissible to speak of as by what is. Consequently, there is much that, it can be said with disciplinary authority, is *not* properly considered in International Relations. There is a great deal at stake here inasmuch as the productive aspects of International Relations’ erasures turn out to be generative not only of the discipline itself but of a discursively unified modern Western subjectivity as well. In this sense, International Relations is also an expression of this unitary Western subject—in effect, an incarnation of “the West” whose cohesiveness is founded as much upon its silences, its marginalizations, and its outright exclusions as on its presumed internal affinities.⁴

As Bhabha (1984) argues, the assessed worth of a text depends to a very large extent upon the degree of its fidelity to hegemonic narratives and ideas, the latter having become the standards according to which relative authority of voice is assessed. Consequently, those speaking from the margins—and, no less, those constituted “otherwise than modernity”—must conform closely to those of the center if they are to be audible. This, of course, is not at all conducive to the articulation of perspectives or the validation of practices that significantly defy convention, to say nothing of cosmologically determined “common senses” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 1989, 6). And yet it is within these limits that the authoritative voices of International Relations articulate and adjudicate upon the meaningfulness of subject positions and legitimate sitings of political agency. Owing to the discursive authority of the credentialed voices that populate it, then, International Relations is appropriately engaged as a site of knowledge production and regulation whence spring authoritative pronouncements upon what does and does not constitute meaningful global political theory and practice; part of the deferred meaning (Derrida 1974, 15; 1981, 26) of what we say counts in global politics or as political community are the subsumed claims about what does not. And this includes both implicit and explicit claims about Indigenous peoples as much as about global politics. In this sense, International Relations has not, in fact, been as silent on Indigenous peoples as it might at first seem.

Site of Discipline

More in the way of its unspoken-said is betrayed by the very circumstance of International Relations' inattention to Indigenous peoples. In accepting the disciplinary parceling of knowledge realms, political commitments whence this "carto-taxonomy" of knowing originated are also in some measure taken up and reproduced. It is important to acknowledge, therefore, that the disciplines we take so much for granted are not things, but sets of practices. Notwithstanding the customary reliance on spatial metaphors to describe them, they do not exist independent of our performance of them. Nor are they at all the long-pedigreed inheritance they are so often assumed to be by virtue of their usual association with Enlightenment tradition. Indeed, academic disciplinarity is much better regarded as the subversion of Enlightenment ideals than as their fulfillment (McKeon 1994, 18). The disciplines we know today did not emerge until the mid-nineteenth century (notably, just as European colonialism reached its pinnacle), hardening into virtual immovability through the first half of the twentieth century (Wallerstein 1995, 840). There is, therefore, nothing "natural" or inevitable about the disciplinary division of knowledge and knowing. It is, rather, the result of a particular confluence of historical circumstances and cultural proclivities, all framed within the dominating knowledge system and underwritten by its operant cosmology. Constituted only in the practices of human subjects occupying particular moments and locations in sociopolitical time and space, disciplines are inveterately bound up with the contexts of their founding and founders and their ongoing reproduction and reproducers. Recognizing this contingency reveals the irreducible aspect of disciplinarity as an expression of power and as a site of political struggle. It also bids us remember that this is a privileged and enclosed discursive space. And that invites—perhaps implores—careful consideration of its complicities in, among other things, hegemonic narratives and ideas.

What in particular, then, can be said of these determinants and complicities? Most readily apparent, of course, disciplinary conventions are important arbiters of the hierarchical ordering of the voices through which they are performed and reproduced, and it is this which enables their regulative control over what counts as an appropriate subject matter and meaningful knowledge about it. The authoritative voices of the discipline are thus simultaneously the voices of authoritative discipline, and "discipline," as Michel Foucault tells us, "is an art of rank" (Foucault 1977, 146). But much more than just the privileged voices of the academy are ranked in this schema. The origins of the disciplines reside amidst

socio-evolutionary ideas dominant in the late-nineteenth century and consequently reflect their racialized notions of the hierarchical division of humanity. Equally reflective of this was the academic division of the social world, consigning different peoples to disciplines deemed apposite to the assessed extent of their socio-evolutionary “progress.” Judged against European referents, those whose lifeways were fashioned “otherwise than modernity” were thought less advanced than Europe and its settler state colonies and therefore not amenable to study in the same ways. Thus, while Economics, Political Science, and Sociology variously engaged the main valences (economics, politics, and civil society, respectively) of the “highly developed” European societies, Oriental Studies was founded for the high (though, it was presumed, static) civilizations beyond the West and Anthropology took up the study of “primitive” peoples (Gulbenkian Commission 1996; Wallerstein 2004, 20).

That the nomothetic social sciences confined their gaze to the West owes to the once widely held view that “less advanced” societies were not meaningfully differentiated according to the spheres of economics, politics, and civil society—all of these, it was believed, were marks only of highly developed societies. The neglect of Indigenous peoples by International Relations scholars is therefore revealing of an underappreciated complicity with the ideational dimension of colonialism which denied the independent ontological significance—even the validity—of non-Western forms of political community and inter-national diplomacy. Such are the socio-evolutionary commitments in which we become implicated when disciplinary boundaries are defended or, likewise, when they are allowed to stand unchallenged. Once more, the very fact of International Relations’ silence on Indigenous peoples turns out to say a great deal. And as this clearly cannot be read as politically neutral, we see that to cede this disciplinary terrain is also to quit a site of contestation articulated through the performance and disruption of discipline(s). There is a sense, then, in which pressing for the inclusion of Indigenous diplomacies in International Relations is also an act of counter-hegemonic resistance.

Site of Knowing

In challenging the authoritative voices and disciplinary strictures enforcing their own relative inaudibility, feminists have persuasively shown that the conspicuous lack of attention to gender by mainstream International Relations scholars does not mean that it has been absent from the field—rather, International Relations has *always* been “about” gender to the

extent that it and the knowledges it has promulgated are themselves profoundly gendered (Peterson 1992; Tickner 1992). Similarly, the apparent exclusion of Indigenous peoples belies their centrality to a range of core concepts and theoretical traditions, including those that dominate the mainstream. If authority and discipline are enacted upon implicit knowledges that are quite telling of the field's colonial/advanced colonial complicities, those ideas and commitments to which it has laid claim and readily calls its own are all the more so. Besides the above-noted valorization of the state, the failure to distinguish settler states as a unique form has the effect of obfuscating ongoing direct colonialism in the Americas and elsewhere. But beyond this, popular imaginaries concerning the Indigenous peoples of the Americas in particular have been indispensable to the production of knowledges foundational to International Relations and its subject matters. Various masculinized and feminized, vilified and romanticized, Indigenous peoples have been constructed and (re)presented in ways both consistent with and constitutive of a host of gendered and racialized dichotomies: culture/nature, rational/irrational, civilized/savage. These are the categories through which the ideational dimensions of European colonialism were articulated and through which its legacies in advanced colonialism and what has been called the "postcolonial condition" are enabled. They also underwrite and are shot through the canon of Western philosophy upon which International Relations has constructed its conceptual edifices.

Building upon ontological terrain inspired by Hobbes and wedding this to a positivist epistemology, Realists have become even more beholden to it than Hobbes himself—that is, for Realists the Hobbesian-inspired account of life in the "state of nature" must have a demonstrable basis in reality. But Hobbes, echoing narratives contained in travelogues authored by those on the leading edge of Europe's conquest of the non-European world, offers only that "the savage people in many places of *America*, except the government of small Families, the concord whereof dependeth on natural lust, have no government at all, and live at this day in that brutish manner, as I said before" (Hobbes 1968, 187; emphasis in original). Though Realists themselves might make no explicit mention of Indigenous peoples, the veracity of this Hobbesian claim is nevertheless imperative to the Realist account of the state as the locus of political order. And, revealing of whose politics are expressed here, this is so notwithstanding that the arrival of Hobbes' leviathan, far from having resolved a war of "all against all" (Hobbes 1968, 185), may actually have fomented war among the Indigenous peoples of the Americas (Ferguson 1990, 237). Marking some peoples as savages who lacked for political order, however, constitutes them

“outside the discourse of sovereignty” (Inayatullah and Blaney 2004, 88) and serves as an apologia for colonialism on the grounds that, as Said puts it, “certain territories or people *require* or beseech domination” (Said 1993, 9; emphasis in original). Thus, as Peter Hulme and Ludmilla Jordanova point out, even indirect recourse to the travelogues of missionaries, conquistadors, and colonial administrators finds the canonical texts of social contractarian thought implicated in the imperialist project: “Some of the principal works of writers like Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Ferguson, and Diderot draw on accounts of these travellers in ways both important for their status as key texts of the Enlightenment, and revealing of their implication with the whole process of European exploration and colonization of the non-European world” (Hulme and Jordanova 1990, 8). The indebtedness of contemporary international theory to the canon consequently recommends a reading of the travelogues as foundational texts of International Relations as well (Beier 2005a, 155–78).

The political commitments bound up in the subsumed claims of the canon are brought into relief by the ambivalent rendering of the “savage” as noble in one context and ignoble in another. This is as true of scholarship as of popular perspectives expressed through the various (re)presentational media of literature, cinema, and so forth. The lifeways of Indigenous peoples have been feminized in their consignment to the realm of culture and their conflation with nature; elsewhere, and as befit the ever-changing exigencies of the colonial encounter, they are constructed as thoroughly masculine. This underscores not only the indeterminacy of these constructions, but also the varied colonial/advanced colonial purposes they served and continue to serve. And while Hobbesian-inspired Realism is the most conspicuously implicated here, it is by no means the only theoretical approach whose genealogy reaches into the enabling knowledges of colonialism. Marxist-inspired theorists, to take but one further example, work in a tradition built in part upon nineteenth century anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan’s now widely discredited ethnographies of the Haudenosaunee. Rooted in the socio-evolutionary commitments of the day, Morgan (1877) fashioned an account of progressive human development from “savagery” to “civilization,” the colonial complicities of which are by now familiar. For Marxists, those societies constituted “otherwise than modernity” cannot be heard on their own terms because, as Pierre Clastres argues, Marxism has already inscribed them as “precapitalist”—an inscription upon which its own logics insist in order to sustain an account of progressive human social development that is inimical in important ways to the traditional lifeways and worldviews of many Indigenous peoples (Clastres 1994, 136–37).

Remembering Indigenous Peoples in International Relations

Whether through authority, discipline, or those things it has pretense to know, International Relations speaks its implicit and explicit claims about Indigenous peoples in ways that simultaneously reproduce advanced colonial knowledges and repudiate Indigenous peoples' accounts of themselves and their diplomacies. One effect of this is to undermine contemporary politics of resistance predicated on traditional knowledges by contributing to a general "common sense" according to which they seem implausible—if the aboriginal condition truly lacked functional mechanisms for the provision of political order and community, for example, it can hardly sustain appeals to traditional forms of governance. Clearly, this is not in the least enabling of what ought otherwise to be a potent oppositional resource. Here we get a glimpse into the more tangible consequences of International Relations' advanced colonial complicities. It certainly does not perform and maintain these violences by itself, but it is nevertheless among the privileged sites of knowledge (re)production that sustain hegemonic narratives and ideas while silencing marginal ones. And, though it may defy even the stated intentions of some, both mainstream approaches and those committed to some emancipatory hope or design are implicated here. Still, inasmuch as International Relations has not been consciously concerned with indigeneity, it is not likely to take seriously the value of Indigenous knowledges and the validity of Indigenous global political subjecthood on the strength of any of this.

An indispensable first step has been to show how International Relations' omissions impoverish it on its own terms by unduly abbreviating the accounts it can give of contemporary global politics. As Franke Wilmer reminds us, this is still contingent upon the degree to which colonial knowledges can be destabilized (Wilmer 1996, 349). In her landmark work on the global political practices constituted through Indigenous activism, Wilmer (1993) urges International Relations scholars to take seriously the long tradition and growing importance of these increasingly effectual diplomacies. Tracing the history of Indigenous peoples' appeals to sovereign power and international legal remediation, she argues that these efforts have become steadily more successful with a shift in the normative basis of the international system from *realpolitik* to self-determination. Thus, the essentially normative positions of Indigenous peoples seeking to assert autonomy against the legacies of conquest and colonialism have at last become audible in international relations, if not to International Relations. The inability of Realism to access Indigenous diplomacies therefore betrays a broader and more general disconnect between the dominant

paradigm and the everyday of contemporary global politics: “if indigenous peoples’ influence is a consequence of rhetorical practices, rather than the use of force or the control of state institutions, then we must admit that . . . international politics is beginning to look less like the anarchic environment portrayed by realism” (Wilmer 1996, 358).

The disciplinary implications of revelations of this sort could scarcely be more profound, but they remain quite decidedly beyond what can be seen through lenses shaped by colonial knowledges. “Once international relations and other fields of social science drop the assumption that indigenous peoples represent some ‘primitive’ or ‘earlier’ stage of western development,” Wilmer argues, “they become open to admitting of the possibility that something truly important and valuable can be *learned* from indigenous peoples” (Wilmer 1996, 349; emphasis in original). Neta Crawford (1994) attempts precisely this, offering a reading of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy under *The Great Law of Peace* as a well-functioning security regime. This would put it squarely on terrain familiar to International Relations scholars, for whom a security regime is a set of norms- and rules-based, though transient (Acharya 1998, 201), arrangements between sovereign bodies intended to minimize conflict by reducing uncertainty and distrust under conditions of anarchy (see Jervis 1982). Having fashioned a two-centuries-long peace between previously warring groups—and one that was undone only through the imposition of colonial wars—the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, in Crawford’s reading, is a superb example of a security regime in the form of an alliance system sustained on democratic foundations and exemplary in the provision of collective security over an extended period of time. And what is more, she argues, it also holds promise as an opportunity to test Realist claims to “cross-cultural and timeless validity” (Crawford 1994, 347).

But without detracting from the importance of Crawford’s contribution—which includes a compelling defense of oral literatures as documentary sources (Crawford 1994, 351)—there is a cautionary tale to be read here as well. Though they describe her intervention as “praiseworthy,” David Bedford and Thom Workman (1997) are nevertheless critical of Crawford’s appeal to International Relations’ own concepts and categories as the standards against which the significance of Haudenosaunee sociopolitical arrangements is assessed. The first danger here is that this treads very close to an evolutionist conjectural historicizing that teleologically imputes superiority to Euro-derived concepts and forms of sociopolitical organization by making appeal to them as evidence of an advanced society. But even more than the obvious privileging of mainstream discourses, forcing knowledges and practices “constituted

otherwise than modernity” into the straightjacket of a modernist framework begets assimilative violence where they exceed the ontological and epistemological possibilities delineated by the dominating knowledge system and its operant cosmology. By way of a careful and nuanced examination of *The Great Law* as “a text about living well” (Bedford and Workman 1997, 108), Bedford and Workman persuasively demonstrate its irreconcilability with International Relations’ mainstream understandings and articulations of international relations. Thus, they caution, “*The Great Law of Peace* must be appreciated on its own ethical and philosophical terms” (Bedford and Workman 1997, 91).

What is perhaps most troubling about all of this in the context of the aims of this volume is that even the best-intentioned efforts are shown to run the considerable risk of repeating the same violences of (re)inscription and erasure in which the mainstream and its canonical foundations have long been implicated. Indeed, Karena Shaw (2002) argues that even the interventions by Wilmer and Bedford and Workman may have the unintended effect of reproducing the marginalization of Indigenous peoples. In Shaw’s view, Wilmer’s narrative of their increasing inclusion inadvertently obscures from view “the extent to which indigenous peoples have . . . always been central to international relations—both as a discipline and as practices of politics among nations” (Shaw 2002, 68). Wilmer’s account, Shaw argues, can be read to objectify Indigenous peoples and diminish their political agency if it is the evolution of the European notion of sovereignty—moving from a basis in *realpolitik* toward the norm of self-determination—that explains their diplomatic ascendancy (Shaw 2002, 69). Something similar befalls Bedford and Workman, according to Shaw: “despite their best intentions and the richness and sensitivity of their representation of *The Great Law of Peace*, their argument potentially reproduces the agency and centrality of international relations and freezes indigenous peoples as at best marginal contributors to its questions and endeavours” (Shaw 2002, 71). Treatment of *The Great Law* as an historical text with something to teach us, she argues, maintains the subject position of International Relations while objectifying Indigenous peoples as bearers of memory rather than acting subjects engaged in present political struggles (Shaw 2002, 73). Remembering Indigenous peoples in International Relations, it seems, can be every bit as risky as forgetting them.

Finding Indigenous Peoples in International Relations

If forgetting is not a politically neutral option and remembering is fraught with new dangers, then how are we to proceed? Reflecting on Wilmer's work, Shaw rhetorically asks whether there might be some value in taking Indigenous peoples and the political possibilities they open up "on their own terms rather than trying to make space for them within an existing understanding of international relations" (Shaw 2002, 70). The imperative of this is brought into sharper relief in a question posed by Crawford: "If international relations theory were based on a reading of [Haudenosaunee] history rather than primarily Western European history, would Kantian or Grotian perspectives of international relations have become dominant instead of the Hobbesian 'war of all against all' paradigm?" (Crawford 1994, 347). This is undoubtedly an important question for *International Relations*, perhaps even for Western traditions of political philosophy more generally, but if our questioning ends there it also reduces Indigenous peoples and their diplomacies to a resource in aid of better theory. Why Kantian or Grotian? Why not Haudenosaunee? Why disciplinary International Relations, for that matter? Crawford's question should be asked, but if we do not also ask these others then we do not break entirely with the idea of the "timeless and cross-cultural validity" of European political-philosophical traditions—key universalist and transhistorical pretensions of what Wilmer (1993, 170) calls the "meta-narratives of international relations" remain very much intact. So too does the authority of the credentialed voices that monologically speak them and, no less, the disciplinary strictures they perform into being.

What is needed, then, is a different way of thinking not only about uncommon knowledges but about whose voices can speak them. To approach Indigenous peoples as repositories of knowledge whose ideas, perspectives, and experiences can *inform*—or subvert—theory is to reproduce both the function and the form of colonial knowledge production and thereby to deny them autonomous voice. It is, in effect, a process of knowledge conversion through which what often seem still to be "primitive" discourses (particularly when interest in Indigenous peoples' knowledges persists in imagining them only in the past or the ethnographic present) are remade into a form audible according to the academy's standards of legitimacy—a practice evocative of the worst aspects and effects of "participant observation" (see Clifford and Marcus 1986). But if we can sustain awareness of the parochial nature and historical contingency of International Relations and, following Sandra Harding, reveal it as a system of "local knowledge" not unlike those of

other cultures (Harding 1998, 178), then we begin to lay bare the power relations that underlie appropriations of Indigenous knowledge. In particular, we see that the pretension to appropriate proceeds from at least three implicit assumptions that cannot be sustained: first, that International Relations sits high enough atop a natural hierarchy of knowledge production sites that it is fitting for more marginal (in a disciplinary sense) sites to feed its advancement; second, that International Relations is separate from ongoing practices of advanced colonialism and therefore has no basis to be bound by an ethical responsibility to its Others (or, alternatively, that the mere fact of an emancipatory project satisfies any ethical responsibility); and, third, that the credentialed voices of International Relations are ultimately the most authoritative on issues of international relations.

If the study of international relations is to benefit from Indigenous knowledges, it will need to demur from these fallacious assumptions and move beyond the bounds of International Relations in meaningful ways. What this will insist upon most fundamentally is that Indigenous peoples can be neither left out nor brought in; their knowledges can no more be used to inform theory in International Relations than knowledges about them can be divorced from it. Rather, and what must be acknowledged, is that what they speak already embody *sui generis* conceptual approaches to, among other things, inter-nation(al) relations. Borne by voices credentialed “otherwise than modernity,” they are not disciplined in the manner of Western academic convention but they are no less regulated and author-ized. And though their authority might owe to culturally and historically specific bases, the same is true of those whose license has been conferred by the academy. In this sense, Indigenous knowledges speak as authoritatively as other local knowledges, including those enclosed by disciplinary International Relations. Bona fide theories of the inter-nation(al) in their own right, they have a legitimate claim to be engaged as such. Here, the independent ontological significance of Indigenous voice is affirmed in an ethical basis of responsibility as being *to* rather than *for* Indigenous peoples. Eschewing lingering commitment to the sufficiency of scholarly voice as surrogate for International Relations’ Others, this moves from appropriation to conversation: that is, sustained reciprocal engagement of the sort that scholars insist upon in respect of their own theoretical commitments. In the end, there is as much to be learned about International Relations as about international relations. It is with this in mind that the authors of the chapters that follow engage Indigenous diplomacies and, crucially, it is also with this in mind that they are most fruitfully read.

Notes

Research for this chapter was supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. The author gratefully acknowledges the thoughtful and supportive suggestions of William Coleman and Peter Nyers.

1. I follow the convention of using “International Relations” and “international relations” to refer to the field of academic inquiry and its subject matters respectively.
2. The nineteenth century power-balancing arrangements under Europe’s post-Napoleonic Concert System institutionalized warfare as the central mechanism for preservation of the status quo before collapsing into a system-wide conflagration in 1914. It is nevertheless held out to students of International Relations as the paradigmatic example of a well-functioning international system marked by the stable provision of political order. Similarly, and notwithstanding its violent play through proxy wars in the developing world and the all-pervading threat of nuclear annihilation, the Cold War has been famously described as “the long peace.” See Gaddis (1987).
3. On the occlusion of “local” knowledges once brought into articulation with hegemonic knowledges, see Shiva (1993).
4. On the analogous ways in which identity is constituted through the state, see Campbell (1992).

This page intentionally left blank

Communication/ Excommunication

Transversal Indigenous Diplomacies in Global Politics

Nevzat Soguk

Introduction

The transversal politics in Indigenous movements in the Americas and beyond has been proliferating in multiple political forms. Ranging from international governmental organizations to extrastatist Indigenous networks, Indigenous struggles have energized historical transversality as a viable political universe. This universe works syncretically within the ambit of the traditional statist diplomatic regime but is neither subsumed within nor eclipsed by it. Following Michel Foucault on heterotopias, this chapter argues the Indigenous universe exists and works side by side, under and above, in and through the prevailing statist regime yet it preserves a certain transformative, even transgressive, autonomy. In the process, this universe introduces indigeneity as an agent of the political, productive of novel communicative horizons. The chapter regards Indigenous experiences in modernity as experiences of not simply massive political and economic devastation and cultural displacement, but also centuries-long refusal to be “absorbed” by modernity’s nationalizing and territorializing relations and institutions anchored in the modern state. Among these are traditional ontologies as political regimes that communicate the statist form while excommunicating indigeneity, among others, from the field of political praxis. With this

dynamic in mind, *a la* Armand Mattelart, the chapter begins to examine Indigenous practices that are mobilized (a) to circumvent their excommunication from the political and (b) to communicate indigeneity into global politics as a different ontology of political being and becoming. The chapter argues that Indigenous activism can be read as critical constructive “engagements” with modernity’s promises and results, in which it is possible to learn limits of politics, present and future, and offer new insights into how local and global politics, including state-centricity, can be critically and constructively reenvisioned in policy and conduct.

In the Beginning . . .

The earliest encounters between Indigenous peoples of the Americas and Europeans took place in political, cultural, and economic spaces laden with Indigenous civilizational practices. Columbus and the succeeding “explorers” wandered into Indigenous spaces already shaped as places in political and cultural terms. Yet, gazing at the unfamiliar from their own historical locations and subjectivities, they registered the new lands and their inhabitants as strange, thereby positioning them as objects of their knowing and ultimately of their conquest. What followed the earliest encounters was the rise of a matrix of positionality in which “Europe” emerged as the center of the world and the “new” lands as peripheral places exterior to, but still knowable by, Europe. This alignment of positionalities and subjectivities would ultimately empower an ideological strategy that would not only effect a dominant European agency with respect to the Indigenous spaces, but also fuel a wholesale assault on, and even negate altogether, Indigenous agency. From the beginning, European programs and projects were set to conflict with Indigenous civilizational practices.

The hierarchy that emerged in the encounters was not coincidental, but a manifestation of Europe’s rising desire for territorial expansion. When Columbus set sail in 1492, Europe had already burst its bounds in search of new territories and wealth. North and West African Coasts had already been thoroughly “explored” and mapped for future enterprises (Jennings 1976, 3). The Canary Islands were in the process of being “incorporated” into Europe’s domain against the background of an edict by Pope Nicholas V blessing and empowering Christian kings to enslave and seize the lands of “all Saracens and pagans whatsoever . . . and where-soever” (Jennings 1976, 4). Issued originally to spur European control of the Mediterranean Sea and the trade routes through the Middle East, the

Papal Edict represented the confluence of proto-modern political and economic interests, though provisionally couched in the still-dominant religious discourse in the early Renaissance. As Francis Jennings put it, the European Renaissance also ushered in a European Reconnaissance driven by political-economic forces. Not surprisingly, the royal contract Columbus signed with Queen Isabella contained articles almost exclusively regulating economic interests in congruence with the financial needs of a political regime in ascendancy (Jennings 1976, 34). In short, Europe's Reconnaissance was envisioned primarily as an extractive and exploitative project.

Spurred by such a drive, in the following centuries several European countries moved to establish economies with worldwide reach (Sokolow 2003, 88). Appropriately, the Americas as the "New World" became one of the first places "wheresoever" such an exploration of a new territory could take place. America's Indigenous inhabitants were similarly objectified on account of their differences with explorers' knowledges on religion, civilization, and governance. Characterized primarily through a political economy of deficits as either primitive or savage peoples (living in a "state of nature," incapable of civilization, "having no government," and unaware of the "true religion of Christianity") they were seen as captives to nature, unable to harness nature's resources, primarily the land, to their advancement.

Thus "naturalized," the Indigenous peoples were discursively divested of their agency in relation to their lands. Worse yet, they were also displaced from their sovereignty over their own lives. The agency and sovereignty shifted to the "civilised discoverers as against the savage barbarians" (Sokolow 2003, 10). In this way, the Indigenous peoples of the Americas emerged as the "whatsoever" pagan people to be captured within Europe's "civilizational" ambit, precisely as they were being externalized to Europe in "political" terms.

Through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this way of encountering, capturing, and externalizing had already produced at least three rhetorical strategies—the available repertoire—for representing the Indigenous peoples of the Americas. These strategies operationalized a limiting economy of representation, portraying Indigenous peoples "either as existing in a state considered to be primitive—that is, enviably innocent of civilisation, or . . . represent[ing them] in a state taken to be inherently savage—that is, one belonging to the implacable enmity, or show[ing them] to be doomed—in which case they represent the products of their own technological obsolescence in the face of

European superiority, whether spiritual or merely material in nature” (Sokolow 2003, 10).

As the Renaissance with its emphasis on humanism gave way to the Enlightenment, its legacy in the Americas proved to be contrary to its stated ideals, in effect, enabling the dehumanization of the continent’s Indigenous peoples in profoundly consequential ways. “Stripped of their contextual social and cultural ties” (Sokolow 2003, 110), the Indigenous people were classified simply as Renaissance Europe’s objects of regimentation.

In the Greek antiquity, the rule-exception division worked simultaneously as a strategy of community making and a self-conscious positioning (enactment) of the political community within and without. It expressed the dominant modalities of belonging in the community and specified the layers of agency therein. It also articulated differences into a hierarchy of ruling norms and their aberrations, for example, between citizens and slaves or the civilized and the barbarians. Centuries later, when Europe “rediscovered,” through Arab interlocutors, “its” Greco-Roman roots, it harnessed the logic of this binary of hierarchization by inflecting it with the political and economic imperatives of the given times. From the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries, the Renaissance would give name and form to this inflection, on the one hand, inventing and celebrating “rationalism and humanism” for all humanity, and, on the other hand, claiming both exclusively for Europe, as Europe’s inheritance. As a result, Europe alone emerged as the political universe in which these principles presumably held—a presumption that was deployed to position Europe as the “privileged” force having the right to project its rationalism and humanism over those who either by nature or by nurture seemed to lack them (Hall 1996, 209).

European explorers introduced this ruling logic into the plane of encounters in the Americas. They encountered and comprehended Indigenous peoples from entirely within the European political, military, cultural, and aesthetic conventions. They reduced the Americas to a discursive product of their imagination by displacing its indigeneity in relentlessly repressing its Indigenous political and cultural qualifications. In the process, Indigenous conditions were represented as those of “bare life”—lacking any meaningful historical political agency.

“America,” appropriately argued one observer of Europe’s arrival in the new world, “had to be invented because of its explorers’ reluctance to discover it” (Jennings 1976, 58). “America” was born of Europe’s expansionist imaginary and in turn fueled it. As it propelled Europe’s territorial expansion, it also energized the construction of a certain kind of Europe. It elaborated a hegemonic Europe in relation to the “other worlds” which

Europe wanted to control and transform into the “new worlds” for its expansion and habitation. Ultimately, as it was imagined and articulated as exception to Europe as the proper trajectory of history, “America” helped to articulate Europe as a rule and made sense of it.

This productive dynamic was crucial in the radical eclipse of Indigenous agency in the relations with Europeans. Through this dynamic, Indigenous peoples were subjected to the ontopolitical formulations of Europeans. Despite their resistance and protests, they were forced into relations of ban—seized, dehumanized, abandoned, and exposed. Their vulnerability was further exacerbated on the thresholds of life where the spaces of inclusion/exclusion regarding Indigenous people shifted into a “zone of indistinction” in which Indigenous peoples’ eligibility in the dominant juridical order’s affirmative protection was negated. In Michael Shapiro’s words, they came to inhabit the uncertain terrain “between violence and the law” (Shapiro 1997, 175).

The shifts in Europe from Renaissance to Enlightenment to Modernity did not initiate foundational changes in the deep logic of the relations of ban. The relations of ban as a repressive mechanism of capture remained central to European encounters with Indigenous peoples. As Stuart Hall contended, rather, the oppositional identities that were supporting the rule/exception divisions continued to create a fertile ground, “a framework of images, in which Enlightenment social philosophy matured [and] Enlightenment social science reproduced within its own conceptual framework many of the preconditions and stereotypes of the earlier discourses of the West and the Rest” (Hall 1996, 219–21).

What enabled this reproductive continuity was not simply the dichotomy of rule/exception as the originary structure of political identities, but its articulation into a discursive field of power and regimentation through relations of ban. Once operational, the field (and the logic that informs its operations) acquired relative stability. The actual operations in the field moved and metamorphosed to accommodate the shifts in historical circumstances, and ultimately, always worked to maintain the field of ban with its dominant modes of agency and sovereignty.

Overall, the paramount task in such a field is the orchestration of subjectivities into a specific ontopolitical “state of being” through the rule/exception division. The idea of exception enables the relations of ban as an expression of a specific form of power—of a sovereign power—that acquires its authority in successfully objectifying, externalizing, and finally normalizing the relations it actively constructs and the boundaries it busily establishes. Sovereign power is therefore manifest precisely in the enactment of the rule/exception division into the relations of ban.

Sovereignty is not *a priori* to the rule/exception division, but it is the enactment and continued reproduction of the very division itself into relations of ban.

Given this, beyond its productive dynamics, this form of sovereignty has far-reaching normative consequences no matter the context. Together, the idea of exception and the relations of ban bespeak an imperious sovereign agency. While in reality sovereignty is enacted always historically through a profitable administration of territories and bodies, politically, it is presumed to be extrapolitical—transcendental of all politics. It figures as a totalizing form of sovereignty. It recognizes no legitimate alternatives; it is imperial. Disastrously, it is this form of sovereignty that has dominated Indigenous histories in the Americas, determining the historical rules of exchange between Europe's colonizing powers and America's Indigenous peoples.

From Earth's Land to State's Territory

Cursed be
All your fences
Which encircle you
from within. . . .
Ours is another land. . . .
The human Earth made free,
sisters and brothers.

—Pedro Casaldaliga

In *Caribbean Discourse*, Glissant (1996, 1997) writes about transversality as history's implosion in all directions, joining places, and throwing people into relations of triumphs and traumas, each traceable to one another through the submarine roots. Just as the Americas' traumas were traceable to Europe's triumphs, Europe's triumphs, too, were traceable in all directions. In addition to the ontological links of the Americas' traumas and Africa's losses, the Americas' traumas were also traceable back to Europe itself, not only in terms of the original inspirations of Europe's wanderings in the world, but also in terms of the effects of those wanderings on Europe itself in the course of the colonial encounters. So, for Glissant, much like for Said and Mignolo, as Europe regimented and recast Indigenous peoples and their civilizations in the Americas and elsewhere, it was also actively shaping and

communicating its own “self” in multiple material and symbolic projects and programs unfolding in the transversal space. The transversal space would reach back from the Americas’ devastated ethnoscaples to Europe’s shifting shores and beyond.

Partly consciously, in part by accident, and also by coincidence, European practices of regimentation over Indigenous peoples, their lands, cultures, languages, and religions folded back on Europe and inspired and sharpened the practices of governmentality over European peoples and spaces. For example, the practices of territorial control in the Americas supported territoriality as a politico-cartographic exercise to recast Europe into multiple mutually exclusive places with physical borders, political hierarchies, and cultural limits.

The infamous Papal Bulls (*Inter Caetera divinai*), which, with an eye on the rest of the world, justified the conquest of the Indigenous peoples in the Americas through the rhetoric of serving the Catholic faith, exhibited a cartographic genius that would have a much greater impact on the Indigenous as well as non-Indigenous peoples than would the Catholic faith. Not too long after its pronouncement, the new cartographic insight contained in the Bulls would be further cultivated in imaginative minds and put to work in the activation of a specific practice of territoriality—territorial control—unfolding increasingly through exclusionary and proprietary modes. It would inspire a world recognized in territorial divisions supporting new political hierarchies and forms of governance. It was Pope Alexander VI who, taking his cue from the queen and king of Spain, demonstrated his knowledge of the profane when he revealed his solution to the Spanish-Portuguese struggle over the same territories in the Americas: “By the authority of the Almighty God conferred upon us . . . do give, grant, assign to you and your heirs and successor kings of Castille and Leon, forever . . . All islands and mainlands found and to be found, discovered, and to be discovered towards the west and south, by drawing and establishing a line from the Arctic pole . . . to the Antarctic pole . . . to be distant one hundred leagues towards the west and south from any of the islands . . . Commonly known as the Azores and Cape Verde.” The pope’s genius in the Bulls would invite the rage of the king of France who, partly in astonishment as to the method of allocating control over lands, and partly because of his exclusions from the newly constructed map of the world protested to no avail: “Where is it written that the world is already divided up?” (CRTFCA 1995, 42). But the practice of so dividing the world stuck, acquired further authority, and shaped the ruling minds and cartographic ambitions in Europe and elsewhere. Territorial practices in and with respect to the Americas thus helped clarify

the trajectory of the territory-controlling practices in Europe, which in turn influenced the strategies of controlling territory in the Americas and the rest of the world. More significantly, the political economies enacted in the material exploitation of the colonies enabled European powers to consolidate their control within the territories of states, thus slowly crystallizing the idea of territorial inside/outside (Shapiro 1997, 28).

The conquest in the Americas would help to give clarity to the content and contour of the state in Europe. As Torbjern Knutsen (1992, 52) puts it, the moral and legal aspects of the wars against the Indigenous peoples in the Americas sparked a continuing debate in Spain and had the effect of enlarging and clarifying the state's rights, privileges, and duties in general. Francisco de Vitoria, for example, undertook a study in the 1530s titled "On the law of war made by the Spaniards on the barbarians" and ultimately articulated positions on governance and the state that were more instrumental in Spain than in Spain's colonies. Vitoria attributed to the state a centrality over the territorial political community as the rightful, if desirably lawful, arbiter, and by extension, the author, of the community. His discussions on the doctrine of the rights of discovery were simultaneously about statism and territoriality, for the rights associated with discovery were both geographical and governmental. As Edward Said reminds us, discovery leading to colonialism meant settling and controlling land. Settling and controlling land in turn fueled the desire to enact effective territorial governance and express its boundaries. As Vitoria stated the necessities, competencies, and boundaries of the "lawful state" in relation to the Americas, he was certainly, if ahead of his time, broadening and deepening the reach of the state as an instrument of territorial governance over peoples.

In an effort to justify discovery and conquest of the Indigenous peoples and their lands, Vitoria argued that Indigenous peoples were unfit to govern themselves since they "had no proper laws nor magistrates, and are not even capable of governing their family affairs; they are without any literature or arts, not only liberal arts, but the mechanical arts also; they have no careful agriculture and no artisans; and they lack many other conveniences, yea necessities, of human life" (Vitoria, quoted in Dickason 1984, 131). Fundamentally, Vitoria was recasting the entire scope of the life of people, from laws to arts to agriculture, as being within the competencies of the colonial state and therefore also as a site of the state's interventions. Forecasted categorically in Vitoria's discourse is the notion of the centralizing and territorializing state as an overarching force well before the idea took its organizational form in Europe in the following two centuries. Of course, Vitoria's intellectual successors, from Hugo Grotius to Emeric Vattel, would sharpen the same logic that

creatively related Europe's overseas engagements to Europe's engagements with itself, articulating Europe as the state of rule and the rest of the world as Europe's exception.

May Joseph (1999) stresses the coproduction of identities and subjectivities in the Caribbean during the colonial era. She argues that early in the conquest the Europeans "read cannibalism into the indigenous sites in order to justify their political, cultural and territorial cannibalism." Following Joseph's insight, it is possible to contend that the European cannibalism in sites of conquest enabled its unique territorial and national "cannibalisms" in Europe, particularly in terms of governmentality—relations, institutions, and subjectivities by which, as Foucault put it, men came to govern other men in regimes of biopolitics. It is important also to remember that the massive economic momentum the Americas' incorporation gave to European economies strengthened the material capacities for effective biopolitics. Kirkpatrick Sale was not exaggerating in characterizing the significance of this transversal gathering that would paradoxically result in its capture or limiting in territoriality: "With this act, two vastly different cultures, which had evolved on continents that had been drifting apart steadily for millions of years, were suddenly joined. Everything of importance in the succeeding five hundred years stems from that momentous event: the rise of Europe, the triumph of capitalism, the creation of the nation-state." Ironically, Europe's ascent inspiring and authorizing its interventions within Europe expresses the dynamics of transversality as an implosion of unlikely convergences in multiple directions. In transversality, the Americas' indigeneity is related to Europe's Renaissance, Enlightenment, and ultimately its European modernity; it relates to Europe and it "relays" Europe to itself (Glissant 1997, 73). It shows how Europe discovered (and constructed) itself in part in the Americas' Indigenous forms. It also shows how in its devastation and dispossession the indigeneity in the Americas has served as a site of early European modernity where modernity's emancipatory claims and promises simultaneously revealed their "darker side" in the "contrapuntal" mirror of colonialism.¹

Taming Transversality

More than in anything else, in Indigenous lifeworlds European modernity has been manifest in Europe's drive to control the transversality of space, to arrest it and transform it from an infinite space to a place with exclusionary boundaries and limits. Conceived in the interstices of

concurrent struggles over the control of territory both in Europe and the colonies, this drive was ultimately aimed at controlling politics and movement by delimiting politics' horizons to the then emergent territorial state imaginary of the inside and outside divide (Walker 1993, 15). In the incipient territorial state-system, Europe attempted to fix the location of politically qualified life within the territorial orders of states by wedding the state to the nation and declaring that the nation can only "be" within the territorial borders of the state.

As Glissant (1997, 14) puts it, in historical terms, this was a drive for a mono-root, singular and unique, where, much like Benedict Anderson demonstrated, none specifically existed in reality. What motivated the drive for a mono-root was the productive politics of the "root" anchored in the political-economy of colonial conquests. Ultimately, claiming uniqueness (in cultural, religious, linguistic, and aesthetic senses) authorized European states, from the absolutist to the national ones, to appropriate the material resources of others. In turn, this political-economy further facilitated the processes of "root-craft" as statecraft in Europe, thus realizing and affirming claims on unique roots. In short, Europe's *a priori* civilizational cultural claims enabled European colonialisms while European colonialisms made possible the subsequent civilizational pursuits that listed Europe as the Center in the world.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987, 293) argue that root politics always run the risk of growing repressive. European civilizational pursuits in search of singular roots eventually took on an "intolerant" sense, articulated only through "the delineation of borders, the inscription of dangers, and the mobilization of defenses" (Walker 1993, 15). Together, they have translated into a repudiation of relationality in favor of hierarchies; they have empowered boundaries instead of cultivating lives in transitions.

It is crucial to note that boundaries were empowered where previously transitions and circular nomadism had characterized life in Indigenous communities. This was true especially in North America where cycles and patterns, "ancient, ongoing, and organic," had guided political and economic activities. The nomadism that accompanied the cycles and patterns was not "free wandering" but an enactment of community in movement. In other words, Indigenous communities established and renewed their roots in constant movements. Accordingly, the cycles and patterns were not "blockages or walls" that incarcerated people but "textures and motions of life that guided" and enabled people in structuring their lives while moving in concert with the shifting textures and rhythms of life (Dunsmore 1997, 30–31). "Indians," Jennings pointed out, "were not wandering, they were commuting."

Yet, for Europeans, Indigenous nomadism represented an expression of aimless roaming—a mode of life utterly incapable of cultivating life and civilization. Civilization required staying in place and establishing roots. It required rootedness in a given territory. Indians who were always moving were not considered to be occupying the land usefully and thus were deemed to have developed no property rights. Such was the simple problematization of Indigenous life that enabled the negation of Indigenous use claims over the lands, which were otherwise hosting and supporting their life cycles and patterns. Many “enlightened” scholars and philosophers, from Diderot to Rousseau, from Locke to Mill, and from Vitoria to Vattel, participated in the disarticulation of Indigenous agency.² As Edward Said stated, the sort of colonialism Europe introduced into the Americas generated “impressive ideological formations” supporting and “even impelling processes of accumulation and acquisition” through a possessive territorializing imaginary (Said 1993, 9). This territorial imaginary recast the Earth into objectified territory to be possessed, occupied, divided up, and made to serve its cultivators. What Indigenous cycles and patterns had interconnected into complex and organic networks of transitions through the transversality of space, European knowledge cut up into territorial patchwork and imposed it upon the space of transversality.

Interestingly, although speaking from different temporal and cultural locations, two unlikely figures—Black Elk and Edward Soja—point to the same ontopolitical conditions under which the Earth was discursively transformed into a territory. For Black Elk, the shift signified a radical new trajectory, for the life sustaining “sacred hoop of life” had been broken. Indigenous peoples seemed to have little choice but to accommodate to the new logic, certainly not of their making, nor to their liking. For Soja, the introduction of the logic of new territoriality meant a new form of thinking on locating human life in the world. “Our being in the world,” he wrote, “occurs through a distancing (detachment, objectification) that allows us to assume a point of view on the world” (Soja quoted in Rundstrom 1995, 3). This sort of objectification of the world in ways that representationally detach and spatially distance Indigenous people from the elements of the world could not easily be accommodated, nor accepted by the native peoples, once the implications became clear. The objectification of the Earth displaces it from its inherent agency, which is expressed not simply in “natural elements” but also through the Indigenous bodies, which are constitutive of nature as well. Therefore, detachment and distancing of Indigenous being in the world have the effect of disarticulating Indigenous human, as detachment and distancing

empower a different mode of agency and impose unfamiliar, often intolerant, boundaries on Indigenous bodies and their Earth. The shift from transversality to territoriality was traumatic for Indigenous peoples.

The historical consequence of this shift to privileging geopolitical territoriality anchoring and bounding nation-roots has since been the substantial eclipse of transversal identity practices, and “fixing and taming such practices within the spatial coordinates of territorial jurisdictions” (Rundstrom 1995, 14). The geopolitical map of the territorial states and nations has become predominant, in spite of the continued resistance, thus still shaping political and ethical problematics the world over (Shapiro 1997, 175). In large measure, it continues to be the imposed location of politics, attempting always to confine individual and collective horizons within its limits; but more than its territorial limits, within its ontopolitical limits.

It is in the imposition of Cartesian epistemology that Europe would attempt to transform the landscapes of transversality, so deeply embedded in Indigenous life practices, into a place of its dreams, not in negotiation with Indigenous epistemologies, but in spite of them and for the purpose of subduing or vanquishing them in Europe’s totality. So when Winnebago, a chief of a Mississippi Valley group, retorted that “It would be difficult to divide it [the land] up, for it belongs as much to one as the other,” he was not expressing a simple difficulty. He was performing an alternative epistemology in which the land was conceptualized and practiced primarily as a place of transitions, not of exclusionary proprietary territories and borders. Between what was imposed and what was preserved, a heterotopic form, with its inspiration rooted still in patterns and cycles, was enlisting transversality to resist.

Drawing permanent exclusionary borders through the space was strange for North America’s Indigenous peoples from the time of the initial encounters. While the land was intimately known to and used by Indigenous people in what Robert Rundstrom (1995, 46) calls “reciprocal collaborations,” it was not generally regimented in ways permanently to deny access to others for use (Rundstrom 1995, 46). In fact, it is this nonexclusionary understanding of the use and control of land that characterized the early encounters of settlers with the Indigenous peoples. People’s “mutual exoduses” into and through places determined the modalities of territoriality in Indigenous landscapes into a sort of aterritoriality. In the polyvalent transversal unity that had brought together so many Indigenous groups in North America, peoples’ relations and identities were thus simultaneously rooted and open: rooted in an awareness of the ritualized construction of their identities and relations in

collaboration with the land and open in the recognition of the agency of the land. The land possessed agency; it possessed a voice. That which has agency and a voice also has spirit; it cannot be divided up, fenced in, or otherwise possessed. One collaborates with it, one does not conquer. One moves with it as it unfolds through rivers, mountains, and forests. One is "it" in all the cosmological senses.

Consider the words of the Nez Perce leader Hin-mah-too'yah-kekht, "Thunder Traveling to Loftier Mountain Heights," which bespeak the deep epistemological differences that shaped the Indigenous conception of territory: "The Earth and myself are of one mind. The measure of the land and the measure of our bodies are the same . . . Do not misunderstand me, but understand me fully with respect to my affection for the land" (Dunsmore 1997, 39).

At the time of these words, at issue were the claims to the Nez Perce land right before the Nez Perce war broke in 1877. The United States government was trying to force the Nez Perce away from their ancestral lands into a reservation at Fort Lapwai. For the Nez Perce, the relationship still centers around an effort to communicate across epistemological divides to convince the self-declared "sovereign," the United States, of the legitimacy of the Nez Perce epistemology and the modalities of territoriality and transversality that flow from it. Hence the plea against being excommunicated: "Do not misunderstand me, but understand me fully with respect to my affection for the land."

The conception of the land, and thus of territoriality, expressed in Chief Hin-mah-too'yah-kekht's words point to much more than what the Nez Perce's antagonists might have characterized as "stone-age" sentimentality and romanticism wrought in "primitive logic." They reflected a real "contemporaneous" alternative epistemology *vis-à-vis* the Cartesian vision of the land undergirding Euro-American modernity. The Indigenous claim that the Earth has a mind and its mind expresses itself in the contours and content of the land was strange and inaccessible to U.S. government negotiators. That the Earth's mind could be one with humans' mind was stranger still, and more importantly, construed as a sign of Indians' lack of historical agency by the "civilized" standards to speak and be heard and fully understood—this form of transversality was excommunicated from political consciousness and history. As transversality was excommunicated, so was indigeneity.

Interestingly, General Howard, who represented the U.S. government in the "negotiations," demonstrated this orientation as he referred to the chief spokesperson for the Nez Perce, Toohoolhoolzote, as nothing more than a "cross-grained growler." Ironically, Toohoolhoolzote in the Nez

Perce native language meant “rhythmic vibrant sound.” Not only did the general not recognize the rhythm in Toohoolhoolzote’s sound as a voice, but he also had him imprisoned for a week during the “negotiations.” Toohoolhoolzote refused to give up the land by “agreement” (being communicated into the territorial logic through the agreement meant being excommunicated into the dustbin of history without any claim to historical legitimacy). He refused to participate in the casting of the Nez Perce as “bare life” to be confined to a reservation, saying: “You white people get together, *measure* the earth, and then divide it . . . The earth is part of my body, and I never gave up the earth” (Dunsmore 1997, 44–45). Toohoolhoolzote’s protests were to no avail; the Nez Perce were forcibly removed to the reservation at Fort Walpai—a paragon of the “relation of ban” elaborated by Agamben (1995) in the sense of a form of modernity that works by banning entire horizons of Indigenous universes.

Reservation Logic, Territoriality, and the Location of Indigenous Peoples

The Nez Perce were neither the first nor the last of Indigenous groups thus ontopolitically incarcerated in what later evolved into the modern United States of America. Reservations as a mode of othering and disappearing the “Indians” became the official policy of the U.S. government in the late nineteenth century. Nor was the Nez Perce imprisonment unique to the United States. In fact, progressively, as the territorial state system emerged as the prevailing model of governance throughout the world, reservation as a regime of confinement (and as a location of regimentation) has become the mode of problematizing Indigenous groups, particularly in Latin America, from Columbia and Ecuador to Brazil and Peru. It has become the instrument of “ban” simultaneously excluding Indigenous peoples from the community of “rule” and capturing them within its regime of relationality in both territorial and ontopolitical senses.

Where formal reservations were not established, the logic of reservation has been deployed in practices of governmentality *vis-à-vis* Indigenous peoples to deny or truncate Indigenous agency. From Mexico and Guatemala to the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Iran, Algeria, and others, indigeneity has been problematized through governmentalities that incessantly work to inscribe on Indigenous political, cultural, religious, and aesthetic spaces the relations of reservation as a relation of ban.

Reservation logic as a logic of ban, at the same time that it manifests in both formal and informal governmentalities casting indigeneities as bare life, has cultivated and empowered the territorial nation-state as a project of taming and controlling transversality. Where Indigenous contra-modern epistemologies, articulated in transitions, translations, and flows, were disciplined and marginalized into reservations as (primitive) exceptions, territorial nation-states were crafted into reality as the presumed “rule,” the primary territorial locations (containers) of politically qualified lives, proper agencies, audible voices, and modern identities. In territorial statism, territoriality attempted to exceed and even terminate transversality.

Surely, exclusionary boundaries were transposed over the boundlessness of transversality to create spaces of territoriality, anchoring the state system. But transversality, while it has served as the ground of territoriality, has also given rise to “heterotopic-relationality” as a condition and location of resistance to the “reservation” logic of territoriality. In his discussion of heterotopias, Foucault (1986) argues that all the predominant spaces produce their counter spaces—heterotopias—that not only reflect the predominant spatial processes and projects, but also contest and invert them, thus exceeding their control (boundaries). In this paradoxical relationality, heterotopias work to unbind the prevailing boundaries of predominant spaces. Dominant spaces are unbundled within and across movements where the transversal imperative makes possible the heterotopic spaces. And where heterotopic-transversality inevitably emerges as both the condition and location of life, what is cast as an exception could still challenge what is declared as the rule. Epistemologies that are marginalized or suppressed in planes of domination can still preserve the material and symbolic resources with which contra-sounds and voices that challenge the dominant voices are produced.

As they resonate in this chapter, Toohoolhoolzote’s and Hin-mah-too’yah-kekht’s “sounds” and voices, for example, continue to echo the heterotopic-transversality of space in which transitions and translations, not boundaries and confinements, shape spaces into places for living. Their voices continue to point to the possibilities of “difference,” with respect to the locations of life. Their besieged yet fugitive knowledges show, in the emergent discourses and practices of critical transversal (transnational/transteritorial) environmentalism, migrations, political economy, and democratic governance, how it might be possible to be one with Earth’s mind. To theorize this tension, one is compelled to dwell on heterotopic-transversality, reflecting the conditions of Indigenous histories in the Americas and beyond in the Columbian era. In

heterotopic-transversality, transversality conditions Indigenous histories in spatial terms in the forceful linking of Indigenous horizons with colonial and imperial projects while the heterotopic dynamism born in these linkages transforms Indigenous horizons into resistant productive spaces, or locations, of Indigenous histories. In their practical fusion, transversality and heterotopic dynamics make possible not only the subalterning of Indigenous peoples, namely the relations of ban, but also their resistant capacities.

In his work on "Other Spaces," Foucault (1986, 23) maintains that historically space has always taken the form of relations among multiple sites as spaces. Any one space in time not only manifests points of linkages and intersections with other spaces, but also contains in it a plurality of spaces. On the one hand, it hosts practices constitutive of the predominant trajectories of the societies and, on the other, practices contesting and exposing dominant ideologies and their methodologies. For Foucault (1986, 23), the latter, the contestatory practices, are made possible in what he calls "heterotopic spaces," in other words, in counter-sites within which the prevailing sites, their relations and subjectivities, are taken hold of and "simultaneously both represented and contested and inverted."

In relation to heterotopic spaces, transversality represents a certain ontology in spatial practices that exerts itself relentlessly in space. In the Glissantian sense, transversality is a mode of history-as-movement that constantly ushers multiple historical trajectories into each other's political, economic, and cultural proximities in convergences and dispersals. It creates new networks of identity in unexpected ways. It establishes novel relations across peoples and places in movements and flows, effecting "subterranean" convergence of histories.³ In the fluid encounters of peoples and places political and cultural consequences ultimately remain unforeseeable in the diffraction of elements. Construed thus, a submarine unity contains too many roots and trajectories to be fully controlled in history.

What Glissant then wants to stress is the relentlessly open, if unpredictable, condition of transversality that ultimately offers no guarantees for even the most hegemonic identity practices. In the openness of the transversal space, even the relation of ban is not guaranteed permanent success. Clearly, Glissant echoes de Certeau (1988) in the argument that while the predominant relations and trajectories are instantiated in spaces, paradoxically, they also draw attention to the conflictual struggles therein. After all, de Certeau (1988, 117) maintains, "spaces occur as

the effect[s] produced by the operations that orient [them,] temporalise [them,] and make [them] a function in a polyvalent unity of conflictual programs.” Thus, spaces as historical political products always remain open to new alignments of relations, identities, and institutions in transversality. The dynamism fueled by the transversal imperatives makes possible, for example, the colonization of continents and their peoples, but also activates and concentrates the resources for resistance and transgression. Geographic expansions, for instance, heighten the value of the land, economic exploitations increase the calls for solidarity, and cultural erasures sharpen the subordinated cultures’ role as a locus of critical enunciations. The relations of ban bear the capacities of insurrection, for the incessant mobility of the elements disallows the stability of relations in the long run.

It is in the productive convergences that heterotopic-transversality reveals the terrestrial and subterranean linkages and intersections conceived, established, and imposed on Indigenous peoples, but also resisted, contested, and even inverted by those peoples. It is the same convergences and dispersals that have fueled Indigenous responses not only to preserve their material and symbolic anchors and grounds in life, but also to assert their Indigenous selves in the relations of control.

Conclusion

They took away everything except the spirit, which they were incapable of seeing.

—Julia Esquivel, 1998

In taming transversality, territoriality largely excommunicated Indigenous nations from “sensible” politics, particularly in national and international arenas. It accomplished that by investing sovereignty and authority in anchors distributed territorially across the Earth’s surface. Subterritorial political formations such as Indigenous governments were denied sovereignty, thus effectively banned from the political realm and flattened into the cultural landscapes. Indigenous peoples have struggled to respond to this stranglehold, primarily, to communicate indigeneity in ways that augment transversality as an alternative planetary compass of governance, a form that does not insubstantialize land as the soil upon which life takes place, but challenges the territory-articulating modernity as the only measure of the world. As de Certeau said, Indigenous

diplomacy is not simply about avoiding being communicated and flattened into the conquerer's map, but rather marking and redistributing their traces onto the map differently.

If Foucault, Glissant, and de Certeau remind us that indigeneity remains, intact, in heterotopic spaces, Armond Mattelart (2008) shows how indigeneity might be communicating itself by using unusual modes of communication in concert with resurgent transversal instincts. This mode of communication works through a "paradigm of the fluid," as much as by the paradigm "of the mechanic." In Mattelart's thinking, the paradigm of the mechanic refers primarily to the dynamics of states and nations while the paradigm of the fluid highlights the rising transnational or transversal interactions and exchanges shaping polities. The paradigm of the fluid characterizes the increasingly post-Cartesian spatio-temporalities around the world's mainstream. It activates an agentive mode in which the communication is not merely a line in networks of exchanges producing the dominant order. Rather, they are "deployed" as instruments of Indigenous struggles creating networks of what Mattelart calls "anti-discipline"—the loosely coordinated, counter-hegemonic practices engendering their own spatio-temporal worlds.

Following Mattelart, it is possible to contend that Indigenous peoples' struggles are situated in the transition from the paradigm of the mechanic (of states, territories, and nations) to the paradigm of the fluid (of rising interactive transversality) which characterizes the increasingly post-Cartesian spatio-temporalities.

Notes

1. See Mignolo (2001) for a parallel reading through the notion of "contrapuntal" as developed by Said (1993).
2. For Locke, see Sokolow (2003, 140); for Vattel, see Jennings (1976, 61); and for Diderot, see Kemal and Gaskell (2000, 92–93).
3. Discussion of transversality and relation can be found in Glissant (1996, 1997).

The Political Stakes of Indigenous Diplomacies

Questions of Difference

Mark F. N. Franke

The increasing and broadening of diplomatic engagements between Indigenous peoples and sovereign states has raised considerable interest in the possibility of difference within international politics. Historically, relations between the two have culminated largely in repeated acts of political and legal exclusion of Indigenous peoples from legitimate standing and voice within the domain of the international. The recent and remarkable achievements of Indigenous peoples to gain the serious attention of states worldwide, then, are of enormous significance, signaling the possible capacity of Indigenous peoples to transform modern international orders and the possible interest of states to open themselves to the different politics lived and aspired to by peoples in this world. The success of Indigenous diplomacies in itself, though, does not entail the introduction of difference into international politics. Indigenous diplomacies may just as well, and, perhaps, even more easily, function to reproduce the centrality or alleged normality of state sovereignty and the rights of sovereign states to subdue and fight against difference.

At stake in Indigenous diplomacies is not simply the encounter of different entities. Rather, it is the possibility of the transformation of these diplomacies themselves. International diplomacies already form a discourse of politics that is caught within states' interests to reproduce their own sovereignty and the authority to exclude others, particularly in the terms of indigeneity. The possibility of introducing difference in international politics around Indigenous diplomacies rests in the ability of

participants to both recognize the politics of these acts and undo from them the disciplining interests of sovereign states. Thus, it is of crucial political significance that both the Indigenous peoples and states involved with and seeking difference within contemporary diplomacies with one another confront and open themselves not only to one another but to the very politics of difference itself.

To trace how politics of difference already function within the context of Indigenous diplomacies, I examine the observations of contemporary scholars on the stakes of Indigenous politics more generally, in relation to three useful critiques of difference relevant to the colonial and postcolonial contexts of Indigenous struggles: the postcolonial theory of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, the critique of anthropological knowledge put forward by Johannes Fabian, and the study of politics in Latin American cultural studies by Alberto Moreiras. Considering what may be learned from this intersection of analyses, I contend that there is no manner of difference that may be introduced to international politics via diplomatic negotiations between Indigenous peoples and states. Rather, difference is to be found only as practices in the politics of negotiating the terms of the relations traditionally referred to as diplomacies.

The Foreclosure of Indigeneity from the International in Diplomacies

Diplomacies are not simply the relations in which sovereign states may engage one another, and they are not, then, a sphere of relations in which Indigenous peoples may be included as partners to states. It is through international diplomacies that sovereign states are constituted, and, even more significantly, they serve as a set of movements by which the political supremacy of sovereign states may be articulated and defended. It is thus of little surprise that Indigenous peoples have been regularly rebuffed in their attempts to engage in such relations with states. However, it must be understood that, in any event, there is no equal place for Indigenous peoples in these proceedings. The politics of international diplomacies is built against Indigenous peoples in such a way that they are inherently foreclosed from their possibility.

Ontologically, sovereign states are rendered possible by the ability of governing bodies to negotiate conditions under which they are willing to recognize each other as such. Students of International Relations regularly rehearse this point, as they repeatedly point back to the 1648 Peace of Westphalia as the moment in which the principle of sovereignty gains modern definition and value. This Peace did not recognize pre-existing

sovereigns; it served as an agreement on terms through which sovereignty may be performed and recognized. In it and the traditions of state sovereignty that follow from its model, political personality, authority, and rights to self-determination are established as proper to state entities who have, via international diplomacies, convinced one another to accept each other's credentials as valid and who have succeeded in defending each other's right to subordinate all other social and political groupings as legitimately subject to themselves or one another.

Within the traditions of modern diplomacies, states negotiate their possible sovereignty in accepting the fact that they will coexist with others, many of whom may express extraordinary differences. However, this acceptance of differences in other international persons is strictly limited to those that may occur within the precise principles that the negotiations of sovereignty prescribe. Consequently, Indigenous peoples may not figure within the class of others to any one sovereign state, in the same way that other states certainly do. Rather, as is convincingly argued by Karena Shaw (2002), Indigenous peoples are formed and identified first as the kinds of social groups against which the sense and validity of state sovereignty is idealized within the very idea of international diplomacies. For state sovereignty to even be thinkable, the conventions of international diplomacies necessarily establish the category of Indigenous peoples as an other both to each state and its international others, as societies even different to those differences acceptable within international community.

State sovereignty, then, is theorized and legitimated in a contradiction. It is an authority that is supposed to be grounded in the particular rule of each state, in its specific diplomacies with other states, but states' exclusive claim to it is supposed to hold as an authoritative universal rule. How is it that a principle that denies universalizable political principles, and, therefore, the possibility of different alternatives such as those offered by Indigenous peoples, may lay claim to universalizable validity? To answer this question, it is helpful to pay attention to Spivak's (1999, 1–111) tracing of how the central globalizing theories of modern human society attempt resolution of their own like contradictions through both the production and foreclosure of "the native." Pursuing deconstructions of Immanuel Kant's statism, G. W. F. Hegel's teleology of nations, and Karl Marx's historical materialism, Spivak describes how the totalist globalism of each is made thinkable and rendered apparently practicable insofar as a subaltern class or practice is imagined as outside this globe and this subject position is filled with actual persons deemed "native" and politically externalized as such. Her point, in each case, is that a Truth of the world can make sense as long

as the alternative truths that may trouble its universal acceptance are symbolized within this Truth as fundamentally external to the modern world and potentially a part of it only through the actions of modernity itself. Hence, according to Spivak, Marx must imagine and foreclose the Asian Mode of Production, labor portrayed as incapable of producing value except if overcome by capitalism; Hegel must imagine societies in Asia and Africa as culturally static, requiring the transformative push of European national histories to become part of human Time; and, Kant must imagine Indigenous others not capable of reasoning their way to the state as their form of political community, requiring the civilizing force of states for their own development. Most similar to Spivak's reading of Kant's statism, one can see how the centering of state sovereignty and interstate diplomacies within the domain of international politics is accomplished by rendering, in diplomatic acts, alternative political orders as outside the political altogether. To this end, the designation of these alternatives as merely Indigenous becomes a crucial move.

Interstate diplomacies make the sovereignty of sovereignty presentable by representing its social alternatives as either prepolitical, subpolitical, or antipolitical. Across the foundational modern theories of sovereignty and the development of international law through diplomacies, peoples are categorized as Indigenous insofar as they are deemed to live in arrangements either closer to nature than civil society, incompetent of sovereign order, or inherently hostile to the state (Nichols 2005). The sovereign state is, thus, presented as the only possible site for political life and a necessary remedy against the dangers to politics that Indigenous peoples supposedly pose (Buchan 2005). It may now be suggested that the increasing diplomatic engagements between Indigenous peoples and states offer the crucial opportunities in which Indigenous peoples may finally present themselves as very much within the political and capable of enriching the sense of political possibilities within the international. However, from the position of indigeneity, there is no unproblematic manner in which this might be accomplished.

On this point, it is useful to draw an analogy to Spivak's (1988) examination of the possibility of subaltern peoples representing and contributing their different experiences and perspectives to postcolonial orders. Spivak makes the point that, from the category of the subaltern, the differences that the subaltern may offer are already defined and limited by the colonial orders that have marginalized them as such. Subalterns may be understood to speak and be heard only insofar as they articulate what it is that the authentic subaltern would already be understood to say. The subaltern that is understood to have spoken is

already not subaltern and, thus, not different but, rather, a reflection of the nonsubaltern and colonial social understanding. Similarly, Indigenous peoples, as Indigenous peoples, are in no position to be heard as anything other than what interstate diplomacies have rendered them, those societies incapable of true diplomacies.

The political conventions of international diplomacies require that Indigenous peoples could be heard to speak, within the context of diplomacies, of only a very strictly limited set of objectives. It amounts to what Mahmood Mamdani (2001) refers to as the politicization of indigeneity, where formerly subject peoples are given the right to establish their political positions only from a standing understood to be already outside the political. They may be heard to negotiate places for prepolitical or subpolitical societies within the state; they may be heard to express a renunciation of antipolitical society and the desire for negotiating either assimilation or, again, social space for pre- or subpolitical existence; or they may be heard to utter defiance against the state and, thus, a backhanded invitation for state violence against them.

Indigenous Diplomacies as Negotiating Places in the Past

Given that it is the case that states are increasingly welcoming or, at least, tolerant of Indigenous diplomacies and that Indigenous peoples are increasingly making diplomacies with states, it may seem absurd or an abstractly theoretical point to argue that the politics of diplomacies forecloses Indigenous peoples from international politics. It is fair to ask, how is it possible for sovereign states who are directly engaged in diplomacies with Indigenous peoples to both take up active and conscious political relations with Indigenous peoples and, yet, work to place them outside the limits of the political within the same practice? In response, I contend that such a contradiction can and does appear completely reasonable within the context of international politics, given the complex ordering of spatial and temporal relations within the principles of sovereignty. The politics of modern international diplomacies, as the conditions under which the sovereignty of sovereignty is performed, allows for the location of indigeneity as both within the grasp of the sovereign yet outside the international proper, within spaces of the past.

The manner in which I am depicting the power politics between states and Indigenous peoples here is a reworking of what Fabian (1983/2002) already argues about the fundamental contradiction of time and space that is enacted by anthropologists and social scientists generally in their

efforts to know others. Fabian asks: how is it that social scientists can claim that direct empirical research, where the scholar is collecting data first-hand and among her or his subjects of study, is the firmest ground from which knowledge of other societies may be built yet, at the same time, profess their knowledge of others as if these others are objects at a distance from the researcher? Fabian's own answer is that social scientists must build within their manners of knowing a spatial-temporal matrix that privileges a position of knower for the social scientist and one of the known for all others. He argues that modern social scientists assume themselves and others to inhabit a universal time, a common flow in which the movements and changes of all societies take place and one through which the learned scholar may move to study these societies. However, Fabian submits further that, at the same time, social scientists enact spatializations of this universe of time, segmenting other societies as prior to their own and limited to specific stages of development in human time, such as inhabiting the "primitive" versus "modern" (1983/2002, 37–69). Moreover, in this respect, it is Fabian's first point of argument to remind his readers that "knowledge is power." He states that "there is no knowledge of the Other which is not also a temporal, historical, a political act" (1983/2002, 1). Fabian's observation is that, by placing themselves in the position of a knower who may move throughout the universe of times that respective peoples on this planet supposedly live, while building knowledge of these others as descriptions of how they move only within specific spaces of time, social scientists give themselves license to both engage directly with others in their learning about them while knowing them as external to the privilege of knowing itself. Thus, the contradiction in knowing appears to be resolved in the knowing.

Similarly, one can see that the manner of diplomacies that produce the possibility of the sovereign state also privileges a political knowledge that grants states power over others to the state system and subordinates these others to the states' past. By rendering state sovereignty as the only site of politics and political understanding in international diplomacies, via foreclosure of indigeneity, states are formed not only as the only true international persons but, also, the only persons who have the authority to know other social orders in terms of the political. As a result, states routinely come to know Indigenous societies not so much as different contemporaries but, rather, as examples of earlier forms of human community now overtaken by and subsumed within politics of the state. As demonstrated in Judy Rohrer's (2006) study of the racialization of Kanaka Maoli by the United States, this dynamic may even reach the astounding point of understanding Indigenous peoples'

interests as reducible to a common social heritage within the state. Additionally, while states can be willing to engage in direct negotiations with Indigenous peoples, these diplomacies regularly amount to developing a knowledge of how segmented spaces may be reserved or made for Indigenous societies within the universe of states. How Indigenous peoples may form social and political spaces in ways that challenge territorial sovereignty of states is rarely an issue (Biolsi 2005; Bruyneel 2007). The discourse typically centers on Indigenous peoples' efforts to make spaces for their own movements, as distinct social dynamics in the world (Muehlebach 2001; Stephenson 2002), and international diplomacies permit states to engage with Indigenous peoples in such ways that they become known and respected as proper to such spaces of time at a distance from the modern world of states.

Indigeneity is not an actual manifest and objectively constituted difference to which states must respond (Corntassel 2003; Corntassel and Primeau 1995; Hirtz 2003; Kingsbury 1998; Niezen 2003; Scheinin 2005). Rather, within the context of diplomacies, indigeneity is a quality that is subject to states' recognition (Ku 2005; Mora 2007; Muñoz 2004; Okolie, 2003). Moreover, to be "Indigenous" offers no specific content or social definition that is not already established within the international diplomacies that, generally, authorize the subordination of indigeneity under state rule. One must appreciate Frank Hirtz's argument, with respect to claims to indigeneity and inter-Indigenous politics in Philippines, where he states "it takes modern means to become traditional, to be indigenous" (2003, 889). Diplomacies between sovereign states and Indigenous peoples, as such, may allow for Indigenous peoples' claims to social existence and respect and support for this existence. Consequently, across the globe it is possible to see how the struggles of subaltern peoples for recognition by states often results in a competitive politics between them for the right to claim indigeneity (Affif and Lowe 2007; Clark 2005; Damodaran 2006; Grossman and Cuthbert 1998; Karlsson 2003). However, these negotiations inevitably circle around and serve states' primary interest in negotiating, under the rubric of "Indigenous," the marginality of all nonstate peoples whose politics are irreducible to the principles of sovereignty. As is shown by Alice M. Nah (2003), in her examination of Indigenous identity politics in Malaysia, even within postcolonial contexts such negotiations can involve a formerly indigenized population seeking sovereignty, in part, through the indigenization of other societies within the jurisdiction of its territorial claim. Regardless of the conditions under which the identity is adopted, though, where Indigenous diplomacies focus on questions of Indigenous citizenship and cultural rights within mainstream society of sovereign states, the

terms of negotiation tend toward a kind of assimilation or the institution of a second-grade citizenship and set of rights (Cairns 2003; Short 2003; Whiteley 2003).

The conventions of Indigenous diplomacies with states function to place Indigenous peoples within national and international memories. Increasingly, Indigenous peoples may be able to negotiate their ways to positions of living memories or legends, deserving of a form of autonomy and free enjoyment of their differences within the spheres cut out for them, but they become constituted as relics nonetheless. Just as Fabian argues that the knowledge of others expressed by social scientists is always a manner of autobiography (1983/2002, 71–104), Indigenous diplomacies with states serve largely to render Indigenous peoples as aspects of states' histories. As the location of Indigenous peoples within nations is so often negotiated in terms of identity with the local nature and environment, risking primitivization within even a national natural history (Morgan 2004), it is possible for states to engage and know indigeneity without troubling the political privilege of states in any way that would undermine the sovereignty of their sovereignty.

Re-productions of Indigenous Subalterneity: From Local to Global Diplomacies

Perhaps some of the greatest hope for both positive changes in the international status of Indigenous peoples and openness to difference within the dynamics of international politics more broadly is focused on the successes Indigenous peoples have had in recent decades to expand their diplomacies on transnational levels, as in their intense negotiation of and contributions to bringing about passing of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (United Nations Human Rights Council 2006). The cornerstone to this document is the right of Indigenous peoples to self-determination, and there is a considerable range of opinion suggesting that this right builds into international law the possibility of Indigenous personality (Anaya 1993; Iorns 1992; Keal 2003; Lawrey 1990; Muehlebach 2003; Otto 1995; Porter 2002; Robbins and Stamatopoulou; Scott 1996; Simpson 1996). In this regard, it is variously supposed that Indigenous peoples may lay claim to and secure their identities on the bases of globalized standards that transgress and overcome the self-identity politics of any one state. While it is true that this globalization of Indigenous diplomacies results in a great transformation in the means by which Indigenous politics and identity may be produced,

I contend that the results are the same. The globalization of Indigenous diplomacies completes the foreclosure of Indigenous peoples, internationally, in its most concrete political form.

To develop this point, I turn to what may be learned from the exploration of difference in Moreiras' (2001) consideration of the politics of Latin Americanist studies, in its contested shift in recent decades from a regionally focused literary studies to a more globalized domain of Latin American cultural studies. Moreiras observes that the older literary studies form is caught in a bind of identity/difference, where scholars look to the fiction and poetry of Latin America to offer alternative critical perspectives on the modern world, framed as alternative modernities (2001, 4). Drawing on a point akin to Spivak's line of argument, though, he indicates that there is no critical difference that can be read from the pens of Latin Americans, studied as such, given that what and how they may write are things already framed as points of difference defined in terms of a modern norm. The Latin Americanist, particularly the non-Latin American Latin Americanist, is always already in the position of knowing best what the authentic difference is that Latin Americans must be able to tell the world (2001, 6). Moreiras then asks the question, once the difference and alternatives of Latin America are wrested away from specific, local, and nationalized bodies of literature supposedly offering the voice of difference and, rather, opened to much more mobile analyses at the level of cultural processes irreducible to the local, is Latin Americanist studies capable of generating a critique of modernity that is not already scripted by it? In response, he challenges his colleagues with a resounding "no."

Moreiras understands that Latin American cultural studies do not privilege the difference of Latin American experience as something originating from an isolated and nonmodern setting. Moreiras is aware that cultural studies renders the difference of Latin America interpretable via modes of production that are temporally uncontainable. The question of Latin America becomes one of understanding the difference of cultural production that permits there to be a Latin America, in all its local forms, tracing these forces and relations as they move. However, Moreiras' point is that cultural studies, therefore, reproduces the difference of Latin America as a cultural alternative to the cultural norms from which Latin Americanists may study so-called other cultures (2001, 13–16). The move from the local, national, or regional to the global may make it more difficult to understand difference as located within a separate time or space, with respect to the time-space of the modern nation. However, in the same move, modernity is refigured in the form of a cultural hegemony,

against and from which different cultures may become respected and known as such.

The turn of Indigenous diplomacies from local struggles within nations to the transnational movements capable of such successes as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples offers no less a reproduction of the marginality of difference through other means. As Simon During (1998) argues, the localized postcolonial politics of many Indigenous people have been deeply catalyzed in recent years by their intersection with forms of globalism often thought to work against them. At the same time, though, Rhiannon Morgan (2007) is quite correct to point to this process as also involving a deep institutionalization of Indigenous politics within the global realm of interstate diplomacies. In the move to shift the conditions of possibility of Indigenous politics from its struggles within the space and subspaces of the nation to global flows of transnational relations, indigeneity is re-produced as an issue of cultural politics that may be rethought as fitting within a culture of rights and self-determination already supplied in the culture of United Nations ideals (Franke 2007). Consequently, Indigenous politics is addressed via diplomacies that become more concerned with a global Indigenous cultural class, as it makes sense to the community of states, and far less interested with the particular struggles that mobilize the different politics of each group claiming indigeneity (Otero 2004; Otero and Jugenitz 2003). Once again, indigeneity becomes centered as something resolvable within and productive of the cultural hegemony of modern states, rather than offering any serious critique of that notion of global culture.

As Courtney Jung (2003) succinctly puts the point, the claims of Indigenous politics in this world are not reducible to efforts to secure an atomistic identity or tradition, but they are not expressive of a universal human need for cultural recognition within a global culture of humanity either. Rather, peoples' efforts to stake their politics on the Indigenous identity they gain in diplomacies must be understood as the identity politics with which they find they must contract in order to have recognition in diplomacies on contemporary global registers (Jackson and Warren 2005). Ravi de Costa (2006a, 694) contends that this does not mean that Indigenous peoples have, therefore, forced a homogenization of their politics, globally. However, while difference in the aspirations and interests of Indigenous peoples may remain, it is surely the case that the heterogeneity that Indigenous peoples offer the domain of the global remains significantly suppressed, insofar as indigeneity is produced within transnational diplomacies in homogeneous terms. At the very least, as a discourse increasingly subsumed within the global culture

and politics of rights dialogue, indigeneity, as formed in transnational Indigenous diplomacies, has the effect of excluding local Indigenous struggles that have little relevance to its terms of reference (Ghosh 2006). Various case studies from different parts of the world demonstrate that Indigenous globalism has become an attractive site wherein political power may be established for subaltern peoples, whether the notion of indigeneity makes sense as an identity for them or not (Goodale 2006; Hodgson 2002a, 2002b; Igoe 2006; Niezen 2000). As is particularly well explored in Renée Sylvain's (2002, 2005) discussions of the globalization of Indigenous politics in terms of the San of southern Africa, the politics of global indigenism, as developed in transnational diplomacies between Indigenous peoples, states, nongovernmental organizations, and international organizations, even has the capacity to force Indigenous people into practices of limiting—often primitivizing—their own identities as an “Indigenous other,” so as to be recognizable as potential participants within this discourse.

Critical Indigenous Diplomacies and Rendering International Diplomacies Impossible

Running parallel to what Fabian traces as the politics of objectification in the social sciences, international diplomacies conserve and contribute to the production of a normal space of world of politics, while simultaneously placing others, as Indigenous, on the margin, to the outside, and even in sites of alternative worlds. Spivak's warnings of the foreclosure of difference remain pertinent to all levels of conventional diplomacies which Indigenous peoples may initiate or in which they may take part. It will always be so, as long as difference is produced and understood as something that exists somewhere else. The key to overcoming this ongoing possibility of exclusion of the Indigenous, then, is to reengage diplomacies so that the separation of identity and difference into different sites is itself rendered an impossibility.

In the case of Latin American cultural studies, Moreiras (2001, 14–16) describes this identity/difference bind as a problem of hermeneutic circles, where a hegemonic (modern) sphere of knowing, grounded in its own privileged tropes, sets itself to interrogate and come to know supposedly different nations, cultures, societies within what is supposed as the tropes peculiar to their own hermeneutic circles. However, in suggesting that there can be engagement between the hegemonic and the alternative, as in the case of the universalization and spatialization of time

Fabian detects in anthropology, this vision betrays the fact that neither the hegemonic nor alternative hermeneutic spheres are actually closed—certainly not to one another. Thus, Moreiras (2001, 16) asks what kind of tropology could replace the reproductive dynamic of this hermeneutic circle; what kind of thinking could theorize a release from a hegemony that forces the thinking of an external savage place? In the same way, the sovereign state requires its engagement with the Indigenous, to make it Indigenous, for its sovereignty to be sovereign. Thus, one must ask what kind of politics and political theory could allow us to abandon the sovereignty of sovereignty. To his own question, Moreiras (2001, 21) contends that the supposed outside of the hegemon, that which Spivak sees as foreclosed and Fabian sees as spaced in time, must be rendered unthinkable, so that the hegemon no longer has an inside to which it may point. Likewise, one may argue that the sovereignty of sovereignty and, thus, the inherent externalization of difference, in the form of indigeneity, may be overcome once it becomes impossible to locate external, separate, or subordinate sites in which the supposed authenticity, originality, and the supposed pre-, sub-, and antipolitical of indigeneity may be reserved.

Establishing the conditions under which difference is possible in Indigenous diplomacies requires that participants focus on how they themselves are made and, thus, possibly unmade in the processes themselves and allowing bringing this ground of possibility to the fore. This is a point already well considered by John Cash (2004) in his study of reconciliation processes between the Australian nation and Indigenous peoples living within its territorial claims. He laments the fact that the terms of reconciliation are typically set as a “psychological process of personal transformation,” wherein Australians and Indigenous peoples living in Australia are supposed to find ways to reform the ethical relationship between one another. Cash complains, though, that such processes of reconciliation miss the fact that the ethical relations in question are being required of subjects, namely citizens and Indigenous peoples, who are already formed as such, through relations of racialization, primitivization, and spatialization that are occluded in the current calls for a mere change of heart (2004, 165–67). Thus, he calls for a politics, rather than a shift in ethics, that compels the participants to address reconciliation as the ongoing work negotiating the making of one another (2004, 169–71).

Within the politics of Latin American cultural studies, Moreiras proposes that this dynamic may take the form of a critical regionalism, wherein the Latin American nation, region, or local society is studied, known, and engaged in many possibilities, rendering it over-determined and irreducible to either inside or outside, what he refers to as “a recalcitrant

production of subjectivity as something other than subjection to history: not what obtains at the intersection of historical time-space, but what exceeds it" (2001, 67). This is similar to what Spivak refers to, throughout her writings, as the forcing of catachresis in the subject-position of the Native-informant, pointing to her or his always mistaken identity. The catachrestic subject is one who is impossible, because she or he never speaks as nor stands as such but only because she or he is always speaking and standing as possible examples of such a figure.

Indigenous diplomacies may also allow for difference in international affairs insofar as they are rendered both groundless and incapable of mapping participants, given the multiple possibilities that may always be opened in the site. A moment for such critical diplomacies may already be found in at least the very fine example of Hopi negotiations of sovereignty in the United States' legal systems available to them, as examined by Justin B. Richland (2007). Investigating a particular dispute of property, Richland outlines the success of drawing out difference in the proceedings not in terms of Hopi ability to introduce a different legal culture or different cultural interpretation of the law but, rather, in the failure of iterations of both cultural differences and norms to necessarily establish either side consistently or well. Richland's point is to detail how even the most mundane levels of Indigenous diplomacies, if followed as actions of and not mere expressions of difference and differentiating, may lead to extraordinary ironies (2007, 553–54), where indigeneity is no longer thinkable as a side to negotiations but, rather, an edge that cuts both and, thus, neither way(s).

The possibility for such a neither-here-nor-there politics is, perhaps, what Lisa Palmer (2006) sees in the move of Indigenous peoples in the Canadian context to take up the position of stakeholders with governments and other social groups in the negotiations of the status and uses of national parks. She draws attention to the fact that these negotiations make it very difficult to reduce indigeneity to environmentally based apolitical communities, in part, because they are partaking in diplomacies regarding spaces that are themselves no longer reduced to the apolitical status of mere nature. Rather, Palmer's suggestion is that these are moments in which social, environmental, economic, and cultural changes are understood to cut across the boundary between park and society, and Indigenous peoples are respected as subjects who are themselves involved in the negotiations of what occurs at these boundaries, these in-between places that undermine both the spacing of place and the placing of people in space.

David Welchman Gegeo's (2001) movements to assert his own Kwara'ae identity offers a useful example of how the disorientation of

identity and place may be more fully thought. Refusing to accept Kwara'ae identity and existence as something that can be confined within a specific social circle on specific Pacific Islands, as has been attempted in colonial discourse, Gegeo notes how the very notion of place for the Kwara'ae is already multiple and more about questions of relations and experiences than mere territories (2001, 493–94). Thus, just as the non-Indigenous citizens may carry their national identities fully intact as they partake of cosmopolitan society, Gegeo locates the stakes of being Kwara'ae in the ability of Kwara'ae persons to locate their indigeneity wherever they are, to be able to draw on their differences in their relations with non-Kwara'ae (2001, 495). To be Kwara'ae is not to reside on the outside of sovereign state orders or within the peripheral domain of potential sovereignty; it is to draw from a knowledge of one's location in places that cannot be erased in one's movement in the world. At stake is the ability to maintain focus on the very mobility of this difference in the moment of relations with others.

Indigenous Diplomacies before the Nation-State

Ravi de Costa

Introduction

The power of Europeans to represent Indigenous peoples remains an important part of the armory of conquest and colonization. Being convinced of the essentially parochial and passive character of Indigenous cultures, Europeans imposed their systems of representation and regulation soon after arriving on Indigenous lands. These obscured and profoundly damaged the ways in which the original inhabitants had historically connected with other peoples and the environment around them. The imposition of fixed borders around territories, resources, and people and the establishment of administrative systems to regulate everything within those borders underwrote the global legitimation of the hegemonic model of sovereignty. In so doing, not only has much of the diversity of human experience of encountering and engaging the other been lost or rendered archaic, but a distinct set of human traditions for practicing what scholars call “international relations” has been cast aside. It should be cause for optimism then, that at precisely the moment when the variety, complexity and urgency of our shared global challenges mandates fresh thinking and new relations between human communities, Indigenous peoples are representing themselves anew, evading the denigration implicit in Europe’s hegemonic categories.

This chapter reflects on what non-Indigenous traditions of knowledge, particularly in anthropology, already reveal about classical Indigenous diplomacy. Attending to the relationships between communities, transcommunal practices, and structures, it reconsiders Aboriginal

society and politics in Australia before the arrival of the British in the late eighteenth century. Indigenous Australians developed systems for encountering and engaging others beyond their communal boundaries that were based on sensitivity to the interests of others and a concern for the environment, relational systems that were shaped by a cosmological understanding of totality. Given how central Australia's Indigenous peoples were to the global anthropological theorizing about the innate capacity of peoples in the nineteenth century, a recovered history of their diplomacies may not only provide an appropriate rebuttal to that era of scholarship but also invite contemporary scholars to rethink the idea of diplomacy itself.

Part of the argument herein is that the very notion of diplomacy is a European convention, a way of denoting formal practices of encounter across sovereign boundaries. Orthodox accounts of diplomacy thus reinscribe modernity's desire for boundaries and categorization, privileging separation and distinctiveness rather than connection and relation. What emerges from the following analysis, however, is that diplomacy can be, indeed has been, far more embedded in transcommunal practices and shared cosmologies. The chapter develops the notion of *Indigenous transnationalism* as a way to capture both the formal and embedded aspects of Indigenous diplomacies. Formal structures of diplomacy are visible particularly in Indigenous protocols for encountering, communicating, and moving across boundaries, while diplomacy is also embedded in the way social orders are constructed and conceived.

Thus transnationalism is both a disposition to and connectedness with other human communities and nonhuman beings. The chapter follows the transnationalism of Indigenous Australians by using the three themes of cosmology, mobility, and exchange. I develop these themes with a short study of the long and shared history of the Yolngu people of Australia's north coast and the Macassans from Sulawesi.¹ In the conclusion, I reflect briefly on what an expanded idea of diplomacy that acknowledges the interrelatedness and connection of all things might imply for the study and practice of diplomacy and international relations more broadly.

The Cosmological Foundation of Transnationalism

In order to understand the patterns by which Indigenous communities in Australia related and negotiated with each other prior to the arrival of Europeans, it is important to grasp the extent to which those diverse

communities inhabited a shared metaphysical order. The anthropologist Les Hiatt (1996) gives this serious thought in an essay on the debate about “high gods.” Numerous different tribes of southeastern Australia, for example, have had initiation cults that revered the same figures: “The unusually high status enjoyed by gods such as Baiame is a consequence of internationalism and religious confederation” (Hiatt 1996, 109), he argues. In Arnhem Land, the Rainbow Serpent known as Yurlunggur, was “an ‘international’ God of Initiation” (Hiatt 1996, 112).

Hiatt (1996, 116) writes of “a genre, a suite of fleeting forms connected with the rainbow through which the philosophers of Aboriginal Australia have sought to express the idea of an underlying reality . . . in the higher reaches of serious reflection, we find a persistent intuition of a presence or power whose Oneness is felt to account for the plurality and impermanence of the sensible world and those who live in it.”

Cosmologically, the unknown worlds nearest at hand and most accessible to the imagination lie in the regions above and below the earth’s surface—the sky and the underworld. Rainbows appear in the former, and snakes emerge from the latter. Their unification in the concept of the Rainbow Snake constitutes not merely an imaginative connection between the two domains of mystery impinging on the everyday world but a theory of an external source of the latter’s Being. (Hiatt 1996, 115)

According to Luke Taylor, the use of the rainbow imagery by the Kunwinjku of western Arnhem Land conveyed a “generalized message that the diversity of life masks an ultimate relatedness” (quoted in Hiatt 1990, 119).

Indeed, it is most fruitful to concentrate on the importance in Indigenous cosmologies of relatedness through shared origins. For the peoples of the Kimberley region of northwestern Australia (Ngarinyin, Wunambal, and Worrora) the creator-being had dreamt the ancestors (*wanjina*) into existence during the creation era (*lalan*) and these beings had taken various forms as they traveled across the country, particularly clouds. The *wanjina* shaped landscapes, literally molding the physical space in which their peoples would live, find food and water (Keen 2004, 229–31). The mobility of cosmic agents of the Dreaming, as they created and named features of the landscape, provided near neighbors with shared narratives of creation.² The Pintupi people’s Dreaming ancestors traveled during the creation era, their paths creating stories that linked places hundreds of miles apart: “The continuity of stories classifies named places into larger systems, and individuals who have a place or part of the story have a claim to be considered for other parts. For some purposes, all those places on a Dreaming path

are considered to be 'one country', and those who own different segments may be considered 'one countrymen.' Such systems of stories undergo a continual process of being reworked, providing an ever-changing charter of who and what can be identified as 'one country.' 'Countryman' relations define potential productive ties" (Myers 1986, 155).

Shared narratives and songs do not imply equivalent ownership or identification but in fact characterize a range of higher and lower order identifications: groups may have strong secondary connections to adjacent "countries" because Dreaming tracks travel from one to another. In such situations, though songs and stories of the track may be shared, one group takes up the authoritative reading of it, giving rise to particular identifications of different groups through their shared relations to the story (Sutton 2003, 7). Such connections gave Indigenous peoples a context for engagement as well as reason to be mobile, to maintain their connections across different countries.

In their major study of Aboriginal Australia before contact, Catherine and Ronald Berndt confirm the political importance of shared stories, pointing out that, "when there is consciousness of a shared tradition, of ritual and sacred mythology held in common, this has helped to widen the horizon, drawing more people into the safe, known world of human beings. Quarrels and fights are not lacking, but in such cases they take place within the range of known behaviour, where the rules of killing or making peace are understood and accepted . . . Through the sanction of religion, a moral rightness is ascribed to the premises on which that society rests" (Berndt and Berndt 1985, 336). Another anthropologist, Ian Keen (2004, 244), writes of the "genius of ancestral law . . . that people of a wide region could agree to a body of legitimate law without there being legislators, and in spite of the autonomy of individuals and kin groups."

In the Kimberley, social relations within and between communities were shaped by the dual character of the concept of *wunan* (*wurnan*): first, that different social groups were distributed over the landscape in a "constellation" formed in the Dreaming; and, second, that those groups then maintain relations through practices of exchange (Blundell and Layton 1978, 231). However, it is misleading to think of creation myths simply as functional models of social order. Since the work of Levi-Strauss, anthropologists have emphasized the ways that mythic accounts—whether of the physical origins of landscape, of biological events like birth and death, or of the rightness of particular social orders—emphasize both the ever-present potential of transformation and the essential relatedness of all things: "[Myths] lift ideas of exchange at the moiety and clan levels into a field of meaning where, by integration into narratives that also

use the imagery of eating, of transformation by cooking, of warfare and the transformation of man into animal, each of these particular images helps to give meaning to those others with which it is associated" (Blundell and Layton 1978, 243–44). By helping people to understand how they are already related, Indigenous cosmology contextualizes an external authority from which people draw ethical norms they use to shape their encounters with others.

The Ethics of Mobility and Nomadic Life

Though Indigenous peoples have understood their social organization and way of life as narrated by cosmological imperatives, anthropologists often emphasize the difficulties of the environment in which classical life took place. In ecologically adverse conditions, mobility and openness were crucial (Kelly 1995; Young, Doohan et al. 1989, 25–27). However, even in territories where there were abundant resources, such as in parts of coastal northern Australia, people remained mobile, still moving several times per year. This "mobility ethos" kept people in touch with relations and gave them a wider knowledge of resource and environmental conditions. It also reinforced the central dynamic of hunter-gatherer society, which relied on movement to gather resources. Mobility encouraged conservation, akin to pastoral patterns of crop or field rotation (Kelly 1995, 152–58). It also ensured people maintained their links with foundational stories as they travelled along Dreaming paths.

Anthropologists differ slightly in their accounts of how mobility and its corollary of openness was manifest in social life. Peterson for example, suggests that Indigenous communities or bands were not in permanent relation, but "the interrelationships of ideas and practice receive their expression in the band" (Peterson and Long 1986, 143). That is to say, classical aboriginal life was characterized by openness to connection with others, regardless of the actual connections existing at given moments. However, Peterson argues that in times of ecological adversity, bands activated their "divergent networks" of kinship and marriage in order to secure access to resources on a household basis (Peterson and Long 1986, 35). Lourandos (1997, 25–26) suggests that in regions of abundance, "alliance systems may have shielded people against greater levels of competition between groups, brought about by overall denser concentrations of population." Myers' (1986, 96) account of the Pintupi emphasized "the positive qualities of exchange," which extend social ties while maximizing the efficient use of resources.

Some scholars have described the construction of boundaries in these Indigenous communities as “social boundary defense.” In areas of low density of resources, inhabitants hold membership in resource-ownership groups, which allow access to custodial areas in order that hardship can be averted (Cashdan 1983, 49–50). This contrasts with “perimeter defence” which involves the maintenance of a physical boundary around resource-laden territories. These ecological explanations of territoriality imply that the “costs” of defending territory decline as the territory’s resources increase; areas dense in resources are more likely to be physically defended (Cashdan 1983, 49).

Social boundary defense reflected principles on which such patterned reciprocity might occur, including the value of good knowledge about resources, a concern that lack of coordination about resource use leads to inefficiency and overcrowding, and an ethics arising from the realization that today’s abundance may be tomorrow’s lack (Kelly 1995, 193–97). Sutton (2003, 24) argues that such principles shaped the ideal of Indigenous encounters, noting that “reciprocity and balance, rather than an asymmetry between privileged permission-giver and importuning permission-requester, [were] the preferred tone of interactions on the subject of intervisitation.” Peterson confirms the plausibility of the social boundary defense theory in the Australian context, pointing out that nowhere in Australia was access to resources limited by the physical defense of territorial boundaries. Rather, it was membership in particular social groups that carried with it the rights to use a territory’s resources. Sometimes in the case of resources that were localized but very abundant, groups from considerable distances away would be able to access the resources, even being invited to do so by messengers from the resource-owning group (Sutton 2003, 24; Peterson and Long 1986, 33).

But such access did not imply that the door to Indigenous country was open to whoever might arrive. On the contrary, crossing territorial boundaries required formal protocols of recognition. In the case of individuals such as messengers, often a symbolic object was carried or decoration worn on the body, and those entering foreign territories frequently lit small fires to indicate their presence. Fire symbolized “domesticity, the friendship of family life.” Early accounts of rites of entry also showed visitors refraining from immediate entry into the central body of the community, but waiting some distance away and indicating their presence with a small fire, until a community elder came to formally invite the visitor into the territory (Peterson and Long 1986, 27–28).

It is in the early accounts of European explorers and colonists that these protocols of diplomacy are best documented. British Captain

Watkin Tench's journals record him witnessing his Indigenous companion, Colbee, engage another Indigenous group near Sydney in 1791. The account may be the earliest example of European knowledge of Indigenous protocol: "Colbee no longer hesitated, but gave them the signal of invitation, in a long hollow cry. After some whooping, and shouting, on both sides a man, with a lighted stick in his hand, advanced near enough to converse with us" (Flannery 1998, 62). John Mulvaney (1989, 1) notes that in these rituals of diplomacy, "speed was never a priority." In the welcome given by a group of Arrernte men near Alice Springs in 1901, the anthropologists Spencer and Gillen noted the centrality of a brief period of waiting: "a deputation of eight of the elder men, who had decorated themselves with bands of white pipe-clay, came into our camp to welcome us formally. It was a solemn ceremony. First of all they squatted on the ground in silence. Then, after a short pause, the head man of the Alice Springs group told us they were very glad to see us again . . . and that we were welcome to their country. We acknowledged their welcome with a present of tobacco" (Mulvaney 1989, 4).

Indigenous protocols made Aborigines indispensable members of explorers' parties, often without the realization of the expedition leaders. As Tim Flannery (1998, 5) notes in his anthology of explorers' journals, "Aborigines were the real, albeit unacknowledged, explorers of much of Australia. They generally carried the guns that fed and defended the expedition, they found the water, and they made the peace." The heroic figures from the annals of Australian exploration would otherwise have "wandered aimlessly through countryside which displayed the invisible weathercocks and compasses of the aboriginals" (Blainey 1975, vi).

Within that genre of colonial literature, a set of Indigenous characters emerges, the "loyal and faithful servant" or the "black boy"—Forrest's Windich, Eyre's Wylie, Mitchell's Yuranigh, Kennedy's Jacky-Jacky—men whose competence became evident as parties moved through thick bush, who read the landscape for presence of other humans, creatures, or sources of water. Reynolds (1980) stressed the ubiquity of these "black-boys" among all manner of traveling parties through the Australian bush in the early years of settlement. He cites the experience of Burke and Wills as instructive: though their expedition was very well provisioned, the lack of Aboriginal assistance brought about their tragedy (Reynolds 1980, 216–18).

Aborigines also "provided information about the customs and languages of contiguous tribes, and acted as diplomats and couriers arranging in advance for the safe passage of European parties. Mitchell realized that while accompanied by local Aborigines his party was "perfectly safe

from the danger of sudden collision' with neighbouring clans" (Reynolds 1980, 216–18). During his second trip into South Australia, rarely without Aboriginal accompaniment though they traveled chiefly by boat along the Murray River, Sturt (1834) developed a much greater understanding of the territorial diplomacy of Indigenous Australia. The events of January 22–23, 1830, are particularly instructive:

The natives, in attempting to answer my interrogatories, only perplexed me more and more. They evidently wished to explain something, by placing a number of sticks across each other as a kind of diagram of the country. It was, however, impossible to arrive at their meaning. They undoubtedly pointed to the westward, or rather to the south of that point, as the future course of the river; but there was something more that they were anxious to explain, which I could not comprehend . . . We had proceeded nine miles, when we were surprised by the appearance in view, at the termination of a reach, of a long line of magnificent trees of green and dense foliage. As we sailed further down the reach, we observed a vast concourse of natives under them . . . an attempt to land would only be attended by loss of life. The natives seemed determined to resist it . . . It was with considerable apprehension that I observed the river to be shoaling fast, more especially as a huge sandbank, a little below us and on the same side on which the natives had gathered, projected nearly a third-way across the channel . . . With every pacific disposition, and an extreme reluctance to take away life, I foresaw that it would be impossible any longer to avoid an engagement . . . I took up my gun, therefore, and cocking it, had already brought it down to a level. A few seconds more would have closed the life of the nearest of the savages . . . But at the very moment when my hand was on the trigger, and my eye was along the barrel, my purpose was checked by M'Leay . . . Turning around I saw four men at the top of their speed. The foremost of them, as soon as he got ahead of the boat, threw himself from a considerable height into the water. He struggled across the channel to the sandbank, and in an incredibly short space of time stood in front of the savage against whom my aim had been directed. Seizing him by the throat, he pushed him backwards, and forcing all who were in the water upon the bank, he trod the margin with a vehemence and agitation that was impressive . . . Thus, in less than a quarter of an hour from the moment when it appeared that all human intervention was at an end, and we were on the point of commencing a bloody fray which independently of its own disastrous consequences, would have blasted the success of the expedition, we were peacefully surrounded by the hundreds who had so lately threatened us with destruction. (Sturt 1834, 101–8)

Later, Sturt reflected on this and acknowledged the diplomacy that had underpinned his progress: "They sent ambassadors forward regularly from one tribe to another, in order to prepare for our approach, a custom that not only saved us an infinity of time, but also great personal risk. Indeed, I doubt very much whether we should even have pushed so far down the river, had we not been assisted by the natives themselves" (Sturt 1834, 126).

Of course, there was unlikely to be perfect comprehension across languages, cultures, and the gulf of intentions. Major Mitchell's expedition into Queensland took him into territories far beyond the linguistic skills of his Wiradjuri guide, Yuranigh, where they met one "frustrated elder [who] burst into tears, finding himself incapable either in words or deeds for a meeting so uncommon" (Mulvaney 1989, 5). Mulvaney (1989) laments the consequences of misunderstanding Indigenous protocols: rituals such as those of the Arrernte of central Australia, wherein an initial massed approach of gesturing and armed men was rebuffed by Europeans as the behavior of "intruders or assailants." What these rituals of power really signified was a demand to be acknowledged and respected, and for that to frame the future relationship (Mulvaney 1989, 7).

Networks of Exchange

We get an excellent sense of the productiveness of classical transnational relations by considering the manner and extent of trade between Indigenous peoples. Numerous writers since Adam Smith have pointed out that trade is a fundamental human activity. In *The Wealth of Nations*, Smith thought that trade and exchange were universal human characteristics, likely to be the consequence of either instinct or the attributes of reason and speech (Smith 1976; Books 1–3, 117–18). More recently, Matt Ridley (1998) in his book *The Origins of Virtue*, concluded that "there is nothing modern about commerce . . . trade, specialization, the division of labour and sophisticated systems of barter exchange were already a part of a hunter-gathering life. Indeed, they had probably been so for many hundreds of thousands of years" (Ridley 1998, 197–99).

In the late 1930s, F. D. McCarthy's major comparative study of Aboriginal trading networks documented three persistent features. First, regional networks connected peoples in heavy trading relationships, including that in southeastern Australia, from western Queensland to northern Australia, in the Lake Eyre basin, and in Arnhem Land. Second, well-defined "trunk routes" connected these regions. And third, some

goods were particularly heavily traded between and within the regional networks, including boomerangs, ochre, the narcotic *pituri* and pearl-shells, as well as aspects of culture, like the knowledge of particular corroborees (McCarthy 1939a, 1939b, 1939c).

Regional trade networks were important not merely because they allowed exchange, but because they activated existing social networks. McCarthy recognized that the density and familiarity of regional exchanges meant that many had become ritualized, especially across kin groups in contiguous areas, and should be seen as a “necessary adjunct to betrothal, marriage and initiation, and especially to the settling of grievances and quarrels . . . At gatherings for barter in Australia the opportunity is taken to settle grievances and social obligations forming part of kinship and other relationships, to cement friendships, and to extend personal and group relationships” (McCarthy 1939b, 174–79).

Certain material objects and cultural items had special ceremonial and sacred value, thereby creating demand and facilitating exchange: “The granting of access to ancestral knowledge was a valuable service for which those in control could demand other valued items in return” (Keen 2004, 377). In some Indigenous exchanges, although items actually changed hands, these were understood as “inalienable possessions,” by which the giver created an enduring bond with the recipient (Keen 2004, 352). Trade networks in the Kimberleys, for example, were highly complex with sacred items moving clockwise through territories among related kin groups and “defined partners,” and nonsacred materials moving in a counterclockwise direction (Akerman 1980a, 1980b). This was formalized in the *wurnan*: “a system of ‘paths’ of exchange homologous with marriage relations, linking individuals and patri-groups and connecting adjacent regions. The goods exchanged included foods such as meat and honey, ochres, stone spear-points wrapped in paperbark, bamboo spears, songs and sacred objects.”

In some areas, such as Ooldea in central Australia, exchanges could involve the temporary use of skilled labor from neighboring communities, especially the services of healers or experts in ceremonial activities (Keen 2004, 357–61). According to Mulvaney (1989, 92), “ceremonial exchange networks were universal across Australia by 1788.” There were even “markets” held at designated sites, such as the “exchange fairs” known as *manja boming* amongst peoples of southwestern Western Australia. In the Lake Eyre basin, markets regularly convened, primarily to exchange the prized medicinal narcotic commodity *pituri*, which contains nicotine (Clarke 2003, 107–8; McBryde 1987, 267; Mulvaney 1987, 92).

The major trading paths, or trunk routes are especially interesting. McCarthy described seven major routes, understood as “the avenues

along which important culture elements—material, social, and religious—have diffused.” For example, the East coast route “functioned from the north to the south of this coast, which consists of a narrow strip of fertile land closed off from the interior by the Great Dividing Range. Traits that have diffused along this trunk route are the fish-hook technique, multi-pronged and bone-barbed spears, bark canoes and containers and increase rites” (McCarthy 1939a, 98–104). In a period of about twenty-five years, “the Mudlunga ceremonial dance [spread] from northwest Queensland to Alice Springs, through the Lake Eyre Basin to reach the South Australian coast” (Mulvaney 1989, 3). McCarthy also noted the diffusion of clear traits and goods from Melanesia and Southeast Asia, and suggested that trunk routes connected the north coast of the Australian mainland through the islands of Torres Strait across New Guinea to its northern coast, as well as from Arnhem Land and the Kimberleys through the Celebes and other island groups of Southeast Asia, as far as the Malay peninsula. Trade also “facilitated the peopling of Australia by making it possible for adventurers settling in new country to obtain from their homeland essential articles, and also others which they may otherwise have to abandon, while ascertaining the resources of the new territory” (McCarthy 1939b, 175–92).

Goods traded over very great distances put trunk routes in greater relief. Prized commodities like *pituri* travelled great distances along trade routes (Clarke 2003, 61–62). Aborigines quarried a range of different types of stone, with some quarries providing stone for a large network of exchange, others serving only “local markets” (Clark 1965; Mulvaney 1987, 92–93). The archaeologists Binns and McBryde used petrological techniques to establish a distribution network of hundreds of kilometers in multiple directions for the axe-stone originating from the Moore Creek quarry in northern New South Wales (Binns and McBryde 1972). Pearl-shell sourced off the coast of the Kimberleys traveled even further, and was exchanged along networks of thousands of kilometers, ending up in South Australia (Keen 2004, 357).

One of the primary motivations for trade was the occurrence or production of valued items in specific places, including items with supernatural significance: “the localities where various objects are made are those where the spiritual ancestors introduced them or their method of manufacture . . . Such a specimen is imbued with the magical potency of the mythical world, the core of spiritual power” (McCarthy 1939b, 172–73). Distance conveyed additional importance on objects like pearl and white baler shells: “As these objects travelled, their ritual importance increased, their functions changing from utilitarian, everyday use as

pubic covers or decorative purposes to secret purposes. In this manner, products from the Indian and Pacific oceans moved gradually across central Australia, their paths intermingling along distances up to 2000 kilometres” (Mulvaney 1987, 93).

Expeditioners would often set out for ochre from the best locations and those proposing to visit key ochre production sites, like the mines at Pukardu or Parachilna in the Flinders Ranges of South Australia, held ceremonies with the owners of countries they traversed. Travelers were expected to alert the custodians of the mine with message sticks that invited the exchange of ochre for other goods, including other pigments and foodstuffs (Clarke 2003, 109–10). Such foreshadowing of intentions to trade was common: “Message-sticks form proof of the nature of the business of a trade-messenger,” thought McCarthy, “but the message is always a verbal one” (McCarthy 1939b, 176). However, after living for over three decades with Aborigines near Port Phillip, William Buckley recalled an encounter with one messenger who had come to trade vegetables for freshwater eels: stripes on his arms signifying either the timing of the trade, or the number of days journey it would take to reach the place where the trade would occur (Blainey 1975, 208).

The Macassans and the Yolngu

I would like to extend a warm welcome to our Indonesian friends. It’s not their first time being in Arnhem Land. They represent their ancestors who have been coming to visit my ancestors a long time before any white faces arrived in this continent. We are celebrating this Garma, the topic is “Livelihood.” While our Indonesian friends and north-east Arnhem Landers have met for so many centuries, so many years, to trade and carry on this particular thing that we talk about here, at this Garma. The “livelihood.”

—G. Yunupingu, “Opening Address”

The varied practices of classical transnationalism discussed so far can be seen very clearly in the shared history of the coastal Aborigines of northern Australia and the very different peoples living in the island archipelagos to the north. By the early 1960s, there was a growing body of empirical research in anthropology and archaeology documenting the dense contacts between Indigenous peoples of northern Australia and the inhabitants of what is now called Southeast Asia. Scholars were increasingly focused on “tangible and visible material” left in the sites of particular visitors; the “indirect evidence in Aboriginal art”; and

the documented evidence of contacts gathered by Europeans and others (Berndt 1965, 3). Chief among these was historian and archaeologist C. C. Macknight, who showed in detail how Macassans encountered Aborigines in Australia's "first modern industry": the collection of the "edible holothurian" trepang (or *beche-de-mer*) from the shallow coastal waters of Arnhem Land for the markets of Southeast Asia and the tables of China (Macknight 1976, 1).³ The exact beginnings of the industry remain under some debate. However, Chinese culinary interest in trepan—the only real source of demand—does not appear to predate the sixteenth century, when first mention of it is made in Chinese recipes, along with other Late Ming delicacies like Sharks' Fin and Birds' Nest soups (Macknight 1976, 7–8, 80–81, 94).

The trepang industry connected the Yolngu people of eastern Arnhem Land with the economic transformations taking place in the hinterlands and entrepôts of Southeast and East Asia, a confluence of what one historian (Bayly 2002) has called "archaic" and "modern" forms of globalization. The evidence Macknight draws on includes traders' manifests located in Dutch maritime archives, which indicate the scale of the industry. At its height in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, trepangers would have collected at least three hundred tons per season from the north Australian coast. Up to one thousand Macassan men would come each season in ocean-going *praus* of about twenty-five tons. Their routine was so regular that, in the late-nineteenth century, South Australian authorities were able to collect duties by finding the trepangers at favored spots like Karruwa (Little Vanderlin) Island (Bayly 2002; Isaacs 1979, 264; Macknight 1976, 15; Mulvaney 1989, 26). Macassans came for trepang until the Australian government banned their visits in 1907. Until then, Macassans left the Celebes each November with the north-west monsoon, arriving on the coast of Arnhem Land in December and staying until the beginning of the dry season the following April. Several *praus* would drop anchor and camp together on suitable beaches. Smaller canoes took divers out to collect trepang while others prepared the catch for the return journey: an elaborate process of sun-drying and smoking the trepang in specially constructed ovens. The fishermen arrived well-provisioned with rice and other foodstuffs from their home, and though conflicts occasionally occurred, the Macassans' activity largely took place independently of the Yolngu. However, the length of the visits plus their seasonal routine established over several hundred years, gave rise to abiding impacts on the cultural life of the Yolngu. Macassans' culture may also have facilitated their reception: though they were Muslims, Macassans practiced certain forms of animism, leaving offerings at particular

rock formations along the coast, which the Aborigines clearly recognized and respected: "Before commencing at a fresh camp they lowered to the bottom of the sea a new plate containing portions of the best food they had on board. When leaving camp some ceremony was gone through for the purposes of making wind" (Macknight 1976, 59).

Yolngu mortuary ceremonies demonstrate that Aborigines observed the Macassans and drew their own significance from the Macassans' activities. Yirritja ancestors are held to include Macassans and death for these Yolngu meant a return to those lands (Keen 2004, 233, 235).⁴ The highly distinctive burial poles reflect the raising of the masts of the Macassan *praus* in readiness for departure, and therefore loss for the Yolngu. Macassan designs adorn these grave markers; flags attached to the top of the poles evoke the flags atop Macassan masts that fluttered as they sailed away. Yolngu song cycles tell of the exhilaration of travelling in a *prau* with its flapping sails and the "singing from the mast" (Berndt 1965, 6–8; Isaacs 1979, 276).

The Yolngu adopted Macassan material culture, including buffalo horn, tobacco, and alcohol, and the Macassans' dug-out canoe technology spread around the coast at the rate of eighty to one hundred kilometers per generation (Clarke 2003, 178–83; Keen 2004, 362–68; Macknight 1976, 43–47; Mulvaney 1989, 26–28). Aborigines highly valued the material they received. It was the anthropologist Donald Thomson who first noticed the Yolngu "ceremonial exchange cycles" between coastal and inland groups, arguing that it was contact with the Macassans that had shaped this cultural patterning of material and conceptual exchange. A pidgin exists in Indigenous communities of the north coast which probably originated as a means of discourse with Macassans and then became "a *lingua franca* among Aboriginal groups who did not share the same language or dialect." The linguists Urry and Walsh have argued that the Macassar language may have been the "catalyst in the establishment of the exchange system" (Macknight 1976, 84–85; Urry and Walsh 1981, 92–100).

Such contacts and exchanges also meant that when the *praus* returned in the dry season, it became "almost normal for Aborigines to visit Macassar." Djaladjari's voyage with the Macassans occurred in about 1895 when he was still a boy; he traveled extensively around the north coast collecting trepang before voyaging to Macassar on the *prau* Kandu'ulang. When he arrived in Macassar, he met Jamaduda, Gadari, and Birindjauwi, men he knew from Arnhem Land, as well as other Aborigines who had come on earlier voyages and stayed, often

marrying Macassar women. Djaladjari traveled on around the islands of the region, going so far as to see the Malay peninsula and the Banda Islands (Isaacs 1979, 269–72; Macknight 1976, 86).

The history Yolngu shared with the Macassans had deep and lasting effects. Early European visitors found themselves addressed in the same pidgin that had emerged as the means of discourse with Macassans. Berndt writes of how in the mid-twentieth century the memories of contact with Macassans were “a living and coherent tradition shared by the people as a whole.” Macassans became integrated into Yolngu narratives of creation, which told of the Bayini or Dreaming Macassans as mythological beings contemporaneous with the Yolngu creator-ancestors, Lany’tjun and Djang’kawu. In the sacred songs associated with the Bayini ancestor, Birrinydji, Yolngu “drew names from words such as *manunu* (ship’s anchor), *mattjuwi* (mast), or *lati* (sword)” (McIntosh 2004, 141–44).

Berndt felt that the history of the trepang industry had created the conditions of possibility for an “adjustment movement” that saw radically new cultural expressions take place from the 1950s onward. It was a way for Yolngu to deal with the massive change Europeans brought after World War II. Similarly, the anthropologist Ian McIntosh (2004) argues that these culturally embedded memories of visitors helped frame the response of some Yolngu to the incursions of the mining industry in particular. Consequently, Yirritja moiety people, as custodians of the Bayini stories, drew on this tradition to underpin a different response to mining than the prevailing opposition, one that saw mining as potentially offering greater autonomy and agency for Indigenous people: “Birrinydji’s vision included Yolngu membership in his new world blessed with many riches” (Berndt 1962, 13; McIntosh 2004, 144–45).

Encounters between Yolngu and Macassans did involve conflicts, but are remembered much more for the benign and productive relations that emerged. This was “a golden age, contrasting deeply with European-Aboriginal relations.” In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, there was talk in the colony of South Australia that the trepang industry should be regulated and customs duties were collected from 1882 but sovereign imperatives prevented both Australian governments and Dutch administrators of what was to become Indonesia from recognizing this long-standing trade. The ongoing practice of detaining Indonesian fishermen caught in Australia’s “territorial waters” indicates how far this convivial history is from current practice (Balint 2005; Macknight 1976, 3; Mulvaney 1989, 27).

Conclusion

Returning to think about classical Indigenous life need not be an anachronism. As Mulvaney (1989, 27–28) suggests, we can at least appreciate the cultural openness, exchange, and innovation that is visible in many situations when Indigenous societies came into contact with others (Mulvaney 1989, 27–28). Australia's Aborigines were not the static, parochial isolates of public discourse, but lived a life intimately aware of the connections with others that had been made by the agents of creation. Over tens of thousands of years, Aboriginal peoples developed social practices that helped them to manage a world of limited resources, of difference and competing interests. They did so by evolving a social order based on the cosmological principle of the interconnection of all things. This was structured into the social networks they formed across the blended edges of their countries and was acknowledged in the narrative paths that people took as they traveled. Some territories were open to people in need when rituals of acknowledgement had been performed. Economic life involved Indigenous peoples in a trade conducted across vast distances by pedestrians who invested great significance in the goods they carried. All of this is clear in the way the Yolngu engaged with and remember the Macassans. This matters because Indigenous experience resonates with contemporary difficulties. One of the core assumptions of the discipline of International Relations and the study of diplomacy is that humans live in stable and coherent bounded entities. Until relatively recently, sovereignty has constructed dominant understandings of what is in and what is out (Wendt 1992). Examining classical Indigenous traditions we see Indigenous peoples also held concern about boundaries and membership, but did so in ways that stressed the fundamental connectedness of human life, meeting their needs for identity, security, and order through cosmologically narrated relationships of material exchange and mobility.

Returning to this history cannot provide us with a template for the global societies we now inhabit, but it does more than merely reacquaint us with the antiquity of the challenges that comprise international relations. Globalization has forced many International Relations scholars and practitioners to rethink their categories and structures of analysis. A corollary of this is the realization that a formal model of diplomacy cannot capture all the ways that human communities engage with others. In fact, encounters need also to be understood as taking place within the composition of our material interests in the maintenance of communal and environmental order and sustainability, and the ways by which we satisfy those interests.

What new spaces and possibilities for action have the transformation of state power created, in which older and newer aspirations might

find voice and autonomy? The contemporary Indigenous diplomacies discussed by other contributors to this volume reveal both formal and embedded aspects of diplomacies, adapted to the new circumstances of globalization but retaining the continuity of cultural difference. Formal practices are visible in those international bodies where Indigenous actors have become significant, especially the Working Group on Indigenous Populations and the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, with the recent triumph of the United Nations General Assembly Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Indigenous culture, particularly in the form of prayers, dance, songs, and dress, and most importantly in Indigenous peoples' insistence on self-representation, has reconstructed these institutions' formal rules about recognition and participation. However, a new kind of embedded diplomacy is visible in the transcommunal networks of the global Indigenous movement. Indigenous actors are representing themselves as discrete and distinctive communities who communicate with, learn from, and cooperate with others and who have a collective and unique contribution to make to the global community. Shared experience, emotion, and solidarity are the lines of affinity that now stretch between communities, buttressed by the new forms of encounter made possible by modern communications and transport.

Not only by encouraging the reconstruction of formal international relations but also by attending to the embedded aspects of diplomacy, might we elide the destructive effects of a hegemonic but largely artificial order of sovereignty. As that order continues to be transformed, or perhaps breaks down, Indigenous conceptions of social order and transcommunal relations, both past and present, provide all of us with ways to reconstruct our understanding and management of international relations. They do this by focusing our attention on the material and environmental needs of living communities, rather than those of abstract sovereign entities.

Notes

1. Elsewhere I have considered these stories as part of the long history of transnational Indigenous activism. See de Costa (2006b).
2. A good introduction to the traditions of precontact Indigenous Australia can be found in Clarke (2003).
3. Macassans came from Macassar, now known as Ujung Pandung, a city in the southwest of Sulawesi.
4. Like much of Indigenous Australia, the Yolngu are divided into two moieties, Yirritja (yiritja/jiridja) and Dhuwa (dua), with Yirritja people having responsibility for all things "foreign."

This page intentionally left blank

A “Revolution within a Revolution”

Indigenous Women’s Diplomacies

Laura Parisi and Jeff Corntassel

Tomorrow . . . if there is to be one, it will be made with the women, and above all, by them.

—Subcomandante Marcos, “Twelve Women in the Twelfth Year: The Moment of War, March 11, 1996”

Introduction

In his reflections on the early days of the 1994 Zapatista (EZLN) uprising that garnered global attention, Subcomandante Marcos acknowledges the real impetus for change behind this Mayan political and cultural movement that was hidden from the headlines: the women. As Vinding (1998, 12) notes, Indigenous women have been “underrepresented in Indigenous organizations and are seldom heard in international fora.” Although women’s rights and Indigenous rights are now officially codified as human rights,¹ both women’s rights and Indigenous rights movements have been problematic spaces for Indigenous women’s participation in treaty making and standard setting in domestic and international legal fora. Due to colonization and ongoing imperial influences, both rights movements often require Indigenous women to make trade-offs (either as women or as Indigenous peoples) rather than make space for the more fully intersectional frameworks that Indigenous women have been demanding through strategies that go beyond political lobbying.

Thus, Indigenous women have had to create new diplomatic spaces at the global, regional, state, and local levels to pursue simultaneous negotiations for both their individual rights as women and collective rights as members of Indigenous nations.² In this chapter we ask, what are the implications of Indigenous women's unique location in terms of representing themselves in diplomatic arenas? In addressing this question, we assess the notion of diplomacy as applied to Indigenous women's political activities and strategies. We argue that, based on Indigenous women's narratives of their own work and positions, Indigenous women engage in a politics of intersectionality in framing their diplomatic engagements. The concept of intersectionality encompasses a feminist theoretical and methodological approach to a nonessentialized identity politics as well as providing a basis for social justice action (AWID 2004, 1).

Intersectional approaches start from the analytical premise that people's identities (i.e., gender, race, class, sexuality, nation, etc.) are not mutually exclusive or additive, but rather multiple, layered, and inter-related and, as such, produce unique and specific experiences that are not easily essentialized (AWID 2004, 1–2). Intersectional approaches take into account how the multidimensional nature of identities are derived from and embedded in “social relations, history, and the operation of structures of power” (AWID 2004, 2). Intersectional approaches go beyond simplistic binary gender-based analysis, which examines only one relationship of power, to highlight how social categories “gain meaning and power by reinforcing and referencing each other” (CRIA 2006, 8). Furthermore, “for Indigenous women, who have long experienced violence and discrimination based on multiple identities, the notion of ‘intersectionality’ is not an arcane academic concept but daily lived reality” (IIWF 2006, 6). Intersectionality also provides a basis for social justice action. Therefore, intersectional analysis is an appropriate tool for understanding how Indigenous women locate themselves as diplomats in their families, clans, communities or nations, host states, and the transnational and international arenas.

Although not all Indigenous women may use the formal concept of intersectionality³ when referring to their work, they are acutely aware of their unique locations in terms of their simultaneous pursuit of individual rights (as women) and collective rights (as Indigenous peoples) and how these identities are inextricable from, and define, one another. In the words of Blanca Chancoso, an Indigenous woman from Ecuador, at the Second Continental Meeting of Indigenous women in Mexico, December 1997,

We, Indigenous women, wish to be recognized as people with rights, not only duties. We need to be seen, within our families and communities, not only as cooks and child-bearers, but as female human beings. This is what we want, not to be seen as second-class people. We need our voices to be heard as the expression of one single thought and one heart in order to strengthen our position as indigenous peoples. [Indigenous women] cannot separate nor feel isolated from the situation lived by indigenous peoples, nor can they detach themselves from their own situation as women within these peoples. (quoted in Palomo 1998, 279–80)

There is no doubt that there are many other intersecting identities, such as class, sexuality, age, ableness, spirituality, religion, geographic location, and motherhood, that are applicable to Indigenous women's lives.⁴ Yet, for the purposes of this discussion, the above quote not only succinctly illustrates a core intersectional identity that guides many Indigenous women's diplomatic activities but also frames their diplomatic activities in a rights and responsibilities discourse that is easily identifiable in a number of examples.

Building on the theoretical aspects of intersectionality and multi-layered citizenship (discussed further below) by analyzing Indigenous women's activism through two case studies that demonstrate the multiple and linked levels of Indigenous women's diplomatic activities, we show how the diplomatic activities of Indigenous women reveal the limitations of traditional definitions of state-based diplomacy, as well as a purely collective rights understanding of Indigenous self-determination. Although elsewhere we have analyzed Indigenous women's interventions at the United Nations level in both the Indigenous and women's rights arenas (Parisi and Corntassel 2007), in this chapter we focus on the Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (Zapatista Army of National Liberation or EZLN) uprising and ongoing self-determination movement in Chiapas, Mexico, and the recent Rotinoshon'non:we (Six Nations Confederacy) clan mothers' reclamation of their homelands in Ontario, Canada to highlight how Indigenous women have practiced intersectionality as a diplomatic strategy to represent themselves on their own terms. These two cases also transcend the artificial boundary between the local and the global and serve as an important illustration of Andrea Smith's (2006, 17) claim that Indigenous women operate in a "framework that understands Indigenous women's struggles as part of a global movement for liberation."

In keeping with the premise of intersectionality, it is important to clarify whom we mean when we reference Indigenous women, since

we are cognizant of the pitfalls of an overgeneralized and essentialized identity category. There is no consensus on the question as to who is Indigenous, and international organizations, such as the United Nations, have not adopted an official definition of Indigenous peoples, despite the recent passage of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Corntassel 2003). However, there are working definitions, such as the one developed by the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations in 1986, that offer some generally accepted guidelines for self-identifying Indigenous peoples and nations:

- Self-identification as Indigenous peoples at the individual level and accepted by the community as their member;
- Historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies;
- Strong link to territories and surrounding natural resources;
- Distinct social, economic, or political systems;
- Distinct language, culture, and beliefs;
- Form non-dominant groups of society; and,
- Resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities (UNPFII 2006).

While there is a great deal of discussion over the complexities of defining 370 million Indigenous peoples around the world, *ultimately the question of who are Indigenous women is best answered by Indigenous women themselves*, rather than imposing a state derived categorization that potentially reproduces colonial constructs of Indigenous women. This is especially important since many Indigenous women's organizations, such as the International Indigenous Women's Forum, also do not define Indigenous women. Although this may make the use of the term "Indigenous women" seem unwieldy or homogenous, the emphasis on self-identification is congruent with the criteria set forth by the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues as well as other international legal instruments, such as ILO Treaty 169 (Corntassel 2003). A policy of self-identification is designed to overcome colonial practices of denying Indigenous identities while acknowledging the agency of Indigenous women in determining their own identities, thereby rendering the definition of Indigenous women as fluid and heterogeneous.

"Where Are Your Women?": Gendering Indigenous Diplomacies

When addressing a British treaty delegation in the late-1770s, Tsalagi (Cherokee) peace chief Ada gal'kala asked, "Where are your women?" He was speaking to the British exclusion of women in their treaty party; in contrast, Tsalagis always brought delegations comprised of men, women, and youth to participate in negotiations. While traditional (Realist) understandings of diplomacy in the field of International Relations have focused on the ability of sovereign states to negotiate solutions with one another in order to maintain peaceful relations and to avoid militarized conflict or war, Indigenous nations have practiced diplomacy long before first contact with colonial powers by sending delegations to global destinations in order to foster new alliances of peace and friendship,⁵ and Indigenous women had been actively engaged in international diplomacies prior to and during first contact with colonial powers. Since Indigenous nations often identify as self-determining entities, the Realist understanding of diplomacy does not fully capture the complex nature of Indigenous interactions that occur both within their communities and in external relations between other Indigenous nations, states, and international organizations. For example, many Indigenous nations regard their strategic interactions and formalized relationships with colonial host states as foreign policy, rather than as domestic policy, since many "see themselves as citizens in the communities of the stateless societies which existed in these countries" prior to colonization (Yuval-Davis 1999, 126).

There is also an important spiritual dimension to Indigenous diplomacies. For Tsalagis (Cherokee Nation), as with other Indigenous nations on Turtle Island (North America), political diplomacy goes hand in hand with spiritual integrity. For example, prior to any treaty negotiations or ceremonies, male and female Tsalagis spiritually prepared themselves and the community—these ceremonies ensured that spiritual and political compacts would be kept. Spiritual commitments superseded all political relations and the continuous renewal of one's roles and responsibilities (individually, as well as to family, clan/society, community, etc.) formed the basis of Indigenous governance. Other Indigenous nations have similar philosophies and practices regarding diplomacy, further demonstrating that political action ideally emanates from the spiritual practices of a community. According to Oren Lyons (1984, 5), Faithkeeper of the Turtle Clan of the Onondaga Nation, "Spirituality is the highest form of politics, and our spirituality is directly involved in government."

Indigenous women have also emphasized the importance of spirituality in their diplomatic pursuits, which in some cases, as we discuss below,

has challenged both the nation and the state to recognize their leadership in their communities. As such, their diplomacies are not just political processes in the Western sense. They are also spiritual processes that are inextricable from their lives as Indigenous women. As Sharon Venne explains, "Our spirituality and our responsibilities define our duties . . . Our sovereignty is related to our connections to the earth and is inherent" (as quoted in Smith 2006, 17).

Indigenous women have sought to complicate the picture even further by challenging not only the state driven model of diplomacy but also Indigenous nation-centered depictions of diplomatic activity and treaty making. They have done this through enacting a politics of intersectionality, which demands that their multiple locations as women and as Indigenous peoples must be made visible, and by linking the local to the global and the private to the public, thereby challenging the artificial boundaries of these political and personal spaces.

For Indigenous women, these locations (i.e., families, communities, host states, and international fora) are not approached as separate, mutually exclusive spaces but rather as interlocking entities in which local issues are connected to global ones and vice-versa. This framing can be thought of as multilayered citizenship "in which one's citizenship in collectivities in the different layers—local, ethnic, national, state, cross- or trans-state, and supra-state—is affected and often at least partly constructed by the relationships and positionings of each layer in a specific historical context" (Yuval-Davis 1999, 122). As Yuval-Davis suggests, a multilayer model of citizenship presents a challenge to Western understandings of citizenship that equate citizenship (and, by definition, diplomatic activity) solely with the state, and allows for analysis that is gendered and non-Western-centric (1999, 118).

Multilayered citizenship is not necessarily hierarchical in the sense of traditional International Relations understandings of levels of analysis. Rather, the layers are relational, overlapping, intersecting, and contextual, allowing for an understanding of acts of citizenship that are simultaneous across and within various layers rather than isolated acts within a hierarchy of levels of governance that are construed as mutually exclusive. For example, Yuval-Davis (1999, 122–23) includes the concept of "intimate citizenship" which problematizes and politicizes the profoundly feminized domestic or private sphere as part of her construction of multilayered citizenship. This frames citizenship, which in the Western tradition is usually thought of as only a public act, as inextricable from private life. This move allows for the analysis of the gendered body as a site of "multi-layered rules and regulations" (Yuval-Davis 1999, 123), which

is particularly important to Indigenous women's struggles against violence as well as the protection of their ancestral homelands. It also provides a conceptual space for the inclusion of Indigenous women's spirituality and informal leadership responsibilities deemed to be outside of the public sphere, which are often marginalized or ignored when utilizing Western citizenship and diplomatic frameworks. By adopting a multilayered citizenship framework, spirituality and politics become interconnected and Indigenous women's multiple and intersecting roles and responsibilities as family members, clan mothers, and leaders become an integral part of an examination of diplomatic strategies.

While a few International Relations scholars have noted how marginalized and invisibilized Indigenous peoples are in the global diplomatic arena (Beier 2007; Keal 2003; Shaw 2002; Wilmer 1993), the complexities of Indigenous women's diplomacies are not accounted for. For example, Epp's (2001, 301) definition of Indigenous diplomacies as Indigenous practices is too sweeping, since it begs the question of whose practices, and on whose behalf? As Rao (1995) argues, political positioning or activity done in the name of culture or a cultural group is not value or power free. It matters whose voice is heard—especially in the context of Indigenous diplomacies since Indigenous cultural and political practices have not been immune to the effects of ongoing colonialism. Indigenous women have been quick to recognize the limitations of a Western definition of diplomacy that is purely understood as a state based activity as well as notions of Indigenous diplomacy that recognize only the activities of the official representatives of nations, who are, more often than not, male. In summing up the position of Indigenous women in Latin America, Alderete et al. (1994, 9–10) argue that “the invasion of non-Indian values has drastically changed the relationship between men and women and the role that women play in the communities and nations . . . from now on, we will work on the continental level, in a coordinated manner, and we will actively participate in local, national and international meetings.”

This observation by Alderete et al. links together the issues of colonialism, gender inequality, and resistance. One notable consequence of Western imperialism has been the shift from matriarchal and/or matrilineal or gender equitable to patriarchal and/or patrilineal societies and the subsequent devaluation and invisibilization of Indigenous women's contributions to public and private life in many Indigenous communities.⁶ Thus, the nation as a political and diplomatic representative for Indigenous women *vis-à-vis* the state, as well as in international fora such as the United Nations, is fraught with difficulty as Indigenous

women's interests are often ignored. In the global Indigenous rights fora, Indigenous women have fought to keep their interests from being subsumed under Indigenous rights rhetoric that does not take seriously the important intersection of indigeneity and gender. Such an approach assumes that Indigenous men and women experience infringements on their rights in the same ways. Put another way, Indigenous women have mobilized to ensure that the Indigenous male experience is not read as the only Indigenous experience at all levels of governance. The following examples of the Zapatista women and the Rotinoshon'non:we (Six Nations Confederacy) clan mothers illustrate the power and necessity of Indigenous women's diplomacies.

¡Ya Basta!: Zapatista Women Revolutionize the EZLN

One year prior to the EZLN's January 1994 uprising in which they declared war on the State of Mexico, Zapatista women within Mayan communities in Chiapas launched what many in the EZLN have declared the *first* EZLN uprising, by presenting and demanding the acceptance of the Ten Revolutionary Laws for Women (Mora 1998, 167). Taking advantage of the Zapatismo ideology to give voice to the voiceless through self-representation and the new space created by women joining the military arm of the EZLN, Zapatista women, in the words of Comandante Susana in an interview with a journalist, "decided that things would be better if there was a Law of Women . . . The women, my *compañeras*, saw there isn't any respect, that is why we wrote the law, so that there would be respect" (as quoted in Mora 1998, 167). The laws were the result of an effective diplomatic strategy of a long period of grass roots community consultation and consensus building within and across Mayan communities (Hernández Castillo 2002). This consensus building was achieved through the affirmation that Indigenous women cannot, and should not, separate their lives as women and as Indigenous peoples.

The Ten Revolutionary Laws reflect the intersections of these identities by insisting, for example, that Indigenous women have the right to choose the number of children they have and who to marry as well as the right to participate in the revolutionary struggle as soldiers and leaders. As Hernández Castillo (2002, 386) notes, these women "questioned their historical exclusion from political spaces and [advanced] a platform advocating democracy from within the private, family space," thereby articulating a position grounded in multilayered citizenship. Thus, Zapatista women issued a challenge to both government and Indigenous discourses by

pointing out their intersecting oppressions as Indigenous peoples within the state, and as women in their own communities, where cultural arguments justifying gender inequality were prominent. Yet despite these cultural arguments, the Revolutionary Laws were accepted unanimously by the EZLN, a testament to the power of Indigenous women's strategic and diplomatic interventions. As Subcomandante Marcos, a spokesperson for the EZLN observed, it was a "revolution within a revolution" (as quoted in Pellarolo 2006).⁷

What is particularly noteworthy about the diplomatic success of the Zapatista women is that unlike many other revolutionary struggles in which women's issues are put on the back burner until the revolution is successful, the EZLN, by adopting the Ten Revolutionary Laws, before the public uprising that would make them known to the rest of the world, put women's rights at the forefront of their overall revolutionary objectives (Mora 1998, 175). Thus, the Ten Revolutionary Laws were incorporated and read, as follows, on the radio and published online as part of the EZLN's first proclamation on January 1, 1994:

In its just fight for the liberation of our people, the EZLN includes women in the revolutionary struggle without regard to race, creed, colour or political affiliation. The only prerequisite is that they make the demands of the exploited their own and that they abide and enforce the laws and regulations of the revolution. In addition, and taking into account working women's situation in Mexico, their just demands for equality and justice are included in the following Revolutionary Law for Women:

Article One: Women have the right to participate in the revolutionary struggle, wherever and to the degree that their own conscience and abilities dictate, without regard to race, creed, colour or political affiliation.

Article Two: Women have the right to work and receive a fair wage.

Article Three: Women have the right to decide the number of children they can have and care for.

Article Four: Women have the right to participate in community affairs and hold posts if they are freely and democratically elected.

Article Five: Women and their children have the right to basic health care and decent food.

Article Six: Women have the right to education.

Article Seven: Women have the right to choose their partners and not be forced to marry.

Article Eight: No woman may be struck or physically mistreated by either family members or strangers. The crimes of attempted rape and rape shall be severely punished.

Article Nine: Women may hold leadership posts in the organization and military rank in the revolutionary armed forces.

Article Ten: Women will enjoy all rights and obligations established in revolutionary laws and regulations. (Reprinted in Millán 1998, 74–75)

Although the Revolutionary Laws were also incorporated in the first round of accords (San Andrés) that both the government and the Zapatista leadership signed (thus setting the stage for representation at the global level), at the time of the initial uprising, most news media outlets failed to even acknowledge the Revolutionary Women's Laws and their significance (Millán 1998). In addition, the press did not consider Zapatista women to be the diplomats or spokespeople of the EZLN, despite the fact that the first EZLN insurgency on January 1, 2004, was commanded by a woman, Major Ana Maria, whose name we only learn fifty days after the fact when she is asked by female journalists (Marcos 2001). In his reflections on the event, Subcomandante Marcos recalls that after the first insurgence, reporters asked him his name but not Ana Maria's even though she was standing right next to him, rendering her invisible (Marcos 2001).

Even though Subcomandante Marcos, with his ability to speak fluent Spanish, has often been the public voice of the EZLN, it is also important to note that often it has been Indigenous women higher up in the EZLN leadership who have been the diplomatic representatives of the EZLN. For example, Comandante Ramona, who also led a command in the initial uprising, was the EZLN's delegate for the first round of peace talks with the Mexican government in 1994, and continued to be a highly visible leader of the EZLN until her untimely death in 2006. In 2001, Comandante Esther was the first Indigenous woman to ever address the Mexican Congress. In her speech urging the Congress to adopt the Commission of Concordance and Peace (COCOPA) law that would include Indigenous rights in the Mexican constitution she highlighted the importance of her diplomatic presence: "And it is also a symbol that it is I, a poor indigenous Zapatista woman, who would be having the 1st word, and that the main message of word as Zapatistas would be mine" (Esther 2006, 17). Two years later, a speech written by Comandante Esther was read out loud at the World Trade Organization's convention in Cancun.

Zapatista women's diplomacies have taken place in all levels of the EZLN—from the highest leadership level of the Clandestine Indigenous Revolutionary Committee (CCRI) to the women only militias to the support bases. Although exact figures are unknown, it is thought that women

now comprise 40 percent of the military arm of the EZLN, up from 30 percent a decade ago (Nash 2001, 180). There are many other examples of their diplomatic engagements which include rejecting government funding for their collectives (Swords 2007), participating in marches and protests, preventing troops from entering their villages, and taking over a university radio station in Oaxaca for three months to air their demands (Hernández Castillo 2008).

Although Zapatista women's diplomacies are notable in that they have served as an inspiration for Indigenous women around the world and have influenced many Indigenous women's participation in treaty processes in the state, regional, and global arenas, it is also important not to romanticize the position of Zapatista women as their struggles for self-determination are ongoing. Zapatista women's diplomatic successes have ironically made them more empowered in some ways and more vulnerable in others (Bogado 2006; Hernández Castillo 2008; Millán 2006; Mora 1998; Nash 2001; Olivera 2005). For example, Zapatista women continue to struggle to fully implement the Revolutionary Laws for Women within their communities, where domestic violence is still a widespread problem. As Millán (2006, 80–81) explains, "Family structure works as a contradictory core: it is simultaneously a unit of solidarity and resistance, which implements cooperative strategies for survival and reproduction, and a power structure, which establishes the internal relations and the women's place within them, where inequality is marked by gender and generation."

In an act of intimate citizenship, as Zapatista women are negotiating gender roles in the private sphere, they are simultaneously negotiating their public ones as well. Their roles in the private sphere profoundly affect their diplomatic opportunities and abilities in the public sphere. Hernández Castillo (2008, 153) cautions that, "for the most conservative sectors of mestizo and indigenous society, the presence of organized women in a community is virtually synonymous with political radicalism." This creates an ironic and untenable counter-loop between their communities and the Mexican state. For example, their increased visibility at all levels in the EZLN has also marked them as central political targets of the counter-insurgency. The state violence against Zapatista and other Indigenous women has taken the particular form of sexualized violence as well as the criminalization of their organizations in order to imprison leaders. In both of these cases, Zapatista women's bodies are gendered and indigenized by playing on internalized sexism in their communities as a source of reverse-leverage by the counterinsurgency. Yet, at the same time, as delineated in the Women's Revolutionary Laws

as well as their participation in barricades, Zapatista women have used their own bodies as diplomatic leverage. In this way, we can see that their experiences are profoundly different than men's, even as they serve as envoys for the EZLN as a whole.

As Speed (2006, 219) notes, Zapatista women have rejected the individual-collective rights binary and have articulated "a conjunction of the individual and collective as central to their struggles" as well as their diplomatic engagements. For Zapatista women, individual rights cannot be conceptualized and pursued outside of the community context. Perhaps the most symbolic diplomatic act of this precept is the masks that they wear, which simultaneously render them (in)visible as they speak publicly about their struggles as Indigenous women. Coupled with the Women's Revolutionary Laws, which are perceived as an ongoing diplomatic process, the EZLN is a significant example of Indigenous women's intersectional identities at work. It illustrates both violence and discrimination perpetrated by the state as the result of colonization and ongoing colonial processes, as well as violence in their communities. It acknowledges that violence against Indigenous women has taken a specific form and shape (especially domestic violence and sexual abuse) that is not equally applicable or the same as the violence that Indigenous men have experienced in the colonial process. Rather, it names the profoundly gendered private sphere of family and community violence as well, and holds Indigenous communities accountable for their actions. It is also an illustration of the complexities of multilayered citizenship in that it intersects the private and public spheres with community, state, and systemic practices.

Behind the Barricades: The Rotinoshon'non:we (Six Nations Confederacy) Clan Mothers

As suggested throughout this chapter, Indigenous women occupy multiple sites of citizenship and intersecting identities that frame their ongoing diplomatic engagements at all levels of governance. Indigenous women on Turtle Island and around the world currently engage in diplomatic strategies that demonstrate the complexity of their political and cultural relationships, emphasizing the need for spiritual and cultural renewal. We acknowledge that there are vast differences among Indigenous nations in Canada and we do not assume homogeneity of cultural practices, experiences, or worldviews. However, there are two issues that link all Indigenous communities: violence and land rights. These two

issues have been at the forefront of many Indigenous women's movements and organizations in Canada,⁸ and they are concretely linked to the diplomatic activities of the Canadian state, international organizations, and international treaties.

A recent example of Indigenous women's diplomacies illustrates the resurgence of Indigenous women's leadership in Six Nations Confederacy—another revolution within a revolution—and demonstrates the complex linkages between internal and external community relations. On February 28, 2006, Rotinoshon'on:we (Six Nations Confederacy) clan mothers and warriors reclaimed forty hectares of their traditional territory in Ontario, Canada. The disputed Haldimand Tract, which includes six miles of territory on each side of the Grand River, had been granted to Six Nations peoples by the British Crown (subsequently Government of Canada) in 1784 and Six Nations' title to this territory had never been relinquished. In order to prevent a housing developer, Henco Industries Ltd., from constructing a new subdivision on their homelands, Six Nations clan mothers and warriors reoccupied their traditional territory along the Grand River.

The roots of the Haudenosaunee reoccupation began in October 2005 when Six Nations' spokeswoman for the hereditary chiefs, Janie Jamieson, organized a potluck in order to commemorate the 221st anniversary of the Six Nations' Haldimand Tract (Walkom 2006). As part of the commemoration, Jamieson held a two-day protest at the site of the proposed subdivision, along with the potluck supper, and the event was widely attended by community members. The potluck supper was an interesting diplomatic strategy to pursue within the community, since cooking is often regarded as a domestic activity and the responsibility primarily of women. Thus, an activity typically thought of as belonging to the private sphere helped shape the public sphere diplomatic response. After publicizing the illegality of the proposed subdivision for several months, Jamieson and her allies received permission from the hereditary chiefs to occupy the site indefinitely and they reoccupied the territory on February 28, 2006 (Walkom 2006).

From the very beginning of the struggle, Rotinoshon'on:we clan mothers established themselves as the legitimate representatives of the Six Nations peoples and the true title holders of their homelands because, as Janie Jamieson explains, "In our teachings, all forms of life come from the women. All responsibilities towards life come from the women" (Edwards 2006). After pointing out that the elected Six Nations Council of Grand River, set up under Canada's 1876 Indian Act, did not represent the Rotinoshon'on:we people, the clan mothers,

along with hereditary chiefs, took the leadership role as the legitimate protectors and representatives of Six Nations territory people by meeting directly with federal negotiators. In fact, on March 27, 2006, the clan mothers and hereditary chiefs sent the federal negotiator back to Ottawa and demanded that an appropriate Canadian authority (i.e., Attorney-General or Governor-General) be sent to Caledonia in order to engage in authentic diplomatic negotiations.

Behind the barricades, clan mothers also exerted their authority with warriors by lining up in front of them at heated moments in the stand-off in order to quell action against Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) forces until it was deemed necessary. For example, on March 28, 2006, more than a hundred Indigenous women, including clan mothers, using their bodies as a source of diplomacy, locked their arms in a human chain to prevent police officers from crossing the barricade. As one young Six Nations' warrior relates in his observations during the occupation, "I saw clan mothers there [at the barricade] every night. I never saw one Chief there, not once in the entire blockade, I never saw a Chief. But there were clan mothers there sitting with the people, talking with us and supporting us any way they could" (Alfred 2006a, 24).

Utilizing all diplomatic avenues available to them, Rotinoshon'non:we clan mothers, as "Title Holders" of the land, also issued an "Objection to Invasion of Kaianereh'ko:wa territory by the Foreign Governments of Canada and Ontario" on March 20, 2006. Citing the illegality of Canadian and Ontario governments' invasion of their traditional territory in Caledonia, clan mothers invoked UN General Assembly resolution 1541, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), Canada's Constitution Act of 1982, as well as the traditional laws of Rotinoshon'non:we, including Two Row Wampum and Wampum 44 (Rotinoshon'non:we Clan Mothers 2006). The clan mothers also asserted that the only legitimate forum to discuss the illegal encroachment onto Haudenosaunee territory was "the traditional Rotinoshon'non:we process as set out in the Kaianereh'ko:wa [and that] Canada and Ontario have no authority to make political decisions on behalf of our People" (Rotinoshon'non:we Clan Mothers 2006).

The clan mothers' declaration was presented to the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in May 2006, as well as to the UN Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights in Geneva. In response to the clan mothers' oral intervention at the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, the attending Canadian delegates abruptly left the room. However, United Nations officials responded quickly to the clan

mothers' declaration. On May 22, 2006, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous Peoples, and Pablo Espiniella, a Human Rights Officer, visited Kanehsatake and Kahnawake communities to document the struggle to retake their original Kaianereh'ko:wa territory. As of this writing, the blockade continues and all forms of Haudenosaunee diplomacy have been utilized at the local and global levels.

The ongoing leadership and diplomatic strategies of the Rotinoshon'non:we clan mothers demonstrates the complexities of internal and external diplomacies that Indigenous women continue to pursue in order to reestablish their traditional roles as community leaders, both spiritually and politically. Their engagement with multilayered strategies means that diplomatic relations pursued at one level of governance can influence and condition other levels of governance. This, in turn, has put external pressure on the Canadian government. Their fight against neoimperialism in their communities is conditioned by their location as part of a wider Indigenous struggle against the Canadian state, which is connected to the global Indigenous rights movement as well as women's rights movements more generally. The Rotinoshon'non:we clan mothers, like the Zapatista women, fighting against violence in their communities are operating on multiple and intersecting layers of identity and citizenship, thereby simultaneously acting as diplomats on the global level.

Conclusion

As indicated in our opening paragraph, Indigenous women historically have had an important role to play in Indigenous diplomatic activities. However, due to colonization and ongoing neoimperial practices, Indigenous women have often been marginalized and invisibilized. In response to these developments, Indigenous women have challenged the traditional diplomatic structures and activities in their communities, host states, and at the international levels in ways consistent with their understandings of their responsibilities as Indigenous women. They have sought and continue to seek self-determination for themselves as women and as Indigenous peoples.

This analysis has sought to complicate the study of Indigenous diplomacies by using an intersectional framework that highlights the intersecting identities of Indigenous women. Indigenous women use these intersecting identities and multilayered citizenship as the basis of their diplomatic activities, and such an analysis is important in understanding

the wider Indigenous rights movement. Indigenous women have engaged in a politics of intersectionality that allows them to represent themselves on their own terms by invoking both the global Indigenous and women's human rights discourses to further their aims in ways that ostensibly benefit the collective whole. This analysis reveals that, for Indigenous women, there can be no true Indigenous self-determination as long as internalized sexism exists in their communities.⁹ Indigenous women's intersectional positioning mirrors what Yuval-Davis (1999, 131) calls "transversal citizenship politics" in which it is possible to pursue equality across difference by breaking down perceived homogeneity of specific identity groups in diplomatic spaces, such as Indigenous peoples and women. Furthermore, transversal citizenship politics also recognizes that there is much "unfinished knowledge" in these processes (Hill-Collins 1990, 236, as quoted in Yuval-Davis 1999, 131). The idea of unfinished knowledge allows for the construction of Indigenous women's diplomacies as an (re) evolutionary process, as seen in the diplomatic actions of both the Zapatista and The Rotinoshon'non:we clan mothers. In short, a revolution within a revolution.

Notes

1. Respectively as CEDAW 1979 and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 2007.
2. See, for example, the Asian Indigenous Women's Network, <http://www.asianindigenouswomen.org/>; the Indigenous women's biodiversity network, <http://www.nciv.net/spaans/iwbn/IWBN.htm>; and the Continental Network of Indigenous Women, <http://enlacemujeresindigenas.org/ing/>.
3. Nor may they explicitly subscribe to feminism, which is often perceived as a Western construct. See Tohe (2000) for a thoughtful discussion of this issue.
4. See, for example, the essays in IWGIA (2004); Zea (1999); Vinding (1998).
5. For more historical details on these diplomatic missions, see Deloria and DeMallie (1999), Williams (1997), and Viola (1995).
6. The authors recognize that this statement is an overgeneralization, which masks the vast differences between Indigenous nations, but due to space limitations cannot delve further into this important point. Yet, many Indigenous and feminist postcolonial scholars have also made this point, suggesting that the general idea is applicable to many nations. For more, see Smith (2005) and Loomba (1998).

7. For a recent interview with Subcomandante Marcos in which he further elaborates on the position of Indigenous women in the EZLN, see Bogado (2006).
8. See, for example, Coulthard (2006) and Native Women's Association of Canada (<http://www.nwac-hq.org>).
9. Conversely, there can be no true gender equality for Indigenous women unless the women's rights movement takes seriously their struggle for Indigenous self-determination. See Parisi and Corntassel (2007) for more on this important point.

This page intentionally left blank

Achievements of Indigenous Self-Determination

The Case of Sami Parliaments in Finland and Norway

Rauna Kuokkanen

The postwar period engendered a dramatic period of change and adjustment for Indigenous communities. This is no less true for the Sami, an Indigenous people whose traditional territories have been divided between the four nation-states of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia. Despite this fragmentation (and Russia notwithstanding), Sami in the Nordic countries have achieved an extremely high level of political organization. They have also been very active in global diplomacies at the same time as they interact with and between the Nordic countries in a manner self-consciously understood and explicitly articulated as diplomacy. The Sami Council, a representative body with NGO status at the United Nations Economic and Social Council, was established only a decade after the cessation of hostilities of World War II. However, as this chapter will show, official recognition and other forms of “success” in hegemonic or “mainstream” diplomatic arenas may turn out to be quite hollow when diplomacy rests ultimately on mainstream rather than Indigenous ideational foundations.

Following schismatic events surrounding the Alta Dam affair¹ in Norway in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the Nordic countries moved to recognize Sami rights (albeit at different speeds) with an emphasis on culture and language rights. Deeply influenced by the political systems and consensus models of the Nordic countries, Sami political and

organizational activism has resulted in representative Parliaments in each of the countries in which they reside, except for Russia. Norway, the country where the Sami are most numerous, is arguably where the most significant gains have been made, as signified by the recently passed (2005) Finnmark Act. A comanagement agreement governing the northernmost county of Norway, the Finnmark Act ensures a measure of Sami representation and input into major decisions affecting the use of land and resources in the Finnmark County.

However, a closer examination of legislation shows that Sami, while ably represented by their own political assemblies, may have failed to realize the full potential of the political, financial, and social resources at their disposal. Are Sami land rights a reality or a distant dream while the Sami Parliaments struggle with issues that are more local or even internal in character? With renewed interest in the resources of the Arctic by the nation-states, Sami political organizations are faced with an explosion of development in their traditional territories. Will the Sami and their representative bodies have a real say in the natural resource deals and negotiations, or will their much vaunted success at playing the Nordic system prove to be an empty prize?

This chapter examines the achievements of Sami self-determination with a critical lens. Focusing particularly on Finland and Norway, the chapter asks whether the Sami, with their unrivaled level of political access and financial resources that most other Indigenous peoples could only envy, have fallen short in their quest for self-determination.

Sami Political Organization

The Sami are the Indigenous people of Sápmi (Samiland), a territory that today spans central Norway and Sweden through northern Finland to the Kola Peninsula of Russia. A rough estimate of the Sami population is between 75,000 to 100,000, with 45,000 in Norway. Historically, Sami society was organized locally by the extended-family system called the *siida*. Each *siida* had its own tribunal to look after such matters as hunting and fishing disputes and disputes about a certain territory between two *siidas*. The *siida* system was the early model for Sami self-determination which was, however, completely ignored and gradually erased by the colonizing states. From the 1800s onward, harsh assimilatory policies toward the Sami were implemented in the Nordic countries. This was done mainly in the name of education and social welfare. According to the governments, the need for education and social welfare could be

fulfilled only through learning the majority language of the country. In Norway, for instance, teachers were paid a bonus if they succeeded in teaching Norwegian to Sami. In 1902, a law was passed by which land could only be owned by a citizen who both knew and used Norwegian.

A cooperative body of Sami organizations, the Nordic Sami Council was established in 1956 as a result of increased pan-Sami collaboration after World War II. Its original mandate was to advance Sami cooperation and promote the economic and cultural interests of the Sami people. The Council's work is delineated by the Sami Conference held every four years and attended by the member organizations. Soon after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Russian Sami officially joined the organization and the name was changed to the Sami Council in 1992. Prior to the establishment of the elected Sami Parliaments, the Sami Council's focus was on internal Sami issues such as education, language, traditional livelihoods, women's issues, health and social issues, and cultural heritage. It also allocates funding for cultural and other projects and grants the Sami Council Literary Prize every year (Sami Council 2007). Besides this, however, the Council has had a growing role in international diplomacies over the last few decades. The Sami Conference was one of the cofounders of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples in 1976 in Port Alberni, British Columbia. Since the 1980s, Sami attentions have increasingly focused on international Indigenous issues. For example, the Sami have been involved in the work of the United Nations' Working Group on Indigenous Populations since its establishment in 1982. The Council has had consultative status at the United Nations Economic and Social Council dating to 1989. The Sami Council is also one of the Permanent Participants of the Arctic Council, a cooperation forum of eight Arctic states, six Arctic Indigenous organizations (called Permanent Participants), and other interest groups.

Like other social justice movements throughout the world in the late 1960s and 1970s, the second wave of the Sami movement (the first took place at the start of the twentieth century) demanded particularly an improved recognition of Sami culture and the Sami languages (of which the North Sami is, by far, most widely spoken). In 1992, Sami Language Acts in both Norway and Finland gave the Sami the right to use their mother tongue when dealing with the government agencies and state authorities. There are, however, serious shortcomings in implementing these laws. A recent study on the Sami Language Act in Finland revealed that, despite amendments in the law, many authorities and state bodies either ignore or are unaware of their legal obligations with regard to the Sami language (Haapala 2007). In Sweden, the Sami language has only a

minority language status together with other minority and immigrant languages spoken in Sweden. In Russia, there are no special laws protecting Sami languages.

The Sami movement also led to the establishment of Sami Parliaments, first in Finland in 1973, then in Norway in 1989, and in Sweden in 1993. The Sami in Russia do not yet have their own parliament but the matter has been debated for many years. The Sami Parliaments are elected bodies representing the Sami in their respective countries and have an advisory status on Sami-related affairs, though limited political and decision-making authority. They differ slightly from one another in terms of their mandates and functions, but their advisory role is such that they are in a constant state of diplomatic interaction with the governments in their countries.

The Finnish Sami Parliament started in 1973 as an experiment proposed by an ad hoc Committee on Sami affairs and the first elections were not held until 1975. Its role was largely limited to issuing statements related to Sami affairs in Finland. It also had the right to raise questions that it deemed important to be discussed in the national Parliament. In 1995, the Finnish Parliament passed an Act on the Sami Parliament that strengthened the previously weaker position of the elected body. In addition to its existing tasks of attending to Sami cultural and language-related affairs, issuing statements, and making initiatives, the new act "obligates the authorities to *negotiate* with the Sami Parliament in all far-reaching and important measures which may directly and in a specific way affect the states of the Sami as an indigenous people" (Myntti 1997, 124). At the same time, the Finnish Parliament revised the Constitution to include the recognition of the Sami as an Indigenous people in Finland and guarantee their right to "cultural autonomy" according to which the Sami, in their geographically defined Sami region,² have self-determination on affairs related to culture and language. This "cultural autonomy" is administered and implemented by the Sami Parliament.

Founded in 1989, the Norwegian Sami Parliament is a result of the work of the Sami Rights Commission appointed after the Alta Dam conflict in 1980 to consider and to make recommendations about the legal situation of the Sami in Norway, especially related to the question of land and natural resource rights. Its first set of recommendations led to the approval of the Sami Act in 1987 and a constitutional amendment to include Sami rights in 1988. The Constitution's article 110a states that, "It is the obligation of the State authorities to create the conditions necessary for the Sami to protect and develop their language, their culture

and their society” (quoted in Henriksen 1999, 37). The Sami Act mandated the establishment of the Sami Parliament and its areas of activity include, according to the Act’s article 2.1, “all questions that the Parliament considers to relate to the Sami.” Moreover, “the Sami Parliament has the authority to make decisions when this follows from other provisions in the law or is decided in another way” (quoted in Henriksen 1999, 39). Like its counterpart in Finland, the Norwegian Sami Parliament can also raise questions and issue statements related to Sami affairs. Despite the wording of the Act, the political authority of the Sami Parliament in Norway is also limited to an advisory role except in some administrative areas such as allocation of funds to Sami organizations and projects.

The Sami Parliament in Sweden was established in 1993. The Alta River conflict triggered growing pressure to address the question of Sami rights in Sweden as well. In 1981, the Sami in Sweden requested a comprehensive evaluation of their situation and urged the government to start working on a Sami Act. A commission was established to this end and its findings were published in three parts between 1986 and 1990. As a result, a Sami Act was passed at the end of 1992. The Act delineates the establishment of the Sami Parliament with the primary task of promoting “a living Sami culture.” Unlike Norway and Finland, Sweden did not approve constitutional amendments to protect the Sami as an Indigenous people as recommended by the Sami Rights Commission. Rather, it was argued that the Swedish Constitution already adequately protects the Sami alongside the country’s ethnic, linguistic, and religious minorities (Henriksen 1999).

Unlike the Sami Acts in Finland and Norway, the Sami Act of Sweden carefully defines the formal mandate of the Swedish Sami Parliament. Moreover, the Act specifies the Sami Parliament as a state authority not to be considered a self-determining body. The main functions of the Swedish Sami Parliament include the administration of funding for cultural projects and language-related initiatives, dissemination of Sami-related information, and ensuring that Sami needs and interests are taken into consideration in local and regional planning. Further, the Swedish Sami Parliament is in charge of Sami-related EU programs such as the programs on Sami development and on Sami communities. Together with its counterparts in Finland and Norway, it has also participated in the European Union cross-border community initiative called Interreg II (Henriksen 1999).

In 1986, the Sami Conference, the highest body of the Sami Council, formulated and accepted the Sami Political Program that states the following:

1. We, the Sami, are one people and state borders shall not divide us.
2. We have our own history, traditions, culture and language. From our ancestors, we have inherited the right to the land, water and livelihoods (Sami Council 1986).

In reality, the nation-state borders have divided the Sami people for centuries (the first border was drawn in 1751 between the present-day Norway and Finland). In general, however, the state boundaries were not explicitly felt until World War II and its aftermath, when the Nordic countries fell under different camps of the Cold War.³ After the war, Sami were also required to settle down more permanently on either side of the river, although many families had land on each side. New laws were passed to regulate land ownership. According to the Norwegian law, "Finnish citizens" (i.e., the Sami who happened to live on the Finnish side of the river when the border was drawn in 1751) were no longer allowed to own land on the Norwegian side.

In 1995, Sweden and Finland joined the European Union while Norway, following its referendum, decided to stay outside. This has had the effect of increasing the lived realities of borders dividing the Sami people. The Sami in Finland and Sweden were successful in negotiating a separate agreement in the European Union, the Protocol No. 3 on the Sami People, which recognizes the Sami and their rights as an Indigenous people in Europe. The protocol acknowledges the obligations Finland, Norway, and Sweden have toward the Sami according to national and international law to protect and develop Sami language, culture, society, and livelihoods, especially reindeer herding (Henriksen 1999).

To counter the divisive nature of state borders, and thus different national policies and legislation, the Sami have been working toward a joint Sami policy and improved cooperation and collaboration in the four countries in which they live today. The Nordic countries, which have a long tradition of Nordic cooperation, have already created bodies such as the Nordic Cooperative Body for Sami Issues and Reindeer Herding, established in 1964, to address questions related to livelihoods, language, culture, and education (Henriksen 1999). In 1995, the Nordic Council of Ministers agreed to set up a working group to draft a Nordic Sami Convention with the objective of strengthening the Sami rights to language, culture, and livelihoods. Established in 2002, the working group submitted its proposal in 2005 to the Nordic ministers in charge of Sami affairs and the presidents of the three Sami Parliaments for their approval. Negotiations on ratifying the Convention were subsequently delayed due to a lack of action on the part of the Finnish government to debate the

text in the Parliament (Eira 2007). Finland has also had difficulties in accepting some of the articles in the draft Convention, such as Article 3 on the right to Sami self-determination, Article 4 on Sami land rights, and Article 42 on reindeer herding as a Sami livelihood (Josefsen 2007b).

The collaboration between the three Sami Parliaments has been formalized by the establishment of the Sami Parliamentary Council in 2000. With limited funding and no secretariat, the work of the Sami Parliamentary Council has been, thus far, largely limited to occasional joint meetings of the Parliaments and networking among the presidents of the Sami Parliaments. The Sami in Russia attend the work of the Parliamentary Council as observers.

The Status of Sami Self-Determination

Henriksen (2004) outlines four main ways of organizing contemporary Indigenous autonomy and self-government in various parts of the globe. These include autonomy through contemporary Indigenous political institutions; autonomy based on the concept of an Indigenous territory; regional autonomy within the state; and Indigenous overseas autonomy. The Sami Parliaments in Norway, Sweden, and Finland, along with the Torres Strait Islander Commission in Australia and the Waitangi Tribunal in Aotearoa/New Zealand are examples of Indigenous self-government models constructed and practiced by means of contemporary institutions.

It is important to bear in mind that self-determination is a much broader concept than self-government. Self-determination ultimately refers to the right and ability to determine and make decisions in all spheres and aspects of life as articulated, for example, in the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Existing Indigenous self-government agreements and structures are generally limited in their political and economic capacity and only allow for self-administration of certain programs. Below, I consider more closely the implementation and materialization of Sami self-determination in Finland and Norway.

Finland

In Finland, Sami self-determination is framed in terms of “cultural autonomy.” The Act on the Sami Parliament was passed amidst intense opposition by the non-Sami population of Northern Finland who feared that Sami cultural autonomy would lead to economic benefits for the Sami

and the recognition of Sami land rights. To dispel these concerns, it was emphasized at parliamentary hearings that cultural autonomy and Sami economic rights related to the land are two different issues and that the former does not anticipate solutions with regard to the latter. However, it has been argued that, as with other Indigenous peoples worldwide, Sami culture and land rights cannot be separated from one another. The Act on the Sami Parliament articulates the Sami participatory rights in relation to land use in the Sami area. For example Article 9 obligates the state representatives to negotiate with the Sami Parliament about “all far-reaching and significant measures” that can affect the status of the Sami as an Indigenous people.

What is more, in international agreements such as the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Convention No. 169 on Indigenous and tribal peoples and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, culture is defined in a broad sense that includes economic and material dimensions. For example, the preamble of the UN Declaration recognizes the importance of control over Indigenous peoples’ lands and territories in maintaining and strengthening their cultures. Further, in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights Article 27, widely employed by Indigenous peoples, culture has been defined to comprise numerous forms, including specific ways of life closely connected to the land and resource use (Scheinin 2001). However, as Henriksen notes, “The current Finnish legislation does not acknowledge or grant any special land rights to the Sami people in their own Homeland, neither does the legislation acknowledge any exclusive rights for the Sami people to pursue their traditional livelihoods. Most of the land areas (90%) within the demarcated Sami Homeland in Finland are regarded as state property” (Henriksen 2004, 5). Although “cultural rights” may provide a basis for Indigenous peoples to defend and advance their collective rights (e.g., see Robbins and Stamatopoulou 2004), it can also be argued that separating Indigenous self-government from a land base transforms “the identity of Indigenous peoples from peoples to other minority groups that do not have a territorial/homeland attachment.” It also “denies Indigenous communal ownership” (Altamirano-Jimenez 2004, 354). This approach reflects the neoliberal agenda and construction of Indigenous rights that seek to reduce and redefine Indigenous rights to fit into a new model of market citizenship with a focus on economic development.

Despite the Sami cultural autonomy guaranteed by law, it cannot be argued that the Sami in Finland have self-determination in any meaningful sense of the concept. While a historically varied and contested concept without a single norm (Lâm 2000), self-determination for Indigenous

peoples means the right to “freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development” (United Nations Human Rights Council 2006, Article 3). In Finland, the Sami Parliament is not in a position to make decisions about the economic, social, and cultural development of the Sami people nor has it been very successful in putting and maintaining pressure on the national government to ensure, for example, the implementation of the obligation of the state to negotiate with the Sami Parliament in matters affecting the Sami.

There is no real intention or political will to solve the land rights question and the Sami Parliament has largely failed to keep it on their own or the national agendas. There are a few Sami Parliament representatives who consider ensuring Sami linguistic and cultural rights (in a narrow sense) sufficient to Sami self-determination, thus leaving land rights aside altogether because it has been proven to be so contentious. For several years, the Finnish government has indicated that it is interested in ratifying the ILO Convention No. 169 but before it is able to do so it will need to address the unresolved Sami land title and find a solution to it. However, the national government is interested only in finding the minimum requirements for the ratification of the Convention, not genuinely recognizing Sami people’s right to their territories.⁴ This is despite recent and extensive legal historical research that incontestably demonstrates that the land currently designated as the state property has belonged to the Sami until as late as the early twentieth century (Korpijaakko 1993; Korpijaakko-Labba 2000).

Why have the Sami in Finland achieved so little in terms of self-determination although they were the first to gain their own elected representative body already over thirty years ago? One explanation can be found in its politically weak structure. The twenty-one Sami Parliament representatives are elected on an individual basis (i.e., there are no lists, organizations, or parties involved). Each candidate stands on his or her own merit and also, if elected, only represents himself or herself. This means that the Parliament consists of twenty-one individuals who are not committed to joint political platforms or agendas. Individual candidates may have election platforms but nothing prevents them changing their positions on issues upon being elected. Without a group behind the representative, voters have limited possibilities to have their concerns translated onto the agenda. Plenary meetings often are little more than opportunities for the voicing of a cacophony of individual opinions. Perhaps more significantly, due to institution of individual representation, there is no organized opposition in Sami politics in Finland that would exert pressure on the Parliament, especially in no performance situations.⁵ As Eva

Josefsen (2007b, 19) notes, “The establishment of [the] Saami Parliament [in 1973] led to Saami activists changing their focus from political mobilization to cooperation with the State.” This has resulted in an almost absurd situation where the most significant achievement of the last period (2004–7) of the Finnish Sami Parliament is, in the words of long-time president Pekka Aikio, the decision by the national government to build a Sami cultural center in Anár/Inari—an issue that dominated the Sami Parliament agenda and discussions for several years (Yle sämeradio 2007).

Norway

Unlike in Finland, the Sami in Norway have had strong national organizations since 1948, when the Norwegian Reindeer Sami Association was established. In 1968, the Norwegian Sami Association was established to represent all Sami whatever their means of livelihood. Today, there are other central Sami organizations but it is the Norwegian Sami Association that has been most successful in promoting Sami rights, including land rights. Also unlike the situation in Finland, the representatives of the Norwegian Sami Parliament are elected from lists created by Sami national organizations, Norwegian political parties, and local coalitions (Josefsen 2007b). Until the elections in 2005, the Norwegian Sami Association held a majority in the Sami Parliament. In autumn 2007, the “minority government” formed by the Norwegian Sami Association resigned and, for the first time, the president and the executive council were members of a Norwegian political party, the Labour party. This created a curious situation wherein the Labour party found itself in control of both the Sami Parliament and the Norwegian national government.

The Sami in Norway have, by far, achieved the most in terms of self-determination. The Alta River Case in the 1970s and early 1980s forced Norway to reconsider its Sami policies. In Finland and Sweden, the Sami “have not been able to confront the national authorities in the same manner” (Josefsen 2007b, 23). In Norway, however, the recognition of Sami land rights has not been met with the same fierce opposition and resistance as in Finland. The Finnmark Act, passed in May 2005 and hailed as an example for other states and Indigenous peoples to follow (Min Áigi 2005b; 2005a), recognizes Sami rights to the land and water. However, in its current form the Act only gives a right to limited comanagement.⁶ Besides setting up a comanagement board, the Act stipulates an establishment of a commission to further examine the nature of Sami land

rights. In practice, the act does not mean much for ordinary Sami people in their interaction with the land and resources (Utsi 2005a).

Norway was the first country to ratify the ILO Convention No. 169 concerning the rights of Indigenous peoples in 1989. With the passing of the Finnmark Act, the Norwegian government is also considered the first country in the world to integrate the Convention into its national jurisdiction. However, it can be argued that even in Norway the Sami are not meaningfully in control of their own affairs. While in recent years there have been positive developments in terms of recognizing Sami land rights in Norway, the Finnmark Act merely gives the Sami the right to internal and only partial self-governance in the form of comanagement. And, as James Tully (2000, 57) points out, giving Indigenous peoples “a form of proprietary right to a small portion of their territories under the domestic legal system” does not represent self-determination under international law. “As a result,” he continues, “they are precluded from appealing to international law as peoples to redress infringement of their rights under the guise of domestic legal system” (Tully 2000, 57). Thus, internal self-governance “is not a valid form of self-determination at all,” but rather, “a form of indirect colonial rule.” As Tully explains, “The principle or right of self-determination is, on any plausible account of its own criteria, the right of a people to govern themselves by their own laws and exercise jurisdiction over their territories, either exclusively or shared. A people are said to govern themselves, and thus to be a free people, when the laws by which they are governed rest on their consent or the consent of their representatives” (Tully 2000, 57). In spite of the consultation agreement between the national government and the Sami Parliament signed in 2005 (Josefsen 2007a), the Sami Parliament continues to have limited authority and decision-making power. Lately, it has also been somewhat hindered from within by internal politicking and disarray, including a change of leadership in the middle of term.

Symbolic Institutions without Influence?

Sami political and representative bodies such as the Sami Parliaments and the Sami Council are in many ways direct copies of their Nordic counterparts. They have adopted mainstream political structures, practices, and procedures without careful examination of their appropriateness and without employing traditional Sami self-determination models, such as the *siida* system, as a foundation or set of guiding principles for contemporary Sami organization. As Australian political scientist Peter Jull (1995) points

out, the trusting approach to the mainstream Nordic governing structures is reflected in the establishment of the Sami Parliaments. Jull's inquiries into process in the context of the Norwegian Sami Parliament "revealed little or no serious thought to structures, staffing, program management, etc. Those things were taken for granted. Capable Sami would simply slip into an elite Norwegian hierarchy" (Jull 1995, 132).

Instead of bringing a greater self-determination for the Sami in the form of increased control over our lives and future as a people, mainstream practices and agendas contribute first and foremost to the increased personal power and high-level positions for a handful of individuals. It is important also to recognize the ways in which mainstream politics and practices reflect patriarchal bias and thus reproduce existing gender hierarchies and inequality. The three Sami Parliaments in Norway, Sweden, and Finland have been male-dominated and, in the cases of Sweden and Finland, continue to be so (the percentage of women is 35 percent and 43 percent, respectively). The Norwegian Sami Parliament has had special campaigns to recruit more women as candidates as well as to encourage women to vote in its elections. In the autumn 2005 election, women formed, for the first time, the majority (51 percent) of the Norwegian Sami Parliament's total of 39 elected representatives (before the 2005 elections, the percentage of women representatives was as low as 12 percent). There is, however, a need to look beyond numbers and percentages. Although significant, the achievement of gender parity in the Sami Parliament does not automatically guarantee political practices or procedures that revoke or even challenge patriarchal structures, priorities, and political processes.

In contemporary Sami and other local organizations and political processes, they manifest, for example, through practices of trivializing and discrimination against women. Most often, these practices are very subtle and difficult to expose as discrimination but, as feminist scholars (see, for example, Enloe 2004, 5; Plumwood 1993) have pointed out, they nevertheless function as powerful mechanisms of control. Sami women politicians' perspectives and attempts to participate in a political debate is particularly trivialized when the topic under discussion is something traditionally considered as belonging to the "male sphere"—for instance, all-terrain vehicle permits, reindeer herding policy, and natural resource management. Aili Keskitalo, the first woman president (whose term came to an early and unexpected end in autumn 2007), challenged the practice of trivializing women's perspectives on such issues on several occasions (Utsi 2005b). She was the first high-ranking Sami politician to point to the reality of male mechanisms of control operating in Sami

politics—such as having her views discounted by her male colleagues who considered her lacking in competence—as well as witnessing the undermining of other Sami women politicians who have been told that “they don’t know what they are talking about” (Aslaksen 2007).

The Nordic countries are considered world leaders in terms of social welfare, well-being, and equality of all of their citizens. Importantly, these countries also choose to promote and present themselves in that very way in international contexts. In keeping with this, they also cultivate an image of themselves as governments friendly to Indigenous peoples at the UN and in other fora where Indigenous rights are debated. They all voted for the adoption of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in September 2007 at the UN General Assembly. In the midst of this apparently favorable environment, the Sami also enjoy relatively good access to national authorities and politicians with long-standing cooperation (rather than mobilization) (Josefsen 2007b). Why, then, have the Sami not achieved a stronger position to implement their self-determination?

In his comparative study, Jull (1995) notes that, unlike countries such as Canada, New Zealand, and the United States, there is no visible Indigenous opposition in the Nordic countries in politics, the media, the academy, or other public arenas calling attention to Sami issues and criticizing the governments. There is a noticeable lack of political and public debate of the sort that is required to change public perceptions—as Jull points out, there is no change in policy without changing public perceptions. The Sami have also failed, by and large, to use media, courts, and other avenues to demand attention to Sami issues and to place and maintain political pressure on governments. Jull concludes that, although the postwar Sami movement developed somewhat earlier than Native movements in Canada and although the Sami appear among “the best educated, the most work-skilled, and the greatest participants in mainstream politics” of all Indigenous peoples in the world, the Sami seem “to have achieved less of what Canada’s indigenous peoples regard as the main indigenous political agenda” (Jull 1995, 131).

The Sami leadership has chosen a different strategy, that of diplomacy and collaboration. Sami politicians have traded off their political agendas “for some official recognition and high-profile positions” and have “chosen to cooperate quietly” (Jull 1995, 138). As a result, Sami political discourse can be characterized as conservative; radicalism is commonly considered negative and “troublemakers” are made unwelcome if not ostracized altogether in and by public and political Sami discourses. During my own involvement in the work of the Sami Council in the late 1990s, I was told that the Sami approach is decidedly

different from the militant, radical, and adversarial ways of Indigenous peoples in North America. According to what I was told, the Sami approach, that of diplomacy, was much better because it has brought the Sami respect in various circles and led to leadership positions in international circles. This is a kind of conservatism that is commonly framed as a “common-sense approach” and validated by arguments according to which it is not a Sami tradition to “rock the boat.” Instead, the central Sami strategies have always been adaptation and withdrawal and these have guaranteed the continuance of Sami culture despite assimilative pressures and policies. As Sami scholar Veli-Pekka Lehtola argues: “In the face of new influences, new models of government, new restrictions and new abuses and drawbacks, the Sami never rushed to an uprising and resistance. Instead, they have always given way, receded and retreated but yet held their own and integrated changes as an integral part of their own culture” (Lehtola 1996, 17–18).

Such strategies can be at least partly explained by the strong influence and heavy emphasis on equality in the Nordic context. Despite the Sami presence as well as the presence of historical minorities and increasing numbers of immigrants and refugees, the notion of homogeneous nations (the national romantic idea of “one people, one nation”) prevails in public imaginaries and political discourses (Tuulentie 2001, 2003). This has led to framing equality as sameness, minimizing differences and emphasizing similarities (Gullestad 2001). Moreover, this framing of equality as sameness takes place in the framework of individualism in which there is very little, if any, attention paid to structural relations of power. In other words, although Sami rights are recognized as having a collective dimension, they nevertheless are largely constructed and represented within the frameworks of individualism and equality of individuals.

Another explanation for the apparent complacency of Sami political discourse and leadership can be found in the integration of the Sami in the Nordic welfare state after World War II. This has meant that, at present, “welfare services are by and large extended to Sami individuals in the same way as they are to the majority population in each of the Nordic states . . . [including] a wide variety of health and other personal social services, social assistance, education and occupational training, and housing” (Olsson and Lewis 1995, 162). As a result of this integration, the Sami in general are not plagued by social problems such as housing, unemployment, and ill health to the same extent as Indigenous peoples in other “First World” countries like Canada, the United States, and Australia. While the positive effects of the welfare state on the Sami

are visible to everybody, the negative effects have not been considered, even among the Sami themselves.

Sociologists Sven E. Olsson and Dave Lewis (1995, 177) have analyzed the conflicting ideologies of the welfare state and Indigenous peoples' collective rights and note that the principles of egalitarianism, social equality, and individualism represent "fundamental obstacles to the development of Sami cultural autonomy" and contribute "to the limited perspective of Sami minority [*sic*] rights held by non-Sami, Scandinavian policy-makers and society at large." They argue, "Of particular effect in this regard has been the dual Scandinavian expression of individualism and societal wholeness, leaving little space for the Sami to express or develop their own collective cultural interests. In essence, the Nordic welfare states have provided social security to Sami individuals with the intent of ensuring them a parallel standard of living to that of the Scandinavian majority while, simultaneously, tending to diminish both the importance and realization of the Sami's collective rights to protect their culture" (Olsson and Lewis 1995, 177–78). Individualism and social equality, the much-praised pillars of the Nordic welfare states, have dismissed and thus diminished the sense of collective existence of the Sami as an Indigenous people who, besides individual rights and freedoms, also have collective rights. Interestingly, this conflict between individual and collective rights has not been raised, discussed, or further examined by the Sami themselves, including the Sami leadership and political bodies. This is so despite the fact that the conflict goes to the very core of the question of Sami identity as a distinctive collectivity separate from the Nordic nation-states and peoples.

If the Sami are to achieve a higher level of self-determination, there is a need to examine the incompatibility of the values of the welfare state ideology and the basic tenets of Indigenous peoples' collective rights. Robert Paine (1977) has coined the term "welfare colonialism" to describe the economic integration of Northern Indigenous peoples by the Canadian state. The central elements of welfare colonialism include a radical undermining of traditional livelihoods and placing Indigenous people on welfare benefits. As a form of colonialism, welfare represents a subtle means of neocolonial social control through well-meaning policies which erode and hinder local autonomy. By creating dependency and passivity, welfare colonialism paralyzes mobilization and practices of self-governance.

Tully (2000) also discusses the strategies of incorporation as contemporary forms of internal colonization. He points out that, in the Canadian context today, there are two main competing strategies: assimilation and

accommodation. One of the characteristics of assimilation is difference-blind liberalism that treats Indigenous people like any other members of the mainstream society. The ideologies of individualism and social equality that translate into “sameness” have been very powerful driving forces in Nordic society for the past several decades without prevailing counter-discourses (except, to some extent, in Norway since the Alta River conflict) to make a strong case for a collective “Indigenous difference” of the Sami as is the case, for example, among Indigenous peoples in Canada, New Zealand, and the United States. As a result, there are Sami who are content with rights that are more individual in nature, such as the promotion of Sami language in daycare, education, and media, and consider demands for collective land rights excessive or “impossible to achieve, thus utopian.” A strong pressure to conform and the faith in the authorities—that the government will provide—have resulted in a general atmosphere of passivity, the lack of mobilization, and, in many cases, the adoption of a colonial mentality.

Conclusion

In recent years, particularly Indigenous women around the world have mounted timely and legitimate criticisms toward existing self-government models that must be taken seriously if we want Indigenous peoples’ self-determination to succeed beyond words and beyond internal self-governance. The realities of multilayered violence faced by Indigenous women within and outside their communities are directly linked to the question of survival of Indigenous communities. Indigenous women play a crucial role in maintaining and cultivating practices, systems, and bodies of knowledge, values, languages, modes of learning—aspects that the recently adopted United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, for instance, seeks to safeguard. In short, Indigenous women play a crucial role in envisioning models of autonomy that do not merely replicate patriarchal, hierarchical structures that often reproduce the marginalization and subjugation of sections of society.

If the Sami are to succeed in establishing and putting in practice successful and viable structures of local autonomy and self-determination, it is necessary to closely and critically examine the hegemonic, often invisible and even taken-for-granted systems and relations of power that naturalize (if not deny) the social and political inequalities and thus undermine, prevent, and sometimes also negate the realization of Sami self-determination. This necessarily includes analyses within Sami society

and local communities in order to prevent the replication of colonial, patriarchal, and masculinist practices and structures of power. It might also be necessary to reconsider the centralization (and thus, consolidation) of power to national bodies such as Sami Parliaments while recent examples from other Indigenous peoples—in Canada, Chiapas, Bolivia, and elsewhere—indicate that implementation of self-determination is most successful at local and regional levels.

Sami leaders and Sami scholars alike have yet to engage in this kind of critical analysis and interrogation. Perhaps most importantly, there is a pressing need to engage in an ongoing public and political debate about the underpinning, unexamined (and unchallenged) liberal notions of Sami rights that construct them in individualistic, equal opportunity terms and thus fail them. One of the reasons that Indigenous peoples in Canada and New Zealand, for example, have achieved more in terms of articulating their rights as collective rights is that they have questioned and rejected “difference-blind liberalism” and argued for Indigenous difference that is not only cultural difference but includes material practices (see Macklem 2001). Obviously, the Sami Parliaments and other political bodies are an important dimension in implementing Indigenous self-determination, but far from the only one, especially if they exert their power and authority by and large in symbolic terms.

Notes

1. This was a major political issue in Norway that mobilized significant protest and other forms of oppositional politics in response to construction of a hydroelectric dam in Finnmark at the cost of flooding of Sami lands.
2. In Finland, the Sami region consists of the three northernmost municipalities as well as the northernmost province of Soadëgilli/Sodankylä municipality. Only in the northernmost municipality, Ohcejohka/Utsjoki, are the Sami in a numerical majority.
3. Northern Norway was liberated from the German occupation by Russians while Finland was, at the end of the war, a German ally. Norway became a member of NATO while Sweden remained outside the military alliances. Although also officially neutral, Finland was, for decades after the war, under heavy supervision by the Soviet Union.
4. This is a good example of the continuing double standard of the Finnish government and its position on Sami rights. In international fora, Finland is keen to present itself as a progressive promoter and defender of Indigenous rights, yet at home the same Ministry of Foreign Affairs gives its support to Metsähallitus, the state-owned enterprise that administers “the state lands”

and which is logging in the winter grazing areas of Sami reindeer cooperatives (Scheinin 2001).

5. There is only one national Sami organization in Finland, Suoma Sámiid Guovddásearvi, established in 1996 to solve a representation problem with regard to the Sami Council. Previously, the Sami representatives from Finland to the Sami Council were elected from the Sami Parliament due to the lack of a national Sami organization. Another Sami organization, Sami Litto, was established in 1945 but never gained much strength in terms of representing the Sami in Finland (Sillanpää 1994). The organization no longer exists.
6. Limited because the Act excludes, for example, traditional fishing rights of the coastal Sami. Further, the Act only covers the northernmost county, whereas the Sami inhabit several other counties in Norway.

Coming in from the Cold

Inuit Diplomacy and Global Citizenship

Frances Abele and Thierry Rodon

In the past, Inuit societies were often pictured as unorganized, primitive, and isolated. Their impressive success in domestic and international politics over the last forty years contradicts these early stereotypes. Inuit have been strong partners in an international movement to create a stable and equitable political regime in the circumpolar world. Beginning in the 1970s, Canadian Inuit made common cause with Inuit of Alaska and Greenland, forming the very effective nongovernmental organization, the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC) in 1977. They developed an Arctic Policy to support international efforts to better manage the circumpolar basin, fought and won a battle to create a global program to reduce the production of persistent organic pollutants, and have led international efforts for action on climate change.

In this chapter, we review the diplomatic activity of Canadian Inuit, identifying continuities in their diplomatic practices from the times before there was extensive contact with other peoples, through colonial times, to the present. As a transnational people relying entirely upon peaceful means, they were able to transform the colonial logic in the Arctic using four strategies: (1) forming a transnational Inuit polity cutting across four nation-states, but directly challenging none of them; (2) creating an Arctic region based on cooperation between nation-states; (3) establishing the Inuit as international people; and (4) negotiating self-governing arrangements in most of the Inuit regions. We shall argue that these achievements have been possible as a result of the successful adaptation of practices present in traditional Inuit societies, as well as certain structural conditions, such as the relatively late and qualitatively different

colonization of the North and the strategic location of the Arctic between two superpowers for most of the postwar period.

We have previously argued (Abele and Rodon 2007)¹ that the traditional meaning of “diplomacy” should be expanded to include the multiple levels of diplomatic activities that can exist inside states, notably in federations where Indigenous peoples have engaged the greater society in the process of decolonization.

The international activities of Indigenous peoples have been studied by a few scholars (Coates 2004; Forest and Rodon 1995; Jhappan 1992; Ponting 1990; Salée, Field, and Horn-Miller 2004; Sanders 1992; Wilmer 1993; Woodward and George 1983). These authors have seen the importance of Indigenous peoples’ international legal and diplomatic initiatives for international law, and for various domestic and international political processes. A strand of analysis locates Indigenous peoples’ contemporary international diplomatic activity in a tradition of interaction that began in the earlier colonial period (Delâge 1995; Sanders 1992; Woo 2003). While not focused on Indigenous peoples, others (Chatterjee and Finger 1994; Princen and Finger 1994) have challenged the state-centric model in much International Relations scholarship (Badie and Smoots 1992; Bloomsfield 1981; Rosenau 1990), while Beier (2005a) aims to reform the field of International Relations at the level of the very terms and concepts of its core analysis to take fully into account the significance of colonialism and Indigenous peoples’ political actions.

Canadian Indigenous peoples as a whole have long been very active internationally (Manuel and Posluns 1974; Petersen 1984; Sanders 1992). Inuit have often collaborated with other Indigenous groups,² but they have also developed a distinctive path based upon circumpolar collaboration with Inuit from Greenland, Alaska, and Russia. In the early 1970s, Inuit overcame significant geographical and financial obstacles to create the ICC, an active international organization that advocates for Inuit land rights, human rights, and environmental protection. Their circumpolar work likely strengthened awareness in the nation-states of the circumpolar region of these states’ common interests and the need for cooperation, leading the states themselves to form the Arctic Council to advance international cooperation. It is significant that Canada’s first two Circumpolar Ambassadors were Mary Simon (an Inuk leader from Nunavik) and Jack Anawak (a former Member of Parliament from Nunavut), and that Inuit have been leading supporters of Indigenous causes in other countries, such as Australia (Jull 1993).

Oran Young has noted the early and explicit internationalism of Inuit politics and their constructive role in drawing international attention to

the urgent policy issues in the circumpolar basin (Young 1992, 11) and he has speculated that the pronounced internationalism of Inuit political activity may be a reemergence of pre-1930s patterns of interaction among Inuit societies. We support this suggestion: the boundaries of nation-states have come only very recently to the Arctic, and, we shall argue, to a region where people were accustomed to orderly, free-ranging interaction. There are thus important continuities between the very effective diplomatic initiatives undertaken by Inuit with respect to the Canadian state, and their international relationships and campaigns. Some of these continuities appear to have their roots in very old cultural traditions of interaction, conflict avoidance, and conflict resolution, while other measures appear to be innovations prompted by the very urgent concerns facing Inuit societies at the present time. In what follows, we attempt to describe the spirit, content, and intent of Inuit diplomacy by way of illustrating the contemporary salience of their distinctive approach.

Inuit Diplomacy in Historic Times

Inuit are a circumpolar people who live in Greenland, Canada, the United States (Alaska), and Russia, numbering about 155,000 people. Their relations with the states within which they now find themselves, and the history of these relations, share some common qualities but also vary considerably (Armstrong, Rogers, and Rowley 1978; Damas 1984). We hope that our work on Canada will encourage others to write in a similar vein about developments in the other Inuit territories.³

It is known that over the last several thousand years, Inuit have made a number of migrations in the circumpolar region, and that the region has known the elaboration of various similar but distinct material cultures of peoples who today share a common language, although there are different dialects. In virtually all times and places, save the very recent past, Inuit lived by marine and terrestrial harvesting, in relatively small groups of people who knew long periods of isolation. In Canada, Inuit encountered other unrelated groups of Inuit and, on their southern borders, groups of Dene, Cree, and Innu, and eventually European wayfarers and emissaries. Not enough is known about most of these encounters, but in Inuit oral history and early written records may be found some indication of external relations practices.⁴

When diplomacy failed, leading to a complete disintegration of the relationship between two groups of Inuit, small-scale warfare broke out (Bennett and Rowley 2004, 136). It seems clear that relations with

Dene and Cree were more distant, characterized by mutual distrust and occasional violence. Where peaceful interaction occurred, traditional diplomatic practices (involving mutually beneficial exchange of material goods, services, information, and cultural practices) appear to have been crucial.

A review of Bennett and Rowley's (2004) compilation, and several other sources,⁵ permits a few generalizations. Without claiming to have produced an exhaustive list, or to have identified characteristics of all Inuit societies at all times, we suggest that the following attitudes and practices characterized Inuit diplomacy in the period before they encountered modern industrial cultures, have advanced the well-being of many of the peoples whose descendents have formed today's Inuit polity, and have been an asset as they have been forced to adapt to intensive contact with exogenous forces.

1. *Voluntary associations.* The creation of bonds between unrelated people based upon food sharing, adoption, trade partnerships, cultural exchange, and so on, in order to establish pathways of peaceful interaction among unrelated groups.
2. *Collective persistence.* Without at all requiring unanimity, an ability to work cooperatively and in the longer term toward a common goal, despite numerous setbacks and roadblocks.
3. *Political Realism.* Strategies and actions taken based on a close appraisal of the balance of power.
4. *Adaptability.* An ability to readily recognize changed circumstances, however unwelcome these may be, and to react constructively and quickly.
5. *Well-developed strategies to avoid win-lose confrontations.* A tendency to soften direct criticism by indirect expression and a reluctance to force an opponent into a corner.

Inevitably, these diplomatic practices informed Inuit approaches to European visitors whom they began to encounter around the turn of the first millennium.⁶ Europeans responded to each of these diplomatic styles from their own rather similar repertoire, driven by various purposes: acquisition of local knowledge to facilitate exploration, trade, employment of local labor, collection of material objects, and kidnapping of people (Harper 1986).

As far as is known, Inuit in Greenland and eastern Canada first encountered Europeans when Viking seafarers arrived over one thousand years

ago.⁷ Little is known about the pattern of interaction between Vikings and the Indigenous peoples they encountered, although it is likely that there was not intensive, friendly contact. The next wave of Europeans to arrive in Inuit territories came as part of the expanding mercantilist wave that was to cover the globe. John Frobisher was the first recorded explorer to land on Baffin Island (1566 and 1567), in what is now known as Frobisher Bay, at a place where Inuit were accustomed to fish, and where Iqaluit, the capital of Nunavut, is presently located. This contact ended in bloody skirmishes. Whalers followed the explorers, and Inuit and Inuvialuit in a number of places (Pangnirtung, Chesterfield Inlet, Hershel Island, among others) established trade and laboring relations with them. From what is known of these encounters, it seems clear that they followed a pattern quite similar to that which characterized relations among Inuit societies who were not related, and among Inuit and the Amerindians described above. That is, there was wariness, but eventually relations were established involving the exchange of goods, information, and shared cultural practices, the establishment of some kin relationships, with occasional resort to violence or the threat of violence when this was considered necessary (Dick 2001).

The next phase of Inuit-European relations (ending in the middle of the twentieth century) was dominated by the famous northern triumvirate: the fur traders, the missionaries, and the Royal Northwest Mounted Police (who entered most parts of the north in that order). The intensity of contact varied with time and place, but it is clear that religious conversions, the introduction of a written form of Inuktitut, the eventual enforcement of Canadian law, and the sheer presence of these emissaries did have a widespread effect in Inuit societies due to the introduction of new diseases (tuberculosis and influenza, among others) and resulting widespread loss of life.

Anxiety over Canada's ability to maintain sovereignty has been more or less constant, if not always a source of action, since Great Britain transferred sovereignty over the high Arctic to Canada in 1880. The federal attitude toward the inhabitants of the Arctic was, in general, vague and neglectful, with responsibility lodged in an Ottawa-based Eskimo Affairs Committee, and very little besides a police presence in the north itself. In contrast to the policies followed with respect to Aboriginal peoples in more southerly parts of Canada, Dominion authorities did not attempt to assimilate, expropriate, or otherwise disturb the Inuit, adopting instead the view that they would be best left to their existing means of making a living (Coates 1985; Grant 1988; Rea 1968).

Almost everything changed with the advent of World War II. It has been repeated often that Inuit moved from “pre-capitalist” times to capitalist liberal democracy in a single generation, traveling a path that required three centuries in Europe. Regardless of whether such a comparison can be entirely sustained, it does give some indication of the force of the changes experienced by Inuit in virtually every part of the north in the first few decades after World War II. By the 1960s, virtually everyone was living in a wooden house in a community, with children who were attending school (sometimes very far away). There were more wage labor opportunities, and patterns of hunting, fishing, and gathering changed with the introduction of new technologies such as guns and snow-machines. Nascent institutions of local self-government (in the cooperatives and later in housing associations, and finally in municipal governments) were established. From many people’s accounts, the 1950s and 1960s were not only a period of massive cultural change, but also a period in which Inuit confidence in their ability to cope with newcomers was at its nadir. Peter Ittinuar, a member of the generation of Inuit who were to transform the relations of power in the Arctic forever, was a child in the 1950s. He describes the situation this way:

When I went to work in Churchill, I said to myself as Tagak Curley did, “What’s wrong with this picture? There is something wrong here. Ottawa is being the lord and master and governing us and we are just little nobodies.” Life was pretty good, but I hate to say it, the white man was still God. When I was a kid in Chesterfield Inlet any white man could tell any Eskimo to do something, like shovel their porch for no pay. There was like a slave class and an upper class. Rankin Inlet also became like that during the sixties. The white man stood head and shoulders above the Eskimo man in terms of standing. (Ittinuar 2008)

The changes brought by the emissaries of the state, be they police or bureaucrats, were massive, and, for the generation that lived through this transition, the exercise of power and rapidity of the changes were taxing. For the first time, Inuit experienced feelings of dependency on outside forces (Canada 1994, 12–16; Robinson 2004, 205–13). In the 1970s, with the maturing to adulthood of the first generation of children to attend school in large numbers, dependency turned to a constructive defiance. As this generation came of age in the 1960s and 1970s, the international movement of Indigenous peoples quickened, international movements of decolonization erased the old imperial ties, and young people throughout the developed world joined what seemed for a time to be a

global social revolution. It was in this shining time of the Generation of '68 that a new form of Inuit diplomacy, domestically and internationally, was developed. Although the Inuit movement grew alongside the more confrontational racial politics of these times, it did not itself build upon confrontation or upon racial difference, but upon the traditions of external relations already present in Inuit culture.

Decolonization by Diplomatic Means

Inuit efforts to respond to the massive incursions into their territory extended to domestic Canadian institutions and to international affairs. In both venues, Inuit responded pragmatically to what appeared to be unchangeable, while making the most of the opportunities that presented themselves and of the advisors that were available to them.

Within Canada, Inuit created representative organizations to negotiate land claims agreements (modern treaties) and to establish self-governing political entities throughout the Inuit territories. They identified and used the levers of power available in the Canadian federal liberal democracy. Canada's unfinished, relatively permeable constitution (already accommodating of the francophones) seemed to offer some space for the inclusion of other collectivities, including Inuit and other Indigenous peoples. The various avenues for public participation that opened after the mid-1960s (core funding for representative organizations, policy consultations, inquiries, and commissions) created opportunities for influence and mobilization. The actions of other Indigenous organizations and movements, and a consequential series of superior court decisions, ultimately changed federal policy: where once any special political status and land rights for Indigenous peoples was denied, after 1973 a process for negotiating land rights and special status was gradually elaborated (Abele 1987; Ponting and Gibbins 1980). For Inuit, whose territory was the circumpolar north, concurrent and somewhat parallel processes in Greenland and Alaska were also important.⁸

Initially, Inuit living in three subnational jurisdictions—Labrador, northern Quebec, and the Northwest Territories—considered seeking a single, self-governing Inuit territory. The formidable complexity of dealing with federal, provincial, and territorial governments, along with increasing pressures for development of their lands, led them to pursue separate and somewhat coordinated regional negotiations (Amagoalik 2007). This approach has been successful. Inuit political action led, in 1999, to the establishment of the new territory of Nunavut, which has a

public government; that is, in contrast to the case for First Nations who live under Band government or modern treaties, Inuit share their territory with non-Inuit who participate as equals in all areas of governance. In Nunatsiavut (in Labrador) a form of self-government was recently created, while the two other regions, Nunavik⁹ and the Western Arctic¹⁰ are actively negotiating the establishment of regional governments. In all four jurisdictions, Inuit have negotiated modern treaties with the Crown, under which they have clarified their exclusive ownership of surface and subsurface lands; gained a pool of capital to be used for common purposes in partial compensation for land rights ceded; and established a number of new institutions for shared management of key northern resources, such as water and caribou.

The negotiations that produced these outcomes took place during one of the most tumultuous periods in Canadian constitutional history, when federal policy with respect to Aboriginal land rights underwent a series of dramatic changes and elites from all sectors of Canadian society were occupied with patriation of the Canadian constitution and negotiations over what would be enshrined there. Throughout the period, Inuit kept focused on their objectives, and collaborated through their original representative organization, Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (ITC).¹¹ Inuit women formed Pauktuutit—The Inuit Women's Organization—to focus on social and health policy, an area that might otherwise have been neglected in the “high politics” of land claims negotiations and constitutional battles. To deal with the struggles and stresses that attended patriation of the Constitution, Inuit created another organization, the Inuit Committee on National Issues.

Very early and with impressive pragmatism, Inuit leaders accepted and adapted to the colonial pattern that divided their territories with north-south boundaries, even though the Inuit consciousness and thousands of years of practice followed an east-west axis. The decision to sustain a single representative organization, the ITC, comprised of regional representative organizations and to negotiate self-governing arrangements in the very different political circumstances of each region cannot have been easy, but it was taken early and acted upon consistently. The other organizations provided them with mechanisms for cooperating to make progress on other key issues. We would argue that this early pragmatism, even in the highly uncertain and chaotic policy framework of the last forty years does recall the pragmatism and superb adaptability of pre-contact Inuit societies, and show the ability to adapt to the complexities of Canadian intergovernmental diplomacy

Each of the four Inuit jurisdictions that exist today have an interesting history. For reasons of space, we have chosen to discuss just two of these—Nunavut and Nunavik—in order to illustrate the scope and practice of the internal diplomacies practiced by Canadian Inuit.

Nunavut

In 1967, the Government of Canada moved to extend a rudimentary form of regional self-government to the old Northwest Territories—at that time a vast territory extending from the eastern boundary of Canada, west to the Yukon border, and north from the sixtieth parallel to the North Pole. About half of the old Northwest Territories was comprised of Inuit and Inuvialuit lands. In 1967, the seat of territorial government was transferred from Ottawa to Yellowknife, a territorial bureaucracy was established, and, in stages, the old Northwest Territories Council of appointed members became a Legislative Assembly of elected representatives. Inuit held about half of the seats in the Assembly and, after 1979, Inuit legislators worked with non-Inuit legislators on further political development. Specifically, they persuaded the other members of the Legislative Assembly to support a plebiscite on the matter of division of the Northwest Territories; a measure they saw would create a territory in which Inuit were the vast majority. In 1983, the plebiscite returned an affirmative answer in support of division (Abele and Dickerson 1985). Concurrently, the Inuit of what is now Nunavut were negotiating a land claims settlement through another organization, the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut.¹² These separate processes—the project to garner support for division of the Northwest Territories by Inuit legislators, and the negotiation of a modern treaty—resulted in the creation of the new territory of Nunavut in 1999. Having built (and then, through the plebiscite, demonstrated) support for division of the Northwest Territories among all its residents through the territorial political process, Inuit negotiators of the modern treaty insisted upon the inclusion of a clause in the treaty providing for the creation of the territory of Nunavut.

Nunavik

The Nunavik path to self-government offers an even more striking example of political Realism and active diplomacy. In fact, the relationship between Nunavik and the province of Quebec can only be understood in the sometimes competing, sometimes congruent quest for autonomy.

Nunavik was added to Quebec through the Boundaries Extension Act (Quebec) of 1912. This did not have much of an effect on the Inuit, who were not made aware of the change (Zebedee Nungak, 1995). Change began during World War II with the extension of the welfare state to the Inuit of Northern Quebec. It was accompanied by a strong incitation to sedentarization and in some cases relocation in the far North¹³ all amounting to a loss of control by the Inuit over their lives. However, in 1969, when the Inuit were asked which level of government should provide service to them, some Inuit strongly advocated for the creation of an Inuit government.

The issue of Inuit self-government resurfaced in 1973 during the negotiation of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (JBNQA) but the governments were only willing to grant a measure of administrative autonomy to Northern Quebec. The proponents of self-government refused this limited autonomy and created a dissident organization called Inuit Tungavingat Nunanimi. Three villages, Puvirnituk, Iqviqvik, and Salluit, refused to endorse the JBNQA and the notion of self-government seemed to be far from reach.

However, Quebec Premier René Levesque renewed hope when asked by Eliyassi Sallualuk during a parliamentary commission on Aboriginal rights: "If all existing groups of Nouveau-Québec decide to work together for the creation of such a government, could you tell them: OK, let's go?" He answered that he was ready to consider entering into talks about self-government once the Inuit were united behind a common proposal. His position was not very surprising given the fact that the Parti Québécois government was trying to obtain more political autonomy for the province of Quebec, if not separation from the Canadian federation. The Inuit were very aware of this situation and this created a rapprochement between Quebec and the Inuit.¹⁴

In order to overcome their dissension, the dissident and the Inuit organizations stemming from the JBNQA agreed to create a joint working group in charge of consulting Inuit communities and proposing a project for self-government. The Nunavik constitutional committee visited all communities to hear people's opinions and drafted a project for a constitution that was approved in a referendum held in 1991. The Inuit were now reunited behind a common process and negotiations could take place. It should also be noted that it was at this time that Quebec agreed to use the term Nunavik instead of Nouveau-Québec, a very symbolic and significant change.

In 1995, as Quebec prepared for a second sovereignty referendum in respect of its own place in the Canadian federation, Nunavik took a back

seat in Quebec politics. Inuit were more than willing to challenge this and during the referendum campaign they clearly expressed that if Quebecers could choose to separate from Canada, the Inuit of Nunavik could in turn choose to separate from Quebec. In order to assert this right, the Inuit organized their own referendum one week before the Quebec referendum and 96 percent of Inuit voted in favor of remaining within Canada in the event of Quebec separation. This was a strong statement that demonstrated to Quebec sovereignists that they needed Inuit support if an independent Quebec were to include its northern region.

The Inuit of Nunavik are now very close to a final agreement that would allow them to create a Nunavik regional government—a form of the self-government that they have been seeking since 1969. Throughout this process, the Inuit of Nunavik have had to overcome deep divisions through a very democratic process. They have also had to contend with Quebec nationalism and federal politics and have gradually shifted their focus toward the Quebec government. The signing of the AIP is a tribute to their adaptability, resilience, tenacity, and political Realism. Furthermore, they are creating a new type of jurisdiction in Canada: a regional government inside a province that allows for political decentralization and provides a model for the decolonization of the province's north.

The ability to establish good relations with and to gain support from the non-Inuit northern residents has been an important asset in Inuit efforts to realize self-government in both Nunavut and Nunavik. For example, the plebiscite on division of the Northwest Territories would not have been held, and it would not have passed without the support of non-Inuit voters and legislators (Abele and Dickerson 1985). Without the support of senior public servants during the negotiation of the Nunavut Agreement (modern treaty) it is unlikely that the provision of the Agreement that provides for the creation of the new territory of Nunavut would have been adopted. The Inuit from Nunavik were able to overcome the deep dissension among themselves and take advantage of the federal and provincial rift to develop their own aspirations for self-government.

These examples illustrate very well the benefits of the flexibility and the political Realism of the Inuit leadership. In this connection we recall the pre-contact methods for establishing peaceful and mutually beneficial foreign relations. Resilience, pragmatism, a readiness to form alliances based upon cooperation and exchange, and perhaps a certain skill in working together in groups, seem to characterize Inuit social interaction in historic times and in modern politics.

In developing a collective strategy for securing a future in which they might maintain a sufficient and practical level of self-determination,

Canadian Inuit recognized two features of their political context. First, they found themselves within Canada: a federal liberal democracy with certain traditions of participation and inclusion; they developed a negotiating approach that took full advantage of these attributes.

International Diplomacy

During the intense period of internal diplomacy that produced the four negotiated new governments within Canada, Inuit were also active internationally, again with the objective of enhancing their collective security. Although we do not have space to discuss the full range of international diplomacy practiced by Inuit, by way of example we offer a brief discussion of the foundation and activities of the ICC, illustrating the successes and characteristics of Inuit diplomacy on the international scene.¹⁵

ICC is a transnational organization with institutional members in Greenland, Canada, Alaska and, since 1990, Russia. The United Nations recognized the ICC with nongovernmental organization status in 1983.¹⁶ In this forum and elsewhere, ICC has worked to promote and to participate in the establishment of the Arctic as a coherent political region, to foster international cooperation in a strategic Cold War zone, to develop and advocate a pan-Arctic environmental strategy, to support a non-threatening decolonization of the Arctic, and to establish the Inuit people as international actors (Bloomfield 1981; Lauritzen 1983; Petersen 1984). Pressure from oil development, the desire for self-government, and cultural survival were issues shared by most Inuit living in the circumpolar nation-states. They particularly saw that the protection of the viability of the northern ecosystem could not be addressed adequately within each nation-state. Eben Hopson, an Inupiat leader from Alaska who was instrumental in the founding of ICC, clearly expressed this need in his testimony to the mid-1970s Berger Inquiry into the Construction of a Pipeline in the Mackenzie Valley:

There is only one Beaufort Sea. It is a single ecological system shared by the North Slope Borough, and the Northwest Territories. We Inupiat are a single Beaufort community living under two national flags. We must contend with two different political systems, and two sets of rules governing oil and gas development, to protect our environmental values within our larger Beaufort coastal community. For this reason, we have undertaken to create a circumpolar Inupiat Assembly with which to work with the multi-national oil industry to develop a single set of rules for the industry

to follow for safe and responsible circumpolar Arctic gas and oil development. (Hopson 1976, quoted in Shadian 2006)

In 1988, Mary Simon, then president of ICC commented,

Inuit have a legitimate, extensive and varied role to fulfill in international matters. This role has yet to be adequately recognized. In light of the increasing impact of the actions of the international community on Inuit rights, our culture and northern homeland, we have a compelling responsibility to become increasingly involved.

When Inuit speak of promoting Inuit rights at the international level, we are primarily referring to our aboriginal rights, based on past and present use and occupancy of vast circumpolar land and marine areas. These areas transcend the boundaries of Greenland, Alaska and also the Soviet Union. (Simon 1988, 265–66)

If ICC has played a crucial role in the recognition of the circumpolar basin as an important environmental and geopolitical region, by framing major issues in Arctic terms, and by addressing the colonial context (Young 1992), it has also been a means through which Inuit advanced the separate projects of decolonization undertaken in each of the national jurisdictions. Gains in one jurisdiction have been seen by both Inuit and government negotiators as relevant precedents for the other jurisdictions.

ICC has been particularly active in international environmental advocacy, first in opposing a series of offshore oil development projects and North Slope oil development, as well as the Arctic Pilot Project—a 1970s plan to transport liquefied natural gas through the Northwest Passage. ICC did not remain very long in the role of reactive protest, since the scope of environmental issues faced by the Inuit was broadening rapidly to include transnational atmospheric pollution, military waste, ozone layer depletion, and global warming. ICC sought international support for means to manage and respond to these threats, first presenting to the world an Inuit Regional Conservation Strategy in 1985. This led to a lobby for the establishment and adoption of an Arctic Environmental Policy Strategy by all the Arctic countries. The objective was fulfilled in the Rovaniemi Declaration on the Protection of the Arctic Environment signed by all the Arctic countries in 1991, and developed later in the 1993 Nuuk Declaration, where the same countries agreed to establish an Arctic Policy. In 1996, the Arctic Council was created to become a forum for cooperation among Arctic states, with the participation of the Aboriginal people of the Arctic. ICC has been instrumental in all these initiatives

and has a participant seat on the Arctic Council. The creation of the Arctic Council has been an important step in the institutionalization of an Arctic region, fulfilling one of the objectives of ICC: "The Inuit through the ICC implicitly and explicitly redefined the North as a region" (Simon and Jull 1994, 10, quoted in Shadian 2006). The history of the role of the ICC in the creation of the Arctic Council, and all of the diplomatic practices and conventions now in place, illustrates the effectiveness of steady participation and concerted cooperation toward a specific goal.

Environmental concerns have not caused the member organizations of ICC to eschew participation in nonrenewable resource development projects. All of the beneficiary organizations formed after the negotiation of modern treaties have used their capital resources to invest in the development of the regional economies, with interests in airlines and oil and gas ventures, among others. Arguably, the high level and concerted work to protect the northern environment by organizations that are prepared to participate in development projects as they arise reflects the traditionally pragmatic approach of Inuit, who recognize the need for economic development even while they seek to limit and manage its negative effects.

Finally, we would like to draw attention to a subtle and effective strategy based upon the use of ICC's transnational character to avoid possible direct confrontations with national governments on core issues. This approach seems to be a sophisticated elaboration of earlier diplomatic techniques, taking advantage of the existence of an international alliance of Inuit (i.e., ICC). Inuit representatives have been able to wield the power of international opinion and international alliances while avoiding direct international embarrassment or direct confrontation of their home nation-states. Thus, Greenlandic Inuit led the opposition to the Arctic Pilot Project, a U.S.-Canadian venture, and the ICC position on Quebec secession was prepared by an Inupiat from Alaska (Forest and Rodon 1995). A very recent example concerns efforts by the ICC leadership to prompt United States action on climate change.

In recent years, Canadian Sheila Watt-Cloutier, recently retired president of ICC, has led an international initiative to draw attention to the calamitous impact of climate change and global warming. She took the campaign directly to the United States, the largest source of the pollutants that contribute to global warming. In a speech that illustrates well the approach and tenor of contemporary Inuit diplomacy, Watt-Cloutier explained to a climate change conference hosted by Global Green USA why ICC submitted a complaint to the Inter-American Commission on

Human Rights, seeking an investigation of the impact of climate change on the Arctic environment and “a declaration from the Commission that the United States—the source of approximately 25 percent of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions—is violating our human rights detailed in the Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man” (Watt-Cloutier 2006), noting that Inuit, by virtue of their reliance upon hunting and residence in the Arctic, are the “sentinels” of the world, warning of the impact of climate change. She emphasized that they do not seek compensation, but rather, they want “the United States to stop violating [their] rights,” specifically by adopting mandatory emissions controls, including a consideration of Arctic impact assessment in major policy decisions, consultatively developing a plan for Arctic impact mitigation, and developing a plan to help Inuit adapt to unavoidable climate change impacts.

Conclusions

Of all the Indigenous peoples upon whose territory Canada was constructed, Inuit have been among the clearest in asserting that their identity as Inuit does not preclude their full exercise of Canadian citizenship. Clearly, too, exercise of Canadian citizenship has included the realization of collective self-determination in a variety of institutional forms. Similarly, Inuit are claiming global citizenship. Indigenous peoples’ international political activity presents a challenge to the classical notion of the nation-state and to the conventions of International Relations theory. Inuit offer probably one of the most convincing and effective examples of this dynamic. As transnational peoples, they have been able to reframe the colonial logic in the Arctic using the four strategies we have mentioned in the introduction to this chapter.

Perhaps future scholars will consider the evolving dynamics of the circumpolar Arctic basin in recent decades as a showcase example of a new world order in which states and nonstate actors cooperate. At the very least, other scholars should follow Oran Young’s interest in affording the complex intergovernmental and interorganizational relations of the circumpolar basin further study for what these may teach us about the denser byways of international affairs in which nonstate nations and peoples and their various organizations have an impact on state behavior and on outcomes.

On first consideration, Inuit may appear to have vaulted from life in isolated small societies characterized by little knowledge of the outside world and scant capacity to cope with the complexities and demands of

an increasingly global consciousness in a dangerous and complex world. We acknowledge that there is some truth in this observation, but, as we have tried to show in this chapter, it also contains important misconceptions and a serious underestimation of the strengths inherent in the original Inuit societies. On the evidence of what they have achieved in the last two generations, it is clear that the original societies of Inuit had developed a number of attitudes and practices that have been capable of successful adaptation to new challenges. That all of what Inuit have achieved to date, in the arena of internal diplomacy and externally as well, has been achieved peacefully and without disadvantage to other people or groups, should recommend their approach to others.

Notes

1. Some sections of this chapter are drawn from Abele and Rodon (2007).
2. For example, Inuit have been active at the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations at the United Nations. See Sambo (1992).
3. With special emphasis on the Russian Federation, see the chapter by Heather A. Smith and Gary N. Wilson in this volume.
4. We discuss these here, aware that our selection certainly blurs important regional differences, and probably imports an unwarranted functionalism. For fuller information, see our sources: Schledermann (1990); Fossett (2001); Mitchell (1996); Dick (2001); and Robinson (2004).
5. Most of the following traits are explained by several authors. For an exceedingly clear and concise explanation, see Kusugak (2000); also Simon (1989); Mitchell (1996), especially 398–99; Fossett (2001); Dick (2001); Harper (1986); and Briggs (1970).
6. On the diplomacy of the early contact period, see Dick (2001); Harper (1986); and Fossett (2001).
7. Eric the Red reached Greenland in 982. There were Viking settlements in Greenland and Newfoundland, and there were contacts between Inuit and Vikings farther north. For more sustained and searching discussions about these issues, see McGee 2004 and Stevenson 1997.
8. In 1979, Greenland achieved Home Rule, a form of public government dominated by the Greenlandic (Inuit) majority there. The Alaskan Inupiat gained some autonomy through a supra-municipal status for their communities following negotiation of the *Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act* in 1971.
9. An agreement in principle for the creation of a Nunavik Regional Government was signed in December 2007.
10. The Inuvialuit joined with the Gwich'in, a non-Inuit Aboriginal group, to negotiate the creation of a Western Arctic Regional Government.

11. Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (ITC), or Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK) as it is called now, was created in 1971 in order to represent all the Inuit in Canada. At first ITC was responsible for land claim and self-government negotiations. Today, it takes on an advocacy role, leaving the self-government negotiation to the Inuit regional organizations.
12. The Inuvialuit of the western Northwest Territories, also members of ITC, negotiated a comprehensive claims agreement in 1984; Inuit in Nunavik were parties to the first modern treaty, the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (1976); Inuit in Labrador concluded their treaty negotiations in 2005.
13. For example, Inuit from Inukjuak were relocated to Grise Fjord and Resolute Bay, thousands of kilometers north of their traditional territories. See Canada (1994) for more details.
14. In fact, some Inuit dissidents went as far as becoming Parti Québécois members.
15. We have not the space here to discuss very important international political campaigns (such as that concerning persistent organic pollutants in the Arctic), the efforts to develop a standard written form of Inuktitut, and consistent programs of cultural and youth exchanges. For more information, see the chapter by Heather A. Smith and Gary N. Wilson in this volume; see also Young (1992); Forest and Rodon (1995); Sambo (1992); and Shadian (2006).
16. Aqqaluk Lynge, a former president of ICC, is a member of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

This page intentionally left blank

Between the Leader of Virtù and the Good Savage

Indigenous Struggles and Life Projects in the Amazon Basin

Marcela Vecchione Gonçalves

In between borders in an area with the greatest biodiversity in the world, it can be said that Indigenous peoples in the Amazon Basin are still in a process of colonial encounter and under constant identity recreation. Regarded as “human resources,” in the sense that they are the best interpreters of the sociopolitical space that is the Amazon, Indigenous peoples are the path to the Eldorado in the region. Even though this sounds cliché, there is some truth to this story in the deep Amazon rain forest. Upon closer study of the region, however, it is immediately clear that its people are much more than mere human resources or instruments, as most mainstream discourse has framed them. Much to the contrary, Indigenous peoples are fundamental agents in shaping the political aspects of this region, which each day is turned more and more into a zone of multiscale relationships involving the global, the international, and the local. In other words, it is an area of postcolonial diplomacies (Beier 2005a).

Obviously, the present relationships are not the same as when the area was important to define the borders and the sovereignty of the states whose territories intersect in the Amazon Basin. At those times, the Indigenous peoples faced choices that included only slavery or conflict with colonists—or, later, with national armies—that brought not only violence and dislocation, but also many continental European

diseases (Viveiros de Castro 1992). Today, Indigenous peoples know the instruments they have at their disposal to negotiate their place in the global assemblage¹ in the Amazon Basin. Even if in the first instance this goes against traditional lifeways, Indigenous peoples are devising strategies to put traditionalism at the fore in sharing a different language about the political.

They are moved to do so specifically because they are certain they are part of the assemblage. They know this because it is part of their cosmologies, their beliefs, and identities as political beings and as natural and cultural creatures—categories that are not exclusive, but complementary. Even so, the struggle for the Indigenous political self, for being and becoming political (Isin 2002), is still one of the major issues that recurs in the extended colonial encounter in the deep rain forest, regardless of the political instruments for bargaining that are discernible in agreements, alliances, and some political achievements in the sphere of the state and of international organizations.

Based on both these internal and external struggles, I offer a narrative account of the construction of some Indigenous peoples' contemporary political identities in the Amazon Basin. This is a narrative about alternative political subjectivities emergent in the forest, which are counterbalancing and complementing the idea of a cosmopolitan citizenship relayed in notions of environmentalism. This counter-narrative to the usual stories about Indigenous peoples in the Amazon Basin is told through the analysis of some Indigenous struggles and by observations on how their idea of being Indigenous, how their explanations about indigeneity, counters the discourse of sovereignty and the political attributes of the state performed by the practice, concealment, and denial of citizenship. The focus here rests mainly in the Brazilian Amazon, the largest area of the rain forest, and in its borders regions, considered the most conflict-ridden and prosperous territories for Indigenous peoples in the region.

Reminiscences of the Past and the “Fortuna” in the History of the Present

The particular diplomacies based on Amazonian indigeneity should be regarded with careful consideration of where the states which Indigenous peoples of the region are negotiating with and within stand vis-à-vis the North/South discourse. In this context, there is a “borderization” of the Indigenous peoples that corresponds to limits traced between the states and to limits imposed on what the sovereignty of these states means in a

global order wherein colonialism is still a strong discourse in shaping the relationships between the South and the North. Such discourse should not be overlooked in an analysis that intends to tackle the issue of scales of government and political practices and the consequences they have for the political identities in process in an ex-colonial area, as is the case of the Amazon Basin.

In the political space of the Amazon, Indigenous peoples are either seen as a medium for neocolonization by global civil society actors from Northern countries, seizing the opportunity to improve their material condition and to become independent of the states in which they live, or as naive actors seduced by international capital and being corrupted by a system moved by global decisions centred in the North. On the one hand, the “leader of virtù”² looks to the past of exploration and sees in the present opportunities to ensure that the ethnocide and genocide of earlier times will not be repeated. On the other hand, the “good savage”³ with no state to step up for her or his situation, without national identity, and lacking a sense of the unjust character of traditional political structures, believes in the changes brought by progress in politics, without knowing that this would corrupt her or his way of life and undo the balance inherent in the “natural condition.” These are the simplistic characterizations upon which most of the resistance to Indigenous projects in the Amazon Basin is based.

Between the leader of virtù and the good savage, Indigenous peoples in the Amazon experience their life projects and try to tell a different story about cooperation and alliances through the lens of indigeneity. As a narrative about Indigenous political condition belonging to Indigenous peoples themselves, indigeneity could be understood as the way they classify and experience their political, social, and cultural experiences in a changing environment where the history of conquest and colonization has been among the crucial changes and influences affecting their own cosmologies. Under these circumstances, indigeneity is a terminology created at the forefront of the conquest, since the point at which the Indigenous came to be defined as such. Notwithstanding this colonial moment, indigeneity is the reading and the political narrative Indigenous peoples tell and live to account for the world as it was and as it is now and the role they as Indigenous have in it—the political subjectivity they embrace through this process (Alfred 2005; Beier 2005a). By this interpretation, indigeneity is something common to Indigenous peoples all over the world but, at the same time, it marks the differences between them according to their varied experiences of colonialism.

Difference arises because, although Indigenous groups, their classifications, and attendant labels are products of the colonization process—occurring in the Americas between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries—the groups involved experienced European settlement differently and variously resisted or complied with the construction of the state as an institution in different ways as well. Nevertheless, it is worth stressing that these different resistances confirmed Indigenous peoples as political agents within and across state boundaries and, through this agency, they established relationships between them and with varied social movements which, more than denials and reforms of citizenship, were the definitive steps in their political struggles. Such movements as connect Indigenous peoples to the world and to other groups as well as to their land, their past, present, and future is termed “relationality,” and the possibilities for political arrangements that emerge from it under a global order are immense (Osco, forthcoming).

In this sense, it is necessary to trace the relational movements in the Amazon back to the colonial order in order to speak back, as Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2007) says, to the past relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples in order to understand the political narratives articulated in the present. This speaking back, together with the recovery of histories from a different perspective, is important not only to demystify the Indigenous as passive voices in the process and as objects related to a remote past. It is also an action relevant for bringing Indigenous histories to the present, where Indigenous peoples are important actors in a politics that has never been concentrated solely in the state, although most mainstream academic discourse suggests the opposite. In resisting the position that Indigenous peoples and lifeways may be confined to projects employing participant observant anthropology or reduced to objects to write the history of the continent, the focus must be on how Indigenous peoples have been constructing their present relationships in the Amazon today and in such a way as to foreground their agency and their particular positions inside the North/South discourse. This is necessary as well in order to understand how the strategies of internationalization embraced by South American states via the neoliberal program of structural adjustments and shrinking of the state presence in the provision of social goods has affected Indigenous peoples in the forest, especially in the area under Brazilian control.

As Taiaiake Alfred (2005) and Beier (2005a) argue, Indigenous stories are not part of the past, but are as present as their survivances. The ways in which academia and governments feature them make us feel that the figure of the Indigenous is lost somewhere in the past because

the recognition given them by states in the form of integration policies brought them out of the indeterminate position of a remote past and cast them as citizens. They are Indigenous but, above all, citizens if they want recognition accompanied by active political rights in the state—voting and running for political candidacies, for example. They are first people with Indigenous status—as distinct from Indigenous peoples in the collective sense—if they want to have their individual rights preserved in the collective, with rights guaranteed inside the legally demarcated, recognized, and homologated territory. As Isabel Altamirano put it in an interview with Taiaiake Alfred,

To be indigenous is to use our dreams, not as a way of thinking about what we are not, but as a way to interpret our reality, our circumstances. To be indigenous is to have a sense of community as whole, a sense of exchanging and talking until we all have a similar vision of where we are going. To be indigenous is consensus and is reproducing certain ways of doing things. Being indigenous is to have a collective memory of our myths, the ramifications of our concepts, and of what is behind our language . . . In my country, we say that the Mexican recovered the greatness of indigenous cultures as a way of building the *mestizo* identity, but what the state recovered was the history of dead Indians, who have a culture that is rooted not in the pyramids but in everyday life. Dead Indians are secure because they do not oppose what the state does. Dead Indians are good for the state because they are reduced to folklore, rather than forming a conception of the world, politics, and otherness. (Isabel Altamirano in Alfred 2005, 143)

In the Amazon, the dead Indian colonial political story of concession and recognition is similar to the one sketched by Altamirano, specifically because Brazil and the South American countries shared with Mexico a different experience of being colonized from what manifested elsewhere in the Americas. This difference, which wrought unique configurations for a history of the present, relates to the fact that in South America the colonies were not settler societies as in Canada or the United States, for example. Rather, the colonizers who had come to the region had done so to explore it to the extent possible, pillaging the resources of the area in response to the exigencies and maintenance needs of their nation-states in Europe: the metropolis in relation to the colonized, made possible under the protectionism and the exclusivity of the mercantilist state (Hobson 2004).

In Brazil, most of the European exploration in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries was concentrated on mineral

exploration in the province of Minas Gerais. Some other natural resources such as wood were also exploited in the southeast and northeast of the country in the first two hundred years of colonization. The first contacts with Indigenous peoples thus occurred in the coastal areas, whence all of these goods departed for the metropolis. At this time, the Catholic Church had an immense impact in the colonization process due to the fact that it was the institution responsible for building peaceful (or, conversely, fraught) relationships with Indigenous peoples, converting them to the Catholic faith or denouncing those who did not want to embrace it.

In these first two centuries of Brazilian colonization, dominated by the cycles of exploration for mineral resources and the development of coffee plantations in the southeast, the Amazon had never been an important territorial issue in terms of the division of South American territory between the Portuguese, the Spanish and, unofficially, the English.⁴ The Amazon started to be an issue after independence in 1822, however, when the borders and the meanings of sovereignty in the country had begun to be redefined, particularly during the late nineteenth century as the idea of the nation-state took hold in Brazil.⁵ Not having been a central basis for colonization or exploration in the previous centuries, the Amazon Basin at this time was almost untouched by settlers and most of the population was of Indigenous peoples, most of them not having any direct contact with Western “civilization” before.

With the conflicts that were starting to occur in the region in the eighteenth century due to local insurgent movements fighting for the independence from Spain of several of Brazil’s neighboring countries—Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Panama, Ecuador, and Bolivia through the Bolivarian wars—the Brazilian government began to focus on the surveillance and exploration of the Amazonian territory. The focus on surveillance had connected the protection of the national territory, already considered the largest in Latin America, to the need of exploring another primary resource, as the principal commodity (coffee) exports from the country were in a crisis of over-production due to lower consumption. Consequently, entrepreneurs in the southeast connected with the few small settler populations in the north who had learned from people in the forest how to extract latex from the Para tree (typical of the Amazon forest). This quickly began to be exported to Europe and the United States for the production of rubber, used mainly in the new automobile industry. During the expansion of the commodity-export oriented economy to the Amazon Basin, many poor

people from the northeast migrated to the forest not only to extract latex, but with the hope that they would find gold there.

For the Indigenous peoples of the region, contact was violent. Large numbers of those who lived in the forest were killed to open room for the villages established around the extraction pools. The Amazon at the time was popularly regarded as “the last frontier” and the Indigenous as an obstacle. For the reason that they were not considered to be Brazilians, under national legislation they could at best be regarded as “noble savages” in need of protection and “civilizing,” for those who would accept it. Thus, they had the possibility of becoming Brazilians if they were willing to cooperate with the national integration project—failing this, they would be viewed as barbarians for setting themselves against the national interest. In the eyes of regional administrators, entrepreneurs, and the central government, the Indigenous were obstacles to national aggrandizement, even assumed to be cooperating with enemies beyond the borders. The simple fact, however, was that the borders were political and economic fictions to them and an obstacle to their existence.

Leaving aside borders for now, the main point here is that, from the beginning, the encounter with Indigenous peoples in the Amazon Basin was stimulated by the insertion and definition of Brazil first as a colony and later a commodity exporter dependent on international capital for its survival. This survival had been made possible at the expense of the autochthony population in a surge of exploration as well as by the exploitation of slaves trafficked from Africa. The state had already developed and was struggling with a major structural problem under the pressure to come to terms with a competitive international economy. Indigenous peoples not included in the process of transformation of abject population into cheap labor were either killed or left to the forest as barbarians. By the mid-twentieth century, anthropologists contributed to their isolation and to tracing a clear division between Indigenous peoples and white, civilized men and between the remote past and the future in a modernized country. Ethnography by anthropologists from Northern countries served to depoliticize the Indigenous peoples of the Amazon. Mirroring similar experiences in other contexts (see Beier 2005a), the Indigenous peoples became restricted to the past, their struggles and political narratives in the present left aside in a colonial practice of authorization and hierarchization of political identities.

This authorization and hierarchization went on in the policies and processes of legalization and recognition of Indigenous identities as the Brazilian state was further inserted into the international. At times during

the 1940s through the 1970s, Brazil was under dictatorial governments. Through this time, the country was more concerned than ever about its national integration through surveillance and about the modernization of its economy, understood as possible only under strict political control against insurgent groups influenced by communist ideas. In this Manichean frame, the policy toward Indigenous peoples was surveillance veiled in a discourse of protection with the founding of the Indian Protection Bureau (SPI, Portuguese acronym) to control and watch Indigenous populations in the country. The SPI would be responsible for determining Indigenous status through tribal affiliation and, later, with the provision of a register according to which access to state services was directed to Indigenous people. With the recognition of belonging to a tribe native to Brazil, Indigenous people would have access to citizen rights, with the exception of voting and forming a political or social movement, which was prohibited at the time.

It is important to note that international capital had never been so present in the Brazilian economy until dictatorship. This capital could circulate freely in the country as long as the military government authorized it, which increased state control over access to the Amazon. By this time, external relationships between Indigenous peoples and workers in the forest with international and national social groups, including the Catholic Church, was already occurring, albeit in a very restricted and repressed manner. This increased feelings that Indigenous politics could be a threat to the national project and, thus, that Indigenous peoples had to be controlled. It was not for nothing that the SPI had been created by the military government.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, with redemocratization, what had been seen as an economic miracle collapsed into debt crisis and poverty and inequalities in the country increased dramatically. In the Amazon, one of the richest areas in resources in Brazil, but with one of the highest levels of inequality (to the extent of reports reminiscent of slavery at this time), a strong, articulated, and effective social movement emerged. Latex extractors together with some Indigenous and other social and international movements began to articulate themselves in a struggle against the exploitation of the work force in the Amazon Basin and the irresponsible use of the environment. Indigenous peoples started to be seen as icons in such struggles because their lifeways and survival were vulnerable to these changes and the inequalities and poverty began in this sense to reach them.

With Chico Mendes, a rubber tapper in the province of Acre (lower Amazon Basin), as its main voice, the movement was a touchstone in

bringing the articulation of grassroots movements in the country with the new form of activism that exploded in late 1990s: the nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Unsettling local oligarchies still present in the Brazilian Amazon, this brought to the national political debate the undue exploitation of the forest and the lip-service the Brazilian state paid to the local communities in the forest, especially Indigenous peoples forced to leave their communities to make money. The movement connected sustainable development, local political representation, and participation of the traditional communities in the stewardship of the forest, arguing that the state was favoring local elites—as in the colonial state—in order to maintain the integrity of the federation. Chico Mendes was murdered in 1988, inflicting a blow to the fight for sustainable development in harmony with Indigenous knowledge from which it has never fully recovered.⁶ Political violence thus addressed the connection the area began to have with the discourse of sustainable development.

The year of Chico Mendes' death was also the year that the new Brazilian Constitution was created. A symbol of the redemocratization process and called the "Citizen Constitution," it reflected the attempt to broaden the promotion and guaranteeing of rights in Brazil, including minorities and marginalized groups such as Indigenous peoples. The SPI was renamed the National Indian Foundation (FUNAI, Brazilian acronym), part of the Ministry of Justice, and responsible to promote and guarantee Indigenous peoples' rights, mainly in the recognition, demarcation, and homologation of traditional lands. Indigenous peoples would have autonomy over their lands and freedom to control them in a sustainable manner, not permitting their predatory exploitation. The state thus gave Indigenous peoples a voice in citizenship that is related to the control of their land inside the state, and established for them a kind of territorial control of areas rich in resources.

The colonial discourse lingered, however, in public policies, in the Constitution, and in relation to international politics, notwithstanding that the legislation theoretically was protecting Indigenous rights. In practical terms today, two decades after the Citizen Constitution, less than 25 percent of Indigenous lands have been properly demarcated and homologated in Brazil.⁷ The situation in the Amazon is particularly delicate because of the borders and because demarcation can mean conflict with neighboring countries. Meanwhile, lumbering and gold mining proceeds on Indigenous lands without proper government oversight. When Indigenous peoples react, they may be killed; even when they do not, their survival is threatened by deforestation and the pollution of rivers upon which they depend.

Performing Diplomacies in Liminal Spaces

What, then, are the alternatives to extinction? Indigenous peoples of the Amazon raised a political voice in Brazil because of the limitations of the state and the limited citizenship granted to them. Some became social entrepreneurs, organizing discussions, articulating with NGOs, and doing fundraising for the operation of their councils and organizations, which involve the participation of many groups in the Amazon: Catholic missionaries, local association leaders, and advocacy networks. The largest of these is the Confederation of the Indigenous Organizations in the Brazilian Amazon (COIAB, Brazilian acronym).

COIAB was created in 1988 as part of the *Aliança dos Povos da Floresta* (Peoples of the Forest Alliance), including also the Amazon Working Group and the National Conference of the Rubber Tappers when Chico Mendes started to build alliances between Indigenous peoples and the laborers in the forest. The Alliance as well as COIAB emerged anchored in the protection of Indigenous rights and the rights of people of the forest more generally. Mendes inaugurated a way of doing politics in the country, especially in areas where the actuation of the state is precarious. COIAB is an example of this way of exercising citizenship differently, supported by the principles of love for the forest and respect for Indigenous traditions. COIAB's main projects are around sustainable development in the forest, guaranteeing Indigenous cultural space for the development of their work, but at the same time striving for access to basic rights such as health and education in a differentiated manner for Indigenous peoples.

Most of the people working at COIAB have Indigenous roots and understand the organization as militancy for their future. The language used in the projects is one related to development and rights claims. During the 1990s, with the advent of the neoliberal state and the explosion of civil society discourses, such languages were incorporated into the vocabulary of abject populations. Their politics had begun to be informed by the possibility opened for an individual and group based politics ahead of the stimulation given by the neoliberal state to projects connected to the promotion of specific rights that more and more disconnect people's welfare from the state.

In the case of COIAB, a political project was formulated in order to bring ethnicity to the structures of government in the Amazon. The proposal was to create representative organs with the involvement of all the peoples of the Amazon so that claims could be better discussed and taken

as a whole to the Brazilian government. The claims are seen as a means toward self-government and more independence from the government of Brazil. Nevertheless, the structures created by the organization have an institutional design similar to governmental structures, although it has attempted to maintain a better sense of horizontality. Among the approximately twenty Indigenous organizations that are part of COIAB are groups without demarcated lands and in trouble with landowners who are pressuring the government to diminish Indigenous areas in deference to the expansion of agribusiness. As the government has an interest in the expansion of this sector, the majority of policies are currently being concentrated on the provision of special health and education needs instead of the regularization of land. Even so, the provision of these social goods is precarious.

This reflects the fact that the neoliberal reforms in Brazil put an emphasis on economic growth and the international position of the country as a developed or almost developed one. They move to increase individual rights and, in the case of Indigenous rights, to ensure that the individual has the freedom to pursue self-determination for her or himself. The problem is that the apparent redemocratization, combined with market-oriented public policies, has placed Indigenous peoples at an extreme disadvantage in the process because Indigenous projects typically are not market-oriented, they are communal strategies of survival. In some senses, the experience in the Amazon is unique. As Linda Tuhiwai Smith stresses about the somewhat different case of Maori people in New Zealand,

Neoliberalism presented an economic theory for addressing issues of social inequality and disadvantage and offered a promise for social inclusion and participation to various marginalized and disadvantaged communities that differed from the welfarism that had become a feature of post-WWII social programs. Dismantling the Welfare State alongside major reforms in health and education were key platforms for delivering the promise of inclusion and greater equality . . . The old system was often viewed as patronizing, paternalistic and racist. A new approach that promised less dependency on a welfare system and more opportunity for choice and for the devolution of the state was viewed with hopeful anticipation by the Maori. (Smith 2007, 334–35)

The fundamental difference with Indigenous peoples in the Amazon is that the welfare system has never really existed in South America. Paternalistic states were common in the region and they were limiting of

Indigenous political agency, as signaled in the work of the SPI as inclusion of Indigenous peoples in a national integration project. Paradoxically, however, the atomist politics of neoliberalism did hold a certain promise for the communal activism of Indigenous peoples. Very astutely, Indigenous peoples in the Amazon used the disadvantageous situation to boost political alliances for their causes.

A specific trend observed in this process of alliance building through COIAB—a process built into an institutional design that has been widely disseminated to other organizations in the Amazon Basin—is its financing by international organizations, NGOs, and some international governmental agencies, such as USAID and the German Technical Cooperation. This is explicitly politicized as a way to establish contacts, construct discourses, and question the political order; it is another way of being political. Under the agonistic citizenship model guaranteeing minimal rights and understood as an impossibility for the Indigenous, they search for solidaristic strategies to build political resistances as alterity (Isin 2002), as a different narrative about their political subjectivity, and through new conceptions of what it means to be a citizen in the neoliberal era.

Despite the evident gains realized in this relationship, there would be problems if Indigenous cosmologies were to be brought under meticulous consideration. One of the aspects of rights set forth by Indigenous peoples in the Amazon as necessary for their autonomy and survival is the possibility of subsistence activities related to the selling of native crafts and the sharing of traditional knowledge. This is seen by people in the organization as a way to support the resistance activities, of self-financing, and of more independence in the activities. The use of the *fortuna*, represented in the natural resources and the traditional use of the land, is an asset for Indigenous peoples in their alliances both with civil society groups and among themselves. These alliances are part of the history of the present of Indigenous peoples who are searching in other “places” for possibilities for the preservation of the memory of them as a people. Indigenous peoples enact relationality to advance negotiations based on the idea that the preservation of memory is connected to the relationship with other groups and to the recognition of them as agents, as part of the process of changes in the world. It is not possible to isolate Indigenous peoples from processes of change that are occurring in the world; to attempt to do so is to deny the ill effects such process have had in Indigenous peoples’ lives.

That is why Indigenous peoples in the Amazon do not disconnect their struggles from the struggles for sustainability on a global scale or

from other cases of exclusion in the forest. They understand that everyone involved in the process is part of the same process that started long ago, in the fifteenth century, and that their political memory now cannot be disentangled from this encounter. The mistake would be to believe that this is somehow due to constitutional modifications brought by neoliberalism—the struggle for preservation and survival of Indigenous identities through communal claims, understood in the neoliberal case as special rights, was there long before neoliberalism was operating in the forest. Nevertheless, it can be said that the regime contributed to the attenuation of the relationships arising from an identification based on class, highly influenced by communist and socialist ideas, to a relationship based on the experience of everyday life, in the present.

For some critics, this is problematic for the evident disconnect between the means employed and the ends expected. According to Taiaiake Alfred,

One of the problems of indigenous politics is that there is no consistency of means and ends in the way we are struggling to empower ourselves. Approaches to making change that advocate reforming the colonial legal system or state policy or that seek empowerment through the accumulation of financial resources may seem to hold promise, but they are opposed to basic and shared Onkwehonwe in either the means they would use to advance the struggle or in the ends they would achieve. Legalist, economic, and, for that matter, violent insurgent approaches are all simply mimicking foreign logics, each in a different way. How you fight determines who you will become when the battle is over, and there is always means-ends consistency at the end of the game. For Onkwehonwe, the implication of a legalist approach is entrenchment in the state system as citizens with rights defined by the constitution of the colonial state, which is the defeat of the idea of an independent Onkwehonwe existence. (Alfred 2005, 23)

Certainly, this is not something that Indigenous peoples in the Amazon Basin and, specifically, in the Brazilian Amazon have forgotten. However, a rupture of state institutions cannot be afforded, though the forms of resistance can continue to be disruptive and call attention to the inconsistencies in state policies. The means-ends consistency, in like vein, is subtle and perennial in the Amazonian Indigenous peoples' experience. Their perspectives about the colonizers, their states, and the new actors that are operating in global politics are ways of exercising their indigeneity in that sense (Viveiros de Castro, 1992). In

the Brazilian Amazon, such exercise is perceived in the land struggles, related to accommodation of the concept of sovereignty in the country, occurring in the lowlands of the forest.

Indigenous Articulations as Justification for Violent Sovereign Acts

When one is making an analysis about Indigenous issues in the Brazilian Amazon, it is necessary to address land demarcation and the process of homologation of these lands, and the inevitable connection it has with sovereignty. The Amazon Basin accounts for a very large territory both in South American and Brazilian terms. Almost 40 percent of Brazilian territory is part of what is called the “legal Amazon” or that area of the Amazon forest that is inside the national territory and under the surveillance of the Ministry of Justice via the Federal Police.

The truth of the matter is that the borders of that territory are immense—more than seven thousand kilometers—enclosing a vast area, which makes surveillance of the territory almost impossible. If overall territorial surveillance is difficult, the control of the limits of Indigenous lands in the Amazon in order that people do not invade those lands is even more complicated. It is especially so because the state can go back and forth until the land is homologated and can do so also when a situation of conflict in the Indigenous land is taken as threatening the balance in the federal system and in state sovereignty. The rule of the previously acquired rights guaranteed to all citizens is not extended to Indigenous peoples, in this sense. The hierarchy of values here is clear because Indigenous peoples can, by protection and tutelage, have rights but they cannot exercise them in the same manner as others because they have special rights. One can say that this is contrary to the difference and ethnic politics of neoliberalism. However, I would like to suggest that, if the “big picture” of the Brazilian domestic and international politics is considered, it makes a good deal of sense.

I have noted how the North/South discourse influenced the condition of Indigenous peoples in the Amazon forest. Such discourse also influences Brazilian politics and ideas about borders, indigeneity, and the conflict over land, defensively or in an opportunistic manner. Particularly when neoliberal policies for increasing agricultural production and the stability of domestic policies are at stake, such discourse creates opportunities to legitimize actions against Indigenous groups, and sovereignty is an expedient that may be conveyed together with behaviors that at times favor Indigenous peoples and, at other times,

the landowners. The case of the Raposa Serra do Sol land is an example of this to which I briefly turn.

The Raposa Serra do Sol territory is located in the province of Roraima, western lower Amazon Basin. It is more than 1.6 million of hectares of "continuous land,"⁸ homologated in 2002, with some fourteen thousand Indigenous people of five different ethnicities.⁹ Unlike in Canada and the United States, after the homologation is sanctioned by the president, the state maintains the function of arbiter in the territory; the definition of what is conflict and what constitutes the need of protection in Indigenous territory comes from the Supreme Court, not from Indigenous leaders. Such problems related to arbitration and definition of conflict are now occurring at Raposa Serra do Sol (henceforth RSS) and bring to the fore the question of authorship in politics and rights and how this can play in inappropriate ways with respect to Indigenous peoples.

The process of homologation at RSS approved in 2008 is creating significant conflict with rice growers in Roraima who held large amounts of land to produce rice for both export and internal consumption. Unused land was kept without plantation for land speculation in agribusiness. These rice growers alleged that homologation would cause unemployment and rice shortages in the national markets. The biggest problem was not the allegation per se, but the attendant discourse of hate toward Indigenous peoples and the serious implications that has for Indigenous people's safety in the context of a mobilization of the farmers organized against them.

Since the beginning of 2008, landowners are inflaming migrant workers coming from other provinces to work in rice cultivation against Indigenous peoples on the pretence that they are the cause of poverty and impoverishment in the region and an obstacle to economic growth. At the same time, landowners are advancing into Indigenous territories in order to expand their cultivation. They justify this by arguing that it is absurd for Brazilian citizens to accept that 0.4 percent of the population in Roraima should have 40 percent of the provincial territory, which in this case is within the province but is not provincial territory, but an Indigenous territory protected by the federal government. In addition, the quoted percentage of the territory is not only related to the RSS, but to other Indigenous territories in Roraima, which, as it happens, was created in the mid-1960s because of the large Indigenous presence and to guarantee better control of the border area with Venezuela.

A major inconsistency in the homologation process of continuous land in Brazil is that non-Indigenous people continue to live and to

maintain their own structures of governance inside the territory. This is problematic because Indigenous peoples have the responsibility to, among other things, ensure that the land is used in a sustainable manner and for noncommercial activities. The landowners who invade the territory, however, do not ensure this and the responsibility for their deforesting activities ultimately remains with Indigenous peoples. In furtherance of their efforts to improve their control over the territory, landowners use local associations, such as peasants' guilds, to incite violence and racism against Indigenous peoples, claiming that they are selling the country to international interests and threatening national development and sovereignty.

This claim is being made because, as Indigenous peoples have autonomy over their territories and are each day more articulated with international civil society associations as a means of surviving politically and physically, it is said that they are permitting the entrance of foreigners to use natural resources without state concession. Indigenous peoples, by this logic are usurpers, possessing the land for profit and using their racial minority condition to threaten the citizens and the sovereignty of the state, or so goes the discourse. It is also a perspective supported by the military that argues, for example, that it is absurd that a Brazilian cannot transit freely in an Indigenous territory that has become property in a sovereign land. Following this reasoning, of course, we could rhetorically ask why an Indigenous person of the RSS cannot circulate freely in the rice farms or to Venezuela. The answer is that sovereignty and the concept of a popular sovereignty through the acts by which citizens exercise and incorporate them is not an appropriate concept when we turn to Indigenous peoples here. Legally, the territories are not their property because the government has conceded the right of living in them without it being necessary to acquire them; they have control over the land but not in the manner of property. Moreover, they are not creating a parallel government inside the demarcated territory; they do not seek territorial emancipation, which is not an issue. The imagined threat to sovereignty is proffered mainly because Indigenous life projects and ways of life are incompatible with the agricultural entrepreneurs' project.

If the problem is the amount of land devoted to a small number of people, then the terms of quantity must also be revised or the naive notions of sovereignty under threat must be put into context with what sovereignty means in the political struggle for land in Brazil and its connections with productivity and foreign trade in the country. Denying the deployment of sovereignty as an expedient for the normalization

of power discourses inside the country is in the minimum naive, and Indigenous peoples are at the center of this process not because they are a threat to sovereignty per se, but because they deny what the idea of sovereignty represents. In other words, their politics is made for other purposes, although sometimes incorporating much of the liberal state discourse according to which citizenship is the basis to stand (by oneself) for one's rights. Citizenship in this case is the counterfactual for Indigenous peoples, something they use in the struggle for rights, but which is under complex negotiation through the various discourses popular sovereignty assumes depending on the government, on the public policy, and on the political context. One thing that cannot be denied is that this is a political and not solely a legal process, and sovereignty and autonomy in the Indigenous territory are less a narrative about concession and more one about control and keeping peace in the vast Brazilian territory. Sovereignty is not an issue for Indigenous peoples because borders make no sense to them, except for the fact that this will define to whom they must address themselves and seek for political authorization. It is not a matter of secession. As Alfred puts it, "Those who advocate sovereignty as a goal seek only a limited form of autonomy, not independence; the goal relates only to powers of self-government within a framework of constitutional law and authorities delegated by the state . . . The problem is that the assertion of a sovereign right for indigenous peoples continues to structure the politics of decolonization, and the state uses the theoretical inconsistencies in that position to its own advantage" (Alfred 2006b, 324).

The inconsistencies and the discourse of power immersed in the dynamics of the conflict in RSS made the Brazilian Supreme Court step back from homologation in mid-April 2008 on the basis that the conflict was bringing imbalance to the provincial autonomy regulated by the federal arrangement and, thereby, to the unity of the Federation. Mainly, this decision was made because the Federal Police were forced to intervene to take people out of the Indigenous territory. In this case, the popular sovereignty distributed through federal autonomy was used to justify the decision and, once more, the Indigenous were forgotten in the conflict.

The conflict opened the opportunity for articulation with the Indigenous Peoples in RSS with other Indigenous peoples in other areas of the Amazon Basin as well as with organizations like the Indigenous Council of Roraima (CIR) and the COIAB, which is the Indigenous political organization active in the process. COIAB had started to articulate a global resistance in response to the episode, contacting Indigenous

communities in other parts of the world via the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and Alianza Amazonia. The CIR, with all the alliances formed through COIAB, had started to pressure the Brazilian government to offer protection to the Indigenous peoples in the continuous territory. In relation to the peasants and to the allegations of unemployment, the argument of the CIR, mostly administered by Indigenous peoples of the area, is that most of the occupied land is unproductive and used as back-up in case of necessity to stock rice to raise the prices internally and externally.

In this sense, the Indigenous organizations that emerged inside the Raposa Terra do Sol territory were influenced by global initiatives to act in the local, particularly through policies with community sustainable development. The CIR, for example, has four axes for actions and all of them are public policy oriented bringing to the organization the function to operate in a realm that a few years ago was restricted to the state. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the work of CIR and also of COIAB is possible due to sponsorship coming from global NGOs, some corporate actors, and from the state in the form of policies linked to specialized agencies in the Ministries. In the case of the Indigenous peoples in RSS, we can say that "Indigenous organizations are both inside and outside civil society, the state and markets. But this positioning . . . fits quite well with contemporary processes that make it difficult to sustain the distinction between civil society, state and market" (Blaser, Feit, and McRae, 2004, 15).

In this sense, Indigenous Peoples in Brazil have been accused of being intermediaries of multinational and NGO interests when striving for their survival. Of course, these connections can never be absolutely free of external influences. However, the openness to this new kind of relationship is increasing the influence of Indigenous articulations in policies beneficial to their survival as political beings. Even if the military or the state say that Indigenous peoples are compromising sovereignty, one should ask of which sovereignty they are speaking and for what purposes and how Indigenous peoples could possibly be jeopardizing it, if this is not their aim in seeking political survival. Much to the contrary, this has always been the aim of a politics of forgetting of their life projects and cosmologies.

Conclusion: Becoming Political, Being Indigenous

The situation in the RSS is an example of how Indigenous peoples are negotiating in the interstices of broader negotiations of Brazilian sovereignty. These negotiations show how Indigenous peoples organize in the face of difficulties affirming political identities in a place that is in constant movement to negotiate its own. Their own negotiations are examples of the principle of *relationality* and of cosmology illustrated in the constant and perennial relationships between political identities and the space they are in. *Relationality* is a process that if put in parallel with citizenship, for instance—if sameness is considered as alterity and as a technique for political survival and negotiation inside, within, and throughout the states—is the Indigenous way of seeking recognition and personal accomplishment amid the collective.

Under these circumstances, Indigenous peoples are never political, they are constantly becoming political. The process of construction of political subjectivities responds to relationships to the family, the tribe, the Earth, and the European colonizers. They are never one, they are multiple and their identities are always in formation as are their relationships. Without looking at relationships, very little can be said about Indigenous peoples and their relational identities (Alfred 2005; Beier 2005a; Blaser et al., forthcoming; Smith 2007; Martin-Hill 2004).

Between the classifications of a Machiavellian leader of virtù and the Rousseauian good savage, Indigenous peoples are in the end a nomenclature established outside their own through which the political as official state practice is not allowed. That is why they are condemned for doing politics, simply because they are not ascribed to do it. That is the reason their understandings of the political, relationships, and relationality are important to understand the becoming political not only of them, but of us in the form of a changed and negotiated citizenship, which by no means is a firm concept and which reflects the changes in the state as political concept and practice (Isin 2002).

By way of concluding, I would repeat a question posed by the Brazilian anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro: “Who are not Indigenous?” The question makes us think that the attribution of this characteristic was made from without and in a specific time. In that sense, what is the Indigenous today and who is not Indigenous, if most of the people inside the state territory are now native? This question is the basis for the Amazon perspectivism, but what of the definitions and political subjectivities if the Indigenous are understood via their perception about the anthropologist, the social scientist, or whoever is in contact with them? Turning

the question around brings to the fore the relationships and the ideas Indigenous peoples have about the “civilization” that has wandered into their midst. In the case of the Amazon Basin, it brings an understanding about what the Amazon really is and the kind of relationships with the environment, the people, and the institutions it entails.

Who are not the Indigenous and who are the Indigenous in this sense would not be a line of division for understanding the conflicts over land, resources, and the definition of sovereignty in the Amazon. It would be but a point of departure to the possibilities for new diplomacies in multiple, alive, and changing political zones broadly understood and translated by Indigenous political subjectivities and relationships.

Notes

1. According to Aihwa Ong, global assemblage is a cultural, political, economic, and social interrelationship occurring through, within, and inside the state constituting political spaces in perpetual motion. In the global assemblage, there are inter-actions between many social groups that produce a situated politics and a situated ethics (Ong 2006). The global assemblage also produces a sort of governmentality that entails political activities proper to the assemblage that can be disarticulated and rearticulated, according to the situated politics emergent in the assemblage. In other words, the politics that leads to the assemblage is not necessarily the same that will emerge inside it or in the aftermath of the particular moment that could have led to its disarticulation. For Saskia Sassen, this is the result of globalization and is the sign of the emergence of a global scale that is not the same as thinking in a world scale resulting from internationalization. The globalization process leads to different forms of doing politics and exercising authority through differentiated spaces and scales (Sassen 2008). In this way, the global assemblage can be present in a local space and the local can be part of the global scale. The concept, as theorized by Ong and Sassen is important to understanding Indigenous political geographies and life struggles in the Amazon Basin.
2. Machiavelli's (1985) leader of *virtù* is one who is able to learn from lessons of the past in order to avoid repeating mistakes. The leader of *virtù* thus effectively controls *fortuna*, or luck.
3. The image of the “good savage” is described by Rousseau (1992) as describing a natural state of being, before the state and civil society, in which survival is presumed to have been pursued according to instincts of self-preservation but without appetites or ambitions such as Rousseau felt undermined compassion for others in “progressive” society.
4. The English were an exception in the Portuguese colonial pact of the Brazilian colony as they financed the Portuguese Crown during the process.
5. The idea came mainly with the proclamation of the Republic in 1889.

6. On this fundamental issue for Indigenous struggles in the Amazon forest, see Mendes (1992).
7. On the legal basis for Indigenous rights, see article 231 in the Brazilian Constitution, available at <http://www.v-brazil.com/government/laws/constitution.html> (accessed May 1, 2008).
8. The terminology “continuous land” in the Brazilian Constitution means that many Indigenous territories can have recognition, demarcation, and homologation under one large continuous territory, which makes more sense to Indigenous peoples accustomed to living in close and overlapping regions before and during the division of the national territory into provinces.
9. For extensive information about the case, see the CIR (Indigenous Council of Roraima) Web page: <http://www.cir.org.br> (accessed May 1, 2008).

This page intentionally left blank

Aboriginal Diplomacy

The Queen Comes to Canada and Coyote Goes to London

Keith Thor Carlson

The post-War of 1812 relationship between Indigenous people and the Canadian state has been examined primarily through the prism of domestic federal government policy initiatives, and within this paradigm Native people have been seen principally as reacting to agendas set in Ottawa (see, for example, Dickason 1992; Miller 1989; Ray 1999). In western Canada, where British sovereignty was proclaimed much later than it was in the central and eastern regions of what has become the Canadian Dominion (and where First Nations never played the role of military ally in North American skirmishes between European powers) Native-newcomer relations have seldom been approached within the context of diplomacy. And yet, diplomacy is precisely the paradigm that many Indigenous people themselves use when discussing Indigenous-Crown relations. Indeed, there exist among the Salish people of Coast and interior British Columbia several stories of one-on-one diplomatic negotiations between nineteenth- and early-twentieth century Aboriginal leaders and reigning British kings and queens. The conundrum for historians has been that there are no archival documents to corroborate the oral canon; as such, the Indigenous histories have alternatively been ignored or dismissed as either “myth” or “fantasy.” Despite their singular status, these narratives reveal much about the way Native people not only understand their relationship with the non-Native world, but also the role of newcomers within Aboriginal history. As such, they are portals through which we can begin to see and appreciate diplomacy on terms

that go beyond the Western tradition of *realpolitik* and the assumption of the security dilemma. They suggest a diplomatic alternative where difference is not necessarily regarded as inherently threatening. When engaged on their own terms these narratives are every bit as valid as Western ones. Failing to appreciate the sincerity and veracity of this discourse is to close a door on another way of knowing, and to perpetuate a colonialist mindset that inevitably marginalizes Indigenous voices.

Not all Salish stories of diplomacy with the Crown are identical, and it is clear that not all the stories are meant to refer to the same encounter or encounters. Elizabeth Edwards of the Douglas Lake community near Merritt (aged ninety-four in 2004), for example, related an account of Chief Skakahtun's mid-nineteenth century negotiations with Queen Victoria—negotiations that took place on a ship anchored in British Columbia waters. According to Ms. Edwards, the queen of England traveled to British Columbia after learning of the shiny colored rocks of gold that could be found along the Fraser River. When her ship arrived she was eager to come ashore and “walk on the land,” but Skakahtun (who was so highly respected that his people never allowed his feet to touch the earth when he attended high level meetings) intercepted the queen's longboat and told Her Majesty, “No! Not this time. Maybe another time. [Instead] we are going to talk.” And talk they apparently did. As Ms. Edwards explained, the queen and Skakahtun acknowledged that the world would soon be changing, and that neither of them would live forever. They and their people, therefore, needed a long-lasting system of governance and finance that would accommodate the future needs of both the Natives and the newcomers. Seeing Skakahtun's sacks of colored rocks, the queen proposed that she would look after the gold in exchange for ensuring the future welfare of both the Native and non-Native people; they would be able to “live off the wealth.” Ms. Edwards interpreted this to mean that the Crown had committed to providing social assistance or “welfare” to all those First Nations people who were truly “needy.”¹

Though remarkable, Ms. Edward's narrative is not exceptional. In a park in Lytton, BC, overlooking the junction of the Fraser and Thompson rivers stands a vandalized marble memorial, erected in 1927, commemorating Chief David Spintlum (1812–87). Historical documents held in American and British repositories describe Spintlum as a powerful and pragmatic leader who, in 1858, negotiated peace treaties with renegade outfits of American militia bent on waging a war of racial extermination within the British Crown colony to rid the region of Indigenous people and open the gold fields to capitalist development. Within the historiography, Spintlum's actions are described as having

been unappreciated by the British Colonial and Imperial authorities who, ironically, quickly moved to take advantage of the peace Spintlum had created to assert their own more subtle system of alienating Native land and resources. But in the local Nlakapamux oral tradition, as captured in the text chiseled into the marble memorial, a different history is told—one where the queen herself acknowledges Spintlum's contributions to the Empire and recognizes his right to govern his people within their traditional territory:

When the white men . . . [first arrived in British Colum?] . . . bia the Indians were using the land and this caused bloodshed. David Spintlum did not want this loss of life and succeeded in stopping the war. He saw Queen Victoria who was visiting Canada and reported to her what he had done. Her Majesty was glad to hear this and said "there shall be no more war in Canada." She presented him with a flag and a hunting knife and told him he should be chief for ever. David Spintlum made his posts at Spuzzum at Lilloet at Stathshone and at Sheneodos and those four posts are the limits of the Thompson tribal territory.

Two decades later, in 1946, in an appearance before a Special Joint Committee of Parliament, the highly literate and articulate Squamish Native rights advocate Andrew Paull (president of the North American Indian Brotherhood), referred to the agreement between Spintlum and Queen Victoria as an "unwritten treaty." He added that Queen Victoria had subsequently "sent the Marquis of Lorne to Chief Spintlum with a flag and a bible and a sword . . . to ratify this early treaty."² Governor General Lorne is known to have met with British Columbia's Aboriginal people during his 1882 Pacific visit, but no written records exist to suggest his having ratified earlier agreements or treaties with Aboriginal people.

But the Nlakapamux accounts of Spintlum's relations with the monarchy are not the only ones to cite agreements entered into with the Marquis of Lorne. Chief George of Chehalis, from a settlement on the Harrison River (a tributary of the Fraser roughly one hundred kilometers upstream from the Harrison's mouth) was, in the words of the famous anthropologist Franz Boas, a "prize." So great was George's historical knowledge that Boas used him as his primary authority in two separate publications (Boas 1894, 1895). But while Boas reveled in what Chief George could tell him about Aboriginal myths, legends, and the traditional cultural expressions of his tribal community, he was less than impressed with the chief's interpretation of the history of recent Native-newcomer relations.

In a letter to his wife in 1890 describing his research with Chief George, Boas wrote that “at least once a day I have to listen to a speech about how great he is . . . The main topic of his conversation is the fact that his wife once gave Princess Louise, [the daughter of Queen Victoria and] the wife of the former Governor [General] of Canada [the Marquis of Lorne], five cows which she did not even acknowledge, thus proving herself most unworthy” (Rohner 1969, 127).

If Boas failed to take Chief George and his wife’s complaints about the Governor General and Queen Victoria’s daughter seriously, the Canadian government failed to recognize their significance. An article in the November 21, 1883, edition of *The British Columbian*, titled “Gross Neglect,” noted that Aboriginal leaders were “very much disappointed and dissatisfied” that more than a year had passed since the Royal visit with the Marquis’s “voluntary promise” of gifts yet to be fulfilled. Over the subsequent months a flurry of letters between Prime Minister John A. Macdonald, I. W. Powell, the Superintendent of Indian Affairs for British Columbia, and the Auditor General, determined that no one in the Indian Affairs Branch or Prime Ministers office had been apprised of any such promise by the Governor General’s staff. Confused as to what the promise might have been, and unsure of its import within Aboriginal society, Ottawa officials eventually determined, four months later, to forward sixty photographs of the marquis and princess to British Columbia with instructions that they were to be “distributed among the Chiefs to whom the presents were promised.”³ Given that seven years later Chief George Chehalis and his wife still considered their gift of cattle not only unreciprocated but a matter of weighty importance, we can conclude that the photos did not meet Aboriginal expectations.

Along similar lines, many contemporary Stó:lō elders from the lower Fraser River carry oral histories of a promise that was made to them following negotiations between their leaders and the Crown’s representative at a large public gathering in New Westminster in the mid-1860s. According to these intergenerational memories, the Crown committed to providing the Stó:lō people with one third (some versions say one quarter) of all royalties generated from alienated lands and resources within their territory. To express their frustration at the government’s unwillingness to acknowledge the promise, let alone live up to it, the Stó:lō leaders staged a large reenactment ceremony in New Westminster on the queen’s Birthday in 2006. There, after ceremoniously receiving canoes that brought Aboriginal delegates to the former colonial capital as had occurred on May 24, 1864, volunteer actors dressed in period costumes repeated the words that Stó:lō oral history states were spoken by the Crown Colony’s governor.

As noted, narratives such as these sit awkwardly against the historical records preserved in archival documents and interpreted through scholarly histories. According to Western sources, Queen Victoria never visited British Columbia, no commitments were ever made to exchange gold for welfare, Spintlum was never appointed chief for life, the Marquis of Lorne never affirmed the queen's earlier treaty with Spintlum's people, Queen Victoria's daughter never accepted a gift of cattle from George Chehalis's wife, and the Stó:lō were never promised anything for their land and resources. And because such stories are incongruous with the documentary-based historical record, they inevitably fail to resonate with non-Native audiences. As such, in terms of their historical validity, they are marginalized. Because they do not correspond to notions of acceptable evidence as measured in Western culture, they are inevitably rejected as inaccurate, and the events they describe as having never happened. And yet to dismiss such stories is to close the door on another way of knowing—and to the possibility of building future respectful relations built upon the foundations of past ones.

Other ways of knowing reveal themselves through diverse, and sometimes unexpected sources. The September 1904 edition of the *Kamloops Wawa*, the self-proclaimed "Queerest Newspaper in the World," includes the daily travelogue of two sojourning Salish chiefs and an Oblate priest from the interior of British Columbia as they journeyed to Liege Belgium to attend a global gathering of Oblate priests discussing their missionary work, and then to the Vatican where they met the pope. The text of the published journal is difficult to penetrate for it is an obscure form of shorthand taught to expectant priests in mid-nineteenth century French seminaries. In addition to being in shorthand, the language itself, Chinook Jargon, is also obscure. Chinook Jargon is a trade language with a vocabulary of less than one thousand words. It is an amalgam of Chinook proper, Nuuchahnulth, several Salish languages, French, and English, and a sprinkling of Chinese and Polynesian. As such, it was never anyone's first language, but rather a language in the middle that allowed people to communicate across cultural divides. And though widespread a century ago, it is now, for all intents and purposes, a dead language. Scholars have essentially ignored the journal.⁴

On the *Wawa*'s pages we read that on the way to Europe, the three stopped in Britain and took in the tourist sites, including the famous London Zoo. There, among the exotic rhinoceroses, platypuses, and elephants, was a Canadian coyote. For Chief Celestin Chilihitz and Chief Louis, this was a striking moment. One of their own (the central figure in interior Salish creation and transformation stories) had

preceded them to Europe.⁵ Inspired by the account of the European journey presented in the *Kamloops Wawa*, Salish leaders with a much more political agenda organized a second trip to Europe two years later. Originally meant to include one or both of the original chiefs who visited Coyote in London and the pope in Rome, the four members of this second delegation bypassed politicians in Ottawa (they stopped merely to inform Canadian officials of their mission but would not reveal their goals) then secured an audience with King Edward VII in Buckingham Palace. A little over a month later, they returned home with accounts of high-level diplomacy and Royal promises—promises denied by the Canadian government.⁶

More than seventy years later, in 1980, the anthropologist Wendy Wickwire interviewed an eighty-year-old interior Salish Elder named Harry Robinson, who told her a remarkable historical narrative of Coyote's journey to London and his negotiation with, and ultimate betrayal by, the king of England. Long ago, Robertson explained, near the dawn of time, Coyote's twin brother stole the knowledge of literacy and took it with him to distant England where he became the founder of Britain and father of the British people. Later, after English settlers and laws had begun to over-run interior Salish lands, Coyote was directed by an angel to seek redress by traveling to London to confront the king. Coyote did this, and ultimately secured promises from the king that Native lands and rights would be protected. The king promised Coyote that he would write all this in the "Black and White"—a book that would codify Native-newcomer relations. Through subterfuge, Robinson explains, the promise was never properly fulfilled. However, the balance of his narrative explains in great detail the important events in Native newcomer relations that resulted ostensibly from the historic diplomatic negotiations between Coyote and British Monarch.⁷

Myth and history: both terms convey something about the past, but in the mind of contemporary Westerners, or at least in the minds of most contemporary Westerners, the two are distinct narrative forms. The conveyor of one is seldom associated with the practitioner of the other, just as the reality of one is seldom considered with the truthfulness of the other; and as such, both are poorly understood. This is especially the case when the terms are applied to forms of narratives pertaining to the past as understood and used by people from cultures and languages who have not inherited the Western tradition, let alone participated in its creation and evolution.

Whereas most Western newcomers to North America associate myths with premodern fictional understandings of temporal dimensions, no

such distinction exists within the minds of many North American Indigenous people. As such, the term “myth” sits rather uncomfortably as the title of a genre of Indigenous narratives about the distant past. “Oral traditions,” and “oral history,” (terms often used to describe the unwritten historical narratives of Aboriginal people) are, therefore, English glosses that obscure as much as they reveal. The former tend to be associated with myth-like or myth-age stories, the latter with more “real” and more recent (that is, “historical”) happenings. If descriptive words are thought of as metaphors that can help bridge cultural gulfs of understanding, then perhaps the terms oral tradition and oral history might best be regarded as preliminary allegories whose greatest strengths are to serve as starting points for the creation of ever more sophisticated metaphors.⁸

Harry Robinson’s narrative of Coyote’s trip to London and “The Black and White” does not fit neatly into either of the two standard identified genres of Aboriginal historical narratives. As Jan Vansina (1985) has documented, Indigenous oral histories are richest in their descriptions of what has been interpreted as the ancient past (the period when supernatural beings mingled with human characters at or near the beginning of time), and the relatively recent past during the lives of living individuals and their immediate antecedents. In the interior Salish language spoken by Harry Robinson, stories of the first type are known as *Spakwelh*, and those of the second *Spilaxem*. While interior Salish people considered both equally true and real, outsiders have tended to classify the former as myth and the latter as history, the first as fiction and the second as potentially true.

Metaphysics and politics mingle in Harry Robinson’s story. So too do history and legend. In Robinson’s narrative, Coyote, the Okanagan Salish “Trickster figure” who Robinson describes as being half-man and half-animal, receives a message from an angel of God directing him to London to confront the king of England about the abuse Indigenous people are suffering at the hands of the king’s English children and to “make the law between the white people and the Indian.”

Coyote accepts God’s will and travels to England. Once there, however, Coyote cannot gain access to the monarch as he is protected by soldiers and will see no one save the Head of State. Undeterred, Coyote goes to the king’s kitchen door and speaks with the cook, who is frightened by Coyote’s less than fully human form. Coyote tells the cook not to be afraid. Through this lowly servant Coyote’s message is delivered and the British monarch learns that Coyote, too, is a king. He is then admitted to the palace, walks up to the king of England and says,

"I am another King. I come to see you . . . You and I, we can talk the business, then we're gonna make a law, because you King and I am King." He says to the King, "All of your children, they come and they went from here, and then they did cross into my place, into my country. Then from there they go east and they go west . . . and they went about half-ways already and they don't do good to my children. So that's how I come here to see you. So we can make a law and show our children they can be good. Not to be in trouble, not to be bad to one another. That's what I want."

The English king, however, requires further convincing. He asks what it is, exactly, that his children have done to Coyote's people. Was it serious? Did they try to kill Coyote's people? Coyote is quick to answer; his people's grievances are clear: "They just don't care for it . . . they just go and they trade the land and they just do what they like. If my children tell them . . . 'here, this is mine' . . . they will kill them. So it shouldn't be that way. Should be good to one another, and that's what I come here for."

The way it should be, of course, is peaceful—and the Coyote king understands that the English king's people will only be peaceful if their behavior with Coyote's children is regulated by a predictable rule of law. Coyote wants a codified relationship written in "Black and White" that will clarify Native-newcomer relationships principally by defining their rights and obligations toward one another. But the English king is not eager to embrace this. Assuming the superiority of his Western technology and demographics, he suggests that armed conflict would be a quicker and more effective way of resolving the tensions: "Your word is not right. Your word it sounds like war . . . If you are King and I am King we should fight. We'll have a war."

Coyote, however, is prepared for this diversionary tactic. Before agreeing to a fight he instructs the king to look out the window, explaining that he is confident that the English king's attitude will change once he has seen what awaits him through the portal. Summoning the power given to him by God, Coyote makes it so the king "could see plain." Before him were "all kinds of Indians, just as thick as could be; nothing but Indians . . . They all had a feather on their head, and they all had a spear . . . with a sharp end." Coyote clarifies for the king that if there is a war, his feathered soldiers would be sure to "kill you first before the children here." Frightened at the Indigenous resolve, the king in Robinson's narrative sits back down, contemplates his options for a few minutes, and says "I think we not going to have a war because you was ready. Your soldiers are all there . . . But I'm not ready."

There is no honor reflected in the English king's thoughts or words. Given the opportunity, it is clear he would have preferred to simply take Coyote's people's lands. Though he has aged, and supposedly matured, the king is as greedy and conniving as he was when he first stole literacy from his twin at the dawn of time. Indeed, Coyote reminds him that this is the second time the English king has promised before God that he would treat Coyote fairly and not fight—the first being when the king was young and Coyote was still a pup. As such, Coyote needs more than a verbal promise and demands that an agreement be written and signed that will forever define the relationship between Natives and newcomers and ensure everlasting peace “till the end of the world.” This “law” would specifically articulate the king's commitment to protect Aboriginal lands. Faced with Aboriginal strength and acumen, the English king acquiesces.

Prior to signing the papers, Coyote makes an additional, and seemingly unusual demand of the king—one associated with historical preservation of another kind: “‘Before we can talk the business . . . Before we can sign the paper . . . get your camera . . . King, get up and get your camera.’ He took pictures of Coyote sitting or standing or walking . . . [The English king] takes pictures.” These pictures would later prove fortuitous, for as Robinson explains, the king subsequently welches on his promise to write the “Black and White.” All Coyote's people have, in the end, to prove Coyote had indeed met the king and secured the guarantees, is the photo of Coyote in Buckingham Palace.

The photographs having been taken, Coyote and the king enter into full diplomatic negotiations over what should be included in the “Black and White.” But time is precious and Coyote must return to his land. Rather than a full treaty, they have time merely to create a “point” form list. Within this inventory is a clear commitment that the Indian people would be able to identify for themselves what lands they wanted as reserves; that such lands would be forever protected from encroachments by the king's children; and that in exchange, the white people “can use the rest.” Before departing, Coyote instructs the king to “take your time and do the rest [i.e., write the document] . . . when I leave.” As Robinson explains, it was not really necessary for Coyote to take the finished written document with him at that time because his people were still nonliterate. As such, in the end, Coyote leaves England with only the king's verbal promise that he would compose the written text and provide BC Aboriginal people with a written document in due course. What Coyote failed to anticipate was the extent of the king's mendacious character. Without Coyote there to monitor him, the king was in no rush to fulfill his promise.

The tendency for scholars engaging narratives like Robinson's has been to either employ strict synchronic methods—where the words are engaged as though their meaning is best appreciated in totally self-referential terms that are particular to the speaker's time and worldview—or to approach them through a diachronic prism where their principal value is seen as a product of their ability to contribute to what we already know about the past through alternative (archival) texts. Either approach used in isolation denies the insights of the other. But more to the point, in isolation such approaches fail to capture and reflect the story of cultural hybridity that inevitably shapes the way the Aboriginal speakers think about and understand their own past. For European ideas and beliefs often mixed in Indigenous minds and traditions in a manner that simple notions of syncretism struggles to accommodate—and which were not necessarily always exploitative and destructive.

Robinson does not date the visit to the king. Nor does he make any explicit reference to either the 1904 or 1906 Salish delegations to Europe. His description of what Coyote secured in the way of a Royal promise, and his account of the long delay in having the promises committed to paper and recognized by non-Native government and society can, however, be read against the accounts of these earlier actions to reveal striking parallels (Carlson 2005). Speaking before the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs in the Province of British Columbia in the spring of 1913, for instance, Cowichan delegate Charlie Isipaymilt described the 1906 delegation, of which he was a part, by declaring

I went to the King a few years ago to try to get some settlement from the King, and when I got there, the King gave me this photograph. His Majesty promised to do something for us, and said he would send somebody out to look into the matter. The King told me that I need not feel very sorry about these things, as if there was anything he could do[,] anything for me, he would do it. His Majesty promised to give each male Indian on the reserve, 160 acres of land, as this land belongs to us Indians.⁹

Three years earlier, the 1906 delegation's frustrated leader, Chief Joe Capilano, told a reporter from *The Province* newspaper: "They [non-Native detractors] say here that I never saw the Great White Chief in London. They say I make too much of that affair and that I am full of untruth. The men who say such things are little men, the men who have no honour and think all others have no honour also. The big men, the men who deal with real men, know that I speak the truth about all these things. They know that when one chief meets another great chief he not go about

telling all the world what they speak . . . Great men are silent and honourable." Capilano continued, "The Crown is above all and when I go London I speak with the Crown, with the Great White Chief . . . We talk with the King and at the end he shake my right hand hard and with his left hand pat my left shoulder three times . . . and say Chief we see this matter righted but it may take a long time, five years perhaps."¹⁰

The 1906 delegation is not the only event recorded in Western archival documents that echoes features of Robinson's narrative as related above. Parallels are also found with the earlier 1879 efforts of both Interior and Coast Salish communities to negotiate and codify a self-governance system with Indian Reserve Commissioner Gilbert Malcolm Sproat.¹¹ There too, hybridity was at work. In 1879, the aspirations of the interior Nlakapamux and coastal Stó:lō leaders revolved around securing land and resources from non-Native settlers, and in enabling Salish people to retain and standardize mechanisms for self-governance within the constitutional framework of the Canadian dominion.

Seeking to explain the significance of Coyote's early departure from the king, Robinson's narrative goes on to discuss the ramifications of the king's failure to put his verbal promise onto paper. For, from Robinson's perspective, the king was reneging on his promise to put pen to paper and encode a law for the Aboriginal people. Indeed, Robinson explains that the point-form paper negotiated between Coyote and the king sat in the palace and was ignored by no less than four successive English kings. Only after the ascension to the throne of a queen (the original king's great-great-granddaughter) was the promise belatedly honored; and even then, improperly: four copies of the text were prepared, three of which were sent immediately to Canada. The first went to Ottawa, the second to Winnipeg, and the third, the one that was supposed to go to Coyote's people, was instead spirited away to the British Columbia provincial capital of Victoria where nefarious provincial politicians concealed it from the Indian people.

The Okanagan Salish, however, knew it had arrived because one of their members, a man Robinson identifies as "Toma" (i.e., Thomas), was known to have acted as a guide to the government agent transporting the "Black and White" over the mountains between Kamloops and the Pacific Coast. Toma, according to Robinson, had been shown the photo of Coyote taken by the king of England and included in the Black and White's pages.

In trying to link his narrative to a chronology that the anthropologist Wendy Wickwire would recognize, Harry Robinson calculates that the delivery of the "Black and White" to Canada must have occurred at least

one hundred years after the original promise was made. He also hazards the guess that the date of the book's arrival must have been "somewhere around eighteen hundred and fifty, somewhere around that time . . . I couldn't be sure . . . I'd liked to find that out some of these days." Helping to anchor the narrative and the chronology, Robinson also relates how he had seen and met Toma personally: "And I seen him in 1917 and I was seventeen at that time, and I seen him and he was kind of way older than me now. See I'm eighty years old now [in 1980] . . . but the time when I seen him in 1917, he was more than eighty . . . Pretty old. I seen him in Penticton [BC], I seen him twice."

The balance of Robinson's remarkable narrative describes how the interior Salish people eventually, through the initiatives of one of their community's first literate members, a man named Edward Brent, were able to go to Victoria and successfully demand a copy of the great "Black and White." Robinson estimated that he and Brent were born about the same time, but that Brent had died many years earlier. Brent brought his "700 page" copy of the "Black and White" back to his people and organized a series of roughly bimonthly regular gatherings of Salish people from the different language groups living in the region. At each session, he is said to have read three or so pages from the Black and White. Representatives of the various language speakers then translated the English words Brent read into their own language so they could take the information home with them. In this way, Robinson explained, over the course of many months, the people from all around became familiar with the great book and its laws.

Throughout Robinson's discussion, diplomacy and communication are shown to have played a central role in the history of Native-newcomer encounters and relations. Coyotes' desire to encode, standardize, and make predictable the relations between newcomers and Natives through the repatriation of literacy and the "Black and White" illustrate that Indigenous people see differences between themselves and the strangers who came from afar to their lands, but that they anticipate means of peaceful and prosperous relations. Indeed, as twins they share a history of creation. In discussing the "Black and White" Robinson explained, "Now, they had them all finished . . . that's the Indian Law. That's where the Indian's Law is, in that book. Nothing but the Indian Law and that's what they call the 'Black and White,' because whoever made that law, one he was black and the other was white. See that's the key . . . that he was white. And Coyote was black: that was Indian. Black and white. He made that law. That the reason why they called that book 'Black and White.' The law . . . they called the law 'Black and White.'"

The underlying historical truth and reality of Canada's Pacific Coast Native-newcomer diplomacy and relations are conveyed through both Aboriginal and scholarly histories, even though the players are not necessarily the same, or the chronologies exactly compatible. History as portrayed through the scholarly prose of Robin Fisher, Paul Tennant, Hamar Foster, Cole Harris, John Lutz, and a growing list of other academics essentially parallels and corroborates the basic elements of Robinson's narrative: Native people were entitled to certain protections from the Crown, and were led to believe that such protections were forthcoming. These protections never materialized. Non-Native settlers, through the complicity of the provincial government and the indifference of the federal government, abused Aboriginal people and land rights. Out of frustration, and increasingly desperation, the Aboriginal people sought to have their rights acknowledged and codified. The British Columbia government, however, consistently thwarted Aboriginal efforts to have their lands protected and rights recognized. Literacy was a major barrier to Aboriginal people in their dealings with a text based newcomer society. Certain newcomers, such as Indian Reserve Commissioner Gilbert Malcolm Sproat, who represented the government and traveled by horseback between the interior and the coast, were sympathetic and nominally helpful to Indigenous people, if only in encouraging them to continue to try and have their rights clarified and protected. The British Columbia government did effectively, and for many years, hide a book that outlined the improper way in which Aboriginal lands had been alienated: the *Papers Connected with the Indian Land Question* (British Columbia 1975). As well, they reneged on Sproat's 1879 assurance that Nlakapamux and Stó:lō proposals for self-governance within a British system would be favorably received. A delegation of people associated with Coyote did meet with the king of England (in 1906) and upon their return claimed to have secured certain promises that they understood would be codified and acted upon by the Crown. It was a queen (Elizabeth II, in 1982) who, though not the great-great-granddaughter of King Edward, was in fact the fourth to wear the crown after him, who repatriated the Constitution that included for the first time a reference to Aboriginal rights.¹²

The congruencies between Robinson's narrative and the general account of the fight for, and recognition of, Aboriginal rights in British Columbia as revealed through archival documents is suggestive of the power that Indigenous voices have to supplement and enrich what we know about the complicated history of relations between Natives and newcomers. But their value does not end there. Beyond being seen as

new evidence to be fit into established chronologies to enrich existing Western historical narratives, Aboriginal oral traditions open windows that can form the basis of new paradigms where entirely separate chronologies and narrative forms exist into which European archival-based evidence and interpretation can be fit. Certainly, this is the way that many Indigenous people approach the history of Native-newcomer relations.

This should not imply that established academic interpretations should be thrown out, or that lineal chronology should be replaced by an elliptical nonsequential ordering of events. Indeed, little I have encountered in Coast Salish epistemology and historical consciousness suggests the sort of irreconcilable worldviews Donald Fixico (2003) posits.¹³ Rather, beyond efforts to integrate one voice into another's story, there is potentially something very worthwhile to be learned from an examination of the structure of the other's story itself—through a cultural reading of the text.

To the extent that Indigenous people continue to see the world differently, the onus should be on newcomers, like myself, to try to figure out what those differences are, and what they mean. Newcomers are, after all, the ones who entered Aboriginal lands uninvited; and in most cases, what Aboriginal spokespersons have advocated is not that newcomers live according to Native laws and protocols, but that they live up to their own laws and political rhetoric—those that speak of specific protections and recognitions of Aboriginal rights. To accomplish this, non-Aboriginal people might want to consider inverting the intellectual exercise; to try to discern how Indigenous people understand history, and where we, as outsiders, fit into Indigenous history. Accounts like those shared by Ms. Edwards, Chief Chehalis, Chief Spintlum, and Harry Robinson not only offer insights into Salish understandings of their historical relations with the Canadian and British state, but portals through which non-Natives can catch glimpses of themselves through the rippling surface waters of the deep pools of Indigenous culture. Beyond this, the extent to which these oral histories are regarded by Indigenous people as true and accurate representations of aspects of their community history helps explain Aboriginal actions and inactions of various kinds over the past decades. Simply put, people's behavior reflects their perceptions of history and current realities. To the extent that oral histories signal a reality that is unappreciated by non-Natives, we should not be surprised to learn Aboriginal political actions do not always correspond with what outsiders have paternalistically believed is in Aboriginal people's best interests.

The fact that many Indigenous historians like those discussed above have only recently begun to share with non-Natives the metaphysical-bound

stories of Native-newcomer relations is indicative of the emerging confidence Indigenous people feel about their cultural traditions *vis-à-vis* those of newcomer society. Our responses, as outsiders, to these overtures will no doubt determine if the Aboriginal generosity continues.

Oral histories of high-level diplomacy with the Crown suggest an earlier time when Natives and newcomers could speak to one another and genuinely understand one another. That they reveal this through a historical narrative that only occasionally interpenetrates and corresponds with the non-Native historiography is doubly ironic given the inability to communicate effectively now. In wrestling with these issues in her discussions of the Indigenous people of Oceania, Aletta Biersack (1990, 12) argued that to the degree that Aboriginal societies are not static, analysis of tensions and conflict within and between Native groups (and between these same communities and European colonizers) provides rich opportunities for understanding how communities change or remain the same. Along similar lines, cross-cultural analysis of the tensions and conflicts within historical understandings may provide the keys to opening deeper, more meaningful, cross cultural communication and understanding. As such, rather than looking exclusively for moments of congruence, value can be had by engaging the points of narrative departure and the moments of epistemological contention. The differences reveal that doing history involves more than simply embracing the best among competing narratives—for definitions of what constitutes best are inevitably premised upon certain culturally specific evaluations. It also involves more than creating a coherent synthesis from narrative fragments—for coherence is likewise culturally prescribed. The goal is to engage the cacophony and seek new patterns of harmony where previously only discord was apparent. To do so is less an engagement in cultural relativism than a recognition of the relevance of culture.

Notes

For their comments and helpful suggestions on earlier versions of this paper I am indebted to J. R. Miller, Marshall Beier, Mandy Fehr, and Kevin Gambell.

1. Interview with Elizabeth Edwards, Merritt, BC, June 24, 2004.
2. Canada. Parliament. SJC (1946). Minutes. No. 9. 423; I am grateful to Brendan Edwards for drawing my attention to this document.
3. Correspondence to I. W. Powell, March 1, 1884, RG 10, Reel C, 10117, Vol. 3666, File 10147; L. Vankoughnet to John A. Macdonald, December 11, 1883, RG 10, Reel T 16114, Vol. 11303, File 208/1–2.

4. It was ignored by historians and anthropologists, but at least a few linguists have found value in the Kamloop Wawa's text. The most thoroughly versed in the Wawa's contents is David Robertson, PhD candidate at the University of Victoria. I am indebted to him for translating the sections pertaining to the 1904 voyage to Europe—a task made possible through my SSHRC funding.
5. "London," *Kamloops Wawa*, Number 211, 13:2 (September 1904), p. 32.
6. I discuss this delegation in detail in Carlson (2005).
7. I am indebted to Wendy Wickwire for providing me with a tape of her interview with Harry Robinson, and to Harry Robinson for having seen fit to share his knowledge and wisdom with others.
8. I am thinking here principally of Clifford Geertz's (1973) discussion of ethnographic language as metaphor. He challenges scholars to continually be dissatisfied with our metaphors and continually seek newer more refined ones that bring us closer to a genuine Indigenous understanding of a term or concept. See, in particular, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," pp. 3–30.
9. Charlie Isipaymilt, testimony before the *Royal Commission on Indian Affairs in the Province of British Columbia*, May 27, 1913.
10. *The Province*, Magazine Section, March 26, 1910, quoted in Morton (1970), pp. 32, 34. In similar detail, four years earlier, while still in London, *Lloyd's Weekly News* quoted Capilano stating that the Monarch had promised to look into the issue of fishing and hunting rights, although he cautioned that it might take as long as five years to sort out. *Lloyd's Weekly News*, quoted in Gray (2002), p. 326. *Lloyd's* also reported that the delegates received gold medallions from the king and queen on which were the monarch's images. These medallions, worn like medals, are visible on Capilano's and Isipaymilt's chests in the photo taken of them in Vancouver on their return from London.
11. See Gilbert Sproat to Superintendent General, July 29, 1879, RG 10, Reel C-10, 117, Vol. 3669, File 10,691. The Nlakapamux and Stó:lō discussions with Sproat are discussed in detail in Harris (1995–96) and in Carlson (2003, 291–327).
12. These are all matters over which an academic consensus exists. See, for example, Fisher (1977); Tennant (1990); Foster (1995); Harris (1997; 2002).
13. For a general critique of Fixico's conclusions, see Krech (2006).

Inuit Transnational Activism

Cooperation and Resistance in the Face of Global Change

Heather A. Smith and Gary N. Wilson

Inuit have their own definition of sovereignty.

—Aqqaq Lyng, “Address to the Ministerial Summit of Arctic Oceans Agenda
Item: Issues Relating to the Local Inhabitants and Indigenous Communities”

Introduction

Inuit peoples have fostered and strategically strengthened their connections through transnational organizations such as the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC). In turn, the Council has been active in state-based international institutions such as the United Nations (UN) and the Arctic Council, thereby expanding their diplomatic reach. At the same time, increased bilateral relationships between Inuit regions have supplemented and enriched the emerging network of Inuit diplomacy. Working through existing national and international institutions has also provided them with a greater degree of collective influence in both national and international policy making.

In addition to working through existing institutions, the Inuit, through the ICC, have also acted as agents of resistance to the dominant discourse that privileges Western constructions of the state and citizenship, sovereignty, knowledge, and our relationship with the environment. The ICC has woven together pragmatic and strategic political engagement

with a message that implicitly, and often explicitly, rejects key normative assumptions that inform the organization in which they participate.

This chapter begins by discussing the theoretical perspectives that inform the assessment of Inuit diplomacy; in particular the critical theory perspective, as articulated by Robert Cox. The second section examines the evolution of Inuit diplomacy and its main protagonist, the ICC. Part three explores the ICC's involvement in a number of circumpolar political initiatives including the Comprehensive Arctic Policy, the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS), and the Arctic Council. Part four provides a brief case related to climate change as a means by which to highlight the trends identified in part three. The final part of the chapter considers the practical and theoretical relevance of the findings as well as considerations for the future of the ICC. It is argued that the diplomats of the ICC elegantly create liminal spaces in their discourse, and engage in a sophisticated diplomacy that contributes to the internationalization of "indigenous ontologies as key principles for a transformed world order" (Stewart-Harawira 2005, 3).

Theoretical Assumptions

This chapter draws from complementary yet diverse literatures. The starting point is the work of International Relations critical theorist, Robert Cox, whose work has influenced scholars around the world, but for this case, most importantly those writing on global environmental issues (Broadhead 2002; Elliot 1998, 2002; Smith 2007) and Indigenous peoples and globalization (Stewart-Harawira 2005).

Consistent with the work of Robert Cox, it is assumed that "there is . . . no such thing as theory in itself, divorced from a standpoint in time and space" (Cox 1996, 87). There is a rejection of problem solving theory that informs our intention to inquire about the social order captured in the alternative discourse articulated by the ICC. This standing does not require us to disregard state-based institutions or "practical options." It is not, as Cox (1996, 90) argues, "unconcerned with the problems of the real world." However, critical theory "allows for a normative choice in favor of a social and political order different from the prevailing order, but it limits the range of choices to alternative orders which are feasible transformations of an existing world" (Cox 1996, 90). Thus it is reasonable to investigate activities that simultaneously make use of and destabilize existing international norms and institutions. Finally, through the lens of critical theory we acknowledge a "willingness to question all social

and political boundaries and all systems of inclusion and exclusion” (Linklater 1996, 286). This willingness encourages a theoretical curiosity of the intricacies of Indigenous diplomacies.

Related to the environment broadly, critical theorists find themselves suspicious of global environmental governance regimes. Lorraine Elliott (2002, 58) reminds us that global environmental governance is about power relations and not just about international environmental institutions and argues that while there is an increase in state-based negotiation on environmental issues, these negotiations are neither altogether global nor have they “improved the state of the environment” (Elliott 2002, 63). The critical theory approach to international environmental issues is also skeptical of the role played by the state as well as assumptions that the market has the ability to respond to problems and that sustainable development provides for the necessary environment-development balance (Broadhead 2002, 23). Finally, the critical theory approach encourages us to examine “the many ways in which the prevailing order maintains its control of the debate by masking dangerous practices and packaging the debate in ways that obscure the destructive forces at work in the system” (Broadhead 2002, 20).

The Evolution of Inuit Transnational Activism

Although relations between the various Inuit communities and peoples in the circumpolar north predate European contact, the evolution of formal, multilateral relations has been the result of more recent external and internal factors that encouraged, and in some respects compelled, Inuit peoples to organize a collective response to the challenges they face (Wilson 2007).¹

The most important Inuit organization to emerge over the past four decades is the Inuit Circumpolar Council.² Founded in 1977 in response to a series of international and regional issues that impacted directly on the lives of the Inuit, the ICC represents approximately 155,000 Inuit living in Greenland, Canada, the United States and Russia.³ It is a decentralized, transnational organization that consists of several national-level ICC organizations and a multilateral council. Delegates from each of the national organizations meet at a General Assembly every four years to elect an Executive Council and Chair. As a multilateral organization, therefore, the ICC has certain common priorities, but the individual member organizations also engage in distinct activities (Jull 1989, 124).

That the ICC would function both within existing norms and values and challenges those same institutions simultaneously was clear from the start of the organization. The work of Jessica Shadian (2006) shows the foundational principles for the organization, that continue to resonate today, sought to work within liberal political traditions and make claims on behalf of Inuit peoples that reflected their interests and their culture. For example, Shadian (2006, 252) notes the importance of Inuit rights to the ICC and how “this discourse of rights has been couched as part of a western liberal discourse.” Similarly, claims for self determination were not only about political autonomy, but were also about cultural autonomy or what Shadian (2006, 251) refers to as “cultural sovereignty,” which is understood as “the right to maintain an historical relationship with the Arctic land.” Complicated citizenship claims were also part of the early life of the ICC: members of the ICC are both citizens of their respective states and Inuit peoples. They are not either/or, they are both. This construction, articulated by Eben Hopson, the founder of the ICC, in the 1970s, has been restated by Inuit leaders such as Mary Simon (1985, 35), former Chair of the ICC, and Aqqaluk Lynge (Rowe 2008), President of ICC Greenland. Finally, throughout the early years of the ICC, Hopson and others engaged in the politics of the day, through the existing institutions, but also reminded their audiences of past colonial practices that impinged on and undermined the ways and means of Inuit lives (Shadian 2006, 252).

Many of the elements of the discourse noted above were enshrined in the ICC Charter. The charter preamble is worth consideration as it includes recognition of a common cosmology, shared traditions, and values that bond Inuit peoples as an Indigenous people. The preamble includes a construction of the Arctic and sub-Arctic as homeland and this homeland is an area that transcends “political boundaries.” The environment and Inuit culture are directly connected to the claim made for Inuit self determination. Also included in the preamble is the requirement that “Inuit participation in policies and activities affecting our homeland [be] assured” (ICC 2008). Thus, the preamble articulates a vision of peoples that feeds into competing notions of citizenship, establishes a connection between Inuit peoples and the environment that becomes essential to later Inuit statements around the environment, and enshrines notions of cultural sovereignty that disrupt conventional notions of sovereignty that privilege political control (see ICC 2008). In doing so, the Inuit have claimed agency. They have emphasized their ability “to represent themselves and manage their own affairs” (Lindroth 2006, 244).

The ICC Charter also outlines the purposes of the organization. It is important to provide these purposes in full because they help us to understand the focus of the organization throughout its history:

The purposes of the Conference are: a) to strengthen unity among the Inuit of the Circumpolar region; b) to promote Inuit rights and interests on the international level; c) to promote Inuit participation in political, economic, and social institutions which we, the Inuit, deem relevant; d) to promote greater self-sufficiency of the Inuit in the Circumpolar region; e) to ensure the endurance and the growth of Inuit culture and societies for both present and future generations; f) to promote long-term management and protection of arctic and sub-arctic wildlife, environment and biological productivity; and g) to promote wise management and use of non-renewable resources in the circumpolar region and incorporating such resources in the present and future development of Inuit economies, taking into account other Inuit interests. (ICC 2008)

Since the late 1970s, the ICC and its partner organizations at the national level have become recognized actors in the international and circumpolar policy arenas (Nuttall 2000, 621). Despite its limited budget, the organization has developed and strengthened its internal structure and established important linkages in the international community. It created working groups in a number of policy areas that were important to its members and consistent with its political objectives: whaling, education, language and culture, science and traditional knowledge, and the environment. The ICC also supported Greenland's Home Rule movement and the island's eventual withdrawal from the European Community in 1985. In the international sphere, the ICC was granted NGO status within the United Nations' Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in 1983 (Rosing 1985, 17) and by the mid-1980s was an active member of the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations (UNWGIP) (Nuttall 1998, 29). In the UNWGIP the ICC played an important role in drafting the Universal Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Iorns Magallanes 2004, 240; Nuttall 1998, 29–30).

The ICC has also been an active participant and agenda setter in a number of important circumpolar initiatives. The organization's involvement in the development of the Comprehensive Arctic Policy, the AEPS, and the Arctic Council as well as its work on transboundary pollution has been characterized by the pragmatic, sophisticated diplomacy envisioned by the founders and articulated in the Charter (see Abele and Rodon 2007, 48; and Abele and Rodon in this volume).

The process of developing a Comprehensive Arctic Policy began in earnest in 1983 when the ICC General Assembly sanctioned the creation of a policy document concerning political, environmental, and cultural matters affecting the Inuit. Described by Rosing (1985, 16) as “a guideline for human activities in the Arctic” and “a message from the Inuit people to themselves and to the world,” the process produced a policy document titled *Principles and Elements for a Comprehensive Arctic Policy* (PECAP), which was published in 1992 (ICC 1992). PECAP covers a wide range of areas including Inuit rights, peace and security, environmental, social, cultural, economic, and educational and scientific issues. The section on “Affirmation of Inuit Rights at the International Level” discusses Inuit perceptions of their place in the global community and establishes some important future goals for the ICC. Consistent with the Charter, the section on Inuit rights emphasizes that the rights of the Inuit transcend national boundaries and that it is necessary for national governments to recognize these rights and provide avenues for Inuit organizations to liaise with government departments that deal with international matters (ICC 1992, 10–11). It also discusses the need for meaningful connections between the Inuit and international bodies such as the United Nations and other international policy and law making fora (ICC 1992, 12). Finally, the document stresses the particular role of the ICC as the international representative of the Inuit and as a key facilitator of closer relations between Inuit groups across the Circumpolar North (ICC 1992, 10–12, 15).

In the decade and a half since the policy was tabled, the ICC has made significant progress in terms of meeting these objectives and projecting its interests on the international stage. Since 1993, the ICC has been involved in the AEPS, a series of state-level meetings and declarations initiated by officials from the eight Arctic states. The AEPS not only provided the impetus for the creation of the Arctic Council, but it also established a role for the participation of Indigenous organizations in multilateral deliberations that would later be incorporated into the Arctic Council (Huebert 1998a, 144). In addition to recognizing the “responsibility [of the Arctic states] to protect and preserve the Arctic environment,” the formal *Declaration on the Protection of the Arctic Environment* recognizes “the special relationship of the indigenous peoples and local populations of the Arctic and their unique contribution to the protection of the Arctic environment” (Nuttall 2000, 623). Throughout the process, Indigenous peoples and their organizations, including the ICC, have had permanent participant status in the AEPS meetings. The Canadian signatory

for the 1997 Alta Declaration on the AEPS was Mary Simon, a former Chair of the ICC and at the time the Canadian Ambassador for Circumpolar Affairs.

While the AEPS has enhanced the position of Inuit organizations in circumpolar environmental affairs, the ICC has not restrained its criticism of some AEPS activities (Huebert 1998b, 45–50; Nuttall 2000, 624). Simon and other Inuit officials pressured the members of AEPS and other Circumpolar bodies to take a broader perspective on Arctic development and view environmental protection and sustainable development as part of the same process, not as distinct or conflicting goals (Nuttall 1998, 44). The result of this pressure was the formation of the AEPS Taskforce on Sustainable Development (Nuttall 1998, 43).

Another key recommendation in the PECAP document was the need for new multilateral state level forums among the eight Arctic states. The document also emphasized that any such forums should include the Inuit and other northern Indigenous peoples as permanent members (ICC 1992, 29). These objectives were realized in 1996 with the creation of the Arctic Council. The Council is a multilateral body comprised of eight member states⁴ and six permanent Indigenous members.⁵

The Arctic Council presents itself as an important “intergovernmental forum for addressing many of the common concerns and challenges faced by the Arctic states” and a “unique forum for cooperation between national governments and indigenous peoples” (Arctic Council 2006). The inclusion of the ICC and other Indigenous organizations as permanent participants represented a significant step forward for Indigenous peoples and their relationships with the states that occupy the territory of the circumpolar north, although it is important to note that member states were divided on this issue. Some, such as Canada, openly advocated the idea and were vigorously supported by the Canadian Ambassador for Circumpolar Affairs, Mary Simon (Huebert 1998a, 146). Others, such as the United States, expressed concerns that separate Indigenous participation would cause confusion over the question of who represented the Inuit of Alaska (the ICC or the United States) and that “permanent participant status could give rise to a push for Inuit self-determination” (Huebert 1998a, 146).

Although supportive of the Arctic Council, the ICC raised two initial concerns about this body and its activities. Prior to the establishment of the Arctic Council, ICC leaders such as Mary Simon (1996, 24) argued that it would have to play a meaningful role in addressing issues that were of importance to the Inuit and other northern Indigenous peoples. Furthermore, following the establishment of the Council, the ICC

criticized certain aspects of its founding document, the *Declaration of the Arctic Council*. According to Nuttall (2000, 631), “The ICC had hoped that more attention would have focused on sustainable development and was disappointed that indigenous peoples’ organisations were only accorded the status of ‘permanent participants’, rather than being made full and active members of the Council, that they were not invited to sign the Declaration, that it avoids the use of the plural term ‘indigenous peoples,’ and does not include indigenous perspectives on sustainable development.”⁶

Not only has the ICC been involved in the negotiations around the creation of what may be regarded loosely as Arctic specific initiatives, they have also engaged globally. The ICC actively presented their case during the multilateral negotiations on persistent organic pollutants (POPs). From 1998 to 2001 Sheila Watt-Cloutier and other ICC leaders and supporters pressed the state representatives, including the Canadian government, to take action on this critical issue. The interventions of the ICC at the convention negotiating sessions expressed several key themes—themes that are consistent with the founding principles. As Shadian (2006) has observed, there was a regular articulation of the narrative that the Arctic was the barometer of the world’s environmental health. Watt-Cloutier stated in 1998 that “the Arctic region, seemingly so pure and pristine, but already laced with deadly and invisible pollutants has in my opinion become the canary. If the canary survives so can we all” (Watt-Cloutier 1998).

One of the key elements of the Arctic as the global barometer narrative is the connection of the Arctic to the world and the world to the Arctic, and a reflection that the natural environment knows no political boundaries. Watt-Cloutier also made this connection explicit, while simultaneously giving a human face to the issue, when she stated, “If we can help people to see that a poisoned Inuk child, a poisoned Arctic and a poisoned planet are one in the same, then we will have effected a shift in people’s awareness that will result without doubt in positive change” (Watt-Cloutier 1998, 1999). In this construction she challenges modern notions of our relationship with the environment that cast humanity as above the natural environment.

The homeland, cultural sovereignty, and agency themes also arise in the POPs-related statements. The connection of Inuit peoples to the natural environment is emphasized when Watt-Cloutier states “But we are back now and wish to speak out on behalf of the land that has sustained us for hundreds of generations. We are the land and the land is us. We cannot stand by, waiting for slow moving governments to step in and

make everything right, rather we must try to effect what change we can" (Watt-Cloutier, 1998; see also Watt-Cloutier 2000).

Another interesting aspect of the negotiating process, which deserves particular attention, was the international solidarity that Indigenous peoples expressed with people in the tropical regions of the developing world, many of whom rely on POP producing chemicals such as DDT to control malaria. In the opinion of Watt-Cloutier, Indigenous peoples at the negotiations chose the "high moral ground." As such they "told the delegation that we would not be party to any agreement that threatens others as it was not our way, and we continued to push the delegation not to see the DDT issue in either/or terms as we felt it would lead to inappropriate choices" (Watt-Cloutier 2003a, 260).

Participation in these multilateral initiatives has created important partnerships and linkages between the ICC and state and regional governments, other Indigenous organizations, and international nongovernmental organizations. The goodwill and respect that has been built up has strengthened the ICC's reputation and presence at the international level. Accordingly, the ICC has established itself as a legitimate political actor on the world stage and in Arctic governance (Shadian 2006, 250), including the area of climate change, a topic to which we now turn in a more focused way.

ICC and Climate Change

In the case of climate change, the ICC has been extremely active, on a number of fronts, including the Arctic Council, the United Nations, and its respective organs, leveraging their participation in international institutions as vehicles by which to have their voice heard—a voice that works in and through international institutions while simultaneously disrupting norms that underpin those institutions.

A key initiative, related to the Arctic Council, was ICC participation in the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA). The ICC Canada represented the other permanent participants on the ACIA steering committee and sat on the policy drafting committee. The ACIA is an international project of the Arctic Council and the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC) whose objective is to "evaluate and synthesize knowledge on climate variability, climate change, and increased ultraviolet radiation and their consequences" (Arctic Council 2004).

Through the drafting process of the ACIA, Watt-Cloutier regularly spoke about ICC perspectives on the negotiations and climate change. As

in the case of POPs, she emphasized the way in which the Inuit brought a human face to the case of climate change. Interestingly, in making these comments, there was often a challenge to environmental nongovernmental organizations and their conservation related focus on climate change. In a meeting on the ACIA, Watt-Cloutier stated, "All the Permanent Participants want to put human faces to this issue and to show that climate change raises cultural as well as environmental concerns. WWF and some other environmental non-governmental organizations do valuable work on climate change in the North, but this issue is about people and peoples, as well as thinner and fewer polar bears" (Watt-Cloutier 2003c; see also Watt-Cloutier 2001).⁷

The ICC stressed the global nature of the issue of climate change by reinforcing both the Inuit connection to the land and the interconnections between the Arctic and the global environment. Such broader statements about the health of the planet were infused with references to traditional environmental knowledge (TEK) and alternative ways of knowing. During the ACIA discussions, the ICC representatives restated the view that they were not victims. By claiming their agency, crafting climate change as a matter of Inuit survival, the ICC pressed states to take responsibility for their emissions and the impact they had on Inuit peoples (see, for example, Watt-Cloutier 2003c). The ICC also went further by deeming climate change to be a human rights issue. This framing, as will be seen shortly, underpinned the ICC challenge to the U.S. intransigence on climate change.

Following the release of the ACIA in November 2004, ICC Chair Watt-Cloutier remarked, "Ministers can be pleased with the ACIA. The science is of the very highest standard and a genuine effort has been made to include our traditional knowledge. I want to both thank and honour all those who worked on the ACIA—the Inuit hunters and elders in Arctic communities, scientist [*sic*] in universities and government agencies, and policy experts" (Watt-Cloutier 2004b). Although Watt-Cloutier also commented that "the ACIA policy document is more than many expected, but less than we hoped for initially," she went on to say that the ICC would continue to play a role in climate change negotiations through organizations such as the Arctic Council (Watt-Cloutier 2004b).

Besides the Arctic Council, the ICC has been very active at the United Nations. The ICC has been involved in the Conference of Parties meetings of the Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). These negotiations have shaped the international climate change architecture, producing the Kyoto Protocol in 1997. However, they have been

undermined by competing state interests, a lack of vision for the future that is intergenerational or beyond state boundaries, an unwillingness of large developed emitters such as Canada and the United States to genuinely engage in emissions reductions, and divisions between the global North and the global South (Smith 2006). More than anything, these negotiations seem to be infused with a denial that climate change is happening and has real human impacts. The ICC has challenged the myopic state-based, technocratic, and short term vision of climate change—at the negotiations themselves and in respective UN bodies such as the ECOSOC Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

Watt-Cloutier, for example, spoke at the Ninth Conference of Parties in December 2003 in Milan, and the Tenth Conference of Parties meeting in Buenos Aires. She challenged the sense of distance that might make some feel complacent about the state of the global environment, drawing on the now familiar metaphors that the Arctic was the global barometer and that the Inuit are the “canary in the global coalmine” (Watt-Cloutier 2003b). As with the ACIA, TEK was central to her assessment of the impacts of climate change. Indeed, she rejected the need for Western scientific justification for her claim and, in fact, privileged TEK, stating that “science has in recent years caught up with our observations” (Watt-Cloutier 2003b). As per the discourse related to the ACIA, Watt-Cloutier defined climate change as a human issue affecting her homeland, and took states and corporations to task, asking, “What can Inuit do to convince the world to take long-term action that will have to go far beyond Kyoto?” (Watt-Cloutier 2003b).

At the Buenos Aires meetings, she questioned the path of the UNFCCC, noting, “Where I come from we have a saying about ‘being lost but making good time.’ It refers to those who work hard, and this includes institutions, but without direction or wisdom and so they do not make much progress. Sometimes, I wonder if the UNFCCC process is a little bit ‘lost.’” (Watt-Cloutier 2004a). Agency was claimed again, as well as an unwillingness to be treated as victims: “I am *not* here to bear witness to the disappearance of my people. We are not going quietly into the night. We are not powerless victims” (Watt-Cloutier 2004a; italics in original). More recently, the current Chair of the ICC, Patricia Cochran, spoke at the UN Secretary-General’s High Level Event on Climate Change (Cochran 2007). As in the case of POPs, Cochran invoked Indigenous solidarity and challenged those who framed climate change as a matter of adaptation rather than mitigation. She gently reminded her audience of the colonialism experienced by her people and yet again rejected any framing of the Inuit as victims.

As noted above, the ICC has also been active in the ECOSOC Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. The Permanent Forum took climate change as its special theme for its seventh session in 2008 and produced "Impact of Climate Change Mitigation Measures on Indigenous Peoples and on Their Territories and Lands" (UNPFII 2008). While it may be problematic to take the work of the Permanent Forum as an indicator of the views of the ICC, it is important to note that the corappatour of the publication arising out of this session was Aqqaluk Lynge, Vice-Chair and Arctic Regional Representative of the Permanent Forum, President of the ICC Greenland, and the former Chair of the ICC. The document dedicates several sections to the effects of climate change on the Arctic, invokes the importance of TEK, and, consistent with the statements by Watt-Cloutier, takes states and international institutions to task for their lack of inclusion of Indigenous voices: "many indigenous peoples (including all indigenous peoples in the Arctic) are united in the opinion that the relevant international treaties are not sufficient" (UNPFII 2008, 9).

Given the construction of climate change as a human rights issue and the apparent willingness of the ICC to hold states accountable for their actions, the ICC human rights claim against the United States makes sense. At a meeting in Nome, Alaska in 2003, the ICC decided to develop a petition to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, which operates under the Organization of American States. The petition asked the Commission to recognize that "human-induced climate change infringes upon the environmental, subsistence and other human rights of the Inuit" (Bell 2003). In December 2005, Watt-Cloutier, as Chair of the ICC, filed the petition against the United States, "saying that greenhouse gas emissions produced by US industry threaten [the Inuit] way of life."⁸

Prior to filing the petition, Watt-Cloutier had provided written testimony on the issue of climate change to the United States Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation. In this statement she again invoked traditional knowledge, noting the Inuit elders had been witnessing change since the 1970s, and made connections between the Arctic and the global: "Global warming connects us all. Use what is happening in the Arctic—the Inuit Story—as a vehicle to re-connect us all, so that we may understand that the planet and its people are one. The Inuit hunter who falls through the depleting and unpredictable sea-ice is connected to the cars we drive, the industries we rely upon, and the disposable world we have become" (Watt-Cloutier, 2004c). In her address to the

committee, Watt-Cloutier told a story of her mother who had expressed gratitude for American support for the Inuit during World War II and, drawing on this, she asked again for American help in the fight against climate change. Although the application to the committee ultimately failed, Watt-Cloutier publicized the issue of Inuit rights in the face of climate change. Throughout the life of the climate change issue, she and other Inuit leaders have clearly articulated a discourse that has stressed Inuit rights, put a human face on the issue of climate change, linked the Arctic to the rest of the world, held states and international institutions to account, and reminded us all that global warming is happening now.

Conclusions

When we consider the discourse articulated by the Inuit Circumpolar Council, articulated over time, and especially with reference to the issues of POPs and climate change, several practical and theoretical conclusions present themselves. First, one of the ICC's strengths has been the individuals who have led the organization. ICC chairs such as Mary Simon, Sheila Watt-Cloutier, and Aqqaluk Lynge have been consummate leaders and circumpolar diplomats who are completely comfortable in international settings and willing to devote their lives to representing the interests of the Inuit globally (Fenge 2003; Huebert 1998a). At the same time, these individuals are completely grounded in the values and the culture of the Inuit peoples they represent. In his recent work on transnational activism, Sidney Tarrow refers to this particular type of international actor as a "rooted cosmopolitan" (Tarrow 2005, 42). Simon, Watt-Cloutier, and Lynge are all examples of leaders who, while they engage in diplomatic efforts that often take them "outside their origins, they continue to be linked to place, to the social networks that inhabit that space, and to the resources, experiences, and opportunities that place provides them with" (Tarrow 2005, 42). They are part of a generation of leaders who have "experienced tumultuous change in a short period of time, coming from a very traditional way of life to a modern, high-tech world" (Watt-Cloutier 2003a, 257). What has sustained and driven them throughout, however, is their close connection to their Inuit heritage and culture, their spirituality, and the intertwined nature of their personal and professional lives (Watt-Cloutier 2003a: 256).

Second, this leadership has taken place in spite of the fact that the ICC must deal with the changing nature of governance in the north (Wilson 2007), limited resources, and the limited power of the agencies in which they operate. Even state-level multilateral organizations like the Arctic

Council have little decision making and enforcement capacity. The ICC itself has based its power on the rights claims and moral leverage it brings to the table, not an enforcement capacity. In a world of states, the ICC offers a different way of seeing the world. The ICC articulates notions of citizenship that weave between and among states. It is not simply a global citizen functioning above states; rather, the leaders of the ICC have regularly articulated visions that link them to states, to each other across state boundaries, and to the global. They situate their citizenship in multiple locations, challenging the traditional construction of citizen/state. In doing this, they challenge others to consider their relationship to the state and to each other—across politically constructed boundaries.

The ICC also challenges traditional constructions of sovereignty linked to notions of political autonomy and control. They claim their own agency and do indeed seek political authority, but they also ground their notions of sovereignty to the land, not in terms of ownership, but in terms of a relationship. They frame their “cultural sovereignty” in a historical relationship to the Arctic. Their vision of the relationship between peoples and the environment is holistic. This holistic vision is articulated regularly in references to the Arctic being the global barometer and through the connection of all of humanity to the environment.

The diplomacy of the ICC has been described elsewhere in this volume as nonconfrontational and characterized by political Realism (see the chapter by Abele and Rodon). While the ICC has been very strategic, we are not inclined to link this strategic diplomacy with political Realism. Political Realism, as understood in International Relations, is rooted in the state and state-interest. The activities of the ICC are not designed to support the state, or the status quo. Rather, their discourse as articulated above, challenges states, state-based institutions, and the construction of the present world order. Economic ideologies have been challenged, Western scientific understandings of climate change have been countered with TEK and the modern denial of our dependence to the environment has been turned on its head. We do not see this as political Realism. Rather, the ICC is here read to function as a site of resistance to the dominant Realist vision of the world.

Finally, the ICC has put a human face on international environmental issues. Recall Watt-Cloutier’s reference to the Inuk child, or her mother, or the stories she tells of her peoples. While this human face may be a strategic move on the part of Watt-Cloutier and other ICC leaders to connect their audience with the ICC concerns, it is also a poignant reminder that environmental degradation affects people—real everyday human people. This is a reminder we should all take to heart.

Notes

Gary Wilson would like to acknowledge the excellent research assistance provided by Ryan Dyck.

1. The Inuit are dispersed across four different countries. The main Inuit regions are the Chukotskii Autonomous *Okrug* (district) in the Russian Federation; northern Alaska in the United States; the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (Northwest Territories), the Territory of Nunavut, Nunavik (northern Quebec), and Nunatsiavut (Labrador) in Canada; and Greenland, which has Home Rule status within Denmark.
2. The Inuit Circumpolar Council was formerly called the Inuit Circumpolar Conference.
3. The Russian Inuit, who live in the Chukotskii Autonomous *Okrug*, only became full voting members of the ICC in 1992, after the collapse of the Soviet Union.
4. The member states are Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the United States.
5. The six permanent Indigenous members are the Aleut International Association, the Arctic Athabaska Council, the Gwich'in Council International, the ICC, the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, and the Sami Council.
6. Subsequent developments have addressed some of these initial concerns. See Huebert (1998a).
7. Watt-Cloutier also held the Arctic Council members to account throughout the ACIA process. At Seattle in October 2003, she said the U.S. negotiating position was derailing the ACIA process (Watt-Cloutier 2003c).
8. "Inuit File Human-Rights Complaint Over Warming," *Montreal Gazette*, December 8, 2005.

This page intentionally left blank

Where You Stand Depends on Where You Sit

Beginning an Indigenous-Settler Reconciliation Dialogue

Franke Wilmer

Indigenous peoples' political resistance to conquest parallels the globalization of European dominance and the world system created as a result of it by the twentieth century. By the late nineteenth century, several Indigenous leaders living within the postcolonial English settler states of Canada, the United States, and New Zealand were convinced that the European settlers were not and would not respect their rights as Indigenous peoples, in spite of the fact that these rights were recognized in treaties either with the settlers or the imperial government itself. Indigenous representatives traveled to Britain to present their grievances to King George, but were denied an audience with the king and told that their concerns fell within the "domestic jurisdiction" of the settler states.¹ Thus began the long quest for justice in settler-Indigenous relations, and the pattern of dislocation and relocation, forced assimilation and, at times, outright brutality, was reproduced wherever European settlers (or Indigenous agents of European state-building) expanded their control over resources and territories through the state-building process. Indigenous representatives persisted in seeking redress through international structures, approaching, but denied a voice in the League of Nations, and later, the United Nations. Finally, in the 1970s, the United Nations took up the question of Indigenous peoples within the Economic and Social Council and created a special sub-commission to study and make

recommendations regarding their "situation." The study, authorized in 1971, was completed some eleven years later.

Since the mid-1970s, the movement among Indigenous peoples has grown to global proportions, and has involved both local and global strategies for political change (Wilmer 1993). Indigenous peoples have established a presence at the United Nations through massive NGO participation. A number of Indigenous NGOs have been granted observer status. Indigenous activists have lobbied the World Bank in order to challenge projects involving their relocation and the destruction of their lands, resources, and sacred sites. They have successfully lobbied international organizations such as the International Labor Organization in an effort to eliminate Western institutional paternalism in the organization. They have mobilized networks of political activism through the media, including the Internet; met regularly in a variety of nongovernmental organization forums and conferences; organized politically within states to orchestrate labor strikes, elect representatives to national assemblies, and institute legal proceedings in defense of their rights; and brought cases before the United Nations Human Rights Commission. Several cases (Western Shoshone land claims, Navajo relocation, Lakota Black Hills land claim, and interference in the affairs of the Six Nations or Haudenosaunee Confederacy) have generated complaints against the United States. The United Nations declared 1993 the "Year of the World's Indigenous Peoples."

This chapter attempts first to consider what the present world system looks like from an Indigenous perspective—a perspective that flows from the experience of Indigenous peoples as they have encountered the sociopolitical forces that have constructed contemporary politics in the world system. Thus, where one "stands" in relation to the present world system is determined by where one "sits" in relation to the process of world system construction. I will outline some of the recurrent themes in Indigenous political rhetoric and activism as they bear on historical interpretation of contemporary world order, and argue that Indigenous peoples' experiences and perspectives intersect in many ways with those of postcolonial theorists and writers. The analysis is necessarily limited by my own experience and standpoint as a non-Indigenous social scientist culturally positioned in a Western settler society. Listening to and following the political activism of Indigenous peoples over the past two decades has given me not only a more complete "picture" of the political landscape of contemporary world order, but also a more acute sense of the deficiencies of exclusive or Western-centered perspectives not entirely captured by other critical discourses. What follows is my understanding

of Indigenous perspectives rather than a representation of those perspectives. It concludes with recommendations for the reconciliation of Indigenous-state/system relations that emerged out of specific discussions with Indigenous activists.

American Indians and People like That

Indigenous peoples, for the purposes of this chapter, are those whose collective identities are rooted in cultural narratives of their descent from the first human inhabitants of regions they occupied at the time of European conquest. The process of “defining” Indigenous peoples continues in institutional venues, such as the United Nations, and although participants engage the controversy, dissent, and contention that characterize any open discourse, the articulation and legitimation of Indigenous peoples’ claims for international recognition, rights, and protection has also somewhat progressed over the past two decades or so in spite of the lack of consensus on a fixed meaning of the term.

The concept of “Indigenous” nations is a product of colonization as well as of state expansion, since prior to their encounter with these processes they were simply, as all nations, societies of people who lived where they lived—in the lands of their ancestors, according to the logic of their own cultural evolution. Although political colonization ended effectively in many places during the first half of the twentieth century as norms of decolonization and self-determination emerged in the aftermath of dismantling imperialism, state expansion, in the form of both expanding global industrialization and state assimilation, continues to threaten the existence of Indigenous peoples *as culturally distinct societies*. If we look at colonization as the imposition of alien control over the people and resources of an area, then decolonization is the withdrawal of that control and its replacement by structures of internal control or self-determination. Many Indigenous peoples, in this sense, were colonized during the first wave of imperialism but have failed to receive the benefits of political decolonization.² Furthermore, through state expansion, for example, in Central and South America, many Indigenous peoples during the post–World War II period have only recently been subjected to outside domination. For this reason, Indigenous peoples are sometimes referred to as “internal colonies” (Snipp 1988).

Secondly, even if one accepts the existence of a “law of conquest” (and it goes back to Roman law, long before the creation of modern European nation-states), then the terms and conditions through which it

operates would have to have existed in the U.S.-Indigenous relationship, and they did not (see Anaya 1996; Williams 1993; Wilmer 1993). Finally, and most importantly in my opinion, whether one uses the written historical accounts or Indigenous oral histories, there are few cases in which Indigenous peoples and settlers engaged in direct military confrontation. Most of the cases in which Indigenous sovereignty was compromised or diminished were the consequence of agreements made by the U.S. government as a more powerful state to provide protection to the smaller, more vulnerable Indigenous nations. Chief Justice John Marshall recognized this fact in his famous Cherokee cases when he likened the Indian nations to vassal states.³ The protection was sought mainly against settlers' attacks and persistent encroachment on Indian territories. The United States, of course, hardly kept up its end of the bargain, but worse by many accounts, used the nature of the agreements as a pretext for appropriating Indigenous sovereignty.

Thus, the U.S. response to the UN, quoted in Felix Cohen's *Handbook of Federal Indian Law* described how Indigenous sovereignty was extinguished through "conquest":

- (1) An Indian tribe possesses, in the first instance, all the powers of a sovereign state. (2) Conquest renders the tribe subject to the legislative power of the United States and in substance, terminates the external powers of sovereignty of the tribe, e.g., its power to enter into treaties with foreign nations, but does not by itself affect the internal sovereignty of the tribe, e.g., its powers of local self-government. (3) Their powers are subject to qualification by treaties and by express legislation of Congress, but save as that expressly qualified, full powers of internal sovereignty are vested in the Indian tribes and in their duly constituted organs of government. (Cohen 1971, 122–23)

Today we have the paradoxical situation that while conquest is now regarded by the Western states who dominate the process of international normative development as illegal, some of the same states continue to assert domination over Indigenous peoples' political destiny and deny them the benefits of self-determination on the basis of conquest. This is perhaps what Indian Law Resource Center Director Robert T. Coulter tried to capture when he defined "indigenous peoples" as "American Indians and people like that."⁴

Third World, Fourth World, Many Worlds

The term “third world” came into use after the Bandung Conference when representatives from India coined the term in order to articulate a “third way” between the capitalist model of Western political and economic development, and the socialist model. As the number of decolonized, newly independent states in Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia grew, increasing the total number of states in the system threefold between the end of World War II and the mid-1970s, the term third world became widely associated with a more general concept of non-Western states presumed to be seeking industrialization. I say presumed because it is not as if these states constituted cohesive societies in which people democratically elected to pursue a path of industrial economic development. Rather, the boundaries of these new states were largely determined by the colonization and then decolonization processes overseen by the former imperial and imperialist societies of Western Europe and European settler states (Canada, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand). Following the collapse of communist Central and Eastern Europe, there was some debate regarding the continued usefulness of the terms first, second, and third worlds. The position I take is that these terms—as well as the term fourth world—can be useful in delineating broadly understood paths of historical experience through which societies are being incorporated into a world system through a political process carried out and largely controlled by states, with Western states asserting more influence over the process historically at the present time. This use obscures neither the significant differences between peoples and societies within each group nor the fact that some societies are positioned in such a way as to include some cross-cutting experiences and characteristics.

As broadly conceived historical “ways of encountering” world system construction and incorporation, one view of the first, second, third, and fourth worlds suggests a core-periphery relationship delineated by two defining characteristics: (1) industrialization as the basis for the organization of economic life and (2) political institutions modeled on the European experience of state formation. The first is relatively straightforward, though controversial, but the second characteristic requires some elaboration. It should also be noted that the second, state formation, is very much an agent for economic industrialization, and so the two are interrelated. Stated differently, capitalism produced both industrialization and the state, and early capitalism additionally drove the expansion of the European state as empire. It might also be noted that the European state is constituted as a set of democratic institutions, but I contend

that democratization of the state has occurred as a concomitant and sometimes countervailing process in relation to the economic project of incorporating an expanding base of people and resources into cores or centers of concentrated and complex economic activity. Thus France, as Bourdieu argues, was produced as a society over several centuries of economically driven political incorporation emanating from the core of power in Paris. Great Britain was produced through the expansion by conquest of the Scots, Welsh, and Irish, and so on. The process of incorporation, both in Europe and through imperialism, was a violent and repressive process.

Being geographically located in the first, second, third, or fourth worlds is one way of evaluating the degree to which a contemporary society is shaped by the historical processes of industrialization and state formation when the latter are taken to mean the incorporation process described above. Central and Eastern European societies were from the start peripheral to this process, and the imposition of communist institutions in these societies was legitimated (according to the rhetoric of their leaders) as a way of accelerating their own industrialization and state formation processes. The concept of the second world is still a relevant term inasmuch as it refers to the historical experience of Central and Eastern European societies, both as peripheral to the industrialization and state formation taking place in Western Europe and for their common experience during the first forty-five years following World War II (and longer in Russia) of doing so within the framework of undemocratic communist institutions. Thus the economic and political challenges they face today are defined by their historical experience both on the periphery of Western European political developments as well as their experience under communist systems.

The third world, then, is defined by its formerly colonized status, where state formation might or might not have taken place had there not been colonization, but where European colonization took the form of an intervention in the social, cultural, economic, and political processes of non-European societies. Decolonization has, in reality, at best entailed an attempt at ending political intervention in the form of overt control. However, since even the boundaries of third-world states were largely determined by that intervention—in itself a significant reconfiguration of what is often considered artificial social boundaries—then it becomes obvious that European political intervention for more than two or more centuries cannot simply be “withdrawn” by the “granting” of independence to these postcolonial states. Furthermore, the economic effects of colonization are profound. The people and resources of European

colonies were pressed into land and labor use patterns for the purpose of creating agricultural surplus for the colonizing society. The formal withdrawal of European colonial authority in itself does not alter these patterns. Societies in the third world today are engaged in the process of state formation, which, as in Europe centuries earlier, is also attended by violent and often repressive political struggles.

The fourth world is, in a sense, the most distant from the political and economic core, since the thrust of colonization here most often took the form of outright conquest and the attempt to absorb the people and resources of the fourth world into states created as extensions of empires populated with a majority of European descendants. There has been no political decolonization of the fourth world. They are nations without states in a world wholly carved up by and among states. The populations of fourth-world societies were decimated by direct violence, structural violence, and disease, and survivors were forcibly relocated into territorial enclaves representing a fraction of the land and resource base they had originally occupied. As "settler" states continued to expand politically and economically, they also increasingly demanded incorporation of resources initially "reserved" to Indigenous peoples into the industrializing economy of the state. Like third-world peoples, Indigenous peoples of the fourth world have been subjected to policies of European cultural supremacy. Unlike third-world peoples, the primary focus of these policies was and continues to be their "assimilation," which means, from the perspective of Indigenous peoples, their complete cultural destruction as a people.

Indigenous Peoples and Postcolonial Theory

Postcolonial theory has emerged as a critical theoretical discourse in the literature and rhetoric of non-Western writers, literary and cultural critics, and social scientists, theorists, and philosophers over the past several decades. It can be temporally located during the second half of the twentieth century, or in the aftermath of colonization, culturally located in once-colonized non-Western societies, and spatially located in those sites within non-Western societies where a people struggle against imperialism and Eurocentrism (see Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 1989, 1998; Gandhi 1998; Loomba 1998; Mongia 1996; Moore-Gilbert 1997; Williams and Chrisman 1994). Black Martinique-born psychiatrist Franz Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952) and *The Wretched of the Earth* (1963) are perhaps the earliest examples of postcolonial writing. Rey Chow (1991),

Chandra Mohanty (1991), Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1987), and Vandana Shiva (1993) explore the intersections between postcolonial, feminist, and ecological perspectives; Edward Said (1993), Amitav Ghosh (1992), and Homi Bhabha (1990), the construction of colonial/anti-colonial and national narratives and identities, and Ashis Nandy (1995), Gauri Viswanathan (1989, 1998), and Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o (1982), the psychological consequences of linguistic and cultural imperialism. There are many more. Among Native American Indians, postcolonial voices include writers Leslie Marmon Silko (1991),⁵ Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (1996), and Sherman Alexie (1994), psychologist Eduardo Duran (1995), and political activists Russell Means and John Mohawk (1992).⁶

While stressing particularism in contrast to the totalizing force of Eurocentric universalism, and resistance to dichotomous and hierarchical constructions of identity, there remains a consensus among postcolonial critics regarding the existence of a set of core issues with which people must struggle both in their respective experiences as postcolonized and postcolonizer, as well as in dialogue between these spheres. Many of these issues and the critical discourses in which they are articulated intersect with the central concerns of Indigenous peoples' political activism. They include the following:

1. The cultural and political marginalization and/or exclusion of Indigenous/non-Western peoples from the structures of power through which agency is allocated;
2. The positioning of Western identity and ways of being in the world as privileged and subjective in relation to the "othering," objectification, and essentializing (in both idealized and demonized or "savage primitive/noble savage" terms) of Indigenous/non-Western identities;
3. The use of linguistic and cultural imperialistic strategies to assimilate and annihilate Indigenous/non-Western knowledge and identity;
4. The psychological consequences of the above three colonial processes in subverting the ability of Indigenous/non-Western people to be Indigenous/non-Western people in the world; and,
5. The political and economic marginalization of Indigenous/non-Western peoples sustained by the psychological consequences of colonialism that persist in the postcolonial condition.

Indigenous, fourth-world peoples clearly share in some of the experiences and aspirations of third-world peoples. But there are also points of divergence. Taken together, third- and fourth-world perspectives are, like other critical voices, a force for the democratization

of global political discourse and practice. Political theorists should and do take them seriously as such.⁷ Both third- and fourth-world critics and writers aim to decenter and disturb Western cultural and political hegemony. They call for “discursive reciprocity,” that is, for non-Western versions of historical experience and “ways of knowing” to be respected on equal footing with Western versions of history and knowledge systems. The perception that colonization involves having “an outside power control every aspect of your life,” as Eduardo Duran (1995) has said, particularly when taken as the experience of whole cultures and societies of people, captures the experience of domination against which third- and fourth-world peoples struggle for liberation and self-determination.

Differences in their perspectives derive mostly from differences in their experience, or lack, of decolonization processes, which now have more or less a half century of history, beginning with the decolonization of India. Indigenous peoples, for instance, generally do not seek the creation of an independent state, nor do they assert that self-determination can only be fulfilled through secession. While the artificially constructed boundaries of “colonies” that demarcated the “non-self governing territories” of the third world were sometimes somewhat consistent with local understandings of boundaries (in some parts of Southeast Asia, Saharan Africa, and the Middle East, for instance), they often cut through the territory traditionally occupied by the colonized peoples, or circumscribed multiple groups and parts of groups within a single territory that would, upon decolonization, become a “self-governing” and independent state (particularly in sub-Saharan Africa). These territories were then under the control of a colonial administration that often recruited and incorporated local, Indigenous people. But the majority of the population in these colonized territories remained Indigenous, though not constituting a single group with common ethnic and cultural affinities. Indeed, in some cases groups with a long history of enmity became subjects of a common colonial administration. All of these and other factors figured into the internal and external political conflicts of postcolonial states.

Indigenous peoples, as defined here, suffered a somewhat different fate. In most cases, as a result of disease, direct violence, war, and other cruelties such as forced relocation, they were overrun by an expanding settler population along with an alien colonial administration.⁸ The term “internal colonies” is therefore often used to describe the situation of Indigenous peoples. They were either forcibly relocated or pushed into smaller and smaller parts of their traditional territories, often leaving them on the most marginal and remote lands in climates

and ecosystems not particularly conducive to agricultural development. They were subjected to forced religious conversion and forced or coerced cultural assimilation.

Some Indigenous peoples today prefer to see themselves as “nations,” while others see themselves as “tribes,” without, of course, attaching pejorative meanings to either. Some wish to reconstruct or revive confederacies that existed prior to European colonization.⁹ Whether as nations or tribes, Indigenous societies prefer to remain relatively small by contrast with state societies, and to retain a higher degree of cultural homogeneity. Most are open to negotiating new relationships of coexistence with states, and to experiment with varieties of shared as well as exclusive sovereignties in these relationships. This kind of experimentation could very easily have application to a broader range of problematic state-ethnic relationships.

Inside/Outside Indigenous-State Relations

Colonization as the political practice of Eurocentrism follows from an assumption of cultural supremacy. It presumes the moral superiority of European values, institutions, and knowledge, or ways of knowing. The delineation between moral superiority and moral inferiority has not only psychological but physical consequences, and serves to rationalize harm-doing and violence—both direct and structural—against non-European peoples (Wilmer 1993). Colonization is a paradoxical combination of inside/outside configurations where non-Western and Indigenous peoples are simultaneously excluded as non-Western and Indigenous peoples from the centers of privilege and equality and respect because they are socially constructed by Westerners as the antithesis to Western “enlightenment” identity. Western is forward, progressive, rational, and modern; Indigenous is backward, primitive, irrational, and traditional. Indigenous peoples have thus been the targets of assimilation practices through colonial education and socialization in order to eliminate their “difference” as a condition for their inclusion in “modern” society. Whether in the African, Caribbean, Middle Eastern, or Asian colonies, or within the territorial boundaries of states created by European settlement in Australia, New Zealand, and the Americas, Indigenous and non-Western peoples have been defined as “backward” and “primitive” by Europeans as a way of framing European identity as “progressive” and “civilized.” These colonial norms in all cases are delimited by the “civilizing mission” or the

"White Man's Burden" in the guardian-ward relationship of colonizer to colonized (Doty 1996; Wilmer 1993).

This relationship was only partly dismantled by political decolonization, and even in the case of political decolonization, the momentum of a relationship constructed in terms of the progressive colonizer civilizing the savage colonized people is perpetuated both by its psychological consequences and by its continuation under a series of reconstructed categories: Christianizing, civilizing, modernizing, and now, developing. Thus is it so often reproduced in the form of "modernizing" elites in decolonized states carrying out programs aimed at the deindigenization and "Westernization" of their societies. The result is a reproduction of the colonizer-colonized relationship, albeit between Indigenous groups within a "decolonized" society. Some examples include the Maasi as targets of Westernization in Kenya, and the transmigration program of West Papua New Guinea aimed at displacing local tribal peoples with Indonesian "settlers." Many programs aimed at the assimilation and physical displacement of Indigenous peoples in Central and South America also reflect this dynamic, though further complicated by the emergence of a Mestizo culture and identity over the past five centuries.

Finally, Indigenous peoples in European settler states, whose political status is still circumscribed by the ward-guardian relationship or as "domestic dependent nations," remain "undecolonized" and suffer both the continuing effects of psychological colonization and the continuing presence of "outside" political control. Native American Indian psychologist Eduardo Duran has referred to colonization as "an outside force having complete control over every aspect of your life. Your language, religious practice, politics, even your kids and family."¹⁰ Indigenous peoples' governments and actions by their governments must be "approved" by the governments of settler states. Children removed from their families by state practices and the actions of private agencies authorized or encouraged by state policies to do so, produced many "lost generations" of Indigenous children. Indigenous children forced to attend "boarding schools" commonly suffered physical, sexual, and psychological abuse. Even while non-Indigenous Americans prided themselves on constitutional guarantees of religious freedom, Native American Indian religious practices were regulated and some prohibited by the state until the passage in 1978 of the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. Thus, while Indigenous fourth-world and third-world peoples share a common colonial experience and postcolonial perspective, their worlds remain separated by the fact of continued political colonization in the fourth world.

Toward Reconciliation

Western democracies are unique in their attempt to develop democratic institutions through which relatively large populations can work out the allocation of resources according to articulated values. There have been other democracies, some more democratic, but the scale on which the model of the modern state is patterned is, I believe, historically unparalleled. Yet they were born deeply flawed, and by today's standards, relatively undemocratic. Their history is the history of progressive democratization, progressive inclusion, progressive achievement of higher standards of social justice. It is a history of coming to terms with the more undemocratic elements and darker chapters in one's own past. For African Americans, then, the United States was hardly a democracy at all until voting rights and equal opportunity reforms initiated in the 1960s and 1970s began. White America looks back on a time when our Supreme Court sanctioned the notions that African Americans were property and that racial segregation—an evil we came to call apartheid in South Africa and Zimbabwe—was legal within the framework of our constitution, and we note how far we have come, how much more “evolved” our moral sensibilities and sense of social justice are today.

Social justice is progressive, and in constitutional democracies it is achieved by making adjustments between law and politics. A democracy must be self-critical if it is to fulfill its potential for the good society. Democracy is advanced as a society debates honestly its own shortcomings in the face of pressures for justice and reconciliation from its marginalized sectors. In the case of justice for African Americans, we look backward on ourselves, and we appear to have been, in the past, quite backward. On women's issues, the protection of children, the rights of minorities as individuals, restitution for interned Japanese Americans and their descendants, on these and other issues we are doing better than we did in the past. Yet oddly, the basis on which Native American social justice within American society is legally proscribed remains unchanged since the Cherokee cases in the early 1800s. Chief Justice John Marshall's characterization of Native Americans as “domestic dependent nations” and “wards of the state”—images that draw on the norms of colonization that prevailed in the early nineteenth century—remain the strongest statement on the rights of Native Americans in relation to the state with which they made agreements for the purpose of securing protection. While some degree of reconciliation between the United States and the Indigenous peoples who are the First Nations of this continent has begun, social justice for Native Americans lags far

behind the other emancipatory struggles that define progress in American democracy.¹¹

In the 1970s, Native Americans joined other Indigenous groups from around the world and intensified their efforts to bring their grievances before an international audience as a strategy for influencing the domestic as well as international political and legal framework within which they sought justice. After a decade of studying the contemporary efforts of Indigenous political activists to register their grievances with an international audience, what I wanted to know was, at this point in Indigenous activism—several years after Indigenous issues had made their way onto the United Nations' agenda, after reconciliation policies and programs had been instituted in both Australia and Aotearoa—what had emerged from the experience of Indigenous leaders in their efforts to negotiate changes in their relationship with settler states? I wanted to know, were there no political obstacles, what sort of framework for negotiating a new Indigenous-state relationship would represent a feasible starting point from the perspective of Indigenous activists? Discussions with Indigenous activists and leaders from Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and Canada revealed a surprising level of agreement about the terms and conditions for a new sort of Indigenous-state relationship. I came to call the main points that surfaced during these discussions a "wish list." What would be the starting point of negotiating a meaningful reconciliation between Indigenous peoples and states? How can the process of decolonization begin in the fourth world? If, in other words, political obstacles could be somehow set aside for the moment, and if Indigenous representatives were to sit down now to negotiate with representatives of settler states and put forth a list of conditions that would enable them to rebuild their communities as viable societies with distinct and continually evolving identities and "ways of knowing," and to make progress in their own healing from dysfunctions flowing from colonial and postcolonial injustices, what would this "wish list" contain? Here are the main points that emerged from these discussions:

(1) *Indigenous peoples must have the right to freely determine their relationship with the state.* The category "Indigenous peoples" has emerged in relation to Western colonization and the spread of modernist ideology. Indigenous peoples, however, constitute a tremendously varied constellation of cultural differences as well as political aspirations. This diversity and the uniqueness of each Indigenous community's experience and perspective should never be overlooked even as the notion of common Indigenous interests gains support. Indigenous peoples are, however, similarly situated within a world-system perspective, as well as from the

perspective of having been cast as the backward “other” in relation to the West’s “modern” self. But each Indigenous group is distinct from every other group not only in a cultural sense, but in their own historical context in relation to different nation-states.

Some Indigenous peoples seek a form of sovereignty that is both external and internal, and in a very few cases perhaps sovereignty approaching that of the state. This has been part of recent public discourse in Aotearoa, although it is by no means clear that all Maori, or even a majority of Maori leaders, agree on the extent of sovereign aspirations. Nevertheless, this case contrasts sharply with many other (but not all—the Haudenosaunee are a much noted exception) Native peoples in North America, particularly in the United States, who have few or no aspirations in the direction of external sovereignty or of sovereignty “equal” to the state and who focus instead on varying degrees of internal sovereignty—freedom from external interference. Others seek fulfillment of the “trust” relationship, the basis on which the idea of protection rests, and the promise of sufficient education about the ways and thinking of the Western world in which they are now located to be able to exercise self-determination effectively within their own communities. The right to freely determine one’s own status is consistent with the international principle of self-determination, and most Indigenous representatives to the United Nations have stressed that self-determination does not in itself entail a right to secession from the state.

(2) *Indigenous peoples’ rights must be recognized, not “granted.”* Indigenous peoples insist that their rights do not flow from the good graces of the states that have asserted, in various direct and indirect ways, their de facto “conquest” of Indigenous peoples. Instead, their rights flow from the law of nations which recognizes the right of self-determination and upon which government-to-government relations between states and Indigenous peoples are based. This relationship is sometimes, but not always, evidenced by a treaty relationship; and treaties, similarly, fall within the purview of international law. This is also reflected in more recently articulated international legal norms protecting human rights. Indigenous peoples’ rights are also inherent, and have often been recognized as such within the legal framework of states whose courts have addressed the issue of Indigenous sovereignty. The notion of rights being “granted” presupposes the nonexistence of those rights prior to their recognition. Indigenous peoples’ rights predate the arrival of settlers in their lands. Indigenous peoples assert that their rights flow from their self-determining status prior to colonization, and that global decolonization dictates that those rights be

recognized today and that past infringements on those rights have been both unjust and, under international law, illegal.

(3) *Indigenous peoples must have the right to participate in the political and legal processes of the state without suffering a diminishment of sovereignty.* Settler states as well as states constructed as a result of postcolonial state-building have posited Indigenous peoples' remaining territorial bases as enclaves within the state. Additionally, through programs of coerced relocation and assimilation as well as economic dislocation, many Indigenous peoples live apart from the territories of their communities. This situation is a direct result of the settlement and state-building processes. The multinational state, including both Indigenous and settler communities, best serves the interests of justice and reconciliation when Indigenous peoples have a voice in the political processes of the state whose policies affect them, and when they have access to the legal machinery of the state in order to appeal for judgments involving their rights which rest on their sovereignty. Their sovereignty, which inheres in them and predates the creation of the states in which they now live, should not be diminished when they participate in the political and legal institutions of the state, particularly when the state remains the only institution through which their quest for justice can be given effect.

(4) *Indigenous peoples must have a kind of veto power over state policies in some areas.* Indigenous peoples' dispossession from their land entails more than a loss of economic resources. Indigenous and European conceptions of the human-natural world relationship are often vastly different. For both, albeit in very different cultural contexts, the natural world provides a necessary resource base for the support and continuation of a way of life—different ways of life in many cases. Yet for both, the natural world also provides a sense of “place” in which identity is grounded. But for Indigenous peoples, the natural world has an additional, spiritual dimension of meaning: sacredness. There is probably no comparable concept in Western systems of meaning for the Indigenous concept of a “sacred place,” where identity is meshed with spirituality. Some have compared the notion of a “sacred place” in Indigenous worldviews to the idea of a “church” in Western thinking, with the notable difference that a church can be moved or demolished and rebuilt. Nevertheless, it remains true that sacred places have a profound meaning for Indigenous peoples that has no comparable place in Western thinking at this time. The internal logic of capitalism does not generate any restraints. Yet both environmental concerns and the claims of Indigenous peoples are raising the question of whether or not the forces of capitalist expansion can be restrained for ethical reasons. Indigenous peoples must have a resource

base as well as a right to assert a special relationship with certain sacred places. Whether they choose, through their own internal decision making processes, to exploit their resources as players in a capitalist system, and to what extent, should remain their choice and should not prejudice their claims with respect to sacred places. At the very least, Indigenous peoples must have some power to veto the appropriation for economic exploitation of areas considered by them to be sacred.

(5) *There must be an end to policies and programs aimed at Indigenous peoples' forced assimilation, and reparative policies developed to mitigate the present effects of such past policies.* While boarding schools have disappeared in the English settler states, practices similar to those in which children were lured or forcibly removed from their families in order to attend residential schools whose primary function was to stamp out Indigenous culture and language and replace it with the language and culture of the dominant society, continue in the more developmentally remote areas of Central and South America. Furthermore, the effects of past policies are profound and continuing, resulting in, among other things, a loss or severe reduction in Indigenous language speakers so that at present there are hundreds of Indigenous languages threatened by extinction. As many as 80 percent of Indigenous languages in the United States are presently threatened with extinction. Another effect of forced assimilation is what in Australia is being called the "lost generation" (though the same phenomenon occurred in other settler states as well). Indigenous children were adopted, or relocated, their ties with families erased, and they were, to make matters worse, also often victims of physical and sexual abuse in the hands of their new caretakers. At the very least, there should be programs for reparative justice available to these victims and their descendants. There should also be programs (controlled by Indigenous peoples) aimed at facilitating the recovery of Indigenous languages and cultural knowledge.

(6) *Indigenous peoples need the time and educational resources to develop decision-making mechanisms capable of negotiating on their behalf with the large corporate institutions of the state, multinational corporations, and intergovernmental organizations.* Indigenous peoples' traditional decision-making institutions developed in relation to their societal needs, needs far different from those generated by powerful political and economic corporate interests that continually pressure Indigenous peoples to negotiate for the concession of their lands and resources, or for compensation pursuant to past dispossession. Indigenous peoples' traditional structures are therefore not generally well-suited to the task of fairly and justly representing their interests in arenas constructed and

dominated by states, multinational corporations, and intergovernmental organizations. Furthermore, many Indigenous communities today are often represented by and subjected to the authority of political institutions not of their own choosing or of their own creation. These institutions are often regarded as “imposed” on them by the settler states, and are thus often also not regarded with a high degree of internal legitimacy.

(7) *Indigenous peoples need access to the resources necessary to the development of legitimate and effective political institutions.* The most essential resource is knowledge. Indigenous peoples need support for educational programs focused both on their cultural traditions and history as well as about the political structure, motives, and social processes of the settler societies. To promote Indigenous participation in the educational institutions of the settler society is, by itself, not sufficient. Indigenous peoples themselves must be supported in the development of Indigenous-controlled and community-based educational programs. In the United States, for example, tribal colleges remain desperately underfunded, yet have provided the means and motivation for the reconstruction and recovery of Indigenous knowledge while also providing students with courses comparable to first and second year university or college requirements. They often host extension courses as well as community-based programs for language and cultural revival. Here they can begin to recover their own knowledge base as well as acquire knowledge about the settler societies within which they coexist in a manner appropriate to their own needs, as determined by the Indigenous community.

(8) *Until Indigenous communities develop effective and legitimate decision-making mechanisms, negotiations over issues like resources and land claims should be suspended, without diminishing or prejudicing their right to pursue these claims in the future.* Many Indigenous communities have developed mechanisms for negotiating effectively with states and other actors, and they have developed governing structures perceived internally to be legitimate. But many have not, since much of their time and energy has been consumed by the more immediate necessities of physical and cultural survival. Suspending negotiations may mean that a particular mining or hydroelectric project cannot proceed, and that negotiations over such controversial issues may be suspended indefinitely, until such time as members of the Indigenous community feel confident of the legitimacy and effectiveness of its own decision-making structures.

This list is neither exhaustive nor does it represent conditions that all Indigenous leaders, all over the world would necessarily agree on. It emerged as a result of discussions with Indigenous peoples, and, after developing the list, each point was discussed with the Indigenous leaders,

activists, educators, and scholars I spoke with during my ten days in Brisbane and Auckland, and among these individuals, there was complete agreement. In 1995 the UN Sub-commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities approved a resolution calling for a study of Indigenous land rights. After two decades of debate and discussion, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in September 2007. Efforts aimed at persuading key settler states, including the United States, to adopt a favorable position on the Declaration failed as 143 states voted for it, eleven abstained, and the four English-speaking settler states where Indigenous people interviewed for this study live, voted against the Declaration. Nevertheless, a similar declaration is also being prepared by the Organization of American States Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. The OAS document builds on the draft developed within the UN. The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues met for the first time in May 2002. The first “Decade of the World’s Indigenous People” was declared by the General Assembly between 1995–2004, followed by a second declaration of 2005–15 as the “Second Decade of the World’s Indigenous People.” The decade’s theme “Partnership for Action and Dignity” is expressed in five objectives laid out in the resolution:

1. Promoting non-discrimination and inclusion of indigenous peoples in the design, implementation and evaluation of international, regional and national processes regarding laws, policies, resources, programmes and projects;
2. Promoting full and effective participation of indigenous peoples in decisions which directly or indirectly affect their life styles, traditional lands and territories, their cultural integrity as indigenous peoples with collective rights or any other aspect of their lives, considering the principle of free, prior and informed consent;
3. Re-defining development policies that depart from a vision of equity and that are culturally appropriate, including respect for cultural and linguistic diversity of indigenous peoples;
4. Adopting targeted policies, programmes, projects and budgets for the development of indigenous peoples, including concrete benchmarks, and particular emphasis on indigenous women, children and youth; and,
5. Developing strong monitoring mechanisms and enhancing accountability at the international, regional and particularly the national level, regarding the implementation of legal, policy and operational frameworks for the protection of indigenous peoples and the improvement of their lives.¹²

Some settler states seem to be moving in the direction of satisfying some of these conditions, however reluctantly, and in some cases, however superficially, in response to the persistent activism of Indigenous peoples. Upon reflection, I would add another need to this list: the need to educate descendants of settlers about the history, heritage, aspirations, and present situation of Indigenous peoples. Activism by Indigenous peoples and structural changes in their relationship with states can improve the conditions of Indigenous peoples, but do not necessarily lead to the repair of relationships and the healing of the whole societies in which Indigenous and European descendants coexist. It is within the context of both structural change and consciousness-raising that the long-term prospects for peace and justice reside. The eight recommendations discussed here could well serve as a starting point for dialogue within settler states, even in those that failed to support the International Declaration.

Notes

1. It should be noted that the concept of “domestic jurisdiction” within the state is a reproduction of the patriarchal social structure in which the state/father is free to arbitrarily assert power within the protected “private” sphere of the state/family. The subsequent relationship of state “wardship” over Indigenous peoples and policies of coerced assimilation is a direct reflection of this premise.
2. The term “decolonization” should be viewed critically. After one to two centuries of outside control, and within boundaries artificially constructed by imperial powers, decolonization, according to Niranjana (1992, 7), “can refer only crudely to what has, in the language of national liberation struggles, been called the ‘transfer of power,’ usually from the reigning colonial power to an indigenous elite.”
3. This refers to a trio of cases, *Fletcher v Peck* (1819), *Cherokee v Georgia* (1831), and *Worcester v Georgia* (1832), though the latter two had more to say about the status of Indigenous peoples.
4. Robert T. Coulter, Keynote Address, Native American Awareness Week, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, April 1992.
5. For an excellent critical examination of how Silko’s book *Almanac of the Dead* (1991) interrogates the construction, maintenance, and negotiability of difference, see Jarmon (2006).
6. See also Weaver (1996).
7. See Ivison, Patton, and Sanders (2000), particularly the chapter by Young (“Hybrid Democracy: Iroquois Federalism and the Postcolonial Project”), and Newman (1998).

8. I say most here because there are some countries in Central and South America where the Indigenous population constitutes a majority or very large minority. Some of these states also reflect the pattern described previously, so that, for instance, there is a Mayan population in southern Mexico next to Guatemala where the Mayans constitute a majority. The Yanomami, who live in Brazil and Venezuela, and the Mapuche living in Chile and Argentina, are two examples.
9. The Haudenosaunee (or Iroquois) Confederacy has been in continuous existence, but does not presently enjoy the full support of the communities that make up the confederated Six Nations. The Blackfeet or Pikuni are in the process of discovery, debate, and discussion about the revival and reconstruction of a confederacy that originally extended from central Alberta into northeastern Montana.
10. "Spirits of the Present: The Legacy from Native America," Public Radio series, Native American Public Broadcasting Corporation, 1992.
11. This is a debatable claim. I am referring here to U.S. legislation in the 1970s, such as the American Indian Freedom of Religion Act, the American Indian Education and Self-Determination Act, the American Indian Child Welfare Act, and more recently, the Native American Grave Protection Act (1990).
12. See the "Draft Programme of Action for the Second International Decade of the World's Indigenous People," UN Document A60/270 of August 18, 2005.

Responding to a Deeply Bifurcated World

Indigenous Diplomacies in the Twenty-First Century

Makere Stewart-Harawira

Introduction

The final ratification of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in November 2007 marks a certain culmination of the reconfiguring of the relationship between Indigenous peoples and colonizing states over several decades. It represents the triumph of the determination, persistence, and agency of Indigenous peoples who have struggled unceasingly to win recognition of their rights and of injustices perpetuated through acts of imperialism that many argue continue today (see, for example, Beier 2005a; Corntassel 2007). It also draws a line in the sand between states who choose to acknowledge the rights of Indigenous peoples to be recognized and identified as having specific rights within international law, and those who refuse to recognize these rights outside of their juridical frameworks. The reluctance of some key states to ratify the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples contextualizes the demarcated responses to the needs and requirements of Indigenous peoples and the fourth world conditions in which many Indigenous communities exist inside leading industrialized states including Canada, the United States, Australia, and to a lesser extent, Aotearoa New Zealand. That these same key colonizing states have thus far refused to ratify the

UNDRIP speaks to the nature of the ideological struggle that underpins any diplomatic initiatives aimed at the recognition and enactment of Indigenous rights, including soft law initiatives such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

This wider ideological struggle has long historical antecedents. It has involved a struggle over shaping the politico-economic architecture of the world within a particular framework. Within this framework, the intersection of particular global and local interests is redefining Indigenous diplomacies and ontologies in ways that have important political and ethical consequences and that are notably bifurcated. One of the points of bifurcation is the relationship between economic interests and self-determination. Another is the separation between Indigenous politics and Indigenous philosophies and ontologies. Overarching these bifurcations are rapid and significant changes to the national and international juridical frameworks, particularly with regard to juridical interpretations of self-determination and rights. It is these points of bifurcation that I seek to untangle in this chapter and it is at these intersections that I locate my argument for the relocating of Indigenous philosophies and ontologies at the center of Indigenous diplomacies.

Systemic Crisis and the Fragility of Rights

The juridical changes to the notion of rights that occur at the local and international levels are in large measure legitimated by ideological explanations and interpretations of the multiple crises that have become part and parcel of the global discourse. The theme of global crisis is now so all-engulfing that it has become commonplace to center it in everyday conversations. In the wake of an over-700 billion dollar “bail-out” of the U.S. financial system that nonetheless continues its rapid collapse and the widespread acknowledgement of a global economic meltdown (Duncan 2008), it is almost equally as commonplace to acknowledge the failure of the free market ideology and the greed and corruptness of its prime beneficiaries (although should the bailout succeed in restoring confidence in the U.S. economic system, we might predict a recurrence of the amnesia that maintains its dominance). Foretold several years prior by thoughtful economists such as McMurty, Chossudovsky, and many others, the financial crisis that presently engulfs the United States, Britain, and much of Europe is the most recent in a series of unparalleled and interconnected global crises across multiple arenas. They include over-consumption and

over-exploitation of resources; global warming and global food shortages; democracy, freedom, and the global war on terror, and now, since late 2008, the unmasking and imminent collapse of a global economic system that is characterized by the mystification of greed and corruption and predicated on exploitation of the poor and the marginalised.

These are the signifiers of the troubled times that Wallerstein (1998, 1999) and others presciently forewarned as the terminal crisis of the modern world-system. As Wallerstein points out, historical systems have terminal lives. Once they move far from equilibrium and reach points of bifurcation, they reach demise. There can be no doubt that we have reached those points of bifurcation and that the crises I have mentioned are but some of the most visible symptoms. Less obvious, perhaps, is the depth of the extent to which the death-throe struggles of a politico-economic system fighting to survive impacts on the everyday lives of Indigenous and other marginalized peoples everywhere. These crises intersect with the redefining of the discourse and construction of rights in a manner that unashamedly privileges market rights over civic or other human rights and employs a politics of fear to legitimate unparalleled surveillance of particular individuals, groups, and populations. In the context of our highly developed technological sophistication, this is a time that has no parallel and it is against this backdrop that I unfold the central theme of this chapter.

In this time of deep global and local transformations, the imperative to strive to maintain our integrity as Indigenous peoples becomes more critical than ever. This requires, I argue, the reembedding of Indigenous philosophies and ontologies at the heart of our diplomatic endeavors and political ontologies. In this, my argument aligns with those of other Indigenous scholars and international relations theorists who assert Indigenous philosophies and cosmologies as a counter-hegemonic project (cf. Beier 2007; Corntassel 2007). My argument that Indigenous philosophies and ontologies should be located at the center of Indigenous diplomatic endeavors alongside political and strategic aspirations is a claim that connects across the thematics of this chapter and one to which I return in my conclusion.

A frequently argued limitation to this approach is that there is no single or essential Indigenous ontology or cosmology (cf. Widdowson 2008). This is not disputed by Indigenous scholars. There are nonetheless broadly similar sets of beliefs and principles that have been passed down through and articulated by Indigenous leaders and scholars and are, I

contend, highly relevant to the development of international and local Indigenous diplomacies today. The dissemination of arguments to the contrary underscores a sorry lack of understanding and fails to diminish the credibility of these accounts. It does however give emphasis to Heidegger's (1962) contention of the critical importance of ontology and of questioning our assumptions of "Being."

Indigenous Philosophies in the Diplomatic Context

The political spaces in which diplomacy, mediation, and negotiation with states and other interested parties occur are not those constructed or traditionally practiced by Indigenous peoples. They are spaces that are constructed and bestowed by an imposed political regime and regulation. Consequently, they are spaces within which diplomacy, like trade, is conceived of as occupying a separate and distinct space from that of the Indigenous cosmological and philosophical world. Turner (2006, 81, 119) cogently argues that, given Indigenous peoples' endeavors to regain, reclaim, and reassert measures of self-determination, defined as the right to determine their own way of life according to their own customs, mores, and beliefs and to engage on that basis in the affairs of the state, the ability to clearly articulate those customs and beliefs in terms that the non-Indigenous world can understand becomes crucial. Thus, in order to effectively engage, Turner states, Indigenous peoples are forced to use the normative discourses of the state. This leads to the engagement of discourses of rights, sovereignty, and nationhood by Indigenous peoples in order to defend their position. On this basis, Turner contends that Indigenous peoples can most effectively articulate Indigenous sovereignty arguments in the legal and political discourses of the dominant culture through a division of intellectual labor between Indigenous word warriors and Indigenous philosophers.

While I fully support the argument for the importance of Indigenous philosophies for preserving indigeneity, I find the proposed division of labor between Indigenous intellectuals and Indigenous philosophers troubling. One of the consequences of neglecting to ground Indigenous diplomacies within Indigenous philosophies and cosmologies is that increasingly we find ourselves participants in a neocorporate mode of endeavor that over-exploits our means of survival while centralizing ownership and wealth in the hands of corporate elites. On the other hand, groups who for various reasons choose not to participate in exploitative modes of development are left vulnerable and face

increasingly disturbing consequences. These consequences include being designated as threats to the wellbeing of the state. Such designations lead inevitably to the reduction of civic rights and on occasion today, even the appellation of “terrorists.”

The struggle over more than one hundred years for recognition of Indigenous rights has been arduous and costly. Yet the inarguable effectiveness to date of these rights-based initiatives is demonstrated in the political gains achieved thus far. On this basis, the notion that Indigenous peoples should hone their skills to present themselves as inheritors of those same principles and ideologies by virtue of adopting the same legal language has much merit. My concern arises from ideologically driven discursive reconstructions and interpretations of the nature of rights. This is demonstrated in two ways. Firstly, the drastic weakening of democracy and human rights through the substitution of market-based rights for social rights supported by the expansion of a politics of terror invokes a level of contradiction and compromise that undermines the feasibility of this position. Secondly, the unintended creation of new categories of “have and have-nots” among and between Indigenous nations and communities has arisen due to the tensions and contradictions between Indigenous philosophies and state-driven interpretations of Indigenous rights to self-determination as economic rights. It is my conviction that resolution of these troubling disjunctures in our own communities can only be achieved through the reembedding of our Indigenous spiritual and moral principles, beliefs, and values at the center of our diplomatic and economic aspirations and endeavors. Admittedly, given the already significant loss of expert understandings in these areas, that will be no simple matter. We might begin, I suggest, by reclaiming the political space in which diplomacy, mediation, and negotiation occurs and returning the fire of spirituality alongside diplomacy.

The following review of the relationship between Western philosophical thought and the philosophical underpinnings of the international juridical framework traces the ideological thought that underpins the changing landscape of rights. My purpose here is to recall the ideological nature of the international juridical and politico-economic order that, through our participation, shapes our diplomatic endeavors. Following this is a brief consideration of some core philosophical beliefs and values commonly held by Indigenous peoples, albeit without attempting the in-depth exploration that the imperative for reclaiming political space in this manner would require. That is for traditional knowledge-holders and political leaders to explore elsewhere. My brief discussion of the key

elements of Indigenous philosophical ontologies precursors a commentary on the shifting discourse of self-determination. Here my intention is to highlight the successful strategic and discursive endeavor that saw the concept of Indigenous self-determination reframed as economic development and Indigenous peoples as (junior) players in the global capitalist economy. Most certainly this has come to also frame Indigenous diplomacies in ways that ultimately are neither to our advantage nor in keeping with our espoused Indigenous philosophies and ontologies. Examples drawn from Canada, the United States, and Aotearoa New Zealand illustrate my argument. I conclude the chapter with a commentary on the implications for Indigenous diplomacies in these days of the death throes of a particular form of empire.

Liberalism, Philosophy, and the International Institutions

The integral connection between Western classical thought and the international institutions of world order has been well-described by many authors (cf. Anaya 1996; Stewart-Harawira 2005) but is worth summarizing here. For the purpose of this chapter, I take the beginning of British expansionism as my starting point. It was in this period that Enlightenment ideologies and their corollary, capitalism, established the rationale for capitalist expansion based on the acquisition of territory and resources. The need for consumption and the social benefits that thus accrued were seen as the driving force behind the development of the rational self and defined citizenship in terms of property rights (Tourraine 1995, 49). According to the Scottish Enlightenment philosopher David Hume, luxury was “a spur to accumulation and a moral discourse that civilises men” and hence the expansion of international trade for the purpose of satisfying the need for consumption was integral to the creation of civil order (Rosow 1994, 17). Lockean rationalism supplied the new foundations for the divorce between the individual and society. Civil rights were associated with property rights and property ownership was vested only in those of fixed abode. Locke’s theory of civil government was predicated on the creation of a private sphere that was separate from but exercised a constraining influence over the public sphere. As Foucault (1991) has well established, by the eighteenth century, the analysis of community and the needs of its members as the foundation of government was replaced by an analysis of labor and property that must be protected by law. This cemented the total discontinuity between the state of nature and social organization.

Those who wrote treatises on international law understood these principles to be the product of European civilization. As the interstate system of international law was unfolded, only such states as were inheritors of that civilization were deemed subject to international law, the critical principle being recognition as such by other member states. Following the great revolutions of the seventeenth century in France and England, these ideologies came to frame a new model of civil society that enshrined aristocratic self-government and a market economy regulated by common law. This model was transmitted by transnational elite networks and powerfully shaped the development of the international legal system of nation-states (cf. Anaya 1996; Held 1999; Stewart-Harawira 2005). The expansion in overseas settlement was accompanied by the expansion of transnational networks of power and influence that Pijl (1995) insists, “extended beyond the functional connection created by enterprise” and were often politically as well as economically motivated. These motivations were strongly linked to the political economy ideologies of those such as Hume, who linked consumerism and trade to social and political well-being, and Saint-Simon, who similarly conceived of the end of war through international trade (Stewart-Harawira 2005). As has been detailed by numerous authors, by the beginning of the twentieth century, the influence of these networks of power was being disseminated through “new, distinctive, non-territorial forms of power and domination” (Held, et al. 1999, 43). While these ideologies were challenged, notably by various state-socialist regimes, and most recently, the multilateral historic bloc of socialist and developing countries, the underpinning ideologies of the international juridical system did not and have not changed.

In order to fully grasp the significance of the changes that occurred in the interrelationships between Indigenous peoples and nation-states during this period, it is useful to examine them against the backdrop of politico-economic reshaping of the world at that time. It was a time when the politico-economic underpinnings of international order were undergoing significant structural changes that were ideologically located at the nexus of neoliberal economics and neoconservative politics. The 1970s was a period of peak activism for the civil rights and Indigenous rights movements across the world. Inside the UN, the bloc of unaligned states flexed their muscles, and Indigenous activists stormed the bastille of the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations (cf. Stewart-Harawira 2005). The 1980s saw an intentional rolling back of the freedoms that reigned during the previous decade and a reigning in of what was described by the American Council on Foreign Relations as an excess of

democracy. Ultimately the dissidence exercised during the 1970s by the bloc of unaligned countries gave way before the overwhelming power of structural adjustment policies based on the Washington consensus model and the (un)logic of the market.

The strategic reclaiming of political power by a consortium of neo-conservative and neoliberal forces was enacted differently in Western industrialized states including the four key colonizing states of the United States, Canada, Australia, and Aotearoa New Zealand. As these states increasingly took on the role of conduits for the military/industrial/financial drivers of the global economy, the discursive construction of Indigenous self-determination presaged in 1987 by Professor Turk's recommendation to the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations became evident in the form and often the outcome of treaty settlements negotiated during the late 1990s. Turk's rationale for recommending that Indigenous peoples' requests for "autonomy" could be usefully interpreted as an "instrument necessary for their development and the development of their members, as well as the state as a whole" made sense in the context of the politico-economic ideologies driving the emerging global order. As he then explained, "The usefulness of the idea of the right to development in the context of such groups is that it places the accent of their claim on development rather than political status as such" (Turk 1987, quoted in Kingsbury 1989, 140). As he suggested, this would see a reinterpretation of autonomy and self-determination as economic development rather than political status, a measure that would benefit the state. And so it has proved. Made at a time when the framework for a global economic order was being prepared, Turk's comments were completely in step with the politico-economic climate of the time. The redirection of Indigenous aspirations for self-determination to economic determination changed the climate of Indigenous peoples-states relationships and solved the problem of Indigenous activism being viewed as a barrier to investment by overseas interests. New treaty settlements were negotiated and, as they were given effect, economic investment opportunities and partnerships began to take shape.

In the decade and a half since, this interpretation of self-determination has gained currency to the extent that it is almost unquestioned. Indigenous tribes and nations seeking redress for the grievous losses of territories, languages, cultural knowledge, and political and economic self-determination are encouraged to negotiate new relationships with states through a corporatized framework based on a paradigm of market-rights. Indisputably this model brings mutually beneficial economic outcomes to both the state and the new body corporate of tribal governance.

However the effectiveness of benefits accruing to community members is a matter of hot debate. Following several years of careful study of treaty settlements and detribalization in Aotearoa New Zealand, Lashley (2000) concluded that by the end of the 1990s there was little evidence that significant benefits had or would accrue to Maori communities themselves (cf. Ward 1999). The corporatized governance structures and politico-economic endeavors of today bear little resemblance to historical Indigenous modes in which the status of Indigenous leaders was measured by their demonstrated ability to nurture or cultivate the well-being of their people. Today's corporate Indigenous governance structures and their role in state-Indigenous communities' relationships frequently invoke deeply problematic consequences that are played out in the relinking of citizenship to property rights and the delineation of new divisions among Indigenous peoples and communities. In some cases these divisions arise from contested tribal boundaries and identities resulting from a competitively based settlement system that pits against one another tribal groups and nations that traditionally had shared or overlapping boundaries (cf. Barcham 2000; Bennion 1999; Stewart-Harawira 2005). In most cases, the result has been the resounding failure to significantly improve economic, social, or cultural well-being of Indigenous communities and an unacceptable expansion of class differences between Indigenous elites and working classes (cf. Lashley 2000). Critical divisions also arise over the application of resource development models that are seen by many Indigenous groups and individuals as antithetical to the principles and values of Indigenous ontologies and philosophies.¹

Considering Indigenous Political Ontologies

Regarding ontologies, Heidegger (1962, 2, 31) argued, "Basically all ontology, no matter how rich and firmly compacted a system of categories it has at its disposal, remains blind and perverted from its ownmost aim, if it has not first adequately clarified the meaning of Being, and conceived this clarification as its fundamental task." Heidegger's central concern in *Being and Time* is that we have forgotten to question the nature of our assumptions of "Being." All our encounters and interactions, Heidegger points out, are based on our suppositions of the nature of that with which we are interacting. In forgetting to interrogate the "beingness" of things, he claims that we have tended, particularly since Descartes, to concentrate on classifications of things—entities, humans, nature—that overlook and in fact obscure the inherent richness of their

differentiation. Our failure to interrogate “Being” has thus led us to an impoverished sense of “what being,” or of the nature of being in any particular entity. Mulhall (1996) helpfully clarifies Heidegger’s preoccupation with the meaning of Being. As he notes, academic disciplines are built upon implicit assumptions about “beingness” of given entities based on our everyday experiences of those entities, and the bodies of theories that are produced as a result make up a body of “ontic” knowledge, that is, “knowledge pertaining to the distinctive nature of particular types of entity” (Mulhall 1996, 4). So, too, are diplomacies. Heidegger of course is referring to the ontologies and philosophies of “the West.” My point is that as Indigenous scholars, diplomats, and political leaders, we too are in danger of forgetting to interrogate our own ontologies of being. Yet these same ontologies have not infrequently been invoked in support of our claims to self-determination and, most particularly, in relation to land and territory. This being the case, how might we define an Indigenous ontology or meaning of Being?

From a Maori ontological position, our encounter, or interrogative movement with the material world is experienced through *matauranga Maori*. Maori traditionally approached the “being” of things through Maori knowledge of the world and the sacred energy of which all “being” is simultaneously derived and comprised. Therefore the “beingness” of what we encounter shapes our “interrogative movement” and determines the outcome of our self-reflective experience. The qualities of that beingness are those of the “mauri,” or essence of life, of sacredness, of being one with all things, that is, interrelationality. Durie (2007, 137) identifies the defining characteristic of indigeneity as the inseparability between human beings and the natural world and notes that instead of the idea of human domination, there is a long-standing relationship with land, forests, waterways, oceans, air. Indigenous peoples recognize the interrelatedness of all things and that everything has its own life-force (Cajeete 1997; Duran 1995; Royal 2002). Relationships between human beings and their environment, as with those between humans, were mediated on the basis of reciprocity and relationality. In the same way that, within Indigenous ontologies and cosmologies, the spiritual or “unseen” world is not only present but also seen (cf. Smith 2006), in the Indigenous worldview, spiritual interests are not held as separate from other interests but are integral to all aspects of materiality (cf. Bennion 1999). This recognition gives rise to sets of moral principles, ethics, and values that are given expression in regulatory codes. These codes govern relationships with the environment and with one another (Durie 2003).

Trade relationships between Indigenous groups were also undertaken on the basis of relationship and reciprocity. Trade involved all kinds of exchanges from stories and ceremonies to foodstuffs and materials. Ethical codes governing territorial boundaries and the shared areas of resource were also mediated on the basis of relationship and reciprocity.

The tensions between these principles and values and the principles and values of capitalism that sees the world's resources in terms of a "standing reserve" (Heidegger 1962) are complex and difficult to unpack. The right of Indigenous peoples to economic development and prosperity is unequivocal, as is the right to determine the manner of such development. At a time when many Indigenous communities have the possibility of a level of economic parity for perhaps the first time, the tension between these principles is often difficult to mediate and negotiate and fraught with the potential for miscommunication and cooptation. The challenges and complexities involved in issues of shared prosperity and conceptualizations of self-determination are nuanced and multilayered and require much more teasing out than is possible here. Yet, like Indigenous philosophies and ontologies, they must be acknowledged in any discussion of Indigenous diplomacies in the twenty-first century. The examples in the following section demonstrate some of the complexities and tensions that frame Indigenous diplomatic endeavors in the twenty-first century. Here they are contextualized within a framework of new typologies of development.

Capitalism's Seductions and Typologies of Development

One of the many poignancies of today's diplomatic struggles lies in the fact that, at the moment when a number of Indigenous nations and communities in the key colonizing states of the English-speaking world are poised in relatively strong negotiating positions in economic terms, the conditionalities of their economic engagement are frequently antithetical to the principles and relationships that have historically governed Indigenous peoples' interrelationships to the natural world. Thus, while the resolution of long-standing grievances against colonizing states has indeed, as Anderson, Dana, and Dana (2006) note, enabled at least some Aboriginal communities to bring considerable "capital" to the bargaining table, it has also been the catalyst for new divisions and exclusions among Indigenous communities themselves. Anderson et al. draw on entrepreneurship typologies as an explanatory framework for analyzing Indigenous peoples' participation in the global economy. In this model,

social enterprises, defined as those in which “social purpose is the principal driver of activity, with organizational sustainability as a core objective,” are achieved “primarily through entrepreneurship.”

One example of the linking of diplomacy and trade with mutually satisfactory outcomes of the kind advocated by Turk was the Nisga’a Nation settlement of a long-standing claim against the Canadian province of British Columbia. Tully (2000) notes that, in this case, a settlement sum of approximately 200 million dollars (along with Aboriginal title in the form of an estate in fee simple with certain proprietary rights over the remaining 7 percent, some rights with respect to trap lines, wildlife, and migratory birds outside this area and the right to pay taxes and receive citizenship entitlements to training) opened the way to a level of economic development previously impossible for the Nisga’a people. In addition to compensation for 90 percent of the Nisga’a traditional lands, the settlement also provided for the retention of limited customary rights in regards to hunting and fishing and full citizenship for the Nisga’a people (cf. Tully 2000) and for a limited form of self-determination (cf. Durie 2003, 170). Significantly, it also cleared the path for a billion dollars’ worth of foreign investment that had been dependent upon resolution of Aboriginal customary rights (Stewart-Harawira 2005). Thus, Aboriginal development and state development were mutually assured, albeit at the cost of losing most of the Nisga’a Nation’s traditional lands.

In Aotearoa New Zealand, the Ngai Tahu and Tainui settlements, each totalling NZ \$170 million, brought similar economic opportunities to these respective tribes. In both cases, traditional spiritual and genealogical ties to the traditional lands were central to the tribal claims. Both sets of negotiations were marked by contested historical and genealogical interpretations of occupation. In both examples, competing or opposing claims were brushed aside or under the proverbial carpet and, in all three cases, the final treaty settlements provided the means for the establishment of solid asset bases for the successful claimants. The Ngai Tahu treaty-based claim on behalf of what is arguably the third largest tribe in the country was supported by a substantial amount of development money from the Crown, yet was heavily marked by controversy and challenge. Nonetheless, it succeeded in achieving one of the two largest settlements in New Zealand at that time. The asset base of the tribe was subsequently further enhanced by the exchange of foreign investment for lands returned under the settlement.² Such situations inevitably heighten concerns regarding the gap between politico-economic endeavors and traditional values of historically embedded, genealogical, and spiritual relationships to land and place.

The contradictions that are invoked in the treaty settlement approach to resolving ongoing inequities are most visible in the situations of Indigenous groups and nations that are less able or less willing to participate in this mode of wealth creation. These tensions are perhaps most visibly demonstrated in Canada's western provinces of Alberta and British Columbia where oil and gas developments have come to symbolize the poignancy of the contradictions that Indigenous peoples face in regard to self-determination, development, and Indigenous philosophies. Here the tensions that are evoked between economic development, citizenship rights, and Indigenous ontological and political commitments are most poignantly demonstrated in relation to energy development, notably the extraction of oil from the tarsands that underlie Northern Alberta's boreal forest.

In the Fort McMurray region of Northern Alberta, decades of impoverishment exacerbated by the toxification of the traditional lands of the five Aboriginal bands situated at the heart of development activity that has laid waste thousands of hectares of unique wetlands and ecosystems, was resolved through the Athabasca Tribal Council (ATC) All Parties Core Agreement [1998; 2002]. The ATC Agreement, which was first developed in 1998 to provide for First Nations participation in the aggressive development of the oil sands in the Fort McMurray area, was the first step in a process that has seen the Fort McMurray bands reported as the richest First Nation in Canada (Stainsby 2007). In 2007, the ATC was expanded to provide for the development of partnership projects between the five Fort McMurray Bands and fifteen oil and forestry companies. The outcome for their relatives 280 kilometers north is, to say the least, tragic.

Fort Chipewyan, site of the earliest European settlement in Alberta, was named after the Chipewyan inhabitants of the area. The Athabasca River flows directly upstream to Fort Chipewyan First Nations community that occupied that land long before the establishment of the fort in 1788. There, upstream from what is recognized as the largest and dirtiest development project on the planet, the Athabasca River has excessive amounts of toxins such as arsenic and mercury that have been measured as over five hundred times allowable rates for human and animal well-being (Timoney 2007). The unusually high death rates from rare forms of cancer have been directly linked to the excessive amounts of carcinogens in the river, yet, as Canada's CBC News reported, despite supporting medical and scientific evidence, the Fort Chipewyan community's efforts for recognition of its plight by the Provincial government have thus far been unsuccessful.³ It might, in any other place, be seen as unthinkable that a major waterway of the proportions and significance

of the Athabasca would be permitted to convey such volumes of toxic wastes through a major watershed, yet increasingly—and most certainly in Alberta, Canada—the imperative for energy resources and prosperity override any ecological, climatic, or human well-being considerations.

The dilemma of the Fort McMurray and Fort Chipewyan communities, both situated in close proximity to the tarsands development project, represents one of the deepest complexities inherent in Indigenous peoples' engagement with the politico-economic structures of the global order. Indigenous communities appear to be caught in a similarly impossible bind when it comes to diplomacies. Ironically, and setting aside the thorny issue of Indigenous identities, spiritual connection to land, and the oft-repeated reminders from elders and knowledge-holders of the moral imperative to act as guardians of natural resources, economic development models based on capitalist typologies may soon be recognized as much less advantageous when viewed through the lens of extreme climatic changes, conflicts over energy resources, and a lengthy global economic recession in which the drastically diminished value of investments exchanged for natural resources will equally diminish the ability of tribal corporations to sustain their communities.

Indigenous Diplomacies at the End of Empire

The need for Indigenous diplomacies that are able to successfully mediate the interrelationships between and across Indigenous communities, Indigenous peoples, and nation-states, and our place on the global stage is enormous and in the context of multilayered global crises, urgent. In this context, the determination of viable alternatives for models of diplomacy and development that are sustainable ecologically, culturally, and spiritually is as much an imperative for Indigenous peoples as it is for all peoples. Perhaps one of the greatest challenges for Indigenous peoples is the means by which we afford such determinations. While such means will and must be as unique as the Indigenous nations and communities concerned, the common thread is the necessity of drawing on traditional knowledge sources such as songs, histories, and proverbs.

Manuka Henare (2001) demonstrates this approach when he draws on traditional Maori social and political interrelationships to formulate a culturally grounded typology of sustainable development, one that could just as well be articulated as a typology of Indigenous diplomacy. These

ethical values include: wholeness, cosmos; life essences, vitalism; reverence for life; being and potentiality, the sacred; power, authority, and common good; spiritual power of obligatory reciprocal relationships with nature; spirit and spirituality; the right way, the quest for justice; care and support, reverence for humanity; belonging, reverence for the human person; change and tradition; solidarity; and guardianship of creation. Henare's "spiral of ethics" provides a typology of Maori diplomacy that recenters political interrelationships and diplomacies in the traditional teachings of spirituality and reciprocity without relinquishing participation in the wider global society. There are other Indigenous typologies for political, economic, and diplomatic models, many of which are equally valid and relevant models for non-Indigenous nations and communities. For instance, Mark Anielski's model of sociocultural economics for establishing goals for community wellbeing looks to locally identified Indigenous values for models for development that are based on community-defined goals and aspirations (Anielski 2003; 2007). Marshall Beier (2005a) finds a similar typology in the traditional teachings and practices of the Lakota and Iris Young (2000) has identified a model for international diplomacy in the federalism of the Iroquois Five Nations.

While the philosophies that underpin these typologies are not unique to Indigenous peoples, in these cases they are drawn from the traditional repositories of Indigenous philosophies and cosmologies. Thus they provide appropriate and relevant roadmaps for Indigenous nations and communities to achieving the power in goodness, the power in right-thinking, and the power in connectedness that sits at the heart of good diplomacy. If we are to achieve good diplomatic outcomes, these roadmaps should not be discarded, least of all for diplomacies based on models of commodification, competitiveness, and separation.

In conversation with the author regarding the relevance of Maori ontologies and philosophies in revisioning the notion of "being in the world," noted Tuhoe leader and scholar Tamati Kruger⁴ drew on Tuhoe genealogies of the creation. In the beginning, in the long, long night before pre-creation, there was only the state of oneness, the state of the Divine. The ultimate goal of human existence, said Kruger, is to return to Oneness. This is the fundamental metaphysical principle that Indigenous knowledge holders and wisdom keepers in many and varied Indigenous communities and nations have consistently taught: that beyond the divisions and separations, the political, economic, and social divisions, the divisions of race, of class, of color, of place, we reach that place of

transcendence, of which our ancestors spoke and where there is no such thing as duality.

Critical to this journey, Kruger stated, is the achievement of self-determination. Self-determination is a right that accrues to all peoples and is embedded in human rights law. It is more than a human right, however; it is a spiritual and moral right. Self-determination is the cornerstone of freedom, whether personal, political, or spiritual. And without freedom, there can be neither justice nor equality. Given this, and the fact that—according to Tuhoe traditions—it was Oneness that sang the world into being, how in this fragmented, divided, and degraded state of existence, how do, or how can, Indigenous diplomacies re-sing the world today?

At this point of multi-crises, the most critical Indigenous diplomatic functions are an imperative for traditional wisdom keepers and philosophers—of reminding us of our traditional responsibilities of guardianship and hospitality, of acting as interlocutors of the constructed power differentials between Indigenous and “Western” society, and of recentering Indigenous teachings and spirituality at the heart of our diplomacies. This is neither tribalism nor cultural essentialism (cf. Rata and Openshaw 2007, quoted in Guyver 2008; Widdowson 2008). It is an appropriate, relevant, and principled response to crises that are greatly exacerbated by the cultivation of a global geopolitical divide based on political and financial power. Let me be clear about my meaning, however. The oneness that our genealogies and histories bespeak is not the oneness of universalism, for that is recast as an ideological rationale for political obliteration of our differences and unique contributions. Rather, the oneness that is bespoken is the oneness of transcendence that recognizes the depth of our profound interconnection across all political, ideological, and material boundaries. This being so, then profound interconnection is surely the cornerstone of Indigenous diplomacies and the only appropriate context for articulating a language of “rights.” The task for Indigenous scholars and philosophers is to frame and articulate this profound interconnection of rights through the particular political and spiritual philosophies of the Indigenous Nations.

Notes

1. This is highlighted by Maori lawyer Annette Sykes (2008) in relation to a recent landmark settlement in Aotearoa New Zealand involving multiple tribes and a large quantity of commercial forest land. Sykes raises important questions about the implications for tribal sovereignty when tribes are incorporated into what she terms a regionalized corporate.

2. M. Solomon, Chief Executive, Ngat Tahu Runanga, Christchurch, New Zealand, personal communication, 2006.
3. CBC News, Sunday. (2007). "A Town's Toxic Questions." Documentary posted by CBC.ca at http://www.cbc.ca/sunday/2007/12/120907_4.html. This is a good beginning point for accessing details. There are significant contradictions between the reports of the then local medical doctor, Dr. Connor, and the findings of the Alberta Government. The Timoney (2007) report on behalf of the Fort Chipewyan Community is unequivocal in its findings that contradict those of the Provincial Government of Alberta.
4. Tamati Kruger, Director, Anamata Institute, Whakatane, New Zealand, interview, November 2007.

This page intentionally left blank

Bibliography

- Abele, Frances. "Canadian Contradictions: Forty Years of Northern Political Development." *Arctic* 41, no. 4 (1987): 310–20.
- Abele, Frances, and Mark O. Dickerson. "The 1982 Plebiscite on Division of the Northwest Territories: Regional Government and Federal Policy." *Canadian Public Policy* 11, no. 1 (1985): 1–15.
- Abele, Frances, and Michael J. Prince. "Aboriginal Governance and Canadian Federalism: A To-Do List for Canada." In *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*, edited by François Rocher and Miriam Smith. Peterborough: Broadview, 2003.
- Abele, Frances, and Thierry Rodon. "Inuit Diplomacy in the Global Era: The Strengths of Multilateral Internationalism." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 13, no. 3 (2007): 45–63.
- Acharya, Amitav. "Collective Identity and Conflict Management in Southeast Asia." In *Security Communities*, edited by Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Affif, Suraya, and Celia Lowe. "Claiming Indigenous Community: Political Discourse and Natural Resource Rights in Indonesia." *Alternatives* 32, no. 1 (2007): 73–97.
- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.
- Akerman, K. "Material Culture and Trade in the Kimberleys Today." In *Aborigines of the West: Their Past and Their Present*, edited by Catherine H. Berndt and Ronald M. Berndt. Nedlands: University of Western Australia Press, 1980a.
- . "The Renaissance of Aboriginal Law in the Kimberleys." In *Aborigines of the West: Their Past and Their Present*, edited by Catherine H. Berndt and Ronald M. Berndt. Nedlands: University of Western Australia Press, 1980b.
- Alderete, Wara, Gina Pacaldo, Xihuanel Huerta, and Lucilene Lira Whitesell, eds. *Daughters of Abya Yala: Indigenous Women Regaining Control*. Tennessee: Book Publishing Co., 1994.
- Alexie, Sherman. *Lone Ranger and Tonto Fistfight in Heaven*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1994.
- Alfred, Taiaiake. *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Peterborough: Broadview, 2005.
- . "A Young Warrior's Perspective on the Conflict at Six Nations." *New Socialist* 58 (2006a): 23–25.

- . “Sovereignty’—An Innapropriate Concept.” In *The Indigenous Experience: Global Perspectives*, edited by Roger C. A. Maaka and Chris Andersen. Toronto: Canadian Scholars’ Press, 2006b.
- Altamirano-Jimenez, Isabel. “North American First Peoples: Slipping up into Market Citizenship?” *Citizenship Studies* 8, no. 4 (2004): 349–65.
- Amagoalik, John. *Changing the Face of Canada*. In *Life Stories of Northern Leaders*, edited by Louis McComber. Iqaluit: Nunavut Arctic College, 2007.
- Anaya, S. James. “A Contemporary Definition of the International Norm of Self Determination.” *Transnational Law and Contemporary Problems* 3, no. 1 (1993): 131–64.
- . *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Anderson, Robert B., Leo Paul Dana, and Teresa E. Dana. “Indigenous Land Rights, Entrepreneurship, and Economic Development in Canada: ‘Opting-in’ to the Global Economy.” *Journal of World Business* 41, no. 1 (2006): 45–55.
- Anielski, M. *The Economics of Happiness: Building Genuine Wealth*. New Society, 2007.
- Anielski, M., and D. Pollock. “The State of Inuit Well Being in Nunavut.” Report prepared for the Nunavut Social Development Council and the Nunavut Tunngavik Inc., March 1, 2003.
- Arctic Council. “Arctic Climate Impact Assessment.” November 24, 2004. <http://www.acia.uaf.edu> (accessed December 11, 2006).
- . “Arctic Council.” <http://www.arctic-council.org/> (accessed December 17, 2006).
- Armstrong, Terence, George Rogers, and Graham Rowley. *The Circumpolar North: A Political and Economic Geography of the Arctic and Sub-Arctic*. London: Methuen, 1978.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- . *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Ashley, Richard K., and R. B. J. Walker. “Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissident Thought in International Studies.” *International Studies Quarterly* 34, no. 3 (1990): 259–68.
- Aslaksen, Eilif. “Aili utsatt for hersketeknikk.” Kárášjohka, 2007. http://www.nrk.no/kanal/nrk_sami_radio/1.1997845 (accessed March 12, 2007).
- AWID (Association for Women’s Rights in Development). “Intersectionality: A Tool for Gender and Economic Justice.” *Women’s Rights and Economic Change, Facts & Issues* #9. Toronto: Association for Women’s Rights in Development, 2004. http://www.awid.org/publications/primers/intersectionality_en.pdf (accessed March 9, 2007).
- Badie, Bertrand, and Marie-Claude Smouts. *Le Retournement du monde; Sociologie de la scène internationale*. Paris: Presses de la FNSP, 1992.

- Balint, Ruth. *Troubled Waters: Borders, Boundaries and Possession in the Timor Sea*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 2005.
- Barcham, Manuhaia. "(De)constructing the Politics of Indigenous Sovereignty." In *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, edited by Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Bayly, C. A. "Archaic' and 'Modern' Globalization in the Eurasian and African Arena, c. 1750–1850." In *Globalization in World History*, edited by A. G. Hopkins. New York: Norton, 2002.
- Bedford, David, and Thom Workman. "The Great Law of Peace: Alternative Inter-Nation(al) Practices and the Iroquoian Confederacy." *Alternatives* 22, no. 1 (1997): 87–111.
- Beier, J. Marshall. *International Relations in Uncommon Places: Indigeneity, Cosmology, and the Limits of International Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005a.
- . "Articles of Faith: International Relations and 'Missionary' Scholarship." In *Mixed Messages: Materiality, Textuality, Missions*, edited by Gareth Griffiths and Jamie S. Scott. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005b.
- . "Inter-National Affairs: Indigeneity, Globality, and the Canadian State." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 13, no. 3 (2007): 121–31.
- Bell, Jim. "ICC to Launch Human Rights Petition on Global Warming." *Nunatsiaq News*, July 11, 2003.
- Bennett, John, and Susan Rowley, eds. *Uqalurait: An Oral History of Nunavut*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004.
- Bennion, Thomas. "Ngāti Apa Ki Te Waipounamu Trust v Her Majesty the Queen & Others." *Maori Law Review*, August 1999.
- Berndt, Ronald M. *An Adjustment Movement in Arnhem Land*. Paris: Mouton, 1962.
- . "External Influences on the Aboriginal." *Hemisphere* 9, no. 3 (1965): 2–9.
- Berndt, Ronald M., and Catherine H. Berndt. *The World of the First Australians*. Adelaide: Rigby, 1985.
- Bhabha, Homi. "Representation and the Colonial Text: A Critical Exploration of Some Forms of Mimeticism." In *The Theory of Reading*, edited by Frank Gloversmith. Brighton: Harvester, 1984.
- , ed. *Nation and Narration*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- . *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Biersack, Aletta. "History and Theory in Anthropology." In *Clio in Oceania: Toward a Historical Anthropology*, edited by Aletta Biersack. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990.
- Biolsi, Thomas. "Imagined Geographies: Sovereignty, Indigenous Space, and American Indian Struggle." *American Ethnologist* 32, no. 2 (2005): 239–59.

- Binns, R. A., and Isabel McBryde. *A Petrological Analysis of Ground-Edge Artefacts from Northern New South Wales*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, 1972.
- Blainey, Geoffrey. *Triumph of the Nomads: A History of Ancient Australia*. South Melbourne: Macmillan, 1975.
- Blaser, Mario, Ravi de Costa, Deborah McGregor, and William Coleman, eds. *Indigenous Peoples and Autonomy: Insights for a Global Age*. Vancouver: UBC Press, forthcoming.
- Blaser, Mario, Harvey A. Feit, and Glenn McRae. "Introduction." In *In The Way of Development: Indigenous Peoples, Life Projects and Globalization*, edited by Mario Blaser, Harvey A. Feit and Glenn McRae. London: Zed Books, 2004.
- Bloomfield, Lincoln P. "The Arctic: Last Unmanaged Frontier." *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 1 (1981): 87–105.
- Blundell, V., and R. Layton. "Marriage, Myth and Models of Exchange in the West Kimberleys." *Mankind* 11, no. 3 (1978): 231–45.
- Boas, Franz. "Indian Tribes of the Lower Fraser River." *64th Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science for 1890*. London, 1894.
- . *von der Nordpazifischen Kuste Americas*. Berlin: A. Asher, 1895. Republished in translation in Franz Boaz, *Indian Myths & Legends from the North Pacific Coast of America*, edited by Randy Bouchard and Dorothy Kennedy. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 2005.
- Bogado, Aura. "An Interview with Subcomandante Marcos." *CounterPunch*, 2006. <http://www.counterpunch.org/bogado03102006.html> (accessed March 9, 2007).
- Briggs, Jean L. *Never in Anger: Portrait of an Eskimo Family*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- British Columbia. "Executive Council Committee Report, approved by the Lieutenant-Governor on 6 January 1876." *Papers Connected with the Indian Land Question, 1850–1875*. Victoria: Richard Wolfenden, Government Printer, 1875; reproduction, 1987.
- Broadhead, Lee-Anne. *International Environmental Politics: The Limits of Green Diplomacy*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2002.
- Bruyneel, Kevin. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Brysk, Alison. *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Buchan, Bruch. "The Empire of Political Thought: Civilization, Savagery and Perceptions of Indigenous Government." *History of the Human Sciences* 18, no. 2 (2005): 1–22.
- Cairns, Alan. "Afterword: International Dimensions of the Citizen Issue for Indigenous Peoples/Nations." *Citizenship Studies* 7, no. 4 (2003): 497–512.
- Cajete, Gregory. *Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence*. Santa Fe: Clear Light, 2000.

- Campbell, David. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992.
- Canada. *The High Arctic Relocation: A Report on the 1953–55 Relocation*. Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, 1994.
- . “Looking Forward, Looking Back.” *Final Report: Vol. 1*. Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services Canada, 1996.
- Carlson, Keith Thor. “The Power of Place, the Problem of Time: A Study of History and Aboriginal Collective Identity.” PhD diss., History Department, University of British Columbia, 2003.
- . “Rethinking Dialogue and History: The King’s Promise and the 1906 Aboriginal Delegation to London.” *Native Studies Review* 16, no. 2 (2005): 1–38.
- Carr, Edward Hallett. *The Twenty Years’ Crisis, 1919–1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. London: Macmillan, 1940.
- Cash, John. “The Political/Cultural Unconscious and the Process of Reconciliation.” *Postcolonial Studies* 7, no. 2 (2004): 165–75.
- Cashdan, Elizabeth. “Territoriality among Human Foragers: Ecological Models and an Application to Four Bushman Groups.” *Current Anthropology* 24, no. 1 (1983): 47–66.
- Chatterjee, Pratap, and Matthias Finger. *The Earth Brokers: Power, Politics and World Development*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Chow, Rey. *Woman and Chinese Modernity: The Politics of Reading between West and East*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.
- Clark, A. Kim. “Ecuadorian Indians, the Nation, and Class in Historical Perspective: Rethinking a ‘New’ Social Movement.” *Anthropologica* 47, no. 1 (2005): 53–65.
- Clark, Grahame. “Traffic in Stone Axe and Adze Blades.” *Economic History Review* 18 (1965): 1–28.
- Clarke, Philip. *Where the Ancestors Walked: Australia as an Aboriginal Landscape*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin, 2003.
- Clastres, Pierre. *Archeology of Violence*. Translated by Jeanine Herman. New York: Semiotext(e), 1994.
- Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, eds. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Coates, Kenneth. *Canada’s Colonies: A History of the Yukon and Northwest Territories*. Toronto: Lorimer, 1985.
- . *A Global History of Indigenous Peoples: Struggle and Survival*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Cochran, Patricia A. L. “Statement by Patricia Cochran, Chair Inuit Circumpolar Council to the Secretary-General’s High Level Event on Climate Change.” UN General Assembly, New York, December 24, 2007.

- Cohen, Felix S. *Handbook of Federal Indian Law*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971.
- Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth. *Why I Can't Read Wallace Stegner and Other Essays: A Tribal Voice*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996.
- Corntassel, Jeff J. "Who is Indigenous? 'Peoplehood' and Ethnonationalist Approaches to Rearticulating Indigenous identity." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 9, no. 1 (2003): 75–100.
- . "From Rights to Responsibilities: Rethinking Local and Global Pathways to Indigenous Self-Determination." Paper presented at the International Citizenship Conference at Syracuse University of Law, New York, 2007.
- Corntassel, Jeff J., and T. H. Primeau. "Indigenous 'Sovereignty' and International Law: Revised Strategies for Pursuing 'Self-Determination.'" *Human Rights Quarterly* 17 (1995): 343–65.
- Coulthard, Glen. "Nuu-chah-nulth Struggles Against Sexual Violence: Interview with Chiinuuk (Ruth Ogilvie) and Na'cha'uaht (Cliff Atleo, Jr.)." *New Socialist* (Special Issue on Indigenous Resurgence) 58 (2006): 28–31.
- Cox, Robert, with Timothy J. Sinclair. *Approaches to World Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Crawford, Neta C. "A Security Regime among Democracies: Cooperation among Iroquois Nations." *International Organization* 48, no. 3 (1994): 345–85.
- CRIAW (Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women). *Intersectional Feminist Frameworks: An Emerging Vision*. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women, 2006. http://www.criaw-icref.ca/indexFrame_e.htm (accessed March 9, 2007).
- CRTFCA (Chicago Religious Task Force on Central America). *Dangerous Memories: Invasion and Resistance Since 1492*. Chicago: CRTFCA, 1995.
- Curley, Tagak. "Transcripts of the First ITC meeting." 1971. <http://www.itk.ca/corporate/history-origin-transcript-first-meeting.php> (accessed March 18, 2007).
- Dahl, Jens, Jack Hicks, and Peter Jull. *Nunavut: Inuit Regain Control of Their Lands and Their Lives*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 2000.
- Damas, David, ed. *Handbook of North American Indians: Arctic*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1984.
- Damodaran, Vinita. "The Politics of Marginality and the Construction of Indigeneity in Chotanagpur." *Postcolonial Studies* 9, no. 2 (2006): 179–96.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- de Costa, Ravi. "Identity, Authority, and the Moral Worlds of Indigenous Petitions." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 48, no. 3 (2006a): 669–98.
- . *A Higher Authority: Indigenous Transnationalism and Australia*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2006b.
- Delâge, Denys. *Le pays renversé: Amérindien et Européen en Amérique du Nord-Est, 1600–1664*. Montréal: Boréal, 1995.

- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr., and Raymond J. DeMallie. *Documents of American Indian Diplomacy, Treaties, Agreements and Conventions, 1775–1979, Vol 1*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- . *Positions*. Translated by Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Dick, Lyle. *Muskox Land: Ellesmere Island in the Age of Contact*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2001.
- Dickason, Olive Patricia. *The Myth of the Savage*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1984.
- . *A History of the Founding Peoples from the Earliest Times*. Tulsa: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992.
- Dogan, Mattei. "The New Social Sciences: Cracks in the Disciplinary Walls." *International Social Science Journal* 49, no. 3 (1997): 429–43.
- Doty, Roxanne Lynn. *Imperial Encounters: The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Duncan, Gary. "IMF gives bleak warning on dangers of global recession." *Times Online*, April 11, 2008. <http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/economics/article3716365.ece> (accessed December 1, 2008).
- Dunsmore, Roger. *Earth's Mind: Essays in Native Literature*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.
- Duran, Eduardo. *Native American Post-Colonial Psychology*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1995.
- Durie, Mason. *Nga Kahui Pou: Launching Maori Futures*. Wellington: Huia, 2003.
- During, Simon. "Postcolonialism and Globalisation: A Dialectical Relation After All?" *Postcolonial Studies* 1, no. 1 (1998): 31–47.
- Edwards, Peter. "'The Warrior Spirit is in all of us' Clan Mothers Play Significant Role: Mohawks Claiming Major Victory." *Toronto Star*, April 22, 2006. <http://sisis.nativeweb.org/actionalert/updates/060422torontostar-a.html> (accessed March 9, 2007).
- Eira, Sara Beate. *Sáme konvenšuvdna maŋŋona*. NRK Sámi Radio, 2007. http://www.nrk.no/kanal/nrk_sami_radio/1.4044660 (accessed December 17, 2007).
- Elliott, Lorraine. "Global Governance." In *Global Governance: Critical Perspectives*, edited by Rorden Wilkinson and Steve Hughes. London: Routledge, 2002.
- . *The Global Politics of the Environment*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- Enloe, Cynthia. *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Epp, Roger. "At the Wood's Edge: Toward a Theoretical Clearing for Indigenous Diplomacies in International Relations." In *International Relations Still an*

- American Science? Towards Diversity in International Thought*, edited by Robert Cranford and Darryl Jarvis. New York: SUNY Press, 2001.
- Esther, Comandante. "Speech before the Mexican Congress." In *Dissident Women: Gender and Cultural Politics in Chiapas*, edited by Shannon Speed, R. Aída Hernández Castillo, and Lynn M. Stephen. Translated by Irlandesa. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983/2002.
- Fanon, Franz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. 1952. Reprint, New York: Grove, 1967.
- . *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington. 1961. Reprint, New York: Grove, 1968.
- Fenge, Terry. "POPs and Inuit: Influencing the Global Agenda." In *Northern Lights Against POPs: Combatting Toxic Threats in the Arctic*, edited by David Leonard Downie and Terry Fenge. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003.
- Ferguson, R. Brian. "Blood of the Leviathan: Western Contact and Warfare in Amazonia." *American Ethnologist* 17, no. 2 (1990): 237–57.
- Fisher, Robin. *Contact and Conflict: Indian-European Relations in British Columbia, 1774–1890*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1977.
- Fixico, Donald. *The American Indian Mind in a Linear World: American Indian Studies and Traditional Knowledge*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Flannery, Tim F. *The Explorers*. Melbourne: Text Pub, 1998.
- Forest, Pierre-Gerlier, and Thierry Rodon. "Les activités internationales des autochtones du Canada." *Études internationales* 26, no. 1 (1995): 35–58.
- Fossett, Renée. *In Order to Live Untroubled: Inuit of the Central Arctic 1550–1940*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2001.
- Foster, Hamar. "Letting Go The Bone: The Idea of Indian Title in British Columbia, 1849–1927." In *Essays in the History of Canadian Law, Vol. VI: British Columbia and the Yukon*, edited by Hamar Foster and John McLaren. Toronto: University of Toronto Press and the Osgoode Society for Legal History, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.
- . "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* 16, no. 1 (1986): 22–27.
- . "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
- Franke, Mark F. N. "Self-determination versus the Determination of Self: A Critical Reading of the Colonial Ethics Inherent to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." *Journal of Global Ethics* 3, no. 3 (2007): 359–79.

- Gaddis, John Lewis. *The Long Peace: Inquiries into the History of the Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Post-colonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Gegeo, David Welchman. "Cultural Rupture and Indigeneity: The Challenges of (Re)visioning 'Place' in the Pacific." *The Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2 (2001): 491–507.
- Ghosh, Amitav. *In an Antique Land*. New Delhi: Ravi Dayal, 1992.
- Ghosh, Kaushik. "Between Global Flows and Local Dams: Indigenousness, Locality, and the Transnational Sphere in Jharkhand, India." *Cultural Anthropology* 21, no. 4 (2006): 501–34.
- Glissant, Edouard. *Caribbean Discourse*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996.
- . *Poetics of Relation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Goodale, Mark. "Reclaiming Modernity: Indigenous Cosmopolitanism and the Coming of the Second Revolution in Bolivia." *American Ethnologist* 33, no. 4 (2006): 634–49.
- Grant, Shelagh. *Sovereignty or Security? Government Policy in the Canadian North, 1936–1950*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1988.
- Gray, Charlotte. *Flint and Feather: The Life and Times of E. Pauline Johnson Tekahionwake*. Toronto: HarperCollins, 2002.
- Grim, John A., ed. *Indigenous Traditions and Ecology: The Interbeing of Cosmology and Community*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Grossman, Michele, and Cuthbert, Denise. "Resisting Aboriginalities." *Postcolonial Studies* 1, no. 1 (1998): 109–24.
- Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences. *Open the Social Sciences*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Gullestad, Marianne. "Imagined Sameness: Shifting Notions of 'Us' and 'Them' in Norway." In *Forestillingen om "den andre"*, edited by Line Alice Ytrebus. Kristiansand: Norwegian Academic, 2001.
- Guyver, Robert. "History Curricula in England and New Zealand: Identity, Belonging and the Case for Valuing an Historical Perspective." *Research Papers in Education Online, the Higher Education Academy*. 2008. <http://escalate.ac.uk/4555> (accessed December 1, 2008).
- Haapala, Eero. "Saamen kielilaki lähes tuntematon viranomaisille." *Lapin Kansa* 29, no. 12 (2007): 1.
- Hall, Stuart. "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power." In *Modernity: An introduction to Modern Sciences*, edited by Stuart Hall, David Held, Dan Hubert, and Kenneth Thompson. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1996.
- Harding, Sandra. *Is Science Multicultural? Postcolonialisms, Feminisms, and Epistemologies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

- Harper, Kenn. *Give Me My Father's Body: The Life of Minik, The New York Eskimo*. Frobisher Bay: Blacklead Books, 1986.
- Harris, Douglas. "The Nlha7k-pmx Meeting at Lytton, 1879, and the Rule of Law." *BC Studies* 108 (1995–96): 5–28.
- Harris, R. Cole. *The Resettlement of British Columbia: Essays on Colonialism and Geographical Change*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997.
- . *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002.
- Hayson, Veyan. "The Struggle for Recognition: Labrador Inuit Negotiations for Land Rights and Self-Government." *Études Inuit Studies* 16, no. 1–2 (1995): 179–98.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962.
- Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldplatt, and Jonathan Perraton. *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Henare, Manuka. "Tapu, Mana, Mauri, Hau, Wairua: A Maori Philosophy of Vitalism and Cosmos." In *Indigenous Traditions and Ecology: The Interbeing of Cosmology and Community*, edited by John A. Grim. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Henriksen, John B. *Saami Parliamentary Co-operation: An Analysis*. Guovdageaidnu: Nordic Sámi Institute, 1999.
- . *Case Studies: Different Forms of Indigenous Self-Government and Autonomy*. New Delhi: TPPRC/KREDDHA Seminar on Autonomy, 2004.
- Hernández Castillo, R. Aída. "Gendered Violence and Neocolonialism: Indigenous Women Confronting Counterinsurgency Violence." Translated by Mariana Mora. *Latin American Perspectives* 35 (2008): 151–55.
- Hernández Castillo, R. Aída. "National Law and Indigenous Customary Law: The Struggle for Justice of Indigenous Women in Chiapas, Mexico." In *Gender Justice, Development, and Rights*, edited by Maxine Molyneux and Shahra Razavi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Hiatt, L. R. *Arguments About Aborigines: Australia and the Evolution of Social Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Hirtz, Frank. "It Takes Modern Means to be Traditional: On Recognizing Indigenous Cultural Communities in the Philippines." *Development and Change* 34, no. 5 (2003): 887–914.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. New York: Penguin, 1968.
- Hobson, John. *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004.
- Hodgson, Dorothy L. "Introduction: Comparative Perspectives on the Indigenous Rights Movement in Africa and the Americas." *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 4 (2002a): 1037–49.
- . "Precarious Alliances: The Cultural Politics and Structural Predicaments of the Indigenous Rights Movement in Tanzania." *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 4 (2002b): 1086–87.

- Hopson, E. "Speech: Request for Lilly Endowment Grant Support, First International Inuit Community Conference." September 9, 1975. <http://www.ebenhopson.com/papers/1975/LillyApp.html> (accessed March 29, 2007).
- . Testimony before the 1974–6 Berger Inquiry into the Construction of a Pipeline in the Mackenzie Valley on the Experience of the Arctic Slope Inupiat with Oil and Gas Development in the Arctic." 1976. <http://www.ebenhopson.com/papers/1976/BergerSpeech.html> (accessed March 29, 2007).
- . "Address to the London Press Corps." June 23, 1978. <http://www.ebenhopson.com/papers/1978/London.html> (accessed March 29, 2007).
- Huebert, Rob. "The Arctic Council and Northern Aboriginal Peoples." In *Issues in the North, Volume 3*, edited by Jill Oakes and Rick Riewe. Edmonton: Canadian Circumpolar Institute, 1998a.
- . "New Directions in Circumpolar Cooperation: Canada, the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy, and the Arctic Council." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 5, no. 2 (1998b): 37–57.
- Hulme, Peter, and Ludmilla Jordanova. "Introduction." In *The Enlightenment and its Shadows*, edited by Peter Hulme and Ludmilla Jordanova. London: Routledge, 1990.
- ICC (Inuit Circumpolar Conference/Council). *Principles and Elements for a Comprehensive Arctic Policy*. Montreal: Centre for Northern Studies and Research, 1992.
- . *Inuit Circumpolar Council Charter*. 2008. http://inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?auto_slide=&ID=374&Lang=En&Parent_ID=&current_slide_num= (accessed October 1, 2008).
- Igoe, Jim. "Becoming Indigenous Peoples: Difference, Inequality, and the Globalization of East African Identity Politics." *African Affairs* 105, no. 420 (2006): 399–420.
- IWIF (International Indigenous Women's Forum). *Mairin Iwanka Raya: Indigenous Women Stand against Violence*. International Indigenous Women's Forum, 2006. <http://www.madre.org/fimi/vaiwreport06.pdf> (accessed March 9, 2007).
- Inayatullah, Naeem, and David L. Blaney. *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Iorns, Catherine J. "Indigenous Peoples and Self Determination: Challenging State Sovereignty." *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* 24, no. 165 (1992): 199–348.
- Iorns Magallanes, Catherine J. "International Human Rights and their Impact on Domestic Law on Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Australia, Canada and New Zealand." In *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Australia, Canada and New Zealand*, edited by Paul Havemann. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Isaacs, Jennifer. *Australian Dreaming: 40,000 years of Aboriginal History*. Sydney: Lansdowne, 1979.
- Isin, Engin F. *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

- Ittinuar, Peter. "Teach an Eskimo How to Read . . . : Conversations with Peter Freuchen Ittinuar." In *Inuit Voices in the Making of Nunavut*, edited by Thierry Rodon. Iqaluit: Nunavut Arctic College, 2008.
- Iverson, Duncan, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders, eds. *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- IWGIA (International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs). *Indigenous Affairs: Special Issue on Indigenous Women 1–2*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 2004.
- Jackson, Jean E., and Warren, Kay B. "Indigenous Movements in Latin America, 1992–2004: Controversies, Ironies, New Directions." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34 (2005): 549–73.
- Jarmon, Michelle. "Exploring the World of the Different in Leslie Marmon Silko's *Almanac of the Dead*." *MELUS* 31, no. 3 (2006): 147–69.
- Jennings, Francis. *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1976.
- Jervis, Robert. "Security Regimes." *International Organization* 36, no. 2 (1982): 357–78.
- Jhappan, Radha. "A Global Community? Supranational Strategies of Canada's Aboriginal Peoples." *Journal of Indigenous Studies* 3, no. 1 (1992): 59–91.
- Josefsen, Eva. "Norwegian Legislation and Administration: Saami Land Rights." *Gáldu Cála—Journal of Indigenous Peoples Rights* 1 (2007a).
- . "The Saami and the National Parliaments: Channels for Political Influence." *Gáldu Cála—Journal of Indigenous Peoples Rights* 2 (2007b).
- Joseph, May. *Nomadic Identities: The Performance of Citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Jull, Peter. "L'internationalisme arctique et inuit." *Revue Etudes internationales* 20, no. 1 (1989): 115–30.
- . "Them Eskimo Mob: International Implications of Nunavut." Unpublished Report. Royal Commission on Aboriginal People, Ottawa, 1993.
- . "Through a Glass Darkly: Scandinavian Sami Policy in Foreign Perspective." In *Becoming Visible: Indigenous Politics and Self-Government*, edited by Terje Brantenberg, Janne Hansen and Henry Minde. Tromsø: Centre for Sami Studies, University of Tromsø, 1995.
- Jung, Courtney. "The Politics of Indigenous Identity: Neoliberalism, Cultural Rights, and the Mexican Zapatistas." *Social Research* 70, no. 2 (2003): 433–61.
- Karlsson, Bengt G. "Anthropology and the 'Indigenous Slot': Claims to and Debates About Indigenous Peoples' Status in India." *Critique of Anthropology* 23, no. 4 (2003): 403–23.
- Keal, Paul. *European Conquest and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: The Moral Backwardness of International Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Keen, Ian. *Aboriginal Economy & Society: Australia at the Threshold of Colonisation*. South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2004.

- Kelly, Robert L. *The Foraging Spectrum: Diversity in Hunter-Gatherer Lifeways*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995.
- Kelsey, Jane. *Reclaiming the Future: New Zealand and the Global Economy*. Wellington: Bridget Williams, 1999.
- Kemal, Salim, and Ivan Gaskell. *Politics and Aesthetics in the Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Kingsbury, Benedict. "The Treaty of Waitangi: Some International Law Aspects." In *Waitangi: Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*, edited by I. H. Kawharu. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- . "'Indigenous Peoples' in International Law: A Constructivist Approach to the Asian Controversy." *American Journal of International Law* 92, no. 3 (1998): 414–57.
- Knutsen, Torbjorn L. *A History of International Relations Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992.
- Korpijaakko, Kaisa. "Sami Land Law: Possible or Impossible?" In *Changes in Contemporary Northern Societies*, edited by Ludger Müller-Wille and Linna W. Müller-Wille. Montreal/Guovdageaidnu: Nordic Sami Institute/Northern Studies Program, McGill University, 1993.
- Korpijaakko-Labba, Kaisa. *Saamelaisten oikeusasemasta Suomessa*. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta, 2000.
- Krech, Shepard, III. "Bringing Linear Time Back In." *Ethnohistory* 53, no. 3 (2006): 567–93.
- Ku, Kun-hui. "Rights to Recognition: Minority/Indigenous Politics in the Emerging Taiwanese Nationalism." *Social Analysis* 49, no. 2 (2005): 99–121.
- Kusugak, Jose. "The Tide Has Shifted: Nunavut Works for Us, and It Offers a Lesson for the Broader Global Community." In *Nunavut: Inuit Regain Control of Their Lands and Their Lives*, edited by Jens Dahl, Jack Hicks, and Peter Jull. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 2000.
- Lâm, Maïvân Clech. *At the Edge of the State: Indigenous Peoples and Self-Determination*. Ardsley: Transnational, 2000.
- Lashley, Marilyn E. "Implementing Treaty Settlements via Indigenous Institutions: Social Justice and Detribalization in New Zealand." *The Contemporary Pacific* 12, no. 1 (2000): 1–55.
- Lauritzen, Peter. *Oil and Amulets: Inuit, A People United at the Top of the World*. St. John's: Breakwater, 1983.
- Lawrey, A. "Contemporary Efforts to Guarantee Indigenous Rights under International Law." *Vanderbilt Journal of International Law* 23, no. 4 (1990): 703–77.
- Lee, Richard Borshay. "Twenty-First Century Indigenism." *Anthropological Theory* 6, no. 4 (2006): 455–79.
- Lehtola, Veli-Pekka. "Nimettömän kansan historiasta: Saamelaisten historiantutkimuksen näkymiä." *Historia Fenno-Ugrica* 1, no. 1–2 (1996): 11–22.
- Lindroth, Marjo. "Indigenous-State Relations in the UN: Establishing the Indigenous Forum." *Polar Record* 42, no. 222 (2006): 239–48.

- Linklater, Andrew. "The Achievements of Critical Theory." In *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, edited by Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Lourandos, Harry. *Continent of Hunter-Gatherers: New Perspectives in Australian Prehistory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Lynge, Aqqaluk. "Address to the Ministerial Summit of Arctic Oceans Agenda Item: Issues Relating to the Local Inhabitants and Indigenous Communities." Ilulissat, Greenland, May 28, 2008.
- Lyons, Oren. "Spirituality, Equality and Natural Law." In *Pathways to Self-Determination: Canadian Indians and the Canadian State*, edited by Leroy Little Bear, Menno Boldt, and J. Anthony Long. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince*. Translated by Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Macklem, Patrick. *Indigenous Difference and the Constitution of Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.
- Macknight, C. C. *The Voyage to Marege: Macassan Trepangers in Northern Australia*. Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 1976.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. "Beyond Settler and Native as Political Identities: Overcoming the Political Legacy of Colonialism." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43, no. 4 (2001): 651–64.
- Manuel, George, and Michael Posluns. *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*. Toronto: Collier and MacMillan, 1974.
- Marcos, Subcomandante. "Twelve Women in the Twelfth Year: The Moment of War, March 11, 1996." In *Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings, Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos*, edited by Juana Ponce de León. New York: Seven Stories, 2001.
- Marcus, Alan. *Out in the Cold: The Legacy of Canada's Inuit Relocation Experiment in the High Arctic*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 1992.
- . *Relocating Eden: The Image and Politics of Inuit Exile in the Canadian Arctic*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1995.
- Marglin, Stephen A. "Towards the Decolonization of the Mind." In *Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture, and Resistance*, edited by Frédérique Apffel Marglin and Stephen A. Marglin. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Martin-Hill, Dawn. "Resistance, Determination and Perseverance of the Lubicon Cree Women." In *In The Way of Development: Indigenous Peoples, Life Projects and Globalization*, edited by Mario Blaser, Harvey A. Feit, and Glenn McRae. London: Zed Books, 2004.
- Mattelart, Armand. "Communications/Excommunications: An Interview with Armand Mattelart." Conducted by Costas M. Constantinou, *Review of International Studies* 34 (2008): 21–42.

- McBryde, I. "Goods from Another Country: Exchange Networks and the People of the Lake Eyre Basin." In *Australians to 1788*, edited by D. J. Mulvaney and J. P. White. Broadway: Fairfax Syme & Weldon Associates, 1987.
- McCarthy, F. D. "'Trade' in Aboriginal Australia, and 'Trade' Relationships with Torres Strait, New Guinea and Malaya." *Oceania* 10, no. 1 (1939a): 80–104.
- . "'Trade' in Aboriginal Australia, and 'Trade' Relationships with Torres Strait, New Guinea and Malaya." *Oceania* 10, no. 2 (1939b): 171–95.
- . "'Trade' in Aboriginal Australia, and 'Trade' Relationships with Torres Strait, New Guinea and Malaya." *Oceania* 9, no. 4 (1939c): 405–38.
- McGee, Robert. *The Last Imaginary Place: A Human History of the Arctic World*. Toronto: Key Porter Books, 2004.
- McIntosh, Ian S. "Personal Names and the Negotiation of Change: Reconsidering Arnhem Land's Adjustment Movement." *Anthropological Forum* 14, no. 2 (2004): 141–62.
- McKeon, Michael. "The Origins of Interdisciplinary Studies." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28, no. 1 (1994): 7–28.
- McMurty, John. *Unequal Freedoms: The Global Market as an Ethical System*. Toronto: Garamond, 1998.
- . *The Cancer Stage of Capitalism*. Melbourne: Pluto, 1999.
- Mendes, Chico. *Fight for the Forest: Chico Mendes in His Own Words*. Revised ed. New York: Monthly Review, 1992.
- Mignolo, Walter D. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality and Colonization*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Millán, Mágina. "Zapatista Indigenous Women." In *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*, edited by John Holloway and Eloína Peláez. London: Pluto, 1998.
- . "Indigenous Women and Zapatismo: New Horizons of Visibility." In *Dissident Women: Gender and Cultural Politics in Chiapas*, edited by Shannon Speed, R. Aída Hernández Castillo, and Lynn M. Stephen. Translated by María Vinós. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Miller, J. R. *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.
- Min Áigi. "Historjjálaš láhka." *Min Áigi*, May 20, 2005a, p. 2.
- . "Norga álgoálbmogiid láidesteaddjin." *Min Áigi*, March 16, 2005b, p. 2.
- Mitchell, Marybelle. *From Talking Chiefs to a Native Corporate Elite: The Birth of Class and Nationalism among Canadian Inuit*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, eds. *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.
- Mohawk, John, and Oren Lyons, eds. *Exiled in the Land of the Free*. Sante Fe: Clear Light, 1992.

- Mohawk, John, and Akwesasne Notes. *Basic Call to Consciousness*. Summertown: Book Publishing Company, 1992.
- Mongia, Padmini, ed. *Contemporary Post-colonial Theory: A Reader*. London: Edward Arnold, 1996.
- Moore-Gilbert, Bart. *Post-colonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics*. London: Verso, 1997.
- Mora, Mariana. "Zapatismo: Gender, Power, and Social Transformation." In *The Women and War Reader*, edited by Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- . "Zapatista Anticapitalist Politics and the 'Other Campaign': Learning from the Struggle for Indigenous Rights and Autonomy." *Latin American Perspectives* 34, no. 2 (2007): 64–77.
- Moreiras, Alberto. *The Exhaustion of Difference: The Politics of Latin American Cultural Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. *Ancient Society: Or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress From Savagery Through Barbarism to Civilization*. Chicago: C. H. Kerr, 1877.
- Morgan, Rhiannon. "Advancing Indigenous Rights at the United Nations: Strategic Framing and Its Impact on the Normative Development of International Law." *Social and Legal Studies* 13, no. 4 (2004): 481–500.
- . "On Political Institutions and Social Movement Dynamics: The Case of the United Nations and the Global Indigenous Movement." *International Political Science Review* 28, no. 3 (2007): 273–92.
- Morgenthau, Hans. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 6th ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985.
- Morton, James W. *Capilano: The Story of a River*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1970.
- Muehlebach, Andrea. "'Making Place' at the United Nations: Indigenous Cultural Politics at the U.N. Working Group on Indigenous Populations." *Cultural Anthropology* 16, no. 3 (2001): 415–48.
- . "What Self in Self-Determination? Notes from the Frontiers of Transnational Indigenous Activism." *Identities* 10 (2003): 241–68.
- Mulhall, Stephen. *Heidegger and Being and Time*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Mulvaney, D. J. "The End of the Beginning: 6000 Years Ago to 1788." In *Australians to 1788*, edited by D. J. Mulvaney and J. P. White. Broadway: Fairfax Syme & Weldon Associates, 1987.
- . *Encounters in Place: Outsiders and Aboriginal Australians, 1606–1985*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1989.
- Muñoz, Alejandro Anaya. "Explaining the Politics of Recognition of Ethnic Diversity and Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Oaxaca, Mexico." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 23, no. 4 (2004): 414–33.
- Myers, Fred R. *Pintupi Country, Pintupi Self: Sentiment, Place, and Politics among Western Desert Aborigines*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1986.

- Myntti, Kristian. "Summary in English." *Suomen saamelaisten yhteiskunnallinen osallistuminen ja kulttuuri-itsehallinto*. Helsinki: Oikeusministeriö, 1997.
- Nah, Alice M. "Negotiating Indigenous Identity in Postcolonial Malaysia: Beyond Being 'Not quite/Not Malay.'" *Social Identities* 9, no. 4 (2003): 511–34.
- Nandy, Ashis. *The Savage Freud and Other Essays on Possible and Retrievable Selves*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- . *Exiled at Home: Comprising at the Edge of Psychology, the Intimate Enemy and Creating a Nationality*. London: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Nandy, Ashis, Achyut Yagnik, and Shikha Trivedy. *Creating a Nationality: The Ramjanmabhumi Movement and Fear of the Self*. London: Oxford, 1998.
- Nash, June C. *Mayan Visions: The Quest for Autonomy in the Age of Globalization*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Newman, Stephanie, ed. *International Relations Theory and the Third World*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Nichols, Robert Lee. "Realizing the Social Contract: The Case of Colonialism and Indigenous Peoples." *Contemporary Political Theory* 4 (2005): 42–65.
- Niezen, Ronald. *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- . "Recognizing Indigenism: Canadian Unity and the International Movement of Indigenous Peoples." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42 (2000): 119–48.
- Niranjana, Tejaswini. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Nungak, Zebedee. "Why Quebec Inuit oppose sovereignty." *Nunatsiaq News*, November 3, 1995.
- . "Pigatsi Pivugut—You Attain, Therefore We Attain." In *Nunavut: Inuit Regain Control of Their Lands and Their Lives*, edited by Jens Dahl, Jack Hicks, and Peter Jull. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 2000.
- Nuttall, Mark. *Protecting the Arctic: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Survival*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 1998.
- . *The Arctic: Environment, People, Policy*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 2000.
- Okolie, Andrew C. "The Appropriation of Difference: State and the Construction of Ethnic Identities in Nigeria." *Identity* 3, no. 1 (2003): 67–92.
- Olivera, Mercedes. "Subordination and Rebellion: Indigenous Peasant Women in Chiapas Ten Years after the Zapatista Uprising." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 32, no. 3–4 (2005): 608–28.
- Olsson, Sven E., and Dave Lewis. "Welfare Rules and Indigenous Rights: The Sami People and the Nordic Welfare States." In *Social Welfare with Indigenous Peoples*, edited by John Dixon and Robert P. Scheurell. London: Routledge, 1995.

- Ong, Aihwa. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Oscó, Marcelo Fernandez. "Ayllu: Decolonial Critical Thinking and (An)Other Autonomy." In *Indigenous Peoples and Autonomy: Insights for a Global Age*, edited by Mario Blaser, Ravi de Costa, Deborah McGregor, and William Coleman. Vancouver: UBC Press, forthcoming.
- Otero, Gerardo. "Global Economy, Local Politics: Indigenous Struggles, Civil Society and Democracy." *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 37, no. 2 (2004): 325–46.
- Otero, Gerardo, and Heidi A. Jugenitz. "Challenging National Borders from Within: The Political-Class Formation of Indigenous Peasants in Latin America." *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 40, no. 5 (2003): 503–24.
- Otto, D. "A Question of Law or Politics? Indigenous Claims to Sovereignty in Australia." *Syracuse Journal of International Law and Commerce* 21 (1997): 65–103.
- Paine, Robert. *The White Arctic: Anthropological Essays on Tutelage and Ethnicity*. St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1977.
- Palmer, Lisa. "'Nature', Place and the Recognition of Indigenous Polities." *Australian Geographer* 37, no. 1 (2006): 33–43.
- Palomo, Nellys. "For the Right to a Voice and to Be Free: Building Our Own Identity." In *Indigenous Women: The Right to a Voice*, edited by Diana Vinding. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 1998.
- Parisi, Laura, and Jeff Corntassel. "In Pursuit of Self-Determination: Indigenous Women's Challenges to Traditional Diplomatic Spaces." *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 13, no. 3 (Spring 2007): 81–98.
- Pellarolo, Sirena. "Zapatista Women: A Revolutionary Process within a Revolution." Keynote speech for the International Women's Day event organized by the California State University, Los Angeles, MeChA students, March 8, 2006. http://www.inmotionmagazine.com/auto/sp_zw.html (accessed March 9, 2007).
- Peterson, Nicolas, and J. P. M. Long. *Australian Territorial Organization: A Band Perspective*. Sydney: University of Sydney, 1986.
- Peterson, Robert. "The Pan-Eskimo Movement." In *Handbook of the North American Indians: Arctic*, edited by D. Damas. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1984.
- Peterson, V. Spike, ed. *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1992.
- Plumwood, Val. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Ponting, J. Rick. "Internationalization: Perspectives on an Emerging Direction in Aboriginal Affairs." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 22, no. 3 (1990): 85–109.

- Ponting, J. Rick, and Roger Gibbins. *Out of Irrelevance*. Toronto: Butterworths, 1980.
- Porter, R. B. "The Meaning of Indigenous Nation Sovereignty." *Arizona State Law Journal* 34, no. 1 (2002): 75–112.
- Posey, Darrell A. "Commodification of the Sacred through Intellectual Property Rights." *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* 83, no. 1–2 (2002): 3–12.
- Princen, Thomas, and Matthias Finger. *Environmental NGOs in World Politics: Linking the Local and the Global*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Rao, Arati. "The Politics of Gender and Culture in International Human Rights Discourse." In *Women's Rights, Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*, edited by Julie Peters and Andrea Wolper. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Rata, Elizabeth, and Roger Openshaw, eds. *Public Policy and Ethnicity, the Politics of Ethnic Boundary Making*. London: Palgrave, 2006.
- Ray, Arthur J. *I Have Lived Here Since the World Began: An Illustrated History of Canada's Native People*. Toronto: Key Porter Books, 1999.
- Rea, K. J. *The Political Economy of the Canadian North*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.
- Reynolds, H. "The Land, the Explorers and the Aborigines." *Historical Studies* 19, no. 75 (1980): 213–26.
- Richland, Justin B. "Pragmatic Paradoxes and Ironies of Indigeneity at the 'Edge' of Hopi Sovereignty." *American Ethnologist* 34, no. 3 (2007): 540–57.
- Ridley, Matt. *The Origins of Virtue: Human Instincts and the Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Penguin, 1998.
- Robbins, Bruce, and Elsa Stamatopoulou. "Reflections on Culture and Cultural Rights." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 103, no. 2/3 (2004): 419–34.
- Robinson, Gillian, ed. *Isuma: Inuit Studies Reader*. Montreal: Isuma, 2004.
- Rohner, Ronald P., ed. *The Ethnography of Franz Boas: Letters & Diaries of Franz Boas Written on the Northwest Coast from 1886 to 1931*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Rohrer, Judy. "'Got Race?' The Production of Haole and the Distortion of Indigeneity in the Rice Decision." *The Contemporary Pacific* 18, no. 1 (2006): 1–31.
- Rosenau, James N. *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Rosing, Hans-Pavia. "Towards an Arctic Policy." *Etudes/Inuit/Studies* 9, no. 2 (1985): 15–19.
- Rosow, Stephen J. "Nature, Need and the Human World: 'Commercial Society' and the Construction of the Global Economy." In *The Global Economy as Political Space*, edited by Stephen J. Rosow, Naeem Inayatullah, and Mark Rupert. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1994.
- Rotinoshon'non:we Clan Mothers, the Women Title Holders of the Rotinoshon'non:we. "Statement by the Clan Mothers." March 20, 2006. <http://sisis.nativeweb.org/actionalert/updates/060320clanmothersstatement.html> (accessed March 9, 2007).

- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*. Translated by Donald A. Cress. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1992.
- Rowe, Mark. "Aqqaluk Lynge, 'In Conversation'" *Geographical*, February 1, 2008. <http://www.articlearchives.com/transportation-warehousing/transportation/373711-1.html> (accessed October 1, 2008).
- Royal, Ahukaramū Charles. "Indigenous WorldViews: A Comparative Study." A report on research in progress, Te Wananga-o-Raukawa, February 21, 2002. <http://www.mkta.co.nz/assets/sabbaticalreport31.1.2002.pdf> (accessed February 10, 2009).
- Rundstrom, Robert. "Indigenous Peoples and Epistemological Diversity." *Geography and Geographic Information Systems* 22, no. 1 (1995): 45–57.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Salée, Daniel, A. M. Field, and K. Horn-Miller. "De la coupe aux lèvres: L'action politique des peuples autochtones sur la scène internationale et la reconfiguration des paramètres de la citoyenneté au Canada." In *Contestation transnationale, diversité et citoyenneté dans l'espace québécois*, edited by Micheline Labelle and François Rocher. Montreal: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2004.
- Sambo, Dalee. "Indigenous Human Rights: The Role of Inuit at the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Peoples." *Études Inuit Studies* 16, no. 1–2 (1992): 27–32.
- Sami Council. *The Sami Political Program*. Åre: The Sami Conference, 1986.
- . "Frequently Asked Questions." Ohcejohka, 2007. <http://www.saamicouncil.net/?depid=1230> (accessed December 10, 2007).
- Sanders, Douglas. "Remembering Deskaheh: Indigenous Peoples and International Law." In *International Human Rights Law: Theory and Practice*, edited by Irwin Cotler and F. Pearl Eliadis. Montreal: Canadian Human Rights Foundation, 1992.
- Sassen, Saskia. *Territory, Authority and Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Scheinin, Martin. "Saamelaisten ihmisoikeudet, kulttuuri ja maakäyttö." In *Toteutuvatko saamelaisten ihmisoikeudet?* edited by M. Scheinin and T. Dahlgren. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 2001.
- . "What Are Indigenous Peoples?" In *Minorities, Peoples and Self-Determination: Essays in Honour of Patrick Thornberry*, edited by N. Ghanéa and A. Xanthaki. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2005.
- Schledermann, Peter. *Crossroads to Greenland: 3000 Years of Prehistory in the Eastern High Arctic*. Komatik Series 2. Calgary: Arctic Institute of North America, 1990.
- Scott, C. "Indigenous Self-Determination and Decolonization of the International Imagination: A Plea." *Human Rights Quarterly* 18, no. 4 (1996): 814–20.
- Shadian, Jessica. "Remaking Arctic Governance: The Construction of an Arctic Inuit Polity." *Polar Record* 42, no. 22 (2006): 249–59.

- Shapiro, Michael J. *Violent Cartographies: Mapping Cultures of War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Shaw, Karena. "Indigeneity and the International." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31, no. 1 (2002): 55–81.
- Shiva, Vandana. *Monocultures of the Mind: Perspectives on Biodiversity and Biotechnology*. London: Zed Books, 1993.
- Short, Damien. "Reconciliation, Assimilation, and the Indigenous Peoples of Australia." *International Political Science Review* 24, no. 4 (2003): 491–513.
- Silko, Leslie Marmon. *Almanac of the Dead*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991.
- Sillanpää, Lennart. *Political and Administrative Responses to Sami Self-Determination: A Comparative Study of Public Administrations in Fennoscandia on the Issue of Sami Land Title as an Aboriginal Right*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1994.
- Simard, Jean-Jacques. "Dernier épisode: un gouvernement pour le Nunavik." In *La réduction*. Québec: September, 2003.
- Simeon, Richard. *Federal-Provincial Diplomacy: The Making of Recent Policy in Canada*. 1973. Reprint, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Simon, Mary. "The Role of Inuit in International Affairs." In *Northern Voices: Inuit Writing in English*, edited by Penny Petrone. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1988.
- . "Security, Peace, and the Native Peoples of the Arctic." In *The Arctic: Choices for Peace and Security: A Public Inquiry*, edited by the True North Strong and Free Society. West Vancouver: Gordon Soules, 1989.
- . *Inuit: One Arctic—One Future*. Peterborough: Cider, 1996.
- Simpson, G. J. "The Diffusion of Sovereignty: Self-Determination in the Post Colonial Age." *Stanford Journal of International Law* 32, no. 2 (1996): 255–86.
- Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Smith, Andrea. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge: South End, 2005.
- . "Indigenous Feminism without Apology." *New Socialist* (Special Issue on Indigenous Resurgence) 58 (2006): 6–17.
- Smith, Cheryl. "Straying Beyond the Boundaries of Belief: Maori Epistemologies Inside the Curriculum." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 32, no. 1 (2006), 43–51.
- Smith, Claire, and Graham K. Ward, eds. *Indigenous Cultures in an Interconnected World*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2000.
- Smith, Heather A. "Disrupting the Global Discourse of Climate Change: The Case of Indigenous Voices." In *The Social Construction of Climate Change*, edited by Mary Pettenger. London: Ashgate, 2007.

- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. "The Native and the Neoliberal Down Under: Neoliberalism and 'Endangered Authenticities.'" In *Indigenous Experience Today*, edited by Marisol de la Cadena and Orin Starn. New York: Berg, 2007.
- Smith, Steve. "Positivism and Beyond." In *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, edited by Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Snipp, C. Matthew. *Public Policy Impacts on American Indian Economic Development*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988.
- Sokolow, Jayme A. *The Great Encounter: Native Peoples and European Settler in the Americas, 1492–1800*. New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2003.
- Speed, Shannon. "Rights at the Intersection: Gender and Ethnicity in Neo-Liberal Mexico." In *Dissident Women: Gender and Cultural Politics in Chiapas*, edited by Shannon Speed, R. Aída Hernández Castillo, and Lynn M. Stephen. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. In *Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- . *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- . "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- Stainsby, MacDonald. "The Richest First Nation in Canada: Ecological and Political Life in Fort MacKay." *The Dominion: News from the Grassroots*, November 12, 2007. <http://www.dominionpaper.ca/articles/1457> (accessed December 1, 2008).
- Stephenson, Marcia. "Forging an Indigenous Counterpublic Sphere: The Taller de Historia Oral Andina in Bolivia." *Latin American Research Review* 37, no. 2 (2002): 99–118.
- Stevenson, Marc G. *Inuit, Whalers, and Cultural Persistence: Structure in Cumberland Sound and Central Inuit Social Organization*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Stewart-Harawira, Makere. *The New Imperial Order: Indigenous Responses to Globalization*. New York: Zed Books, 2005.
- . "Race and Terror in the Global Surveillance State." *The Ardent Anti-Racism & Decolonization Review* 1, no. 1 (2008): 36–40.
- Sturt, Charles. *Two Expeditions into the Interior of Southern Australia, During the Years 1828, 1829, 1830, and 1831: With Observations on the Soil, Climate, and General Resources of the Colony of New South Wales*. London: Smith Elder and Co., 1834.
- Sutton, Peter. *Native Title in Australia: An Ethnographic Perspective*. Cambridge: New York, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Swords, Alicia C. S. "Neo-Zapatista Network Politics: Transforming Democracy and Development." *Latin American Perspectives* 34 (2007): 78–93.

- Sykes, Annette. "The Sovereignty Debate: Has it Been Silenced?" *The Indigenist Intelligence Review*. 2008. <http://indigenist.blogspot.com/2008/06/sovereignty-debate-has-it-been-silenced.html> (accessed February 1, 2009).
- Sylvain, Renée. "Disorderly Development: Globalization and the Idea of 'Culture' in the Kalahari." *American Ethnologist* 32, no. 3 (2005): 354–70.
- . "'Land, Water, and Truth': San Identity and Global Indigenism." *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 4 (2002): 1074–85.
- Tarrow, Sidney. *The New Transnational Activism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Tennant, Paul. *Aboriginal Peoples and Politics: The Indian Land Question in British Columbia, 1849–1989*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1990.
- Tickner, J. Ann. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Timoney, Kevin P. "A Study of Water and Sediment Quality as Related to Public Health Issues, Fort Chipewyan, Alberta." Report published on behalf of the Nunee Health Board Society, Fort Chipewyan, Alberta, 2007.
- Tohe, Laura. "There is No Word for Feminism in My Language." *Wicazo Sa Review* 15, no. 2 (2002): 103–10.
- Tourraine, Alain. *Critique of Modernity*. Translated by David Macey. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1995.
- Tully, James. "The Struggles of Indigenous Peoples for and of Freedom." In *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, edited by Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Turner, Dale. *This Is Not a Peace Pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Tuulentie, Seija. *Meidän vähemmistömmä. Valtaväestön retoriikat saamelaiden oikeuksista käydyssä keskustelussa*. Helsinki: SKS, 2001.
- . "For and Against the Rights of the Sami People: The Argumentation of the Finnish Majority in the Debate on the Sami Rights." In *Indigenous Peoples: Resource Management and Global Rights*, edited by Svein Jentoft, Ragnar Nilsen, and Henry Minde. Delft: Eburon Academic, 2003.
- United Nations Human Rights Council. "Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." UN Doc. E/CN.4/2006/79 (2006).
- UNPFII (United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues). *Fact Sheet: Who Are Indigenous Peoples?* New York: United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, 2006. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/5session_pressrelease2_en.doc (accessed March 7, 2007).
- . "Impact of Climate Change Mitigation Measures on Indigenous Peoples and on Their Territories and Lands." 2008. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/E_C19_2008_10.pdf (accessed October 1, 2008).
- Urion, C. "Recording First Nations Traditional Knowledge." Unpublished paper, U'mista Cultural Society, 1999.
- Urry, J., and M. Walsh. "The lost 'Macassar language' of Northern Australia." *Aboriginal History* 5, no. 2 (1981): 90–108.

- Utsi, Josef Isak. Finnmarkoláhka: Vuordámušat ja váikkuhusat, April 15, 2005a, pp. 4–5.
- . “Nissonolbmot dahkkojit bogostahkan.” *Min Áigi*, September 19, 2005b: 4.
- van der Pijl, Kees. “The Second Glorious Revolution: Globalizing Elites and Historical Change.” In *International Political Economy: Understanding Global Disorder*, edited by Bjorn Hettne. Halifax: Zed Books, 1995.
- Vansina, Jan M. *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.
- Venne, Sharon Helen. *Our Elders Understand Our Rights: Evolving International Law Regarding Indigenous Rights*. Penticton: Theytus Books, 1998.
- Vinding, Diana, ed. *Indigenous Women: The Right to a Voice*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 1998.
- Viola, Herman J. *Diplomats in Buckskins*. Bluffton: Rivilo Books, 1995.
- Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest Literary Study and British Rule in India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.
- . *Outside the Fold: Conversion, Modernity, and Belief*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. *From the Enemies’ Point of View: Humanity and Divinity in an Amazonian Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Walker, R. B. J. *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Walkom, Thomas. “‘Protest Began with a Potluck’ Woman’s Event Marked 1784 Grant: British Rewarded Loyalty with Land.” *Toronto Star*, April 22, 2006. <http://sisis.nativeweb.org/action/alert/updates/060422torontostar-b.html> (accessed March 9, 2007).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. “What Are We Bounding, and Whom, When We Bound Social Research.” *Social Research* 62, no. 4 (1995): 839–56.
- . *Utopistics or, Historical Choices of the Twenty-first Century*. New York: New Press, 1998.
- . *The End of the World as We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-First Century*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- . *The Uncertainties of Knowledge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2004.
- Ward, Alan. *An Unsettled History: Treaty Claims in New Zealand Today*. Wellington: Bridget Williams, 1999.
- Wa Thiong’o, Ngugi. *Devil on the Cross*. London: Heinemann, 1982.
- . *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: J. Currey, 1986.
- Watt-Cloutier, Sheila. “Speech Given by Ms. Sheila Watt-Cloutier, President of Inuit Circumpolar Conference (Canada) And Vice-President of Inuit Circumpolar Conference; Plenary Intervention in Geneva, Switzerland, at the Third Meeting of The Inter-Governmental Negotiating Committee Toward a Global Convention

- on Persistent Organic Pollutants." June 29, 1998. <http://www.inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?ID=110&Lang=En> (accessed October 1, 2008).
- . "Speech Given by Ms. Sheila Watt-Cloutier, President of Inuit Circumpolar Conference (Canada) And Vice-President of Inuit Circumpolar Conference; Plenary Intervention in Geneva, Switzerland, at the Third Meeting of The Inter-Governmental Negotiating Committee Toward a Global Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants." September 7, 1999. http://inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?auto_slide=&ID=106&Lang=En&Parent_ID=&current_slide_num (accessed October 1, 2008).
- . "Speech Given by Ms. Sheila Watt-Cloutier, President of Inuit Circumpolar Conference (Canada) And Vice-President of Inuit Circumpolar Conference; Plenary Intervention in Bonn, Germany, at The Fourth Meeting of The Inter-Governmental Negotiating Committee Toward a Global Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants." March 20–25, 2000. http://inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?auto_slide=&ID=103&Lang=En&Parent_ID=&current_slide_num (accessed October 1, 2008).
- . "Address to the ACIA International Steering Committee given by Ms. Sheila Watt-Cloutier, President of Inuit Circumpolar Conference (Canada) and Vice-President of Inuit Circumpolar Conference on Inuit, Climate Change, and the Arctic Council Climate Impact Assessment." Ottawa, December 4, 2001. http://inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?auto_slide=&ID=94&Lang=En&Parent_ID=&current_slide_num= (accessed October 1, 2008).
- . "The Inuit Journey towards a POPs-Free World." In *Northern Lights Against POPs: Combatting Toxic Threats in the Arctic*, edited by David Leonard Downie and Terry Fenge. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003a.
- . "Speech Notes for Sheila Watt-Cloutier, Chair, Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Conference of Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change." Milan, Italy, December 10, 2003b. http://inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?auto_slide=&ID=242&Lang=En&Parent_ID=&current_slide_num= (accessed October 1, 2008).
- . "Climate Change in the Arctic: Perspectives of Indigenous Peoples." Informal Meeting to Discuss the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment." Svalbard, Norway, August 6, 2003c. http://inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?auto_slide=&ID=81&Lang=En&Parent_ID=&current_slide_num= (accessed October 1, 2008).
- . "Plenary Intervention at the Tenth COP to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change." Buenos Aires, Argentina, December 17, 2004a. http://www.inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?auto_slide=&ID=282&Lang=En&Parent_ID=&current_slide_num= (accessed October 14, 2008).
- . "Remarks by Sheila Watt-Cloutier to the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting." Iceland, November 24, 2004b. http://inuitcircumpolar.indelta.ca/index.php?auto_slide=&ID=274&Lang=En&Parent_ID=&current_slide_num= (accessed October 1, 2008).

- . "Testimony of Sheila Watt-Cloutier Chair, Inuit Circumpolar Conference." Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation. Washington, DC, September 15, 2004c. http://inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?auto_slide=&ID=261&Lang=En&Parent_ID=&current_slide_num= (accessed October 1, 2008).
- . "The Arctic and the Global Environment: Making a Difference on Climate Change." Speech to the Global Green USA Conference on Solutions for Communities Climate Summit. Beverly Hills, California, April 1, 2006. <http://inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?ID=329&Lang=En> (accessed March 18, 2007).
- Weaver, Jace. "From I-Hermeneutics to We-Hermeneutics: Native Americans and the Post-Colonial." *Semeia* 75 (1996): 153–76.
- Wendt, Alexander. "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992): 391–425.
- Whiteley, Peter. "Do 'Language Rights' Serve Indigenous Interests? Some Hopi and Other Queries." *American Anthropologist* 105, no. 4 (2003): 712–22.
- Whitt, Laurie Anne. "Indigenous Peoples and the Cultural Politics of Knowledge." In *Issues in Native American Cultural Identity*, edited by Michael K. Green. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.
- Widdowson, Frances. *Disrobing the Aboriginal Industry*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 2008.
- Williams, Patrick, and Laura Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Williams, Robert A. *The American Indian in Western Legal Thought: The Discourses of Conquest*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . *Linking Arms Together: American Indian Treaty Visions of Law & Peace, 1600–1800*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Wilmer, Franke. *The Indigenous Voice in World Politics: Since Time Immemorial*. Newbury Park: Sage, 1993.
- . "Indigenous Peoples, Marginal Sites, and the Changing Context of World Politics." In *Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations*, edited by Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1996.
- Wilson, Gary N. "Inuit Diplomacy in the Circumpolar North." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 13, no. 3 (2007): 65–80.
- Woo, Grace. "Canada's Forgotten Founders: The Modern Significance of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Application for Membership in the League of Nations." *Law, Social Justice & Global Development Journal* 1 (2003). http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/elj/lgd/2003_1/woo/ (accessed March 18, 2007).
- Woodward, M., and B. George. "The Canadian Indian Lobby of Westminster." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 18, no. 3 (1983): 119–43.
- Yle sämeradio. "Sämediggi čoaħkkin árvvostalai iežas doaimma bohtosiid." Anár, 2007. <http://lotta.yle.fi/> (accessed December 22, 2007).

- Young, E. A., and Kim Doohan. *Mobility for Survival: A Process Analysis of Aboriginal Population Movement in Central Australia*. Darwin: Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, 1989.
- Young, Iris Marion. "Hybrid Democracy: Iroquois Federalism and the Postcolonial Project." In *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, edited by Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Young, Oran R. *Arctic Politics: Conflict and Cooperation in the Circumpolar North*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1992.
- Yunupingu, G. "Opening Address." Garma 2005—Livelihood, ABC Radio National. *Latenight Live*, 2005.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. "The 'Multi-Layered Citizen': Citizenship in the Age of 'Globalization.'" *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1, no. 1 (1999): 119–36.
- Zea, Tarcila Rivera, ed. *The Roads of Indigenous Women*. Lima: CHIRAPAQ: Center of Indigenous Cultures, 1999.

This page intentionally left blank

Index

- Abele, Frances, 8, 130n1, 184
Aborigines. *See* Indigenous peoples
Ada gal'kala, Chief, 83
Agamben, Giorgio, 7, 42
Aikio, Pekka, 106
Alderete, Wara, 85
Alexie, Sherman, 194
Alfred, Taiaiake, 136–37, 145, 149
Altamirano, Isabel, 137
Alta River conflict, 101, 106, 112
American Indian Religious Freedom Act, 197, 206n11
Anawak, Jack, 116
Anderson, Benedict, 38
Anderson, Robert, 217
Anielski, Mark, 221
anthropology, 19, 21, 48, 51, 58, 61–77, 139, 151–52, 157–60, 165, 170n4
Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA), 179–81, 185n7
Arctic Council, 99, 116, 127–28, 171–72, 175–81, 185n7
Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS), 172, 175–77
Asian Indigenous Women's Network, 94n2
Athabasca Tribal Council (ATC) All Parties Core Agreement, 219–20
Australia
 boundaries and, 191, 196
 Indigenous peoples and communities in, 3, 7, 58, 62–77, 77n4, 110, 207
 Inuit support for, 116
 lost generation in, 202
 Macassans in, 62, 72–76, 77n3
 reconciliation process in, 58, 199
 social boundary defense theory and, 66
 Torres Strait Islander Commission, 103
 trade networks in, 69–76
 vote against UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 1
 Yolngu people in, 62, 72–76, 77n4
ban, relations of, 33–34, 42–45
Bedford, David, 23–24
Beier, J. Marshall, 116, 136, 169n, 221
Bennett, John, 118
Bhabha, Homi, 15, 17, 194
Biersack, Aletta, 169
Binns, R. A., 71
biopolitics, 37
Black Elk, 39
Boas, Franz, 157–58
Bogado, Aura, 95n7
Bourdieu, Pierre, 192
Brazil, 9, 42, 134–51, 152n4, 153nn7–8, 206n8
Brent, Edward, 166
Briggs, Jean L., 130n5
Bruyneel, Kevin, 5
Buckley, William, 72
Burke, Robert O'Hara, 67
Campbell, David, 27n4
Canada
 1876 Indian Act, 91–92
 Athabasca Tribal Council (ATC) All Parties Core Agreement and, 219–20

Canada (*continued*)

- Indigenous peoples as stakeholders in, 59
 - Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC) and, 176–81
 - Inuit in, 115–30, 131n11, 173–81, 185n1
 - Nisga'a Nation settlement against, 218
 - Rotinoshon'non:we (Six Nations Confederacy) and, 81, 86, 90–94
 - Salish oral history and, 155–69
 - vote against UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 1
- Capilano, Chief Joe, 164–65, 170n10
- capitalism, 37, 50, 120, 156, 191, 201–2, 212, 217–20
- Carlson, Keith Thor, 9, 170n6, 170n11
- Cartesian epistemology, 40–41
- Casaldaliga, Pedro, 34
- Cash, John, 58
- Castillo, Hernández, 86, 89
- Catholic Church and Catholicism, 35, 138–42, 159
- Chehalis, Chief George, 157–59, 168
- Cherokee Nation (Tsalagis), 83, 190, 198, 205n3
- Chossudovsky, Michel, 208
- Chow, Rey, 193–94
- Clarke, Philip, 77n2
- Clastres, Pierre, 21
- climate change, 115, 128–29, 172, 179–84
- Cohen, Felix, 190
- Cold War, 14, 27n2, 102, 126
- Coleman, William, 27n
- collective rights, 5, 8, 80–81, 90, 104, 111–13, 204n2
- Columbus, Christopher, 30–31
- Commission of Concordance and Peace (COCOPA), 88
- Comprehensive Arctic Policy, 172, 175–76
- Confederation of the Indigenous Organizations in the Brazilian Amazon (COIAB), 142–44, 149–50

Continental Network of Indigenous

- Women, 94n2
 - contrapuntal, idea of, 37, 46n1
 - Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth, 194
 - Corntassel, Jeff, 8, 95n9
 - Coulter, Robert T., 190
 - Coulthard, Glen, 95n8
 - Cox, Robert, 172
 - Crawford, Neta, 23, 25
 - critical theory approach, 172–73
 - cultural sovereignty, 174, 178–79, 184
 - cultural studies, 55–58
- Dana, Leo Paul, 217
- Dana, Teresa E., 217
- de Certeau, Michel, 44–46
- Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man, 129
- Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 1, 10, 54–56, 77, 82, 103–4, 109, 112, 175, 204, 207–8
- decolonization, use of the term, 205n2
- de Costa, Ravi, 3, 7, 56
- Deleuze, Gilles, 38
- Deloria, Vine, Jr., 94n5
- DeMallie, Raymond J., 94n5
- Descartes, René, 215
- Dick, Lyle, 130nn4–6
- Diderot, Denis, 21, 39, 46n2
- difference, politics of, 47–60
- diplomacy, definitions and meanings of, 116
- Djaladjari, 74–75
- Dogan, Mattei, 15
- domestic jurisdiction, 187, 205n1
- Duran, Eduardo, 194–95, 197
- Durie, Mason, 216
- During, Simon, 56
- Dyck, Ryan, 185n
- Edwards, Brendan, 169n2
- Edwards, Elizabeth, 156, 168
- Elliott, Lorraine, 173
- Enlightenment, European, 18, 21, 32–33, 37, 196, 212

- Epp, Roger, 85
 Eric the Red, 130n7
 Espiniella, Pablo, 93
 Esquivel, Julia, 45
 Eurocentrism, 193–94, 196
 European Union, 101–2
 Eyre, Edward John, 67
- Fabian, Johannes, 48, 51–22, 54, 57–58
 Fehr, Mandy, 169n
 feminism, 14, 19, 80, 94n3, 94n6, 108, 194
 Ferguson, Adam, 21
 Finland, Sami self-determination in,
 103–6
 Finnmark Act, 98, 106
 Fisher, Robin, 167, 170n12
 Fixico, Donald, 168
 Flannery, Tim, 67
 Forrest, John, 67
 Fossett, Renée, 130nn4–6
 Foster, Hamar, 167, 170n12
 Foucault, Michel, 18, 29, 37, 43–44,
 46, 212
 fourth world, 191–99, 207
 Framework Convention on Climate
 Change, United Nations
 (UNFCCC), 180–81
 Franke, Mark F. N., 7
 Frobisher, John, 119
- Gaddis, John Lewis, 27n2
 Gambell, Kevin, 169n
 Gaskell, Ivan, 46n2
 Geertz, Clifford, 170n8
 Gegeo, David Welchman, 59–60
 Ghosh, Amitav, 194
 Glissant, Edouard, 34–35, 38, 44–46,
 46n3
 global assemblage, 134, 152n1
 globalization, 3, 14, 49, 54–57, 73,
 76–77, 152n1, 187
 Gonçalves, Marcela Vecchione, 9
 good/noble savage, concept of, 135,
 139, 151, 152n3, 194
Great Law of Peace, The, 23–24
- Greenland, 115–21, 126–30, 130nn7–
 8, 173–75, 182, 185n1
 Grotius, Hugo, 36
 Guattari, Félix, 38
- Hall, Stuart, 33
 Harding, Sandra, 25–26
 Harper, Kenn, 130nn5–6
 Harris, Cole, 167, 170nn11–12
 Haudenosaunee Confederacy, 8, 13,
 21, 23, 25, 91–93, 188, 200, 206n9
 Hegel, G. W. F., 49–50
 Heidegger, Martin, 210, 215–17
 Henare, Manuka, 220–21
 Henriksen, John B., 103–4
 heterotopias and heterotopic spaces,
 29, 43–44, 46
 Hiatt, Les, 63
 Hin-mah-too'yah-kekht, Chief, 41, 43
 Hirtz, Frank, 53
 Hobbes, Thomas, 14, 20–21, 25
 Hopson, Eben, 126–27, 174
 Huebert, Rob, 185n6
 Hulme, Peter, 21
 Hume, David, 212–13
 hybridity, 9, 164–65
- indigeneity, politicization of, 51
 Indigenous activism, 10, 22, 30, 77n1,
 188–89, 199, 213–14
 Indigenous Council of Roraima (CIR),
 149–50, 153n9
 Indigenous diplomacies
 anthropology and, 19, 21, 48, 51, 58,
 61–77
 globalization of, 54–57
 as negotiating places in the past, 51–54
 overview of, 4–6
 philosophies and ontologies at the
 heart of, 209–22
 politics of difference and, 47–60
 Sami and, 107–13
 transversality and, 29, 34–46
 women and, 79–94
 Indigenous languages, 202

- Indigenous peoples
 activism concerns of, 194–95
 of the Amazon Basin, 9, 133–52,
 152n1, 153n6
 borderization of, 134
 defining, 189–90, 199–200
 early encounters with Europeans in
 America, 30–34
 exception and, 34
 forced assimilation of, 98, 110, 187,
 194–97, 201–2, 205n1
 as good/noble savage, 135, 139, 151,
 152n3, 194
 as human resources, 133
 humanism and, 32
 as leader of virtù, 135, 151, 152n2
 liberals and, 14
 naturalization of, 31–32
 oral histories and, 117, 157–69, 190
 postcolonial theory and, 193–96
 Realism and, 14, 22–23
 relations of ban and, 33–34, 44–45
 self-identifying guidelines for, 82
 subalterneity and, 44, 49–51, 53–57
 in the third space of sovereignty, 5
 Indigenous politics, 10, 48, 53–57, 140,
 145, 208
 Indigenous protocols, 62, 66–69
 Indigenous rights, 3, 79, 86–88, 93–94,
 104, 109, 113n4, 141–43, 153n7,
 200–201, 208, 211–14
 Indigenous transnationalism, 3, 62–72
 Indigenous women, 8, 79–94, 95n7,
 95n9, 112, 204n4
 Indigenous women's biodiversity
 network, 94n2
 individual-collective rights binary, 90
 industrialization, 189, 191–93
 International Arctic Science
 Committee (IASC), 179
 International Indigenous Women's
 Forum, 82
 International Labour Organisation
 (ILO) Convention No. 169, 82,
 104–5, 107, 188
 international law, 3, 50, 54, 102, 107,
 116, 200–201, 207, 213
 International Relations, field of
 colonial complicities of, 6, 20–21
 Concert System of Europe and, 27n2
 as a discipline, 1–3, 18–19, 25–26
 gender and, 19–20
 global politics and, 16–17
 Indigenous diplomacies within, 11–15
 Indigenous peoples in, 22–26
 as knowledge system, 16
 origins of, 13–14
 nomadism and, 38–39, 65–69
 as site of authority, 16–17
 as site of knowing, 19–21
 social sciences and, 19
 as system of local knowledge, 25–26,
 27n3
 travelogues and, 20–21
 intersectionality, 8, 80–81, 84, 86, 90,
 93–94
 Inuit, geographical dispersion of, 185n1
 Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC),
 9, 126–29, 131n16, 171–84,
 185nn2–3, 185n5
 Charter of, 174–76
 climate change and, 115, 128–29,
 172, 179–84
 granted NGO status, 175
 Inuit Committee on National Issues,
 122
 Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK), 131n11
 Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (ITC), 122,
 131nn11–12
 Iroquois Five Nations, 221. *See also*
 Haudenosaunee Confederacy
 Isipaymilt, Charlie, 164, 170n10
 Ittinuar, Peter, 120
 Ivison, Duncan, 205n7
 James Bay and Northern Quebec
 Agreement (JBNQA), 124,
 131n12
 Jarmon, Michelle, 205n5
 Jennings, Francis, 30–31, 38, 46n2

- Jordanova, Ludmilla, 21
 Josefsen, Eva, 105–6
 Joseph, May, 37
 Jull, Peter, 107–9
 Jung, Courtney, 56
- Kant, Immanuel, 25, 49–50
 Keal, Paul, 3
 Keen, Ian, 64
 Kemal, Salim, 46n2
 Kennedy, Edmund, 67
 Keskitalo, Aili, 108–9
 King Edward VII, 160–67
 King George, 187
 knowledge systems, 16–18, 24, 195
 Knutsen, Torbjern, 36
 Krech, Shepard, 170n13
 Kruger, Tamati, 221–22
 Kuokkanen, Rauna, 8
 Kyoto Protocol, 180–81
- law of conquest, 189–90
 leader of virtù, 135, 151, 152n2
 League of Nations, 13, 187
 Lehtola, Veli-Pekka, 110
 Levesque, René, 124
 Levi-Strauss, Claude, 64
 Lewis, Dave, 111
 Locke, John, 21, 39, 46n2, 212
 Loomba, Ania, 94n6
 Lorne, Marquis of, 157–59
 Lutz, John, 167
 Lynge, Aqqaluk, 131n16, 171, 174, 182–83
 Lyons, Oren, 83
- Macdonald, John A., 158
 Machiavelli, Niccolò, 151, 152n2
 Macknight, C. C., 73–75
 Mamdani, Mahmood, 51
 Marglin, Stephen A., 16
 Marshall, John, 190, 198
 Marx, Karl, 49–50
 Marxism, 21, 49–50
 Mattelart, Armond, 7, 30, 46
 McBryde, Isabel, 71
- McCarthy, F. D., 69–72
 McGee, Robert, 130n7
 McIntosh, Ian, 75
 McMurty, John, 208
 Means, Russell, 194
 Mendes, Chico, 140–42, 153n6
 Mexico, 80–81, 86–90, 137, 206n8
 Mignolo, Walter D., 34, 46n1
 Mill, John Stuart, 39
 Millán, Mágina, 89
 Miller, J. R., 169n
 Mitchell, Marybelle, 130nn4–5
 Mitchell, Thomas, 67, 69
 mobility ethos, 65–69
 modernity, 15–17, 19, 21, 24, 26,
 29–30, 33, 37, 41–42, 45, 50, 55
 Mohanty, Chandra, 194
 Mohawk, John, 194
 Moreiras, Alberto, 48, 55, 57–59
 Morgan, Lewis Henry, 21
 Morgan, Rhiannon, 56
 Mulhall, Stephen, 215
 multilayered citizenship, 8, 81, 84–87,
 90, 93–94
 Mulvaney, John, 67, 69–71, 76
 Myers, Fred R., 65
- Nah, Alice M., 53
 Nandy, Ashis, 194
 Native Women's Association of
 Canada, 95n8
 New Zealand, 1, 103, 109, 112–13,
 143, 187, 191, 196, 199, 207, 212,
 214–15, 218, 222n1
 Nez Perce, 41–43
 Niezen, Ronald, 3
 Niranjana, Tejaswini, 205n2
 nongovernmental organizations
 (NGOs), 57, 97, 115, 126, 141–42,
 144, 150, 175, 179–80, 188
 Norway, Sami self-determination in,
 106–7
 Norwegian Sami Association, 106
 Nuttall, Mark, 178
 Nyers, Peter, 27n

- Olsson, Sven E., 111
 Ong, Aihwa, 152n1
 oral histories, 117, 157–69, 190
Origins of Virtue, The (Ridley), 69
- Paine, Robert, 111
 Palmer, Lisa, 59
 Papal Bulls, 35
 Parisi, Laura, 8, 95n9
 Patton, Paul, 205n7
 Pauktuutit (The Inuit Women's Organization), 122
 Paull, Andrew, 157
 Peace of Westphalia, 48–49
 persistent organic pollutants (POPs), 115, 131n15, 178–83
 Peterson, Nicolas, 65–66
 Pope Alexander VI, 35
 Pope Nicholas V, 30
 postcolonial theory, 10, 48, 188, 193–96
 Powell, I. W., 158
Principles and Elements for a Comprehensive Arctic Policy (PECAP), 176–77
- Queen Elizabeth II, 167
 Queen Isabella, 31
 Queen Victoria, 156–59
- Rao, Arati, 85
 Raposa Serra do Sol (RSS), 147–51
 Realism, political, 9, 14–15, 20–23, 83, 118, 123–25, 184
realpolitik, 13–15, 22, 24, 156
 relationality, 9, 38, 42–43, 136, 144, 151, 216
 Renaissance, European, 31–33, 37
 reservations, 41–45
 Reynolds, H., 67–68
 Richland, Justin B., 59
 Ridley, Matt, 69
 rights of discovery, doctrine of, 36
 Robinson, Gillian, 130n4
 Robinson, Harry, 160–68, 170n7
- Rodon, Thierry, 8, 130n1, 184
 Rohrer, Judy, 52–53
 root politics, 38–39
 Rosing, Hans-Pavia, 176
 Rotinoshon'non:we (Six Nations Confederacy), 81, 86, 90–94
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 21, 39, 151, 152n3
 Rowley, Susan, 118
 Rundstrom, Robert, 40
- Said, Edward, 21, 34, 36, 39, 46n1, 194
 Saint-Simon, Henri de, 213
 Sale, Kirkpatrick, 37
 Sallualuk, Eliyassi, 124
 Sambo, Dalee, 130n2, 131n15
 Sami Council, 8, 99–102, 107, 109–10, 114n5, 185n5
 Sami Language Act, 99–100
 Sami Parliamentary Council, 103
 Sami peoples and political organization, 97–113
 Nordic Cooperative Body for Sami Issues and Reindeer Herding, 102
 Parliaments, 98–113, 114n5
 self-determination of, 98, 101, 103–13
 Sanders, Will, 205n7
 Sassen, Saskia, 152n1
 Schledermann, Peter, 130n4
 second world, use of the term, 192
 Shadian, Jessica, 131n15, 174, 178
 Shaw, Karena, 24–25, 49
 Shiva, Vandana, 27n3, 194
 Silko, Leslie Marmon, 194, 205n5
 Simon, Mary, 116, 127–28, 130n5, 174, 177, 183
 Six Nations Confederacy (Rotinoshon'non:we), 81, 86, 90–94
 Skakahtun, Chief, 156
 Smith, Adam, 69
 Smith, Andrea, 81, 94n6

Smith, Heather A., 9, 16, 130n3, 131n15
 Smith, Linda Tuhiwai, 136, 143
 Smith, Steve, 16
 social boundary defense theory, 66
 Soguk, Nevzat, 7
 Soja, Edward, 39
 Sokolow, Jayme A., 46n2
 sovereignty of sovereignty, 50–51, 58
 Speed, Shannon, 90
 Spintlum, Chief David, 156–59, 168
 Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, 48–50, 55, 57–59, 194
 Sproat, Gilbert Malcolm, 165, 167
 Stavenhagen, Rodolfo, 93
 Stevenson, Marc G., 130n7
 Stewart-Harawira, Makere, 10
 Sturt, Charles, 68–69
 subalterneity, 44, 49–51, 53–57
 Sykes, Annette, 222
 Sylvain, Renée, 57

 Tarrow, Sidney, 183
 Taylor, Luke, 63
 Tench, Watkin, 67
 Tennant, Paul, 167, 170n12
 Ten Revolutionary Laws for Women, 86–90
 territoriality, 7, 35–45, 66
 third space of sovereignty, 5
 third world, use of the term, 191–97
 Thomson, Donald, 74
 Tohe, Laura, 94n3
 Toohoolhoolzote, Nez Perce
 spokesperson, 41–43
 traditional environmental knowledge
 (TEK), 180–84
 transnational activism, 171–84
 transnationalism, 62–72
 transversal politics, 7, 29, 34–46, 94
 travelogues, 20–21, 159
 Tsalagis (Cherokee Nation), 83, 190, 198, 205n3
 Tully, James, 107, 111–12, 218

United Nations
 Committee on the Elimination of
 Discrimination against Women
 (CEDAW), 94n1
 declaration of 1993 as the “Year of the
 World’s Indigenous Peoples,” 188
 Declaration on the Rights of
 Indigenous Peoples, 1, 10,
 54–56, 77, 82, 94n1, 103–4, 109,
 112, 175, 204, 207–8
 Framework Convention on Climate
 Change (UNFCCC), 180–81
 Human Rights Commission, 188
 Indigenous peoples’ presence at,
 187–88
 Permanent Forum on Indigenous
 Issues, 13, 77, 82, 92, 131n16,
 150, 181–82, 204
 Urry, J., 74
 Rotinoshon’non:we clan mothers
 and, 92–93

 Vansina, Jan, 161
 Vattel, Emeric, 36, 39
 Venne, Sharon Helen, 3, 84
 Vinding, Diana, 79, 94n4
 Viola, Herman J., 94n5
 Viswanathan, Gauri, 194
 Vitoria, Francisco de, 36–37, 39
 Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo, 151

 Waitangi Tribunal (Aotearoa/New
 Zealand), 103
 Wallerstein, Immanuel, 209
 Walsh, M., 74
 Wa Thiong’o, Ngũgĩ, 194
 Watt-Cloutier, Sheila, 128–29, 178–84,
 185n7
Wealth of Nations, The (Smith), 69
 Weaver, Jace, 205n6
 welfare colonialism, 111
 Whitt, Laurie Anne, 160, 165, 170n7
 Wickwire, Wendy, 160
 Williams, Robert A., 94n5
 Wills, William John, 67

- Wilmer, Franke, 3, 9–10, 22–25
 Wilson, Gary N., 9, 130n3, 131n15
 Wilson, Woodrow, 13
 Winnebago, Chief, 40
 Working Group on Indigenous
 Populations (WGIP), 1, 77, 82, 99,
 130n2, 175, 213–14
 Workman, Thom, 23–24
 World War I, 13
 World War II, 75, 97, 99, 102, 110, 120,
 124, 183, 189, 191–92
 Young, Iris, 205n7, 221
 Young, Oran, 116–17, 129, 131n15,
 205n7
 Yunupingu, G., 72
 Yuval-Davis, Nira, 84–85, 94
 Zapatista Army of National Liberation
 (EZLN), 79, 81, 86–90, 93–94,
 95n7
 Zea, Tarcila Rivera, 94n4, 251