RED POWER[1]

Coulthard asserts that "instead of ushering in an era of peaceful coexistence grounded on the ideal of *reciprocity* or *mutual* recognition, the politics of recognition in its contemporary liberal form promises to reproduce the very configurations of colonialist, racist, patriarchal state power that indigenous peoples' demands for recognition have fought to transcend."[2] He defines the "settler-colonial relationship" as characterized by a particular form of *domination*,"[3] intertwined "discursive and nondiscursive facets of economic, gendered, racial, and state power … [that] continue to facilitate the dispossession of Indigenous peoples of their lands and self-determining authority."[4] It is "territoriality" that constitutes "settler colonialism's specific, irreducible element."[5] Territoriality Coulthard associates with capitalism, that "for Indigenous peoples to reject or ignore the insights of Marx would be a mistake, especially if this amounts to a refusal on our part to critically engage his important critique of capitalist exploitation and his extensive writing on the entangled relationship between capitalism and colonialism."[6] That said, Coulthard cautions that "any analysis or critique of contemporary settler-colonialism must be stripped of this Eurocentric feature of Marx's original historical metanarrative."[7] To do so, he does so by "*contextually shifting* our investigation from an emphasis on the *capital relation* to the *colonial relation*."[8] That shift is required as Marx's "interest in the specific character of colonial domination was largely incidental."[9]

Not only Marx and Marxism come under Coulthard's critique; he alleges that "left political strategy" generally and "critical theory" more specifically have ignored or downplayed "the injustice of colonial dispossession," thereby "becoming complicit in the very structures and process of domination that it ought to oppose."[10] In doing so, they "also risk overlooking what could prove to be invaluable glimpses into the ethical practices and precondition required for the construction of a more just and sustainable world order."[11] Coulthard concludes "that the history and experience of *dispossession*, not proletarianization, has been the dominant background structure shaping the character of the historical relationship between indigenous peoples and the Canadian state."[12]

Coulthard articulates a "theory and practice of Indigenous anticolonialism, including Indigenous anticapitalism" as "a struggle primarily inspired by and oriented around *the question of land* – a struggle not only *for* land in the material sense, but also deeply *informed* by what the land as *system of reciprocal relations and obligations* can teach us about living our lives in relation to one another and the natural world in non-dominating and non-exploitative terms."[13] Coulthard calls "this place-based foundation of Indigenous decolonial thought and practice *grounded normativity*," by which he means "the modalities of Indigenous land-connected practices and

longstanding experiential knowledge that inform and structure our ethical engagements with the world and our relationships with human and nonhuman others over time."[14]

For Coulthard "any strategy geared toward authentic decolonization must directly confront more than mere economic relations" – he rejects Marx's "economic reductionism"[15] - as "it has to account for the multifarious ways in which capitalism, patriarchy, white supremacy, and the totalizing character of state power interact with one another to form the constellations of power relations that sustain colonial patterns of behavior, structures, and relationships."[16] To undertake such an "intersectional analysis,"[17] Coulthard returns to Fanon who, Coulthard suggests, "demonstrate[s] how subaltern populations often develop what he called 'psycho-affective' attachments to these structurally circumscribed modes of recognition."[18] The "subjective" character of these "ideological attachments are essential in maintaining the economic and political structure of colonial relationships over time."[19] Later, Coulthard critiques what he regards as "Fanon's overly instrumental view of the relationship between culture and decolonization," given that "Indigenous people tend to view their resurgent practices of cultural self-recognition and empowerment as permanent features of our decolonial political projects, not transitional ones."[20] My takeaway from Fanon is that colonized peoples' internalizations of colonialist tropes are not easy to exorcize, that any pre-contact purity of "cultural self-recognition" becomes (practically-speaking) impossible in post-contact colonized peoples, certainly not in the short term, maybe never. But then the situation of Indigenous peoples in Canada today and that of native Algerians in 1960s Africa are not completely comparable.

Economics and politics cannot, for Coulthard, be severed from culture, something he associates with "the left-materialist claim regarding the displacement of economic concerns by cultural ones,"[21] rendering – I confess I'm unsure about this point – culture becoming a kind of consolation prize, substituting for land repossession. If I read him right, Coulthard laments that, "within the mainstream Dene self-determination movement, which in the context of northern land claims and economic development has resulted in a partial decoupling of Indigenous 'cultural' claims from the radical aspirations for social, political and economic change that once underpinned them."[22] Such decoupling Coulthard casts "as an effect of primitive accumulation via the hegemonization of the liberal discourse of recognition and due to some core deficiency with indigenous cultural politics as such,"[23] an assertion that perhaps unintendedly underscores Fanon's concern that internalization of colonialist tropes not only precludes pre-contact cultural self-recognition but also structures the political conduct of the once – but still, in a subjective as well as political sense - colonized peoples.

Affirming the intersectionality of culture, politics and economics in Indigenous nations, Coulthard complains that accusations of "essentialism" – defined as identities as "fixed, immutable and universal," rather than "constructed, contingent, and open to 'cultural variation'" – function to undermine the integrity of Indigenous identity, as "to

avoid this potentially repressive feature of identity politics" – e.g. essentialism – "we are told that the various expressions of identification and signification that underpin demands for recognition … must remain open-ended and never immune from contestation or democratic deliberation." [24] Again and perhaps inadvertently, Coulthard's point not only shelters Indigenous identities from Non-Indigenous critiques, it also points to the cultural incommensurability between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous (specifically European-descent) peoples. To the extent Indigenous identities rest on unchanging cultural certainties – including the primacy of blood lines – is, I suspect, the extent to which there will always be antagonism between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous, rendering "reconciliation" a pipedream.

For Coulthard, too, I suspect "reconciliation" is rhetoric not reality. After all, with broken treaties, residential schools, and cultural genocide, why would Indigenous peoples want reconciliation? Coulthard affirms "Indigenous peoples' anger and resentment … [as] a sign of moral protest and political outrage,"[25] suggesting that Indigenous peoples "redirect our struggles *away* from a politics that seeks to attain a conciliatory form of settler-state recognition for Indigenous nations toward a *resurgent politics of recognition* premised on self-actualization, direct action, and the resurgence of cultural practices that are attentive to the subjective and structural composition of settler-colonial power."[26] This is precisely what I derive from Fanon, namely that "decolonization" must occur subjectively as well as culturally and politically - and *within* colonized peoples. To demand that non-Indigenous peoples decolonize – to shed their own cultural composition – is politically pointless, however advisable such self-questioning and self-critique might be. I have argued that anti-racist education invites "self-shattering,"[27] subjective reconstruction through inner excavation and subjective intervention. But Coulthard's example – Idle No More[28] - seems more political than psychic, although of course the two are intertwined even when unacknowledged.

Then Coulthard returns to the psychic, invoking Fanon again, who, he says, "was insistent that a change in the social structure would not guarantee a change in the subjectivities of the oppressed," noting that "without transformative struggle constituting an integral aspect of anticolonial praxis the Indigenous population will not only remain subjects of imperial rule insofar as they have not gone through a process of purging the psycho-existential complexes battered into them over the course of their colonial experience – a process of strategic *desubjectification* – but they also remain so in that the Indigenous society will tend to come to see the forms of structurally limited and constrained recognition conferred to them by their colonial "masters" *as their own*: that is, the colonized will begin to *identify* with "white liberty and white justice."[29] Coulthard concurs, writing that: "So today it appears, much as it did in Fanon's day, that colonial powers will only recognize the collective rights and identities of Indigenous peoples insofar as this recognition does not throw into question the background legal, political, and economic framework of the colonial relationship itself."[30]

From an acknowledgement that recognition cannot be counted on to translate into restoration of lost lands, Coulthard concludes that "it would appear that recognition inevitably leads to subjection."[31] I find this statement odd because he seems to assume Indigenous are already subjugated, so nothing new is needed to lead to subjection. Given how paltry the promise of recognition appears to be, it's not odd that Coulthard returns to Fanon to consider that "the colonized must initiate the process of decolonization by first recognizing themselves as free, dignified, and distinct contributors to humanity."[32] Indeed, Coulthard asserts appreciation for "Fanon's call in *Black Skin, White Masks* for a simultaneous turn inward and away from the master," suggesting that "far from espousing a rigidly binaristic Manichean view of power relations, instead reflects a profound understanding of the complexity involved in contests over recognition in colonial and racialized environments."[33] I share Coulthard's preference for Fanon over Althusser – he finds the latter's concept of "interpellation" "overly negative and all-subjectifying[34] - and I share Coulthard's skepticism toward Fanon's later endorsement of "anticolonial violence" as "cleansing."[35]

Indigenous self-recognition implies, then, subjective reconstruction, animated by efforts to exorcise internalized colonist elements – cultural, political, psychic – and reactivate the past, that is rejuvenate Indigenous cultures, especially language and land. Coulthard returns to the latter, reminding readers that Indigenous peoples hold their lands as having the highest possible meaning, that in contrast to "most Western societies," which "by contrast, tend to derive meaning from the world in historical/developmental terms, thereby placing *time* as the narrative of central importance,"[36] a cultural distinction noted above. From "land" he moves to "place" – the two concepts apparently almost interchangeable – noting that: "Place is a way of knowing, of experiencing and relating to the world and with others; and sometimes these relational practices and forms of knowledge guide forms of resistance against other rationalizations of the world that threaten to erase or destroy our senses of place."[37] And this primacy of place seems almost ontological and even specifically epistemological in that Coulthard's Indigenous worldview appears to threaten our – a "Western" - sense of time's centrality, specifically as structuring historical narrative.

Such cultural incommensurability – a concept Coulthard mentions in passing[38] – informs ongoing disputes over land. Recall that early on Coulthard positioned "territoriality" as "settler colonialism's specific, irreducible element."[39] He defines Indigenous nationhood as "best understood as informed by a complex of cultural practices and traditions that have survived the onslaught of colonialism and continue to structure the forms and content of Indigenous activism in the present."[40] More specifically: "Understanding 'culture' as the interrelated social totality of distinct modes of life encompassing the economic, political, spiritual, and social is crucial for comprehending the state's response to the challenge posed by our land-claim proposals."[41] In Coulthard's analysis, "from the state's perspective, the land-claims

process constitutes a crucial vehicle for the 'domestication' of Indigenous claims to nationhood."[42] Returning to the issue of identity politics referenced above, Coulthard "contend[s] that when anti-essentialist theories of cultural identity are projected as a universal feature of social life and then employed as a justificatory measure for evaluating the legitimacy of claims for recognition within and against the contested authority of the *colonial state*, they can inadvertently sanction the very types of domination and inequality that both social constructivist and deliberative democratic projects ought to mitigate."[43] Coulthard defends cultural essentialism – for him it denotes cultural integrity – of Indigenous peoples, but such integrity (or essentialism for critics) underscores cultural incommensurability, a fact Coulthard illustrates by referencing the concept of sustainability for the Dene: "Unlike the discourse of sustainability underwriting the Dene claims examined above, which sought to establish political and economic relations that would foster the well-being of people, communities and land over time, sustainability now refers primarily to the *economic* sustainability of capital accumulation itself."[44]

The issue of cultural integrity has apparently been put to use within Indigenous communities to justify misogyny, but Coulthard blames not the Indigenous offenders themselves, but the fact of colonialism (and in the Fanonian sense as subjectively internalized), as the offenders are merely reiterating (internalized) settler sexism in their misconduct. "There is no doubt," Coulthard allows, "that certain segments of the male Native elite have problematically seized the language of cultural incommensurability, tradition, and self-preservation to justify the asymmetrical privileges," but he insists that they are not themselves responsible, given that such "reification and misuse of culture in this case cannot be understood without reference to the colonial context within which it continues to flourish."[45] No doubt: reference internalized misogyny but I worry that reducing present conduct to colonialism renders Indigenous men exempt from responsibility – and from any pretense of autonomy. I can't imagine Coulthard could countenance those consequences. Never mind that more than a few descendants of settlers – and newcomers to Canada – have worked through (admittedly not always voluntarily) these gendered artifacts of earlier era. Predictably, Coulthard locates the blame on the "colonial state," which "is not only a racial structure … [but] is also fundamental patriarchal in character."[46] No nuance in his analysis here, but Coulthard continues undeterred: "Subsequently, when women turn to the state apparatus in their struggles for gender justice they risk reiterating rather than transforming the subjective and material conditions of their oppression."[47] Does not Coulthard trust women to make the right strategic decision? Perhaps there's nowhere else for Indigenous women to turn, since, as he has earlier asserted, Indigenous men have internalized colonialist patterns of patriarchy. Coulthard's conclusion is rather different, and more theoretical, and certainly circumspect: "In sum, then, no discourse on identity should be prematurely cast as either inherently productive or repressive prior to an engaged

consideration of the historical, political, and socioeconomic contexts and actors involved."[48]

Next Coulthard turns to reconciliation itself, noting that: "In Canada, we have witnessed this relatively recent 'reconciliation politics' converge with a slightly older 'politics of recognition,' advocating the institutional recognition and accommodation of Indigenous cultural difference as an important means of reconciling the colonial relationship between Indigenous peoples and the state."[49] He explains that the term tends to be invoked in three distinct yet interrelated ways," the first referring "to the diversity of individual or collective practices that Indigenous people undertake to re-establish a positive 'relation-to-self' in situations where this relation has been damaged or distorted by some form of symbolic or structural violence."[50] In this first sense "recognition" plays a "fundamental role."[51] In its second, the term registers "the act of restoring estranged or damaged social and political relationships," and in its third sense it references "the process by which things are brought 'to agreement, concord, or harmony; the fact of being made consistent or compatible'."[52] Coulthard considers the "state's attempt to impose this third understanding of reconciliation on the institutional and discursive field of Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations … [as] effectively undermining the realization of the previous two forms of reconciliation."[53] Apparently the state's insistence on "harmony" dilutes, at least from Coutlhard's perspective, the anger prerequisite to undertaking political action, perhaps even prerequisite to undertaking the exorcism of internalized colonialist elements.[54] By insisting on "concord" the state is diverting attention from the present "abusive colonial structure" by focusing on "overcoming the … legacy of past abuse."[55] That enables the state – and, presumably, settlers – who cast those Indigenous peoples "who refuse to forgive and/or reconcile" as "being saddled by the damaging psychological residue of this legacy, of which anger and resentment are frequently highlighted."[56] The truth is, Coulthard asserts, "that under certain conditions Indigenous peoples' individual and collective expressions of anger and resentment can help prompt the very forms of self-affirmative praxis that generate rehabilitated Indigenous subjectivities and decolonized forms of life in ways that the combined politics of recognition and reconciliation has far so far prove itself capable of doing."[57]

"Indigenous peoples' *ressentiment*," Coulthard continues, "is actually an entirely appropriate manifestation of our resentment: a politicized expression of Indigenous anger and outrage directed at the structural and symbolic violence that still structures our lives, our relations with others, and our relationships with the land."[58] Noting that the OED defines resentment as a feeling of "bitter indignation at having been treated *unfairly*," Coulthard concludes that "resentment, unlike anger, has an in-built *political* component to it, given that it is often expressed in response to an alleged slight, instance of maltreatment, or injustice," a distinction he then blurs by casting "resentment can be understood as a particularly virulent expression of *politicized anger*."[59] He reminds us of Nietzsche's worry that wallowing in resentment is to castrate one's

capacity to actively "forget," to "let go," to "*get on with life*."[60] Coulthard associates Canada's "reconciliation policy" representing "the view that Indigenous peoples suffer from *ressentiment* in a way not entirely unlike Nietzsche describes."[61] Coulthard confesses that "Indigenous peoples' negative emotional responses to settler colonization can play out in some of these problematic ways," but he adds: "it is important to recognize that they do not always do so."[62] Combining decolonization as simultaneously psychic and political, he suggests that "these affective reactions can also lead to forms of anti-colonial resistance grounded in transformed Indigenous political subjectivities," invoking again Fanon who, he underscores, "refused to dismiss or condemn them; instead he demanded that they be *understood*, that their transformative potential be *harnessed*, and that their structural referent be i*dentified* and *uprooted*."[63]

Coulthard is quick to point out that Fanon appreciates that the "legitimate desire for revenge" deriving from the colonized subject's nascent "hatred" and "resentment" toward colonization cannot by itself "nurture a war of liberation."[64] While hatred and resentment may not result in war, they still have a function; Coulthard "suggest[s] that these negative emotions nonetheless mark an important turning point in the individual and collective coming-to-consciousness of the colonized."[65] In fact, he "think[s] that they represent the *externalization* of what which was previously internalized: a purging, if you will, of the so-called 'inferiority complex' of the colonized subject."[66] And anger and hatred not only enable an Indigenous person to feel better about her/himself, these "reactive emotions can also prompt the colonized to revalue and affirm Indigenous cultural traditions and social practices that are systematically denigrated yet never fully destroyed in situations of colonial rule."[67] In addition to feeling better about oneself and reinvigorating denigrated cultural and social practices, anger and hatred – might also prompt Indigenous peoples to struggle against continuing colonial oppression.[68] Consequently, Coulthard "argue[s] that Indigenous peoples' anger and resentment represents an entirely understandable – and, in Fanon's words, 'legitimate' – response to our settler-colonial present."[69]

Coulthard then returns to his critique of "an approach to reconciliation that goes out of its way to fabricate a sharp divide between Canada's unscrupulous 'past' and the unfortunate 'legacy' this pas has produced for Indigenous people and communities in the present."[70] "If there is no colonial present, Coulthard continues, "but only a colonial past that continues to have adverse effects on Indigenous people and communities, then the federal government need not undertake the actions required to transform the current institutional and social relationships that … produce the suffering."[71] "Rather than addressing these structural issues, state policy has instead focused its reconciliation efforts on repairing the psychologically injured or damaged status of Indigenous people themselves."[72] That "rather than affirm Aboriginal title and substantially redistribute lands and resources to Indigenous communities through a renewed treaty process."[73] While I suspect that the treaty process has not been "renewed," there is an update to report regarding land redistribution, at least specific

parcels of land in Vancouver. I'll pause this review of Coulthard's compelling text to provide that information.

Bystanders No More?

Vancouver's original inhabitants have long been "bystanders" in the city's lucrative property market, reports the Japanese-Canadian journalist Norimitsu Onishi.[74] Owners of "vast tracts of prime lands" in the city, they have been "courted" by real estate developers and are "poised" to reshape the city.[75] "In the past, we were looking in windows just to be a part of things – we're now at the table," said Wilson Williams, a spokesman for the Squamish Nation, which broke ground in August 2022 on an 11-tower, 6,000-unit residential project called Sen̓ák̲w, covering 11 acres across English Bay from downtown Vancouver.[76] The Government of Canada provided the Nation a $1.3 billion loan to build 3,000 homes on land that had been an ancient village burned and expropriated a century ago, but returned in 2003 to the Squamish Nation, who proclaimed the development is the largest Indigenous-led housing and retail development in the history of Canada.[77] When complete, the Sen̓ák̲w development will boast 6,000 homes; the federal government has committed to finance the first two of four phases.[78] "The project that we are embarking on with our partners represents an over $10-billion return that is going to come back to the Squamish people through the use of our lands, through sustainable economic development," said Sḵwx̲wú7mesh Úxwumixw (Squamish Nation) Council Chairperson Khelsilem.[79]

How the Squamish, as well as the Musqueam and Tsleil-Waututh nations, became big-time real estate developers is a tale of "decades-long legal battles" prompting a "tentative union" among the three First Peoples - altogether numbering approximately 7,500 people - over "competing land claims."[80] The court decision and federal government's financial participation represent actions in the ongoing process of national reckoning over the "brutal treatment" of Canada's First Peoples, a fact "highlighted" when, in July 2002, Pope Francis apologized for the Catholic Church's role in that history.[81] Onishi also reports that colonial authorities in British Columbia "never bothered" to negotiate treaties, instead simply appropriating Indigenous-held land.[82] "The British governor came here and just started taking land away and giving it to his friends without any kind of agreement with local nations," acknowledged Kenney Stewart, the mayor of Vancouver, adding: "If you're applying English common law, you can't just take people's land without authority, and so that really set the groundwork for everything."[83]

Preference has been given to the First Nations to purchase federal or provincial land governments no longer use, including a former military site and the headquarters of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; on these last portions of "prime" property in Vancouver the First Nations are building two new developments.[84] These purchases have been financed through loans from the federal government or from banks,

sometimes in partnership with private developers like Ian Gillespie, the founder and chief executive of Westbank, a major developer involved in Sen̓áq̲w and other Indigenous projects. These were "much more" than real estate developments, Gillespie said, they are about achieving "true reconciliation" through the First Nations' acquisition of "power."[85] Gillespie (who is not Indigenous) said: "When it comes to real estate in Greater Vancouver, it's our Microsoft, our Tesla," adding: "And so if you can put the First Nations at the center of that, then they are in a position of power."[86] In addition to the Squamish-led project called Sen̓áq̲w, the Musqueam Nation has already built approximately 40 percent of a 1,250-unit development on 21 acres near the University of British Columbia. Called Leləm̓, its public spaces feature Musqueam art and designs.[87]

These two projects will be "dwarfed" by one planned 90 acres of one of Canada's "most valuable" properties with views of the Pacific Ocean.[88] Known as the Jericho Lands, located in West Point Grey, a wealthy neighborhood with both beaches and mountain views, the three First Peoples are developing a former military enclave, purchasing federal and provincial land under a jointly-owned company formed in 2014, MST Development.[89] Altogether, these three First Peoples – separately or together - have acquired approximately 175 acres in metropolitan Vancouver during the past eight years, according to David Negrin, the chief executive of MST. T Mr. Negrin added that these three First Peoples are currently negotiating to acquire another 100 acres of land on 14 sites from the provincial government and two tracts from the federal government, all these also within metropolitan Vancouver. "If you look at the land they've got back, it's nothing compared to the land they had," reminded Mr. Negrin, a "high-profile developer" employed by the three First Nations to run MST.[90] In fact, what the First Peoples have purchased was land they once inhabited, land never ceded to the colonial authorities. Consequently, Indigenous leaders are pressing governments to simply "return" land as expression of reconciliation.[91] "The nations are moving in that direction now, that they'd like to get more of their land back and not pay for it," Mr. Negrin confirmed.[92] Outside Vancouver, Onishi reports, "few" Indigenous peoples have succeeded in reclaiming a major portion of city land, in "great part" due to competing land claims by different First Nations over the same territory.[93]

Conclusion

When Coulthard complains that "Canada's policy framework is grounded on the assumption that Aboriginal rights are subordinately positioned within the ultimate sovereign authority of the Crown,"[94] he is not mistaken. But developments that have taken place, that are taking place, after Coulthard's important 2014 book show that, under the sovereignty of settler governments, small portions of once-Indigenous inhabited lands are now being returned – admittedly often at great cost but also offering great profit – to First Peoples, at least in metropolitan Vancouver. Coulthard seems to anticipate such developments when he writes:

> If the specific context of Canadian settler-colonialism, although the *means* by which the colonial state has sought to eliminate Indigenous peoples in order to gain access to our lands and resources have modified over the last two centuries – ranging from violent dispossession to the legislative elimination of First Nations legal status under the sexist and racist provisions of the Indian Act to the "negotiation" of what are essentially land surrenders under the present comprehensive land claims policy – the *ends* have always remained the same: to shore up continued access to Indigenous peoples' territories for the purposes of state formation, settlement, and capitalist development.[95]

While the economic driver of colonialism, capitalist development now promises to profit Indigenous peoples, at least in the real estate projects depicted above.

"If *ressentiment* is characterized by a pathological inability to "get over the past," Coulthard continues, "then according to the state-sanctioned discourse of reconciliation, Indigenous peoples would appear to suffer from *ressentiment* writ large," adding: "We just cannot seem to get over it."[96] While he judges "the specific commemorative and educational goals outlined in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's (TRC) mandate" to be "important and admirable," he finds that "many of the shortcomings that plagued both *Gathering Strength*[97] and the 2008 apology[98] also typify the mandate's terms of reference."[99] Coulthard's criticism of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission is that it locates "settler-colonialism in the past and focuses the bulk of its reconciliatory efforts on repairing the injurious legacy left in the wake of this history."[100] Moreover, "Indigenous subjects are the primary object of repair, not the colonial relationship,"[101] a complaint that ignores that repairing the colonial relationship requires the repair of all participants in it - the colonized as well as the colonizers. And if the colonial relationship has been internalized – the psychic cost of colonialism, as Fanon documented - then the Indigenous themselves cannot always be assumed to be acting in their own best interests.

Coulthard acknowledges his intellectual debt to Fanon in claiming that "Indigenous peoples' anger and resentment can generate forms of colonized subjectivity and anticolonial practice that we ought to critically affirm rather than denigrate in our premature efforts to promote forgiveness and reconciliation on terms still largely dictated by the colonial state."[102] Coulthard recommends "critically holding on to our anger and resentment," as they "can serve as an important emotional reminder that settler-colonialism is still very much alive and well in Canada, despite the state's repeated assertions otherwise."[103] He acknowledges that Fanon worried "whether the rehabilitated forms of Indigenous subjectivity constructed out of this anger and resentment ought to inform our collective efforts to reconstruct decolonized relationships and communities."[104] In contrast to Fanon, Coulthard asserts "that insofar as these reactive emotions result in the affirmation and resurgence of Indigenous knowledge and cultural practices, they ought to be seen as providing the substantive foundation required to reconstruct relationships of reciprocity and peaceful

coexistence within and against the psycho-affective and structural apparatus of settler-colonial power."[105]

There is additional critique of Fanon[106] – and Sartre – and I recommend reading these pages (as well as the entire book) in the original, but I end here with Coulthard's reiteration of this conviction that: "*Settler-colonialism is territorially acquisitive in perpetuity*."[107] The hegemony of capitalism – as the above real-estate story recounted above – is such that Indigenous land repossession is also "territorially acquisitive" and in capitalistic as well as cultural terms. Given the hegemony of capitalism, it is entirely understandable that the Indigenous are determined to profit from land repossession, but it is also testimony to Fanon's insights that the psychic consequence of colonialism is its psychological internalization. Despite his de-emphasis of this aspect of Fanon's analysis, Coulthard appears to concur: "Seen from this angle, settler-colonialism should not be seen as deriving its reproductive force solely from its strictly repressive or violent features, but rather from its ability to produce *forms of life* that make settler-colonialism's constitutive hierarchies seem natural."[108] Exactly.

Reincorporating his earlier targets, Coulthard continues: "The optics of recognition and reconciliation can also have an impact on Indigenous subjects. … settler-colonial rule … can produce neocolonial subjectivities that coopt Indigenous people into becoming instruments of their own dispossession." [109] Cultural dispossession perhaps, but not land – "real estate" in colonial terms – as litigation, negotiation, and acquisition remain underway to improve the economic circumstances of the Indigenous, now capitalists themselves (at least in the Vancouver instance described above). Coulthard couldn't disagree more, affirming that "the resurgent approach to recognition advocated here explicitly eschews the instrumental rationality central to the liberal politics of recognition and instead demands that we *enact* or *practice* our political commitments to Indigenous national and women's liberation in the cultural form and content of our struggle itself," adding: "Indigenous resurgence is at its core a *prefigurative* politics – the methods of decolonization prefigure its aims."[110]

Acknowledgement of cultural contamination[111] is altogether missing in his "Five Theses on Indigenous Resurgence and Decolonization."[112] These include (1) the "necessity of direct action,"[113] as well as acknowledgement that "land has been stolen, and significant amounts of it must be returned," as must "power and authority,"[114] (2) the end of "capitalism,"[115] (3) "Indigenous Sovereignty in the City," as "more than half of the Aboriginal population now lives in urban centers,"[116] (4) "Gender Justice and Decolonization,"[117] demanding "that Indigenous people, in particular Native men, commit ourselves *in practice* to uprooting the symbolic violence that structures Indigenous women's lives as much as we demand *in words* that the material violence against Indigenous violence women come to an end,"[118] and (5) moving "beyond the nation-state,"[119] demanding "that we begin to shift our attention away from the largely rights-based/recognition orientation that has emerged as hegemonic over the last four decades, to a resurgent politics of recognition that seeks to practice decolonial, gender-

emancipatory, and economically non-exploitative alternative structures of law and sovereign authority grounded on a critical refashioning of the best of Indigenous legal and political traditions."[120] That Coulthard is here (inadvertently) acknowledging that post-contact cultural preservation is impossible, that Indigenous "traditions" must undergo a "critical refashioning." The point of "privileging and grounding ourselves in these normative lifeways and resurgent practices" is "surviving our strategic engagements with the colonial state with integrity and as Indigenous peoples,"[121] surviving as subjective, cultural, and political reconstruction.[122]

To my mind, Coulthard is the most sophisticated scholar-theorist of Indigenous issues I have thus far read. Despite this intellectual sophistication, he seems to succumb to the same tendency other Indigenous scholars and "allies" show, namely blaming everything on colonialism, a move that risks erasing agency on the part of the victimized, as it positions oppression as all-powerful, totally determinative, thus impossible to overcome. Correcting injustice requires non-coincidence with what has occurred, with what occurs now, appreciating that the enemy is not only the nation-state or capitalism or colonialism but is also within, as colonialism is subjectively internalized, meaning that decolonization is not only a demand that ongoing colonialism be questioned and confined, but also a demand for subjective reconstruction, a fact that, at the end, Coulthard appears to acknowledge.

REFERENCES

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition.* University of Minnesota Press.

Fanon, Frantz. 1967. *Black Skin, White Masks.* [Trans. by Charles Lam Markmann.] New York: Grove Weidenfeld.

Innes, Robert Alexander and Anderson, Kim. Eds. 2015. *Indigenous Men and Masculinities: Legacies, Identities, Regeneration*. University of Manitoba Press.

Kincheloe, Joe L. and Pinar, William F. Eds. *Curriculum as Social Psychoanalysis: The Significance of Place.* State University of New York Press.

Knox, Shauna. 2022. Engaging *Currere* Toward Decolonization: Negotiating Black Womanhood through Autobiographical Analysis. Routledge.

Onishi, Norimitsu. 2022, August 24. Indigenous Communities Acquire Prime Land, and Power. *The New York Times*, CLXXI, No. 59,525, A4.

Pinar, William F. 2006. *Race, Religion, and a Curriculum of Reparation*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F. 2019. *What Is Curriculum Theory*? Routledge.

Pinar, William F. 2015. *Educational Experience as Lived*. Routledge.

Somtochukwu, Ani Kayode. 2023. *And Then He Sang A Lullaby*. Roxane Gay Books.

ENDNOTES

[1] Coulthard 2014, 4.
[2] 2014, 3.
[3] 2014, 6.
[4] 2014, 7.
[5] Ibid.
[6] 2014, 8.
[7] 2014, 10.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid. Coulthard (2014, 14) rejects "Marx's (and orthodox Marxism's) economic reductionism," influencing – as will see momentarily – his conception of "authentic decolonization."
[10] 2014, 12.
[11] Ibid.
[12] 2014, 13.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.
[15] 2014, 14.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Ibid.
[18] 2014, 17-18. I, too, turn to Fanon to discuss decolonization (Pinar 2015, 188-200). As do I, Coulthard relies on *Black Skin, White Masks*.
[19] 2014, 18.
[20] 2014, 23.
[21] 2014, 19.
[22] Ibid.
[23] 2014, 20.
[24] Ibid.
[25] 2014, 22.
[26] 2014, 24.
[27] Pinar 2006, 180.
[28] "Idle No More," Coulthard (2014, 24) writes, "offers a productive case study through which to explore what a resurgent Indigenous politics might look like on the ground."
[29] 2014, 39.
[30] 2014, 41.

[31] 2014, 42.
[32] 2014, 43.
[33] 2014, 44.
[34] Ibid.
[35] 2014, 47.
[36] 2014, 60.
[37] 2014, 61.
[38] 2014, 94.
[39] 2014, 7.
[40] 2014, 64.
[41] 2014, 65-66.
[42] 2014, 67.
[43] 2014, 80.
[44] 2014, 77.
[45] 2014, 94.
[46] 2014, 101.
[47] Ibid. Later, Coulthard (2014, 157) double-downs on this attribution of patriarchy solely to colonialism, praising "the crucial interventions of Indigenous feminist scholarship and activism over the years [that] have made it *impossible* for any credible scholar working within the field to ignore the centrality of sexism to the colonial aims of land dispossession and sovereignty usurpation. This crucial area of work has also made it impossible to credibly ignore the impact that colonial patriarchy continues to have on our national liberation efforts." See Innes and Anderson 2015 (research brief #47).
[48] 2014, 103.
[49] 2014, 106.
[50] 2014, 106-107. Just becoming more "positive" towards oneself smacks of self-help books, hardly acknowledging the complex challenge decolonization poses to the colonized. Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks* is the definitive reference here; for a more recent demonstration see Knox 2022. What is needed – and perhaps what exists but of which I'm ignorant – is an Indigenous versions of Fanon and Knox, even an Indigenous *currere*.
[51] 2014, 107.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Ibid.
[54] I'm reminded of how anger functioned for a bullied beaten Nigerian gay kid: "And so Segun came to hold on to that rage. Because he could look at his life, look at everything that had happened to him, and take solace in the conviction that it was all of that, and not him, that was out of place, abnormal. In that way, his rage brought him comfort" (Somtochukwu 2023, 74).
[55] 2014, 109.
[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid.
[58] Ibid.
[59] 2014, 110.
[60] 2014, 111.
[61] Ibid.

[62] 2014, 112.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Quoted passages in 2014, 114.
[65] 2014, 114.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid.
[68] 2014, 114-115.
[69] 2014, 121.
[70] Ibid.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid.
[73] 2014, 122.
[74] 2022, August 24, A4.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Quoted in 2022, August 24, A4.
[77] https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/squamish-nation-senakw-development-groundbreaking-1.6573841
[78] Ibid.
[79] Quoted in https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/squamish-nation-senakw-development-groundbreaking-1.6573841
[80] 2022, August 24, A4.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Ibid.
[83] Quoted in 2022, August 24, A4.
[84] 2022, August 24, A4.
[85] Ibid. Is power equivalent to "reconciliation"? Sounds like "Western" style democratic politics to me.
[86] Quoted in 2022, August 24, A4.
[87] 2022, August 24, A4.
[88] Ibid.
[89] Ibid.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Quoted in 2022, August 24, A4.
[93] 2022, August 24, A4.
[94] 2014, 123.
[95] 2014, 125.
[96] 2014, 126.
[97] *Gathering Strength* was an action plan designed to renew the relationship with the Aboriginal people of Canada, built on principles of "mutual respect, mutual recognition, mutual responsibility and sharing," identified in the report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples: https://homelesshub.ca/resource/gathering-strength-canadas-aboriginal-action-plan-1997#:~:text=Gathering%20Strength%20is%20an%20action%20plan%20designed%20to,report%20of%20the%20Royal%20Commission%20on%20Aboriginal%20Peoples

[98] On June 11, 2008, Canada's Prime Minister - Stephen Harper - publicly apologized to Canada's Indigenous Peoples for the IRS system, admitting that residential schools were part of a Canadian policy on forced Indigenous assimilation: https://ruggedthuglife.com/canada/when-did-canada-apologize-to-first-nations/#:~:text=On%20June%2011%2C%202008%2C%20Canada%E2%80%99s%20Prime%20Minister%2C%20the,of%20a%20Canadian%20policy%20on%20forced%20Indigenous%20assimilation

[99] 2014, 127.

[100] Ibid.

[101] Ibid.

[102] 2014, 128.

[103] Ibid.

[104] Ibid.

[105] 2014, 129.

[106] See 2014, 132ff.

[107] 2014, 152.

[108] Ibid.

[109] 2014, 156.

[110] 2014, 159.

[111] For Pasolini a positive concept, akin to cosmopolitanism: Pinar 2023, 200.

[112] 2014, 165.

[113] Ibid.

[114] 2014, 168.

[115] 2014, 170.

[116] 2014, 176.

[117] Ibid.

[118] 2014, 177.

[119] 2014, 178. Even the "First Nations"?

[120] 2014, 179.

[121] Ibid.

[122] Oddly perhaps, the same point I make: Pinar 2019, 140, n. 2.