



**Ward Churchill**

**Affirmation as Denial: The Case of the "Postcolonial" Colonial**

I bring you greetings from the South. It's an honor to be back here at St. Thomas again and it is even more of an honor to be standing on Maliseet land, which is what this is. From the South I bring you specifically greetings from the Colorado Chapter of the American Indian Movement, Colorado AIM. And from Leonard Pelletier, who tonight as I speak to you continues to sit in a cage maintained by the federal government, not for anything anyone, including even his prosecutor, at any point since 1986 has been prepared to say publicly they believe he actually did. Rather as a symbol of the arbitrary ability of the federal government of the United States to repress the legitimate aspirations and deliberations of Native peoples within its claimed boundaries. The emphasis there is on 'claimed.' The difference between a claim and a reality is that they can claim the moon it doesn't mean they own it. That difference is really what we will be talking about tonight. In that difference is the reason Leonard sits where he sits. That symbol is very important.

What the symbol is both to indigenous people and to everyone else in a way, is that if you take the supposed liberal democratic rights espoused by the mega states of North America at face value and you treat them as if they were real and, as a consequence of that reality you act upon them to try to exercise them, it can be cost prohibitive. It doesn't matter which right we are talking about. Freedom of speech - you are free to say anything you want so long as no one listens. If people listen, and more importantly if what you say resonates, if it galvanizes, if it causes people to act upon their fundamental interests, to see things in another way, and most of all to exercise their rights, there are consequences. There are costs to free speech as it is formulated in the United States. Not to be insulting to anyone's national pride but I always enjoy my visits to the northern provinces of the United States, which means it is no different here than it is down there. Leonard had the audacity to see his rights clearly, to see his peoples' rights clearly, not to negotiate, not to equivocate, but to assert those rights forcefully in the world. Here's the message - you really do that, we have got a cage for you.

There's another message that is embodied in there - if we act in that spirit, if we can get him out, it defeats the message they are trying to send. Leonard Pelletier is very important as a human being, a human being of dignity and worth, a human being who acted in concert with a tradition of his ancestors and for future generations, and therefore so people, his people, all people who would be free. Leonard Pelletier is also important in a way that transcends his immediate humanity, and that is in that symbolic way. He didn't select it, but that is the reality that has been imposed.

I am going to talk about colonialism tonight. That is what they asked me to talk about and there are some aspects of it I have been dying to talk about for a while. I don't always catch up with myself. Things that irritate me, things I think need to be addressed and debunked, I have more of those than I have time to speak to. This is sort of an opportunity to me tonight. You understand colonialism in the first instance is always imposed and maintained by force of arms. Let's just call it what it is. You can qualify it as one or another form of colonialism, you can call it neocolonialism, you can frame it in the rubric of imperialism, you can talk about it in terms of globalization, it still comes down to that. That is never the preferred method. It is crude, it is inefficient. They will always try to convince you that in the pathology of alcoholism, or any other form of denial, the opposite of everything is true. That is the first line of defense. If they can convince you that in your oppression you are free, you will be maintaining the regiment of your own oppression. It is much more efficient if they can make you self colonized.

I am going to go at it two different ways. Colonialism in the sense that we understand it today and the whole paradigm of imperialism as it has been discussed throughout my lifetime is a Eurocentric proposition. It is not that Europe is the only entity, however you want to define that which is European; it is not the only entity, the only process that has ever been colonial in nature. It is not the only imperialist dynamic that has ever existed anywhere in the history of mankind, but it has unique features that have defined those realities for us where we are. I doubt that I could ask very many of you out there to give me a definition of Peloponnesian imperialism and have you come up with much of an answer. It existed, but it's not in the frame of reference. It defines nothing other than of archaic interest in the present reality. How was it that Europe, in undertaking that globalist, and it was globalist from the outset in its ambitions, that globalist enterprise that becomes imperialism and defines modernity, as they put it in the discourse of the academy? How did it become positioned to undertake that project in the first place? You need to find the origins of things. This is consummate with indigenous tradition everywhere. You look over your shoulder to see where you have been, to figure out where you are in order to understand where it is you are going. You have to look back to the origins of things to understand where they came from, to watch their evolution, to understand the nature of the reality, the nature of their essence as you encounter it. In that understanding you can plot the directions, trajectories, however you want to refer to them, to alter circumstance so that if it is objectionable, it will no longer be there.

The answer to that ultimately, I think you can find, and I am sure you can trace it back further, but maybe for our purposes of discussion and understanding here tonight you can trace it back to the coronation of Charlemagne, the crowning of the Holy Roman Emperor, back then in Germany at about 800 A.D. as they compute time in the West. In a certain sense that was a meaningless gesture. At that moment there was no particular power or resonance to the coronation. It was something that had to do with the theological importance of dividing Eastern Christendom and Western Christendom to put Western Christendom back on the map in terms of theological discourse, but in the real world context, in its immediacy, not much. From that moment you can watch that empire proclaimed and a given city state begin to expand outward from a center, roughly central Europe outward like the rings of an onion, like a tree growing outward one concentric circle at a time. Outward, from its center into Eastern Europe, outward from its center into France, northward into Germany, southward to encompass the Rome from which it took its name, ultimately not ending until on the emerald isle of Ireland. The entire project was to take the indigenous peoples of Europe, obliterate their capacity to physically resist subordination to that center of papal power as it becomes, subjugating them, eradicating their traditional understandings of relations between one another and with their environment, Christianizing, emulsifying distinctions between the two, taking each concentric ring and converting them not only to Christianity, but into the basic fodder, the shock troops by which the next concentric ring outward would be conquered, subordinated, ultimately subjugated, transformed into something radically different from what they had been. In other words, in order for Europe to become a global imperialist entity able to project itself outward across the planet in the manner that it ultimately would do, Europe had to be internally colonized. Europe itself is an abstraction, an invention. They refer to it as the continent. Really? Where is its eastern boundary? What divides Europe from Asia? Continents are geographically, and you can ask any cartographer or geographer you want, demarcated from one another by usually a separation or a very distinct narrowing of territoriality; Africa from Asia by the Suez, North America from South America by the Isthmus of Panama, and so on. What is it that divides Europe from Asia? They will tell you the Ural Mountains. If the Ural Mountains are to be taken because they are convenient, and that is about the only thing you can say that would be of significance in terms of dividing the land mass, then how about the so called sub-continent of India, which is after all divided from Asia by the Himalayas, a rather more pronounced chain in the Ural mountains? Eur-Asia is a single contiguous landmass. Europe itself is not a continent; it is a couple of peninsular protrusions off of Asia. They had to invent the geography of Europe. They had to synthesize the culture of Europe. It is an invention that happens after 800 A.D. by a process of colonization, in the wake of conquest, in the name of a true god, a theological abstraction in itself.

In other words, Europe, in order to become Europe, had to be a colonial endeavor in the first instance. In order for Europe to be organized and do what it ultimately would do, it had to be colonized. It had to be ultimately constructed of colonization. It ultimately is a creation of self-colonization. Now, the important part about that as Russell Means would tell you, he flicked this little light bulb in my mind, that process was so thoroughgoing and so complete, and has been sustained on false pretences for so long that those who identify, signify themselves as being Europeans, or of European extraction, they have been so thoroughly colonized and have been so long self colonizing that they have forgotten the very fact of their colonization, and you cannot be more colonized than that. That is ultimately the process of defense. You cannot decolonize if you don't know that you are colonized.

Decolonization is the reverse of the rubric. It would be the fundamental desire of someone who politically speaking, economically speaking, even culturally speaking, signify themselves as an anti imperialist, fighting for somebody else's liberation not realizing that they are part of the process of colonization themselves and would be requiring of decolonization for anti imperialism to be complete. This destabilizes and mires the whole proposition from the outset. To convince you that the opposite of the reality that you occupy is true, if you can be convinced that's true, you will never rationally think your way through to a position where you need tangibly to resist. It takes your liberatory potential, if you are in that position, and turns it into at most altruism. I'm doing this because it's the right thing to do. Not because it is in my self interest, not because I need to, not because many of the things that would actually motivate seriousness grounded in sense of self and community, but rather as an idealistic abstract gesture. Those who are motivated by idealism and abstraction, well, they can always get down in the gutter with the truly oppressed but since they don't understand themselves as such, when the going really gets rough they can climb back up on the curb. That has been the nature of the so-called revolutionary project in North America for as long as it has been chronicled as a revolutionary project in North America.

There is a problem with that – let's take a couple concrete examples, see how this works in other domains, see if we can clarify a little bit how the semantic abstractions and psychological abstractions are used to nullify even the potential of serious change, transformation, realization, rights, and all the rest of that. A quick poll: How many people in the room here have ever been in an Indian gaming facility, otherwise known as a casino? In Canada or the States? Both? I heard both. I'll speak on the basis of my understanding of the process in the States. I expect it is going to be identical up here, but I'm not from up here so I won't speak with quite as much confidence on that score. You can tell me if it's radically different however. In the States, Native people have never, ever, none of them, relinquished sovereignty in the sense that it is understood by the West and the term is used. Native people have somewhat different understandings of the implications of that term, but let's just use Western terms because those are the common denominator of the discourse. Never.

It has been violated. It has been violated across the board. There is not a single indigenous nation of the five hundred plus within the territorial confines of the United States that has sovereignty in tact, but that's not because Native people ever agreed to give it up. It is because somebody else had the power, not the right, but the power to violate it. That's problematic when you promote yourself as being a government, usually popularized as a nation of laws and you want to hold yourself out in the world community as the model to be emulated in legal and enlightenment terms. George Bush said it - that is the current George Bush. He probably learned it from his daddy, but there's one model that is viable in the world today and that's us,

everybody else needs to be trying to be like us. We are the only democratic project, value freedom, aren't evil, and manage to survive more than twenty minutes in the real world. In fact, the real world needs to worry about whether or not it can survive twenty minutes in the face of us.

That's the kind of the proposition, we're it. Well, this nation of laws will flaunt the law, will violate the law, and has to pretend that the opposite is true. That's a fairly glaring circumstance down there, if you think about it, that the United States is the epitome of freedom, democracy and all the rest, owes every square inch of its territorial integrity, which it claims as being its own, to Native people. Now we have got all the treaties and such, but treaties are actually a loaded weapon because in international law, the law of nations as it was known at the time, when most of those treaties were entered into, and in the US Constitution itself, the entering into of a treaty between the federal government of the United States and any other party implies that they are fully sovereign nations, peer in standing to that of the United States itself. The United States is prohibited under its own constitution from entering in to a treaty relation with anything other than another fully sovereign nation. Period. So you've got four hundred ratified treaties, you've got four hundred recognitions that indigenous peoples are nations on a legal footing, exactly the same as that of the United States itself. You have got all sorts of little convolutions they've gone through to make the opposite of that come out to be true, but nonetheless, logical consistency demands that it be recognized that these peoples are entitled to a self determining, self governing existence on the same level as the United States and self evidently also, they are not.

How to get around this one? And how in the hell does that relate to casinos? Put them together. The usurpation of your sovereign prerogatives, the expropriation of your land, the expropriation of your resources, the payment of less than 10 % market rate of royalties in exchange for resources and so forth have done much for the United States economy, on the one hand, and the inverse of that as you got sheer destitution for a great bulk of the Native population. The very poorest people in North America whether you are north of the border or south, are going to be Native people. Although nominally, even after the great bulk of the land expropriations that occurred, you've still got people who on resource profiles should be among the wealthiest strata of the continent. The difference between wealth and poverty has to do with colonial relations, which we will come back to. All that without ever having relinquished sovereign rights, never having agreed to any of this. You can read every treaty that was ever signed between any European power, Canada and the United States, and every indigenous nation that entered into one; you'll find no place that any of them gave it up.

But you are destitute. That is the real, hardcore nitty gritty, day to day reality. You're living on a Pine Ridge reservation in South Dakota in 40 degree below winters, in tar paper shacks and people living in cars. Now here, you can reconstitute a national economy, if not that, at least enough to feed your children, heat your house, have some electricity by opening a bingo parlor. There's a certain irony in that. I'll say this even at St. Thomas. Native people, who seized upon it, as Charlie Hill put it, were really insidious because they seized a central sacred ceremony of the Catholic Church, which is bingo, and turned it into a profit making enterprise. If bingo's not enough, you can add blackjack, you can add backarack, and you can add can roulette, you can add slot machines, you can run casinos. On casinos you can open clinics, you can open schools, a fire department, you can pave your streets, you can guarantee an annual income, people can eat. All you need to do is sign a state gaming compact.

That's the federal law. In treaties, relationship between Native peoples and the settler population is through the federal government, no state gaming compact. In other words, in order to open your casino and run it unmolested, for us to allow, in fact even encourage you to do so, thus taking the strain off the national treasury to do things like pretend we are feeding you and so forth, having rendered you this kind of destitute, all you need to do is accept the rules and regulations for gambling enterprises established by the various states in which your reservations happen to be located. What are the implications of that? Well you've just voluntarily demoted yourself from a government to government relationship with the federal government of the United States, or I would argue, with Canada, and placed yourself under the authority of the states of the Union, or up here the provinces, which down in the states would put you at the level of sovereignty, by your own consent, of roughly a county and in some cases, a municipality. You've just voluntarily relinquished your sovereign prerogatives as nations. The United States has so argued at the United Nations, we are not doing anything to violate the sovereignty of the Native people, they have willingly agreed to place themselves, for money, at the level of sovereignty we are now according them. They can be patrolled by the state police, they can be subjugated to the county authorities where there are municipal conditions, and so on, and they have agreed to it in exchange for being able to feed their children and so forth. That's a devils bargain. It creates the appearance that nothing has been done to Native people, things are being done only with the agreement of Native peoples. The fact that that is an absolute false head is covered up in the gloss and the veneer of the situation creating the appearance that the opposite of the reality is true. Very clever, particularly when you hold all the cards.

Consent - let me put this in another framing in case that was too complicated for people. You all understand that a rape is a crime? It is an abridgement of a personal sovereignty? This is not a sexist argument, rape happens to men as well as women, maybe not with the same frequency but it is certainly a hypothetical possibility for anybody sitting in this room to be raped. You understand that rape is an imposition of, a violation of your most intimate self. It is not an act of love or an act of sex. It is an act of aggression and violence. Except if you consent, if I can make an argument that is plausible in court that you consented, it is no longer rape, it is consensual sex. That is exactly what they are doing. You have a centuries' long perpetration of rape of indigenous societies, every most intimate aspects of being, and what they are doing is soliciting, creating the context where you have the appearance of consent. The rape then goes away and becomes apparently consensual sex, and that of course is no crime.

Subterfuge - that would be the logic and the rules of the whole thing. What you have as national policy with regard to Native people, is essentially the mentality of a rapist at work. The subterfuges work exactly the same way and for exactly the same reasons. To create the appearance that the victim is not the victimizer, but a willing partner in the enterprise. You put it that way and people start to get upset. Get it back over there in that legalistic plane where we don't have to deal with it in real concrete day to day terms that we can actually understand and we can pretend that we didn't understand generation in, generation out, and we just didn't know. Or, we couldn't see it clearly, it was all so confusing. This isn't confusing at all when you start to put it in terms like that, that are concrete and tangible in the day to day existence of not just Native people, but everybody. The violation doesn't just happen to Native people, it can happen to everybody when you are talking about rape, but we've got particular forms of rape that are imposed upon Native people, and guess what? Some people who would be opposed to rape as a matter of principal are willing participants in the rape of Native people because it is to their advantage, perceived at least, to be so. Hence all the obfuscation, mystifying language, always being confused, we just can't understand what you are saying.

How many people here heard of something called post-colonialism? Or post-coloniality? I like that, and post-modernism, and of course, those would go along with post-Marxism, and post-structuralism. How many people have post breakfast cereals every morning? We've got one volunteer for that. What does post mean? Except for the breakfast cereal, maybe it means it for that too, maybe it used to be breakfast cereal but it's not anymore, but you are eating it anyway. Oh, we see a blush, never volunteer. You shouldn't have to go into the military to learn not to volunteer. Hold up your hand, you're going to get jabbed at. Post means after the fact, does it not? Afterwards? Something that used to be but is no longer? This is a post-war period. Of course, you can't have a post-war period in North America because North America, at least in some of its portions is continuously at war with somebody, and has been since its first moment of existence. I never really understood post-war, but they will specify some war and then you'll have a post-war and that means the war is over. So, of course, Marxism might be over, I don't know, I still watch Groucho movies late at night and really enjoy them, so I'm not sure we will ever have a post-Marxist era. Post-structuralism? It looks fairly structural to me, but nonetheless, I guess you could make a philosophical argument for it. Post-modernism? Well, I guess that would depend on how you define modernist, and modernity. One way I suppose would be by way of post-colonialism, because colonialism was the hallmark of creating what was known as modernity. So, you would have had to have post-colonialism emerge in order to declare the post-modern era, would you not? Colonialism is over? I really got riveted by coming across, and this is a source of my irritation, I never much liked the idea anyway.

I'll explain in more detail why, but I really got irritated when I came across a line in a literate piece that I was compelled to read for reasons I no longer remember. I wasn't in school, so I must have been working on some project, but I can't quite imagine what the project would have been that would have led me to this text by an esteemed professor of, they call it commonwealth studies. I don't come from a commonwealth actually, so the parameters sort of evaded me at the time and that is why I am not sure why I was reading it. Anyway, a professor at U of T by the name of Diana Brydon, who's writing in commonwealth studies, addressing post-colonial theorists, and said if you want to apprehend the post-colonial, look to us.

This may require a little clarification. This isn't a Native woman, or East Indian, or West Indian, this is basically, let's pop it up right on the screen, is a Euro-Canadian woman in a very privileged position who is writing as the post-colonial subject, asserting the demand, why, of course because Canada used to be literally a colonial possession of Great Britain, and of course it no longer is, and literally speaking that would make it a post-colonial context. The colonized in this construction that she is asserting would be Euro-Canadians. De-colonization in Canada would have occurred when the Crown no longer had colonial dominion asserted over Canada. Canada became a commonwealth country, ostensibly independent. Colonialism is now over. We are in a post-colonial context. We can study colonialism as an historical artifact. We can talk about the aftershocks in terms of gentle, rarified even, highly theoretical, literary, critical, linguistic, semantic and various other kinds of esoteric ways of shaping the consciousness of the culture, the society and the polity.

What happened to the colonized? The colonizer has now substituted herself for the colonized and become the de-colonial subject. The actual colonized, the people whose land and resources Canada is, always was, have been utterly disappeared from the context of discourse. They don't exist. Colonialism has been abolished. The actuality of Canada, not to be discussed because you have a substitution of colonizer for colonized, a declaration that it is no longer an operant reality, a consignment to the intellectual historical domain, or dustbin, depending. How much more completely could you consummate the ongoing existence of colonial dominion in Canada than to declare it no longer an issue at all? That which is merely historical, that which is merely of intellectual interest, which is of intellectual curiosity, but not operant reality, need not ever be defined, confronted, and transcended. It's gone. Native people, incidentally, would be gone along with it.

So I think we need to take a little look at the nature of colonialism. What is it? They've got a little parody of that as well. If you liken colonialism, which is after all the operative environment of the imperial paradigm, you liken it to a stool, it wouldn't be that one at the old pharmacy soda counter where it sat, or a few bars probably as well, old diners, one leg standing up with a little round cushion you sit on so you can swivel away from the counter and back. You've all seen it in movies about the 1950's, and car hops, and hot rods and all of that, a period piece. I have never heard of a two legged stool, so we can ignore some sort of analogous description of that. It would be for sure, a three-legged stool. All that gets talked about in this notion of post-colonialism is one of those. There are two more that are not addressed. But you can't deal with them and have the notion of post-coloniality at all. It would be a self-nullifying, ridiculous concept. Let's run through this a little bit.

What is colonialism in these configurations? The one we are all familiar with, the one we are really talking about, you could call classical, usually referred to as overseas colonialism. That is, emanating outward from Europe. That process, you could probably run it back into the Crusades. Crusades began not that long after that coronation of Charlemagne that I was talking about. You've got about three hundred years there to internal consolidation, of the construction of Europe, before they begin to have Crusades. That is really, probably the motive force for most of the rank and file, foot soldier, grassroots, whatever, the mass of troops, that their mustering to send on Crusades may have been religious fervor. They may really have thought they were going to get Jesus' birthplace back for Christendom, or whatever, not that anyone was stopping them from visiting there anyway. That's the propaganda edifice. It had very little to do with that. What it really had to do with was an attempt to put Europe on the board in economic terms. Basically Europe is a backwater. Europe is a corruption of a Greek word meaning darkness and ignorance. That is how they were viewed by the centers of civilization at the time. These are guys with an inferiority complex that have never been part of the big game.

Well, the big game is going to be coming down the Silk Road out of Asia. You are going to have tea and spices, and all those things they told you about in grade school. But there is this little problem. It's called the Islamic wall. You've got Islam between East Asia and Europe, and the Silk Road ends in the marketplaces of Islam. Islam is the broker. Brokers as you know, tend to profit. If you have to pay retail prices for everything that you are consuming, you can't get into the wholesale business and you can't have profit margins, you can't amass wealth. You are expending all the wealth that you can muster in order to make acquisitions, things that are of value in your culture. And they are valuing things like silk, spices and such as that that's coming down the Silk Road. So, they are trying to punch a hole through the Islamic wall so that they can have receipt of those goods without the middleman in the bargain, and they never make it. You've got several centuries of repeated crusading ventures trying to solve that particular problem, and they cannot militarily defeat Islam. In fact, it very nearly goes in the other direction.

About 1450, you've got an innovative bunch in Portugal that are figuring out, on the basis of African maps that they have acquired from their safari in the Moors in the institutions in Iberia. The universities are Islamic universities and that has something to do with the nature of Western Christendom, but we are not going to go there either. We are not going to do theology so much tonight. They have got the maps which suggest that you can actually sail around Africa to get to the East. You can circumvent the Islamic wall. So, the Portuguese take off to do that. You may remember there was this guy by the name of Cristobal Colon who is sailing for the Portuguese. You probably know him as Columbus. His name is actually Colon as in colonizer. That is where the word comes from, the same root. He is involved in this project a little further down the road than 1450.

1450 expeditions do not get around Africa, what they do is end up washing up on the West coast of Africa, part way down. They are a failure in their own terms, they do not manage to get to the wealth of the East, but they figure out in the process of hitting the West coast that there is something of value here. And, if you go inland it will be more valuable yet, but you've got a natural barrier in Africa too that is not resolved until very nearly the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It requires prophylactic drugs like Quinine to allow Europeans to penetrate the interior of Africa. Consequently, Africa is not colonized in the sense that the new world will be. But what they found of value was black flesh. Now you've got the corruption of the story of Ham. This comes out of Islam as well; black and slave can be synonym. This can be valuable for labor power, and so you've got the first leg of what becomes the triangular trade. But the object is still to get to the East. OK, you can sail down to Africa and you can bring black chattel slaves back to Europe for use particularly in Iberia. There is still greater wealth to be had, which leads to the Columbian adventure, trying to sail, circumnavigate the Islamic wall, yet by going completely around the world in the opposite direction. He runs into a hemisphere he didn't know was there, or did. We usually assume that he didn't, but it wasn't European charts that he was sailing on, so what was actually known, I don't know. You kind of know what happened there.

From there you get the Hudson Bay Company and the East Asia Company and you get a couple Portuguese companies in Indonesia, you get a process that unravels over time fairly well accelerating as it goes along, as technological innovation becomes increasingly possible. One basis of the technological innovation is something like Potosi. Potosi is a single mountain in the Andes that seems to have been made of little more than silver ore. They took enough silver out of that one mountain to build a bridge, a foot bridge from the East Coast of South America all the way to Spain. But the Spanish, the conquistadores, the hidalgos, the Spaniards in general fairly shortly into this process see themselves as not one, but several cuts above most other Europeans who are still relatively poor. They have got so much wealth pouring in that they don't work. They don't establish manufacturing enterprises. The silver, the gold, everything coming out of the new world holdings of the Iberian imperial powers washes straight through Northwestern Europe and sparks the industrial revolution. They're buying cannon, they're buying armor, they're buying all manner of stuff which has to be manufactured, what for the day would be heavy industry. They create the industrial base that ultimately nullifies them in Europe. That's the technological engine that's occurring. The wealth is coming out of the colonial periphery into the center. The center is able to increasingly exert itself on the basis of this, increasingly project itself outward to the point where you come out of the 19<sup>th</sup> century into the 20<sup>th</sup> century with fully 85% of the land mass of the earth claimed by one or another European power. The entire planet is claimed by Europe.

When I was a little kid, this is the early 1950's, when the process which Phyllis Glendening has referred to as the most inspiring period in her life, which was the de-colonization of Africa, and most of South Asia, and so on, right at the onset of that, my parents saved up and got me a globe. I have always been fascinated by maps, I still am. I have them hanging on my walls, not because I am all that interested in the territorialities involved, and the geopolitics, but I just like them as pictures, as

graphics. This map had several colors. The entire world was color-coded it turns out. Pink was English, so the British Isles were pink. Canada was pink, Australia was pink, New Zealand was pink, South Africa was pink. Everything claimed as colonial possession by Great Britain was pink. France was, I think, green. Somebody else was purple. That was the Dutch. Looks like Rhode Island on the map, I mean there's this tiny little speck of purple, and then all of Indonesia was purple. Belgium and the Congo are the same color. You follow? So this bit about the sun never setting on the British Empire, well the British Empire wasn't the only empire. Then you have that classical construction, the one that everybody thinks of in terms of the colonies, empire, imperialism, undergoes a very rapid dissolution.

Between 1945 and 1965 it's just about vaporized. There are still some little pockets of it out there. There are still some holdings by European powers, they consider these things to be theirs elsewhere. Kind of like America, the United States that is, thinks of America Samoa. They won't call it a colony but America Samoa? How did Samoa become? There talking a little Polynesia, US Virgin Islands and so on. You still have a little of that with regard to the old European empires as well. But that classical model is basically abolished. You see the de-colonization of India. That is the first source of what becomes post-colonial discourse, post-colonial theory and so forth. Virtually the entire continent of Africa. There are some hold outs, Angola takes a while longer, Rhodesia as it is called becomes Zimbabwe, now Mugabe's got it and all that is a horror show. But that is not where I am going either. Virtually the entire continent of Africa is de-colonized in those twenty years. Africa is your second source of post-colonial discourse. It takes hold as an extraction in the lead institutions in the West because it is very convenient.

Now let us interrogate this. I know we've got professors that study such things in the room, I can see you all sitting there. Which one of you can tell me from Antiquity, the history of India, from before the Brits arrived? Let's make Antiquity any point before the Brits arrived. India, what was its existence? Who founded India? I heard somebody say something? They had to be invented there just like here. Actually I think they've got somewhat different origins here, but maybe not. Before the British raided the colonial compartment for administrative purposes, did they call it India? Was there any existence of something called India as a geopolitical entity? As a territory? As a anything? Stony silence here, come on you are all supposed to be well versed in this British historiography. The answer from the wall is no. No such entity existed. You had at various different periods several different empires of sorts on that sub-continent, but you've got three hundred nations that were amalgamated into a single administrative compartment with a bunch of sub-compartments, by British imperialism. Basically, the British East India Company did that with the backing of the government. It made it comprehensible and coherent in imperialist terms, it had nothing to do with the interests of the people who lived on the land in the area now called India. But you have the de-colonization of India. India becomes an independent country. There's something a little wrong with this picture.

Let's try it again. Let's go to Africa now. Whether you could keep up with the change of names in certain areas of Africa you'd probably recognize the national boundaries wouldn't you, generally speaking? You know the difference between South Africa and Zimbabwe, you know the difference between Kenya and the Sudan, you could probably pick most of these out on the map. Can you give me the African heritage, the genealogy of these nations in Africa? I can. In 1887 Berlin, when the imperial powers got together with a blank map of the continent and demarcated their holdings, worked it all out among themselves, so you have something that never existed before come into being. It's called the Congo, it is a colonial administrative department, it's called Niger, you have Ghana, you have Sudan, you have all of these boundaries created by the Europeans for their own convenience to alleviate conflict with one another. It had absolutely nothing to do with Africa other than administrating their subordination.

These same boundaries that were effected in 1887 at the Berlin conference are the boundaries that are recognized as the national boundaries of Africa today in a de-colonial context that will be defended to the death by the independence fighters who drove the Europeans out physically from Africa, maintaining the forms of government that they were indoctrinated to believe were superior, the boundaries that had been established for them, the notions of military organization and so forth that they were educated, so to speak, to adhere to in European universities. Every colonial power educated, which is to say indoctrinated, a segment of the colonized population to do the brunt work of administering through the colony and maintaining order on behalf of the colonizer, not on behalf of their own people. In Africa, India is a somewhat different case because it is all one large mass subdivided into provinces, Africa is actually divided into different countries.

Those boundary lines were a little like the US-Canadian border. You might ask somebody from the Six Nations about that, having an international boundary drawn squarely through your traditional territory, so that part of your people, part of your country is to the north of somebody else's line. In the south, you might ask the people in the Blackfoot Confederation, you might ask the Ojibwe. These are preexisting indigenous nations that have been partitioned by the drawing of a superseding boundary line by the incoming colonizing powers. That is all over the place in Africa. You have got people that are partitioned so that one part of their country is on one side of the line and the other part is on another. You've also got whole countries; lots of them lumped into the larger states. You end up with the revolutionary force of primarily European trained cadres who affect the liberation, the de-colonization, the overthrow or expulsion of classical colonialism maintaining the colonial structure that had been pre-established and imposing it upon themselves. The bloodiest fights in Africa that have occurred since de-colonization are like Katanga province. What was Katanga province about? They didn't have provinces in traditional Africa, that's something that is created. That's administrative compartmentalization again. They simply called particular administrative districts provinces after they threw the Europeans out that was basically conforming to the area of a traditional people, a nation in its own right. The Katangese as they were called, were a particular group, a particular people, a particular nation that didn't necessarily see the benefit of maintaining their amalgamation with all these other peoples in an

arbitrarily defined territorial compartment. They decided to succeed from that monstrosity and resume their traditional way of governing themselves, existing in their territory, maybe even going back in some sense to their traditional economy, and the revolutionary Africans killed them until they agreed to be part of the Congo. You have that up in Ghana with the Ewe, trying to break away from the ascendant tribal group which was basically subordinating them, maintaining them by force of arms, arbitrarily within a colonially determined set of boundaries. You're all part of one nation. No, we're not all part of one nation, we're separate nations. In fact, there are about fifteen, twenty nations in this entity.

How about we all go back to governing ourselves, being self-determining, independent, define our relations among one another without having the legacy of European colonialism define how it is we must interact with one another. How about we actually liberate ourselves? No, that is outside the box of what we were trained to believe was modern and progressive in European universities. That is true for the whole of India. I had a couple Naga military commanders stay with me for a week because it was necessary to come to organize support, to North America. They needed a base of operations. How many people here ever heard of the Naga? A couple? That is one of those three hundred nations that are compelled to remain within this entity created by the Brits, now known as India. Nagaland. They have been a military resistance to being subordinated to centralized rule in India for the last fifty years. If you want to run across the border into Burma, which is another British construction, you're going to find the Karen have been fighting, and you've got the Kachin in the north who have been fighting as well against South Asian regimes, which are maintaining them in the same position that was established in the first place by the European colonizers.

You've got the revocation of a classical colonial model and an absolute seamless transition into an internal colonial model. Internal colonialism is where basically, your own are compelling you, your own in some mystical sense, but actually these groupings and this nomenclature is established in the European colonial tradition as well. We don't tend to have words for things like race in a lot of these languages. Race is an imported idea. The idea of being Americans, or Africans, these are not terms that are indigenous to the areas under discussion. They aren't even conceived. They are imposed from the outside. Taking that set of terms, you've got Africans colonizing Africans, with absolutely identical, ruthless efficiency in terms of the same ideals that were initially imposed from Europe. You have South Asians doing it to South Asians now instead of British imperialists doing it, although the British relied on South Asians to do it for the most part all along, through, interestingly enough, a process of residential schooling and some higher education and running peoples into military combines. They found that they could be good soldiers. They could smell the enemy and they fought ferociously for the privileges that the colonizer would pass along to them, crumbs from the table. We remember what the Kipling poem said, the British officer looks at the slain bugle boy, "You are a better man than I Gunga Din." A better imperialist than I am, basically is what he is saying. I wouldn't have died for the lancers the way you sacrificed yourself against your own people. Internal colonialism is a second leg, and of course, if you are going to be Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak, you couldn't even acknowledge the existence of a leg on the stool that has to do with internal colonialism, because then you could hardly be the purveyor of post-colonial discourse could you?

You have to announce that colonization is at an end when you drove the British out, and that all three hundred of these nationalities, if we discuss them at all, are voluntarily participating in the creation of a new national project. That however, would be false and easily demonstrable as such, so you don't talk about it at all. You simply seal off colonialism with the colonial form and don't discuss the other two.

Now, we've got a third leg. This would be the most virulent of all. It would be very similar in a lot of respects, to internal colonialism because there is not an overseas colonizer. Internal colonialism happens when the old classical overseas colonizer is driven out but the colonial institutions, and borders and rubrics are maintained by those formerly colonized who become internally colonizing. Now, for the third one, it gets to be very interesting. The colonizing population is exported basically, by what used to be referred to as the mother country. British colonizers would be sent to North America, or they would be sent to Africa, in various locales, or they would be sent to Australia, or they would be sent to what becomes New Zealand, and at a certain point, by one means or another, they would sever their relations of dominion, becoming independent. South of the border you had what they falsely referred to as a revolution. I say falsely, because it wasn't the object of anybody involved in it to overthrow King George, just to revoke the authority in the colonies. They somewhat more accurately refer to it sometimes as a war of independence. It was basically a de-colonization struggle of such, in a bourgeois plane, where the colonizing population severs its relations in a formal sense with the colonizing country. But the population remains, which leads to little distortions like Diana Brydon's, fancying now colonialism is over forgetting the fact that she is representative of a population that was the colonizing population, not the colonized, but the colonizing population. Mind you, a demography changes from point to point, but you've got a number of examples, very prominent examples of what I am going to talk about next around the world. The United States is one, Canada is one, South Africa is one, Australia is one, New Zealand is one, we could talk about Israel, but time is short. We'll just stick with the Anglophone manifestations of this. I say demography changes a bit because you've got a tremendous overburden of the continuing imports or descendants of the original colonizing population such that proportionately, numerically, all these statistical ways, really outnumber the original colonized population, about a half percent by official count of the population, the gross population south of the border, where the preferred term is Native American. That's false, there is about three or four times as many Native Americans in the sense people came from that particular geography, and even that is a gross distortion because the particular geography of my people would be north Georgia and Tennessee, mostly residing in Oklahoma after some real estate transactions, and scattered all across. A Mohawk doesn't tend to occupy the same territory as a Cherokee or Apache, so when they talk about the same general territory, they talk about the forty eight contiguous states which is a half continent in scale with different peoples scattered across. As long as you are still within that box, you're home old boy. Yeah right.

The actual population descendant from groups that were resident to the forty eight contiguous states area would be three, four times the size they acknowledge now. If you add in others however, remember that little boundary between the United States and Canada was not drawn by Native peoples. There's a lot of Canadian Aborigines down in the states, but way more people who come up from say, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, and so on. Somehow they become Hispanic. This means, literally, they've got a Spanish last name. Well guess what, they've got a Spanish speaking colonizer. Gee, I wonder how that happened. Those priests didn't speak Quechuan or whatever, they used Spanish nomenclature. And they want to talk about the IQ of the Hispanic population too. Can you give me the DNA code of your last name? Somebody? IQ being a heritable characteristic. Here's the heritable IQ of the Hispanic population, I mean this is insanity. Digression, there is many more people down there of native descent, legitimately entitled to identify that way, and I wish they would. But they won't be recognized as it, in what is reflected in the US census. Nonetheless, even if you took them all, you'd have a Jack Forbes count somewhere around fourteen, fifteen million people, rather than the two million people being talked about as actual, now, versus three hundred million people in the gross population. There is rather a disparity of weight towards non-native and native. On the other hand, in South Africa, you'd have just about a total reversal in that proportionality.

Nonetheless, the colonizers were the import population. The general term that is applied is settler. You can call it invader, you can call it whatever you want to call it, but the usual term that is applied is settler. So you've got settler state colonialism, where the colonizing population has claimed to de-colonize itself in the classical form and maintains colonial domination of the original indigenous population, often denying their very existence. That could come definitionally, that could come statistically, that could come by simply refusing, as the progressives over there in the University of Toronto would have it, to even discuss the matter of continuing existence. Thus, consummating the actuality of the colonial, should I call it project, that's their term, reality, necessity would be the term I would suggest because absent colonialism, colonial domination, the maintenance of a system of colonialism, Canada doesn't exist. Canada does not exist. We're right back to every square inch of territory called Canada, just like every square inch of territory called the United States, was accrued directly from land, property, in Western discourse, expropriated from indigenous people. There's ways that we can talk about that, but that's the bedrock reality that is to be denied in the discourse of post-coloniality.

There's a good reason for that, aside from the immediate material benefits that accrue. This is probably the last thing I'll say and then we can do whatever we're going to do with this. This goes back, I can pull this from Native people, leaders so called, average people over a long period of time, they didn't use necessarily the terms, but the idea is there. But in order to dignify the concept in proper academic terms, let me make the attribution to the guy who put the formula the way I am going to lay it out. That would be Sartre, 1968. He does a little study that is published in Ramparts magazine. I think it is published as a very small book that you can get off of amazon.com for probably two bits if you are interested in it. It's not much in vogue these days. He was charged by the Russell tribunal with looking at the relative impact in terms of the genocide convention of what the United States adventure in South East Asia was producing. He did look at it for a while, but then he went back and said, "We're looking at it all wrong." So, he wrote this little piece to examine what the United States' effect in South East Asia was and the motive force behind it in terms of the French experience in Algeria. Now, the French had an experience in Indochina as well, but he took it in terms of Algeria because Algeria is more recent and raw in the sensibility of the French, probably. You also had a different circumstance that was being looked at as sort of a peak, and for possible liberation by people, and he is trying to pose an alternative.

So, he looks at the US operations at the end of the 1960's in Indochina, that's the Vietnam War. The process of grinding 3 million Indochinese into hamburger in order to prevent them from having a popular election. That's really what that one came down to because they would have elected the wrong guy, and US official said that straight up. He looked at that through the lens of Algeria and he drew a conclusion. He said, "Colonialism equals genocide." You cannot impose and maintain a colonial order on any people without having a genocidal effect because you are compelled, you are absolutely compelled as a colonizer to deform, at the very least, even if it is a relatively non-violent conquest, they don't put up enough resistance that you have to kill a lot of them. Even if you have relatively benevolent imposition of forced labor upon them so that you can extract wealth, even under the most optimal conditions, you must absolutely eradicate their sense of autonomous existence, you must twist and deform and maim their culture, you must train them to be efficient workers for you, converting them into the opposite of what they are. Genocide is not a process of killing per se; it is a process of bringing about the dissolution and disappearance of identified human groups as such. If you string this thing out to its logical conclusion, the inevitable by product of colonial order is the eradication of the colonized as the people they understood themselves to be. That's genocide. You've got all sorts of horror shows that mediate and intervene on that, that are probably closer and more consonant to your popular understanding of genocide, but ultimately the bedrock definition of genocide articulated by Raphael Lemkin, would ultimately and inevitably be satisfied by that.

So, your question, for everybody native or non native alike, because it is entirely possible to be native by some definition or another and actively complicit in this process, ask that other Indian, Gunga Din. Is that a reality in which you find yourself in a position of enough agreement to go along and at least acquiesce if not actively participate? Are you a good German, are you the SS, are you the administrator of the process, because, don't call it what it is not. If you are not in active resistance to this which is to say to de-colonize the indigenous nations of Canada, despite the fact that that's going to be economically and otherwise inconvenient, then you are complicit in it. And is that who you want to be? There are not spectators in this process. If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem and if you are part of the problem, you are just another good German which is to say, subject to being bombed by the Eight Air Force until you submit. That's how it lays out. It's not different here than it was there, it's not always different in North America than it is anywhere else. It's not only the same, this

is the belly of the beast from which the global project ushers forth, which is the next phase of exactly the kind of systematic carnage that I have been talking about all night. Recognize it for what it is. Because it is settler state colonialism does not make it post-colonial. Because it's internally colonizing does not make it post-colonial. Because it's one of these two little examined legs of the stool does not make it any less genocidal. It is just as genocidal, and perhaps more so because of relative degrees of efficiencies and technologies of extermination available now that didn't used to be, or ever was.

Who are you? Who do you want to be? What is it that you want to hand on to your children? How do you see your obligations and how do you see yourself in the world? These are the really fundamental questions that all of this supposedly abstract and detached rhetoric brings up. These are the operant realities of the society and the time in which you find yourself. There's no avoiding it. You have to come to grips. Thank you.