

cit. continued ↘

55. For background on some of the struggles mentioned, see Trask, *From a Native Daughter*; David Robie, *Blood on Their Beavers: Nativist Struggle in the South Pacific* (London/Leichhardt, N.S.W., Australia: Zed Books/Pluto Press, 1989); Gerard Chaliland, ed., *People Without a Country: The Kurds and Kurdistan* (New York: Olive Branch Press, [2nd ed.] 1993); Tony Hodges, *Western Sahara: Roots of a Desert War* (Westport, CT: Lawrence-Hill, 1983); Robert P. Clark, *Negotiating with ETA: Obstacles to Peace in the Basque Country, 1975-1984* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1990); J. Bowyer Bell, *The Irish Troubles: A Generation of Violence, 1967-1992* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993); Gwynfor Evans, *Fighting for Wales* (Talybont, Wales: Y Lolfa Cyl, 1991); Peter Besford Ellis, *The Celtic Revolution: A Study in Anti-Imperialism* (Talybont, Wales: Y Lolfa Cyl, 1985).

56. "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism", Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party," in *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Selected Works*, 3 vols. (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969) Vol. 1, p. 108.

57. Neitschmann, "Third World War."

58. Chomsky, *World Orders*.

ocotillo anarchist press



tucson, arizona
anti © 2004

new_moon@riseup.net

The New Face Of Liberation:

Indigenous Rebellion, State Repression, and the Reality of the Fourth World



by

Ward Churchill

Taken from *Acts of Rebellion: The Ward Churchill Reader*

8. Paul Buhle, "Historical Materialism," in Mary Jo Buhle, Paul Buhle and Dan Georgakas, eds., *Dictionary of the American Left* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992) pp. 317-19.

9. According to the 1989 edition of *Whitaker's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*, which is what I happen to have closest at hand, the two primary meanings of "radical" are, "Of, relating to or proceeding from a root," and "Of or relating to an origin."

10. Russell Means, "The Same Old Song" in *Mexican and Native Americans*, pp. 19-33.

11. Vine Deloria, Jr., "Circling the Same Old Rock," in *Ibid.*, pp. 113-36.

12. A more detailed articulation will be found in "False Promises," herein.

13. This circumstance continues in "nationalist" settings: *Satanic Aztec, Imperialism and Unborn Development* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977).

14. Lynn Dowland Trout, "Western Metaphysical Dualism as an Element in Racism," in John L. Hodge, Donald L. Struckmann and Lynn Dickson Trout, *Cultural Bases of Racism and Group Oppression: An Examination of Traditional "Western" Concepts, Values and Institutional Structures Which Support Racism, Sexism and Elitism* (Berkeley: Riders Press, 1975) pp. 50-69.

15. For perspectives on the racial/class tensions with which this circumstance has been imbued, see Napur Chaudhuri and Margaret Strobel, eds., *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992).

16. Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975).

17. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1966); Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967).

18. Jean-Paul Sartre, "On Genocide," *Resistance*, Feb. 1968.

19. Safiuddin Aga Khan and Hassan bin Talal, *Indigenous Peoples: A Global Quest for Justice* (London: Zed Books, 1987).

20. See the chapter entitled "Hegemony, Historical Bloc, and History," in Walter L. Adamson's *Hegemony and Revolution: A Study of Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980).

21. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Search for a Method* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963) p. 28.

22. Anyone doubting this should have a look at the "Resolution of the 5th Annual Meeting of the Traditional Elders Circle," published verbatim in my *Festivals of the Matter Race: Literature, Cinema and the Colonization of American Indians* (Morroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 1992) at pp. 223-25.

23. See, e.g., Martin Carnoy's *Education as Cultural Imperialism* (New York: David McKay, 1974).

24. Frantz Fanon, *Towards the African Revolution* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967); Amílcar Cabral, *Revolution in Guinea Selected Texts* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969).

25. Virtually all of the incoherent convulsions wrecking Africa since the wholesale post-World War II dissolution of European empires have devolved upon the efforts of indigenous nations to recover their own rights to self-determination vis-à-vis newly independent African states, each of which has set out to consolidate itself within one or another of the territorial "compartments" created for administrative purposes by European colonialism itself. See, overall, J.M. MacKenzie, *The Partisans of Africa, 1880-1900* (London: Methuen, 1983); Stewart C. Easton, *The Rise and Fall of Western Colonialism* (New York: Praeger, 1964); John S. Saul, *The State and Revolution in East Africa* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974).

26. De Beauvoir's relationship to the Algerian liberation struggle is covered in the volume of her memoirs entitled *La Force des choses* (*The Force of Circumstance*). As for Sartre, he penned the preface to Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth* and an introduction to Memmi's *Colonizer and Colonized* while strongly and consistently endorsing the FLN's resort to armed struggle to free Algeria from French rule. The latter is covered well in B. Marie Perinbam's *Holy Violence: The Revolutionary Thought of Frantz Fanon* (Washington, D.C.: Three Continents Press, 1982). More broadly, see Lewis R. Gordon's *Fanon and the Crisis of European Man* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

27. Sartre, *Search for a Method*.

28. For the immediate context of Trotsky's famous remark, see Vladimir N. Borzkin, *The Months After October: Socialist Opposition and the Rise of Bolshevik Dictatorship* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988).

29. Mark Poster, *Postcolonial Marxism and History: Mode of Production versus Mode of Information* (Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1984).

30. Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language* (New York: Pantheon, 1977).

31. V.I. Lenin, *What Is To Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement* (New York: New World, 1969). Attribution for the response goes to Michael Albert's *What Is To Be Done? A Modern Revolutionary Discussion of Classical Left Ideologies* (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1974).

32. On the 1960s variant, see Mitchell Goodman's *The Movement Toward a New America: Beginnings of a Long Revolution* (Philadelphia/New York: Pilgrim Press/Alfred A. Knopf, 1970). For those of the 1930s, see the chapter entitled "Self-Help in Hard Times" in Howard Zinn's *A People's History of the United States* (New York: Harper/Perennial, 1980) pp. 368-97.

33. Herbert Marcuse, "Repressive Tolerance," in Robert Paul Wolff, Barrington Moore, Jr., and Herbert Marcuse, *A Critique of Pure Tolerance* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1965) p. 111.

34. See generally, Kenneth Ahoop, *The Beatniks and Their Era* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961).

35. Dan Baum, *Smoke and Mirrors: The War on Drugs and the Politics of Failure* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1996).

36. Probably the best enunciation of the thinking underlying this approach is contained in Lee Lockwood's *Conversation with Eldridge Cleaver: Algeria* (New York: Delta Books, 1970).

37. Bernstein was the first major marxian revisionist, arguing during the early 1900s that "objective conditions" had changed since Marx's day to the point that revolution was no longer necessary in industrial societies. He posed as an alternative to the idea that socialism could be willed into being, thus fusing the standard position of American progressives; Edward Bernstein, *Evolutionary Socialism* (New York: Schocken, 1961).

38. See "Spiritual Hacktivism: The Rise of the Plastic Medicine Men" in *From a Native Son: Selected Essays on Indigenous, 1985-1992* (Boston: South End Press, 1996) pp. 355-66. On McGonigal in particular, see "Do It Yourself Indianism," in *My Indian Air: US Culture and Genocide in Native North America* (Morroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 1994) pp. 283-89. On Cassiodora, see "Cassiodora: The Greatest Heist Since Piltdown Man," in my *Festivals of the Matter Race: Literature, Cinema and the Colonization of American Indians* (San Francisco: City Lights, [2nd. ed.] 1998) pp. 27-66.

39. See "Indians 'R' Us" herein.

40. A good edition will be found in Leonard I. Steinerman and Lewis Perry, eds., *Patterns of Anarchy* (New York: Anchor, 1968). Also see Peter Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism* (London: Pantheon Press, 1993).

41. Kirkpatrick Sale, *Dwellers in the Earth: The Bioregional Vision* (Philadelphia: New Society, 1991); John Zerzan, *More Primitive and Older Days* (New York: Autonomedia, 1994); *Elman of Rifland* (Columbia, MO: Columbia Alternative Library, [2nd ed.] 1999). Another worthwhile read is Ulrike Heide's *American Left, Right and Green* (San Francisco: City Lights, 1994).

42. See "I Am Indigenous," herein.

43. *Manual and Industrial, Fourth World*.

44. Ramanan Dasbhar Oriya, *Indians of the Americas: Human Rights and Self-Determination* (London: Zed Press, 1984); John Mohawk, *A Race Call to Consciousness* (Bostonsville, NY: Akwesasne Nation, 1978).

45. Hattunui-Kay Trank, *Free a Native Daughter: Colonization and Sovereignty in Hawaii* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, [2nd ed.] 1999); Jeanine Duthart, *A Certain Lack of Culture: Writings on Art and Cultural Politics* (London: Kahn Press, 1993).

46. See my *Struggle for the Land: Indigenous Resistance to Genocide, Eviction and Expatriation in Contemporary North America* (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring, [2nd ed.] 1999).

Citation from
back →

following Pinochet's overthrow of the Allende government.⁵¹ *Nobody* questions the severity of what happened in Chile.

I can't say for sure what happened to the Chilean left as a result of its repression—I suspect it dissipated, because I've not heard much of it for a long time now—but I *do* know what's happened with AIM. We've absorbed the body blows, evolved, decentralized and reappeared all over the continent in different guises. During the armed confrontation at Oka, near Montréal, in 1990, AIM was called the Mohawk Warrior Society.⁵² At the armed confrontation at Gustafsen Lake, British Columbia, a couple of years later, AIM was called something else.⁵³ Whatever the name, whatever the location—James Bay, Big Mountain, Lubicon Lake, Western Shoshone, it doesn't matter—it's all the same thing and it's all indigenist to the core.⁵⁴

The same can be said of the native sovereignty movements in Hawai'i and elsewhere across the Pacific, of the struggles for a "Karin free state" in Burma and for the independence of Nagaland in India, of the Kurdish secessionist movement in the Middle East, the Polisario in the Western Sahara, the Basques and Catalans in Spain, the Irish in Ulster, even the Scots and Welsh on the main British isle.⁵⁵ Anywhere you look, on every continent save Antarctica, you'll find Fourth World liberation struggles. Indigenism, not communism, is the "specter haunting Europe" and the rest of the world these days.⁵⁶

It seems obvious than anything considered threatening enough by the world's ruling élites that they'd wage ninety simultaneous wars to suppress it is something to be taken seriously. Assessing what he'd discovered, Neitschmann described it as amounting to a "Third World War," and in many ways he was right.⁵⁷ World War III, the war for the most fundamental forms of human liberation and against what Noam Chomsky has called "world orders, old and new," is going on right now, as I speak.⁵⁸

Because of it, the world as we all know it is changing rapidly and irrevocably for the better. The only choice to be made in seeking to come to grips with this new face of liberation is whether, like Sartre and Simone, you wish to stand on the "right side of history." If so, the possibilities which present themselves are limitless.

12. THE NEW FACE OF LIBERATION

1. For background, see Peter Worsley, *The Third World* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, [2nd ed.] 1967), and the chapter entitled "The Making of a World" in Robert Malley's *The Call from Algeria: Third Worldism, Revolution and the Turn to Islam* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990) pp. 77–114.

2. See, e.g., Robert K. Thomas, "Colonialism: Classic and Internal," *New University Thought*, Vol. 4, No. 4, Winter 1966–67. With regard to Appalachian whites in particular, see Helen Matthews Lewis, Linda Johnson and Donald Atkins, eds., *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case* (Boson, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press, 1978).

3. George Manuel and Michael Poitras, *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality* (New York: Free Press, 1974).

4. The term "Host World" was coined by Winona LaDuke in her "Natural vs Synthetic and Back Again," an essay written as the preface to my edited volume, *Marcus and Native Americans* (Boston: South End Press, 1983) p. vii.

5. Julian Burger, *Report from the Frontier: The State of the World's Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1987).

6. Noam Chomsky, *World Orders, Old and New* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).

7. The conceptual structure is basically Kantian, but has been shared in various ways by Western philosophers from Comte to Saint-Simon; Morris Ginsberg, "Progress in the Modern Era," in Philip F. Wilson, ed., *Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas*, Vol. III (New York: Scribner's, 1973) pp. 653–50.

Ward Churchill is Professor of Ethnic Studies at the University of Colorado-Boulder co-director of the Colorado Chapter of the American Indian Movement (AIM). He has written scores of academic and journalistic articles, and eight books, including *Agents of Repression*, *The COINTELPRO Papers*, *A Little Matter of Genocide*, and *Pacifism as Pathology* (with Mike Ryan.)

The New Face of Liberation is the first in a series of pamphlets copied and distributed by ocotillo anarchist press that will explore green anarchism, indigenism, and the potential synthesis of these two currents of thought, particular as it relates to anti-colonialist/anti-imperialist struggle in North America.

The New Face of Liberation was used without the consent of Mr. Churchill or Routledge Press. Sorry, Ward.

ably, the colonization of those peoples who are still indigenous is the most recent aspect or dimension of the phenomenon we've been considering. It follows that decolonization of what I've been calling the Fourth World must assume a clear primacy of importance within *everybody's* liberatory agenda.

This is not to say that it is of exclusive importance—I've been trying to show how a very wide range of struggles can be made to interact constructively when properly framed—but that, to reiterate, no other liberatory objective can ever be truly fulfilled until this one is.

The second aspect of prioritization is closely related to the first and concerns the fact that Fourth Worlders still retain the codes of knowledge which allow us to practice our traditional forms of ecologically balanced socioeconomic and political organization. Our expedient decolonization therefore serves to establish working models for adaptation by others.

Doubling back for a moment to what I said earlier about New Agers and cultural imperialism, it seems important to observe that what was just mentioned is precisely the sort of intercultural dialogue I was calling for instead. Note that it represents a sharing of information born in the crucible of mutual struggle and resultant political consciousness, *not* from the structure of domination prevailing today. Note also that it consists of an informational sharing dedicated to the furtherance of the struggle, *not* to the self-indulgent collector's desire to acquire the inside scoop on ritual forms and the like. Learning the size, number, and placement of rocks used in a sweat lodge is about as relevant to the process of liberation as finding out the particular type of wine used when the IRA takes communion.

If your preoccupation is with the "teachings" of hucksters like Carlos Castaneda, Ed McGaa, Brooke Medicine Ego, Sun Bear, Mary Summer Rain, Dhyani Ywahoo, or all of the above, you're engaged in something that is at best a form of dilettantism.³⁸ Unless your aspiration is to *be* a dilettante, to enjoy "quality time" masturbating in the woods along with the rest of Robert Bly's "men's movement," or making perpetual tithes to Lynne Andrews' women's equivalent, it would behoove you to hook into something else.³⁹

That "something else" is of course what I've been advocating here tonight, and it's time we put a name to it. "Anarchism" might be a good one, since quite a lot of what I've had to say overlaps with anarchist thinking. I see a lot of commonality between anarchist ideas of social organization and political economy on the one hand, and indigenous ways of seeing and doing on the other, and so I push people to explore anarchism as their first and most immediate alternative to progressivism.

Check me out on this. Do your homework. Cruise through some classical anarchist material: Lassalle, Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, Rudolph Rocker. Take a gander at Goldman and Berkman and some of the newer stuff.⁴⁰ I recommend Kirkpatrick Sale's *Dwellers in the Land* and John Zerzan's *Future Primitive*, even though Zerzan eventually goes off the deep end and starts demanding the decolonization of carrots.⁴¹

What's left hanging in such readings, however, is both the emphasis I've placed on

of almost every ideological persuasion. This is the existence of yet another world, a world composed of a plethora of indigenous peoples, several thousand of us, each of whom constitutes a nation in our own right.³ Taken together, these nations comprise a nonindustrial "Fourth World," a "Host World" upon whose territories and with whose natural resources each of the other three, the worlds of modern statist sociopolitical and economic organization, have been constructed.⁴

In substance, the very existence of any state—and it doesn't matter a bit whether it is fascist, liberal democratic, or marxist in orientation—is absolutely contingent upon usurpation of the material and political rights of every indigenous nation within its boundaries. To put it another way, the denial of indigenous rights, both national and individual, is integral to the creation and functioning of the world order which has evolved over the past thousand years or so, and which is even now projecting itself in an ever more totalizing manner into our collective future.⁵

We say, and I believe this includes all of us here, that we oppose this prospect, that we oppose what was once pronounced by the papacy to be the "Divine Order" of things, what England's Queen Victoria asserted was the world's "Natural Order," what George Bush, following Adolf Hitler, described as a "New World Order," what Bill Clinton and Newt Gingrich have sought to consummate behind alphabet soup banalities like GATT and NAFTA and the MAI. In other words, we are opposed to the entire system presently "coordinated" by bodies like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and the Trilateral Commission.⁶

We say we oppose all of this, and, with at least equal vehemence, we announce our opposition to more particularized byproducts of the trajectory of increasingly consolidated corporate statism, or statist corporatism, or whatever else it might be more properly called, that we as a species are presently locked into. The litany is all too familiar: an increasingly rampant homogenization and commodification of our cultures and communities; the ever more wanton devastation and toxification of our environment; an already overburdening, highly militarized and steadily expanding police apparatus, both public and private, attended by an historically unparalleled degree of social regimentation and an astonishingly rapid growth in the prison-industrial complex; conversion of our academic institutions into veritable "votechs" churning out little more than military/corporate fodder; unprecedented concentration of wealth and power. . .

We say we oppose it all, root and branch, and of course we are, each of us in our own way, entirely sincere in the statement of our opposition. But, with that said, and in many cases even acted upon, what do we *mean*? Most of us here identify ourselves as "progressives," so let's start with the term "progressivism" itself. We don't really have time available to go into this very deeply, but I'll just observe that it comes from the word "progress," and that the progression involved is basically to start with what's already here and carry it forward.

The underlying premise is that the social order we were born into results from the working of "iron laws" of evolution and, however unpalatable, is therefore both necessary and inevitable. By the same token, these same deterministic forces make it equally unavoidable that what we've inherited can and will be improved upon.⁷ The task of

progressives, having apprehended the nature of the progression, is to use their insights to hurry things along.

This isn't a "liberal" articulation. It's what's been passing itself off as a *radical* left alternative to the status quo for well over a century. It forms the very core of Marx's notion of historical materialism, as when he observes that feudalism was the social precondition for the emergence of capitalism and that capitalism is itself the essential precondition for what he conceives as socialism. Each historical phase creates the conditions for the next; that's the crux of the progressive proposition.⁸

Now you tell me, how is that fundamentally different from what Bush and Clinton have been advocating? Oh, I see. *You* want to "move forward" in pursuance of another set of goals and objectives than those espoused by these self-styled "centrists." Alright. I'll accept that that's true. Let me also state that I tend to find the goals and objectives advanced by progressives *immensely* preferable to anything advocated by Bush or Clinton. Fair enough?

However, I must go on to observe that the differences at issue are *not* fundamental. They are not, as Marx would have put it, of "the base." Instead, they are superstructural. They represent remedies to symptoms rather than causes. In other words, they do not derive from a genuinely *radical* critique of our situation—remember, radical means to go to the *root* of any phenomenon in order to understand it⁹—and thus cannot offer a genuinely radical solution. This will remain true regardless of the fervor with which progressive goals and objectives are embraced, or the extremity with which they are pursued. Radicalism and extremism are, after all, not really synonyms.

Maybe I can explain what I'm getting at here by way of indulging in a sort of grand fantasy. Close your eyes for a moment and dream along with me that the current progressive agenda has been realized. Never mind how, let's just dream that it's been fulfilled. Things like racism, sexism, ageism, militarism, classism, and the sorts of corporatism with which we are now afflicted have been abolished. The police have been leashed and the prison-industrial complex dismantled. Income disparities have been eliminated across the board, decent housing and healthcare are available to all, an amply endowed educational system is actually devoted to teaching rather than indoctrinating our children. The whole nine yards.

Sound good? You bet. Nonetheless, there's still a very basic—and I daresay uncomfortable—question which must be posed: In this seemingly rosy scenario, what, exactly, happens to the rights of native peoples? Face it, to envision the progressive transformation of "American society" is to presuppose that "America"—that is, the United States—will continue to exist. And, self-evidently, the existence of the United States is, as it has always been and *must always be*, predicated first and foremost on denial of the right of self-determining existence to every indigenous nation within its purported borders.

Absent this denial, the very society progressives seek to transform would never have had a landbase upon which to constitute itself in any form at all. So, it would have had no resources with which to actualize a mode of production, and there would be no basis for arranging or rearranging the relations of production. All the dominoes

substantial resistance to it into a coherent opposition politics.³⁵ The Black Panther Party's strategy of focusing its recruitment on "lumpen proletarians"—street gang members, in plain English—made a lot of sense and is another idea that might be usefully resuscitated.³⁶

The primary purpose of everything we do must be to make this society increasingly unmanageable. That's key. The more unmanageable the society becomes, the more of its resources the state must expend in efforts to maintain order "at home." The more this is true, the less the state's capacity to project itself outwardly, both geographically and temporally. Eventually, a point of stasis will be reached, and, in a system such as this one, anchored as it is in the notion of perpetual growth, this amounts to a sort of "Doomsday Scenario" because, from there, things start moving in the other direction—"falling apart," as it were—and *that* creates the conditions of flux in which alternative social forms can really begin to take root and flourish.

This is kind of a crude sketch, but it's easy enough to follow. And, you know what? The rewards of following it don't have to be deferred until the aftermath of a cataclysmic "revolutionary moment" or, worse, the progressive actualization of some far-distant Bernsteinian utopia (which would only turn out to be dystopic, anyway).³⁷ No, in the sense that every rule and regulation rejected represents a tangibly liberating experience, the rewards begin immediately and just keep on getting better. You will in effect feel freer right from the get-go.

Alright, let's follow things out a bit further. The more disrupted, disorganized, and destabilized the system becomes, the less its ability to expand, extend, or even maintain itself. The greater the degree to which this is so, the greater the likelihood that Fourth World nations struggling to free ourselves from systemic domination will succeed. And the more frequently we of the Fourth World succeed, the less the ability of the system to utilize our resources in the process of dominating *you*.

At this point, we've arrived at an understanding of a confluence of interest that utterly transcends the old "three worlds" paradigm, harkening an entirely different praxical symbiosis, one which is not so much revolutionary as it is *devolutionary*. We don't want China out of Tibet so much as we want China out of China. We don't just want the U.S. out of Southeast Asia or Southern Africa or Central America, we want it out of North America, off the planet, out of existence altogether. This is to say that we want the U.S. out of our own lives and *thereby* everyone else's. The pieces dovetail rather well, don't they? Indeed, they can't really be separated and only a false analysis might ever have concluded that they could.

Hence, we must seek nothing less than the dismemberment and dissolution of every statist/corporate entity in the world. All of them. No exceptions. In their stead, we seek reconstitution of that entire galaxy of *nations* upon which the states have imposed themselves. All of *them*, and, again, no exceptions. We are in effect the staunchest and most prideful of all "irridentists."

Here, a certain structure of priorities presents itself, and it does so in two ways. First, methodologically, any process of "undoing" such as I've recommended must commence with the "fixing" of that which is most proximate or recent. Unquestion-

isting system in varying degrees can be created. Something of the sort was beginning to emerge in the U.S. during the late 1960s, as it had in the '30s.³²

Most of all, it's imperative to remember that the first element of oppositional power projection lies in refusal. That means, in the context at hand, that we must rid ourselves of the progressive notion that we can "get laws passed" to fix things. You can hardly set out to undermine the authority of the state while endeavoring to put still more legislation, *any* kind of legislation, on the books. The only legitimate form of activity in the legislative arena is to pursue repeal of the tremendous weight of laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations that already exist. Meanwhile, at least some of them can be nullified by our conscious and deliberate refusal to comply with them.

You've got to break "The Law"—*whose* law?—to get anywhere at all. To cop a line from Bob Dylan back in the days when he still had something to say, "To live outside the law, you must be honest." The flip side of the coin is that if you choose to "live *inside* the law you must be *dishonest*." Worse, you end up being the moral equivalent of a "Good German." Not a very lofty stature, that.

Let me put it to you this way. If I were to say that our mutual goal is ultimately to achieve "freedom," everyone here would immediately agree. But then we'd become mired in some long philosophical debate about what we mean by that, because freedom is typically presented as a sort of abstract concept. Well, it's not really so abstract, and most assuredly not "intangible." In fact, I think it can be quantified and measured. Try this: Freedom may be defined as absence of regulation. The more regulated you are, the less free, and vice versa.

I'm not sure at this point that it matters much which laws you defy, there's such a vast proliferation to choose from, and in some ways *any* of them will do for purposes of initiating a process of transforming the prevailing individual and mass psychologies from that of "going along" to that of refusal. Use your imagination, pick a point of departure, it doesn't matter how small or in what connection, and get on with it. Once a particular bit of "unruliness" takes hold, it can be used as the fulcrum for prying open the next level, and so on. This is what Marcuse meant when he said that false consciousness is always breached at some "infinitesimally small spot," but that any such breach might serve as an "Archimedean point for a broader emancipation."³³

Can application of this principle actually produce results at higher levels? You bet. Look at Prohibition, the Eighteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, to find an example. It was rescinded for one reason and one reason only: People refused to obey. It didn't matter what penalties the state assigned to violating it, or what quantity of resources were pumped into the apparatus of enforcement, Prohibition was met with a stubbornly ubiquitous "culture of resistance" in all quarters of American society. Eventually, it was determined by those who make such decisions that attempts to enforce it were becoming so socially disruptive as to destabilize the state itself, and so the law was withdrawn.³⁴

The so-called "War on Drugs" currently being waged by the state offers the prospect of a similar outcome over the long run, albeit at a statutory rather than constitutional level, particularly if we were astute enough to try and translate the rather

fall from there, don't they? In effect, the progressive agenda is no less contingent upon the continuing internal colonial domination of indigenous nations than that advanced by Bill Clinton.¹⁰

Perhaps we can agree to a truism on this score: Insofar as progressivism shares with the status quo a need to maintain the structure of colonial dominance over native peoples, it is *at base* no more than a variation on a common theme, intrinsically a part of the very order it claims to oppose. As Vine Deloria once observed in a related connection, "these guys just keep right on circling the same old rock while calling it by different names."¹¹

Since, for all its liberatory rhetoric and sentiment, even the self-sacrifice of its proponents, progressivism replicates the bedrock relations with indigenous nations marking the present status quo, its agenda can be seen as serving mainly to increase the degree of comfort experienced by those who benefit from such relations. Any such outcome represents a continuation and reinforcement of the existing order, *not* its repeal. Progressivism is thus one possible means of consummating that which is, *not* its negation.¹²

It's time to stop fantasizing and confront what this consummation might look like. To put it bluntly, colonialism is colonialism, no matter what its trappings. You can't end classism in a colonial system, since the colonized by definition comprise a class lower than that of their colonizers.¹³ You can't end racism in a colonial system because the imposed "inferiority" of the colonized must inevitably be "explained" (justified) by their colonizers through contrived classifications of racial hierarchy.¹⁴ You can't end sexism in a colonial system, since it functions—again by definition—on the basis of one party imposing itself upon the other in the most intimate of dimensions for purposes of obtaining gratification.¹⁵

If rape is violence, as feminists correctly insist,¹⁶ then so too is the interculture analogue of rape: colonial domination. As a consequence, it is impossible to end social violence in a colonialist system. Read Fanon and Memmi. They long ago analyzed that fact rather thoroughly and exceedingly well.¹⁷ Better yet, read Sartre, who flatly equated colonialism with genocide.¹⁸ Then ask yourself how you maintain a system incorporating domination and genocidal violence as integral aspects of itself *without* military, police, and penal establishments? The answer is that you can't.

Go right down the list of progressive aspirations and what you'll discover, if you're honest with yourself, is that none of them can really be achieved outside the context of Fourth World liberation. So long as indigenous nations are subsumed against our will within "broader" statist entities—and this applies as much to Canada as to the United States, as much to China as to Canada, as much to Mexico and Brazil as to China, as much to Ghana as to any of the rest; the problem is truly global—colonialism will be alive and well.¹⁹

So long as this is the case, all efforts at positive social transformation, no matter how "revolutionary" the terms in which they are couched, will be self-nullifying, simply leading us right back into the groove we're in today. Actually, we'll probably be worse off after each iteration since such outcomes generate a steadily growing popular

disenchantment with the idea that meaningful change can ever be possible. This isn't a zero-sum game we're involved in. As Gramsci pointed out, every failure of supposed alternatives to the status quo serves to significantly reinforce its hegemony.²⁰

When a strategy or, more important, a way of looking at things, proves itself bankrupt or counterproductive, it must be replaced with something more viable. Such is the situation with progressivism, both as a method and as an outlook. After a full century of failed revolutions and derailed social movements, it has long since reached the point where, as Sartre once commented, it "no longer knows anything."²¹ The question, then, comes down to where to look for a replacement.

There are a lot of ways I could try and answer that one. Given the emphasis I've already placed on the Fourth World, I suppose I could take a "New Age" approach and say you should all go sit at the feet of the tribal elders and learn all about the native worldview. But, I'll tell you instead that the last thing the old people need is to be inundated beneath a wave of wannabe "tribalists" seeking "spiritual insights."²² This is not to deny there's a lot in the indigenous way of seeing the world that could be usefully learned by others and put to work in the forging of new sets of relationships between humans both as individuals and as societies, as well as between humans and the rest of nature.

Such information is plainly essential. There are, however, serious considerations as to when and how it is to be shared. As things stand, we lack the intellectual context which, alone, might allow a constructive transfer of knowledge to take place. For the people here, or your counterparts throughout the progressive milieu, to run right out and try to pick up on what the Naropa Institute likes to market under the heading of "indigenous wisdom" would be an act of appropriation just as surely as if you were to go after Indian land. There *is* such a thing as intellectual property, and, therefore, intellectual imperialism.²³

The point is that the right of the Fourth World to decolonize itself exists independently of any direct benefit this might impart to colonizing societies or any of their subparts, progressivism included. More strongly, the right of the Fourth World to decolonization exists *undiminished* even if it can be shown that this is tangibly *disadvantageous* to our colonizers. The principle is not especially mysterious, having been brought to bear in Third World liberation struggles for the past half-century and more.²⁴ Yet, where indigenous nations are concerned, nearly everyone—Third World liberationists, not least—professes confusion concerning its applicability.²⁵

To connect this point to that on New Age dynamics I was making a few moments ago, it's as if Simone de Beauvoir had demanded she be made privy to the "folk wisdom" of the Berber elders as a quid pro quo for supporting the Algerian liberation struggle against France. But of course she didn't. De Beauvoir, her colleague Sartre, and a relative handful of others broke ranks with the mainstream of French progressivism—it's worth noting that the French communist party actually *opposed* the decolonization of Algeria—by embracing Algerian independence unequivocally, unconditionally, and in its own right.²⁶

Let's be clear on this. De Beauvoir and Sartre did not take the position they did on

the basis of altruism. Although they gained no direct personal benefit from their stance, they *did* perceive an *indirect* advantage accruing from any success attained by the Algerian liberationists. This came in the form of a material weakening of the French state to which they, apparently unlike French progressivism more generally, were genuinely and seriously opposed. Converting such an externally generated weakness into something more directly beneficial to the liberation of French domestic polity was seen as being their own task.²⁷

De Beauvoir and Sartre displayed an exemplary posture, one worthy of emulation by those members of colonizing societies who reject not just colonialism but the statist forms of sociopolitical and economic organization that beget colonialism. The transition from taking this position vis-à-vis the Third World to taking it with respect to the Fourth seems straightforward enough.

The trick is for members of colonizing societies who wish to support Fourth World liberation struggles to figure out how to convert the indirect advantages gained thereby into something more direct and concrete. This, they must obviously draw from their own tradition; it cannot simply be lifted from another culture. And here is precisely where progressivism, most especially historical materialism, which by its very nature consigns all things "primitive" to Trotsky's "dustbin of history," proves itself worse than useless.²⁸

Fortunately, an alternative is conveniently at hand. It will be found in what is usually referred to as the "Foucauldian method," actually an approach to historical interpretation and resulting praxis developed by Nietzsche during the 1870s and adapted by Michel Foucault a century later.²⁹ Without getting bogged down in a lot of theory, let's just say the method stands historical materialism squarely on its head. Rather than interrogating institutions and other phenomena in such a way as to explain how they can/must "carry us forward into the future," the Nietzschean *cum* Foucauldian approach is to define what is objectionable in a given institution and then trace its "lineage" backwards in time to discover how it went wrong and, thus, how it can be "fixed."³⁰

In effect, where Lenin asked, "What is to be done?," Foucault asks, "What is to be undone?"³¹

I can hear mental gears grinding out there: "This guy can't possibly mean we should all 'go back to the past!'" Well, yes and no. The method I've suggested is not to try and effect a kind of across the board rollback. It's to determine with some exactitude *which* historical factors have led to objectionable contemporary outcomes and undo *them*. You might say that Foucault provided a kind of analytical filter which allows you to pick, choose, and prioritize what needs working on. What I've called for are lines of action that materially erode the power concentrated in centralized entities like the state, major corporations, and financial institutions, things like that.

The ways of going at this, at least initially, really aren't so alien. Consumer boycotts are a useful tool, especially when combined with the creation of co-ops and collectives producing wares to offset reliance upon corporate manufacturers in the future. Barter