

# INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND AUTONOMY

**Other volumes in the Globalization and Autonomy series:**

*Global Ordering: Institutions and Autonomy in a Changing World*

Edited by Louis W. Pauly and William D. Coleman (2008)

*Renegotiating Community: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Global Contexts*

Edited by Diana Brydon and William D. Coleman (2008)

*Empires and Autonomy: Moments in the History of Globalization*

Edited by Stephen M. Streeter, John C. Weaver, and William D. Coleman (2009)

*Unsettled Legitimacy: Political Community, Power, and Authority in a Global Era*

Edited by Steven Bernstein and William D. Coleman (2009)

*Cultural Autonomy: Frictions and Connections*

Edited by Petra Rethmann, Imre Szeman, and William D. Coleman (2010)

*Property Rights: Struggles over Autonomy in a Global Age*

Edited by William D. Coleman (forthcoming)

*Deux Méditerranées: Les voies de la mondialisation et de l'autonomie*

Edited by Yassine Essid and William D. Coleman (2010)

*Globalization and Autonomy: Conversing across Disciplines*

Diana Brydon, William D. Coleman, Louis W. Pauly, and John C. Weaver (forthcoming)

See also the *Globalization and Autonomy Online Compendium*

at [www.globalautonomy.ca](http://www.globalautonomy.ca)



globalization + autonomy

# INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Insights for a Global Age

# AND AUTONOMY

Edited by Mario Blaser, Ravi de Costa,  
Deborah McGregor, and William D. Coleman



**UBC**Press · Vancouver · Toronto

© UBC Press 2010

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright, [www.accesscopyright.ca](http://www.accesscopyright.ca).

20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on ancient-forest-free paper (100% post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free.

---

### Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Indigenous peoples and autonomy: insights for a global age /  
edited by Mario Blaser ... [et al.].

(Globalization & autonomy series, ISSN 1913-7494)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7748-1792-9

1. Indigenous peoples – Government relations. 2. Indigenous peoples – Politics and government. 3. Globalization – Social aspects. 4. Globalization – Political aspects. I. Blaser, Mario, 1966- II. Series: Globalization and autonomy

GN380.I47 2010

305.8

C2010-901066-3

---

## Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Programme, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Research for this volume was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada through its Major Collaborative Research Initiatives Program, Grant No. 421-2001-1000, and by the Canada Research Chairs Program.

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

[www.ubcpress.ca](http://www.ubcpress.ca)

# Contents

Preface / vii

Acknowledgments / xi

## Part 1: Introduction

- 1 Reconfiguring the Web of Life: Indigenous Peoples, Relationality, and Globalization / 3  
*Mario Blaser, Ravi de Costa, Deborah McGregor, and William D. Coleman*
- 2 *Ayllu*: Decolonial Critical Thinking and (An)other Autonomy / 27  
*Marcelo Fernández Osco*

## Part 2: Emergences

- 3 Neoliberal Governance and James Bay Cree Governance: Negotiated Agreements, Oppositional Struggles, and Co-Governance / 49  
*Harvey A. Feit*
- 4 Global Linguistics, Mayan Languages, and the Cultivation of Autonomy / 80  
*Erich Fox Tree*

- 5 Global Activism and Changing Identities: Interconnecting the Global and the Local — The Grand Council of the Crees and the Saami Council / 107  
*Kristina Maud Bergeron*
- 6 Indigenous Perspectives on Globalization: Self-Determination through Autonomous Media Creation / 130  
*Rebeka Tabobondung*
- 7 Reconfiguring *Mare Nullius*: Torres Strait Islanders, Indigenous Sea Rights, and the Divergence of Domestic and International Norms / 148  
*Colin Scott and Monica Mulrennan*

### **Part 3: Absences**

- 8 Making Alternatives Visible: The Meaning of Autonomy for the Mapuche of Cholchol (Ngulumapu, Chile) / 179  
*Pablo Marimán Quemenedo*
- 9 Twentieth-Century Transformations of East Cree Spirituality and Autonomy / 195  
*Richard J. “Dick” Preston*

### **Part 4: Hope**

- 10 The International Order of Hope: Zapatismo and the Fourth World War / 221  
*Alex Khasnabish*

Afterword / 241  
*Ravi de Costa*

Abbreviations / 250

Notes and Acknowledgments / 251

Works Cited / 259

Contributors / 277

Index / 280

## Preface

# The Globalization and Autonomy Series: Dialectical Relationships in the Contemporary World

THE VOLUMES IN THE Globalization and Autonomy series offer the results from an interdisciplinary Major Collaborative Research Initiative (MCRI) funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). SSHRC set up the MCRI program to provide a vehicle to support larger projects with research objectives requiring collaboration among researchers from different universities and across a range of disciplines. The MCRI on Globalization and Autonomy began in April 2002. The research team involved forty co-investigators from twelve universities across Canada and another twenty academic contributors from outside Canada, including scholars from Australia, Brazil, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Slovenia, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Drawing on additional funding from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the project became affiliated with a separate interdisciplinary research team of twenty-eight scholars, the Groupe d'Études et de Recherches Interdisciplinaires sur la Méditerranée (GERIM). GERIM is based in Tunisia and includes members from France, Spain, Jordan, and Lebanon as well. Scholars from the following disciplines participated in the project: anthropology, comparative literature, cultural studies, economics, English literature, geography, history, music, philosophy, political science, and sociology.

The project was conceived, designed, and implemented to carry out interdisciplinary research. We endeavoured to put disciplinary-based theories and conceptual frameworks into dialogue with one another, with a view to

developing new theories and understandings of human societies. Four conditions needed to be met if research was to be done in this way. First, we brought humanities and social science disciplines into a relationship of mutual influence, where perspectives were integrated without subordinating one to another. To achieve this integration, the team agreed on a set of core research objectives informed by existing writings on globalization and autonomy. Members developed a number of research questions designed to address these objectives and a research plan that would permit them to address these questions in a focused, systematic way. Second, team members individually were encouraged to think inside disciplines other than their own and to respect differences across disciplines in terms of how the object of knowledge is constructed. Third, team members were selected to ensure that the research was carried out using multiple methodologies. Finally, faced with researching the complex relationships involved in globalization, an interdisciplinary approach meant that our work would be necessarily pluri-theoretical. We held to the view that theories would be most effective when, in addition to applying ideas rigorously, their proponents acknowledged the limitations of any particular theoretical perspective and consciously set out to cross boundaries and use other, sometimes seemingly incommensurable, perspectives.

To ensure intellectual integration from the start, team members agreed on this approach at the first full meeting of the project and committed to the following core objective: *to investigate the relationship between globalization and the processes of securing and building autonomy*. To this end, we sought to refine understanding of these concepts and of the historical evolution of the processes inherent in both of them, given the contested character of their content, meaning, and symbolic status. Given that *globalization* is the term currently employed to describe the contemporary moment, we attempted to:

- determine the opportunities globalization might create and the constraints globalization might place on individuals and communities seeking to secure and build autonomy
- evaluate the extent to which individuals and communities might be able to exploit these opportunities and to overcome these constraints
- assess the opportunities for empowerment that globalization might create for individuals and communities seeking to secure and to build autonomy

- determine how the autonomy available to individuals and communities might permit them to contest, reshape, or engage globalization.

In seeking to address the core objectives for the project, we moved our research in three interrelated directions. First, we accepted that globalization and autonomy have deep historical roots. What is happening today in the world is in many ways continuous with what has taken place in the past. Thus, the burden of a contemporary examination of globalization and autonomy is to assess what is new and what has changed. Second, the dynamics of the relationship between globalization and autonomy are related to a series of important changes in the locations of power and authority. Finally, the globalization-autonomy dynamic plays out in the construction and reconstruction of identities, the nature and value of community, and the articulation of autonomy in and through cultures and discrete institutions. In each of these three areas, the team developed and agreed to answer core questions to provide clear direction for the research. The full text of the questions is available at <http://globalization.mcmaster.ca/ga/ga81.htm>.

Over successive annual meetings of the team, our research coalesced around the following themes: institutions and global ordering; democracy and legitimacy; continuity and rupture in the history of globalization and autonomy; history, property rights, and capitalism; community; culture; the situation and struggles of indigenous peoples; and the Mediterranean region as a microcosm of North-South relations. The researchers addressing these themes tended to be drawn from several disciplines, leading to interdisciplinary dialogue within each thematic group. The themes then crystallized into separate research problems, which came to be addressed by the volumes in the series. While these volumes were taking form, the project team also developed an online publication, the *Globalization and Autonomy Online Compendium* (see next page), which makes our findings available to the general public through research summaries; a glossary of key concepts, organizations, people, events, and places; and a comprehensive bibliography. The ultimate objective of all of these publications is to produce an integrated corpus of outstanding research that provides an in-depth study of the varying relationships between globalization and autonomy.

## **Globalization and Autonomy Online Compendium**

Readers of this volume may also be interested in the *Globalization and Autonomy Online Compendium* (available at [www.globalautonomy.ca](http://www.globalautonomy.ca)). The *Compendium* is a collective publication by the team of Canadian and international scholars who have been part of the SSHRC Major Collaborative Research Initiative that gave rise to the volumes in the Globalization and Autonomy series. Through the *Compendium*, the team is making the results of their research available to a wide public audience. Team members have prepared a glossary of hundreds of short articles on relevant persons, places, organizations, events, and key concepts and have compiled an extensive searchable bibliographical database. Short summaries of the chapters in other volumes of the Globalization and Autonomy series can also be found in the *Compendium*, along with position papers and peer-reviewed research articles on globalization and autonomy issues.

## Acknowledgments

THE EDITORS WOULD LIKE to express their immense gratitude to Nancy Johnson and Sonya Zikic, the project editors for the MCRI on Globalization and Autonomy, for their excellent work, support, and committed professionalism. We are also grateful to Jennifer Clark, Sara Mayo, and Cassandra Pohl for administrative support throughout the project. William Coleman acknowledges that the research for his contributions to the book was undertaken, in part, thanks to funding from the Canada Research Chairs Program. Finally, the editors and volume authors would like to thank the peer reviewers of this book for their helpful and insightful comments and suggestions.



## **Indigenous Peoples and Autonomy**



## Part 1: Introduction



## chapter 1

# **Reconfiguring the Web of Life: Indigenous Peoples, Relationality, and Globalization**

Mario Blaser, Ravi de Costa,  
Deborah McGregor, and  
William D. Coleman

POPULAR AND SCHOLARLY PERCEPTIONS of globalization emphasize growing interconnectivity between peoples and between places. These interconnections, it is thought, are reconfiguring the world, not least by changing the conditions for exercising autonomy (be it individual, communal, or national) and by reconfiguring how autonomy as resistance may take place. This volume is the result of a shared perception among the editors that the main debates in globalization studies have not adequately involved Indigenous people in thinking about the nature and experiences of change in the contemporary world. Moreover, we believe that attending to this inadequacy by engaging dialogically with Indigenous perspectives could open up unexplored possibilities for understanding not only the dialectical relationships between globalization and autonomy but also the meanings of the concepts themselves.

Acting on these perceptions, we gathered together a diverse group of authors. We sought participants from within the Globalization and Autonomy Major Collaborative Research Initiative as well as from outside that network of scholars. The authors are diverse in terms of Indigenous and non-Indigenous cultural heritages, experience (some have strong ties to Indigenous social movements, some are squarely situated in the academy, and some tread the path between the academy and activism), country of origin (Australia, Argentina, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, and the United States), and disciplinary and intellectual approach (anthropology, geography, oral history, philosophy, and political science). The encounter

between these individuals with diverse experiences and disciplines reflects the very *raison d'être* of a collaborative research initiative — to engage with broad but crucial questions in an interdisciplinary way. Thinking through this imperative led us to conclude that our work must be more than simply interdisciplinary: we also had to strive for mutual learning across cultural differences.

The editors are likewise diverse. Mario Blaser, born and raised in Argentina, is an anthropologist who has been working in association with the Yshiro nation of Paraguay for over eighteen years. He believes that the Yshiro, like other Indigenous peoples, are key political and epistemological actors in the construction of more just, equitable, and liveable societies in Latin America. Ravi de Costa was born in Dublin and lived in the United Kingdom, Papua New Guinea, and Australia before moving to Canada to join this project. He is interested in relations between Indigenous and settler peoples and in Indigenous political movements. Deborah McGregor is Anishinaabe from Ontario and has worked for over two decades with Indigenous communities on environmental issues. For more than fifteen years, she has been an educator at both the university and community levels and has been involved in curriculum development, research, and teaching. Her community and scholarly research is focused on Indigenous knowledge in relation to the environment. William D. Coleman is a political scientist and the organizer and director of the Globalization and Autonomy Project. Over the past eighteen years, he has worked closely with Indigenous peoples near McMaster University to develop its Indigenous Studies Program, and most recently he has worked with the Hodinosa:ni people to conceive a Collaborative Centre on Indigenous Knowledges and Ways of Living.

### **Indigenous Peoples and the Globalization and Autonomy Project**

The other volumes in the Globalization and Autonomy Series each explore selected project questions about globalization and autonomy through the lens of a particular theme — global ordering, history, community, legitimacy, property rights, the Mediterranean region, and cultural autonomy. In contrast, this book is based on the premise that Indigenous peoples' perspectives and experiences provide a unique and alternative way to understand the dynamic interplay between globalization and autonomy more generally. A disclaimer is in order, though: when we refer to Indigenous

communities and movements in this introduction, we are speaking principally about Indigenous peoples in settler societies. Notwithstanding the diversity of Indigenous peoples in the world, the main empirical focus of the volume is on the Indigenous peoples of the Americas. Although many issues that we raise may well apply to Indigenous peoples elsewhere, the sources used in our discussions and our own experiences urge us to be circumspect regarding the scope of our arguments and our conclusions.

From the point of view of Indigenous peoples, the research problematic of the project — to investigate the relationship between globalization and the processes of securing and building autonomy — is one framed according to Western rationality. The problematic's relevance to their worlds is a result of the long trajectory from colonization to globalization. In a sense, invoking autonomy without qualification speaks to a way of living that is foreign to the experience of Indigenous peoples. For this reason, Indigenous people throw our research objectives and questions back at us; they push us to ask how these very questions are part of the processes that have undermined, if not destroyed, their epistemologies, their languages, and their ways of living. They might say to us, "We only became concerned about autonomy after meeting you."

To understand why they might say this, we must briefly review what *autonomy* normally means. The concept of autonomy is commonly used in two general ways. First, it refers to the situations of individual persons and to their capacity to shape the conditions under which they live (Held 1995). Individual autonomy therefore means being able to formulate aims and beliefs about how to achieve one's choices, seek out ways to participate in social life in pursuit of these choices, and evaluate one's success through self-reflection based on empirical evidence and phenomenological experience in working towards these aims. The term is also used in connection with collective bodies: nation-states, minority groups within states, Indigenous peoples, and religious movements being common examples. In this collective sense, the meaning of *autonomy* is usually close to the Greek roots *autos* (self) and *nomos* (law): the capacity of a community to give itself laws or practice self-government.

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, *autonomy* first appeared in the English language in its collective meaning during the seventeenth century, while the personal meaning of *autonomy* did not emerge for two more centuries. These two notions of autonomy became increasingly common with the onset of modernity. The idea of the freedom of the individual

based on her or his natural quality grew out of a rejection of the oppressiveness of medieval institutions in Europe. Gradually, the idea developed that individuals (originally propertied males) had the right to choose their own pattern of life, to decide which convictions they wished to promote, and to take steps to shape their own lives (Taylor 1991, 2). Such notions of individual autonomy came to be understood as complementary to collective autonomy in the sense that, in modern societies, individuals decide on the rules and forms through which they will be governed.

In modern theories of democracy, decisions are expected to arise from the exercise of collective autonomy by communities composed of individuals who themselves possess individual autonomy. In these respects, Habermas (1996, 122) sees collective and individual autonomy as co-original: “The idea of self-legislation *by citizens*, that is, requires that those subject to law as its addressees can at the same time understand themselves as authors of law” (ibid., 120, our emphasis). This co-originality, however, rests on certain other conditions. The decisions are located in “a geographically delimited legal territory and to a socially delimitable collectivity of legal consociates, and consequently to particular jurisdictional boundaries. These limitations in historical time and social space result simply from the fact that legal subjects cede their authorizations to use coercion to a legal authority that monopolizes the means of legitimate coercion and if necessary employs these means on their behalf” (ibid., 124). In short, in the West the social imaginary draws on notions of individual and collective autonomy: people have “a right to choose for themselves their own pattern of life, to decide in conscience what convictions to espouse, to determine the shape of their lives in a whole host of ways that their ancestors could not control” (Taylor 1991, 2). This focus on individuality and the autonomy of the individual rests also on an ontology that, in turn, separates the individual from nature. To speak about “the environment,” as is now common in global discourses, is to presume to act autonomously upon that environment. Accordingly, autonomy carries the weight not only of separating one individual from another and one collectivity rooted in one territory from another but also of separating individual human beings and their societies from the natural worlds of which they are a part.

When we framed the objectives of the project as they are outlined in the Preface to this book, we were considering the reciprocal relationships between these notions of autonomy and the widely varying processes commonly referred to as globalization. In the face of these understandings

and practices of autonomy, Indigenous peoples have had to work with these understandings and practices and claim autonomy if their knowledges and ways of living were to persist. It is in this sense that they may say that they only became concerned with autonomy after meeting settlers living the ontology and epistemology of the West.

In Indigenous peoples' own ontologies and epistemologies, relationality in varying forms rather than separation flourished. "In Indigenous cultural domains relationality means that one experiences the self as part of others and that others are part of the self; this is learnt through reciprocity, obligation, shared experiences, coexistence, co-operation and social memory" (Moreton-Robinson 2000, 16). When Indigenous persons reflect on their own ontologies, epistemologies, and ways of living in light of their experiences with settlers from Europe, they capture the differences between their ontologies and epistemologies and those of the Europeans. The latter start from the inside and move to the outside (Descartes' *Cogito ergo sum*), while their own start from the outside and move to the inside (Fernández Osco, this volume). For the Aymara, about whom Marcelo Fernández Osco writes, starting from the outside position involves seeing the present and the past as interrelated. Many Indigenous languages do not have a past or a future tense: time, space, and all entities are tied together. The person is social, inserted in a multi-dimensional world. Fulfillment comes only through interactions with other elements, human and non-human. "Being well" is therefore relational; it happens through balanced relations with one's family, one's community, and with other human and non-human entities (Quemenado, this volume).

In moving from the outside to the inside, Indigenous cosmologies incubate an expansive concept of the world. Accordingly, Indigenous people might also say to us: we were only limited to the global when we met you. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (2003, 73) captures some of the puzzlement of Indigenous peoples when she contrasts the planetary with the global: "If we imagine ourselves as planetary subjects rather than global agents, planetary creatures rather than global entities, alterity remains underived from us; it is not our dialectical negation, it contains us as much as it flings us away." The stylized sphere that underpins the idea of the global, with its latitudes and longitudes, signifies mapping, controlling, and dominating space. For Indigenous peoples, then, when the globe replaces the world, they feel limitations on their minds, their activities, and their being in the world. Spivak adds: "The globe is on our computer. No one lives there. It allows us to think that we can aim to control it" (*ibid.*, 72).

It is therefore not surprising that when Indigenous peoples speak about globalization, it is often with a sense of weariness — a sense of having seen the violence it has brought before — and with fears that the ways of domination will continue the process of undermining languages, knowledges, and ways of living. Frontier violence, missionization, colonialism, nationalism, development, neoliberalism, globalization — they appear so often as variations on the same disturbing melody. Facing this prospect, Indigenous peoples must fall back on the resort of seeking autonomy. They are highly ambivalent about making this move. On the one hand, the quest for autonomy exposes Indigenous worlds to the many traps of foreign categories and obliges Indigenous peoples to work with them. On the other hand, it instills new meanings into these same categories. As this volume demonstrates, by subverting and expanding the meaning of autonomy, Indigenous peoples and their struggles allow all peoples to imagine different kinds of globalization.

## **Relationality**

Proceeding against the grain and engaging carefully with Indigenous voices that have been shared with us, we point in this introduction towards what we have learned about globalization and autonomy. We have hinted that relationships, conceptualized through the notion of relationality, provide a window for us to present the conclusions of our work. Most Indigenous cosmologies build on the notion that relationships constitute the very fabric of reality: without relations there is no world or life (Alfred 1999; Universidad Intercultural Amawtay Wasi 2004; Arquette, Cole, and AFT 2004; Cajete 2000; Deloria 1999; Fernández Osco 2000; Maaka and Fleras 2000; Waters 2004). While the modern scientific epistemology is focused on separating, classifying, and manipulating discrete entities and substances, Indigenous knowledges stress relations and processes (see Cajete 2000; Latour 1993; Descola and Palsson 1996). In effect, Indigenous knowledges are built upon relationships — with oneself; with one's family, community, or nation; with other nations; and with the other-than-human (Cajete 2000; Cornelius 1992; Clarkson, Morrissette, and Regallet 1992). These relationships are not limited by space, place, or time. They are spiritual, often extending back to ancestors and into the future to those yet born. The scope of Indigenous knowledges is therefore enormous and challenges modern distinctions between nature and society and brings into

view the intricate webs of relations that constitute all that is known (see Cajete 2000; Grim 2001). These ways of knowing involve more than recognizing the mutual connections between nature and society. This distinction itself does not exist in most Indigenous cosmologies. Indigenous knowledges take account of and care for the multiplicity of relations that exist between the elements of creation, all of which are endowed with life and agency.

In relational perspectives, differences are conceived as being a matter of location rather than discrete essences. Diversity (of locations) is a precondition for the very existence of the web of life. By failing to recognize relationality, analysts and commentators often misconstrue Indigenous movements for autonomy. For example, they construct Indigenous peoples' demands for land in primarily economic or political rather than spiritual and emotional terms. Thus, they fail to recognize that their attempt to classify these demands as economic, cultural, political, or educational results from the very modern epistemologies and ontologies that contemporary Indigenous autonomy movements resist.

By keeping relationality as an interpretive grid, we come to see globalization through Indigenous perspectives as a set of processes that reconfigure the constitutive relations of the web of life. Globalization reconstitutes relations not only between places and between peoples but also among other living beings. Although not always of conscious design, these processes do spring from certain ways of conceiving the world. Thus, globalization can be thought of as the ongoing materialization of visions of and projects for the world. We use the terms *visions* and *projects* in this introduction to highlight the perpetual dialectic of human ideals and philosophies with the material world. Indigenous movements remind us that because these visions or projects are multiple, globalization is potentially and actually plural. In this volume we focus on two visions or projects. The first is dominant and related genealogically to modernity — the attempt to reconstitute relations through the production of self-contained entities commensurable in a single system of valuation and through the denial of relationality as the foundation of life. The second project — which, we argue, is the basis of many Indigenous peoples' movements and struggles for autonomy — seeks to bring relationality back to the forefront of human values and practices. In this sense, the aim of the volume is not to present a catalogue of effects that globalization has had on Indigenous peoples' autonomy but to illuminate the visions and projects that are embodied in Indigenous peoples' collective

actions and shed light on how they interact with the dominant project. These visions and projects, in turn, enrich our understanding of the dialectics of globalization and autonomy.

Indigenous struggles for autonomy clearly have profound political and epistemological implications, and we do not stand in a neutral position by drawing them out. In effect, as Bonaventura de Sousa Santos (2004) points out when he writes of alter-globalization movements, many Indigenous peoples and their activists, intellectuals, supporters, and sympathizers enact a sociology of absences and emergences. The sociology of absences seeks to point out practices that actively obscure and render absent alternatives to the present order of things. The sociology of emergences brings forward those alternatives that are immanent in social movements but are not yet fully articulated or realized.

As Rebeka Tabobondung remarks in her contribution to this volume, by the sheer fact that they seek to enact their worlds and their understanding of autonomy, Indigenous movements are profoundly subversive and cut a path towards an alternative globalization (see also Hall and Fenelon 2004). We stress, however, that the alternative globalizations implicit in Indigenous peoples' struggles to sustain their ways of life do not necessarily emerge as a conscious design or in the form of a global project. By working against or apart from the universalizing tendencies of the dominant form of globalization, these struggles give rise to visions of alternative ways to live together. In this respect, this book contributes both to political and epistemic projects. It counters the absences imposed by a discourse on globalization that maintains that there are no alternatives to the present modern order. It fosters the emergence of the alternative visions and projects of globalization that are implicit in many Indigenous peoples' struggles for autonomy. Finally, it seeks to understand the dialectical encounters taking place in multiple locations between Indigenous projects and modern globalization.

### **Countering Absences**

Perhaps the most important absences identified in this book are Indigenous knowledges and ways of living. For instance, from the perspective of a modern account in which autonomy is conceived against the competitive and conflictual background of the state of nature, Indigenous views of relationality may appear romantic or naive. We demur. Indigenous knowledges and

ways of living are precisely where absences become evident, because the modern account is an argument that reflects a lack of awareness of the effects of modern notions of autonomy and their underlying assumptions. Only by believing that one can deny relations with impunity is it possible to see Indigenous concerns with coexistence and co-adjustment as idealistic or anachronistic. Part of the very nature of the global environmental crisis is the way in which it ties together all dimensions of living in the world. Thus, the changes in climate currently being experienced around the world tie together patterns of production, consumption, and accumulation with air pollution in North America and East Asia, drought in Australia and West Africa, flooding in Bangladesh, asthmatic children in New York City, and starving families in sub-Saharan Africa. As Ulrich Beck (1992) points out, in such a risk society, the sciences of modernity are confounded by complexity. In this context the endurance of Indigenous concerns about relations in the face of enormous upheaval, as Richard Preston shows for the Cree in northern Ontario and Quebec (see his contribution to this volume), attests to the grounded and experiential basis of Indigenous knowledges.

It is nonetheless evident that the Indigenous social and cultural institutions in which relationality was once manifest have been damaged. Consequently, we are obliged to read beneath the layers of discourse that Indigenous peoples have incorporated during their engagement with modern practices and institutions. As they try to defend and further their own visions of and projects in the world amid globalizing processes, Indigenous movements unavoidably encounter modern economic, political, and scientific institutions and are forced to grapple with their entrenched logics and grounding visions or projects. As Harvey Feit shows in his chapter on the James Bay Cree, these encounters usually take place on an uneven terrain where Indigenous peoples are forced to engage with the categories imposed by those institutions and with metropolitan languages in order to be heard and understood. He also adds, however, that Indigenous peoples can manipulate the logic of these categories under certain circumstances to defend or secure their autonomy. Not only politics but also epistemological questions are considered on this uneven terrain. Modernity denies the sophistication and relationality of Indigenous worlds by categorizing bodies of Indigenous knowledge as beliefs or superstitions based on myth. At the same time, modern institutions naturalize the order of which they are part by portraying their own philosophical foundations as common sense.

Countering these practices requires genealogical work, digging out and laying bare the roots of modern institutions, in narratives of how the world has come to be. These narratives address the grounding of the modern Western understanding of the world (i.e., the escape from a state of nature) and how this understanding is embedded in institutions such as the social contract and private property and in values such as individual autonomy and progress. This step is important. Once we can place modern and Indigenous stories or visions of the world on an even epistemological ground, their value can be gauged, not in terms of their veracity (for each story lays down its own criteria for truth), but in terms of their effects. Thus, one can better understand that the vision of the world immanent in modern understandings is conducive to the progressive demarcation and enclosure of locations on the web of life. These enclosures are first transformed into discrete autonomous entities and then into commodities.

Demarcation and enclosure simply entail the denial of the multiple relations that constitute every existing entity. This process is a relentless one that constantly finds new ways to transform a complex web into discrete, commodifiable forms. It is also insidious. In their building of a framework to understand the mix of languages of the Maya, for example, the Maya, as Erich Fox Tree shows, open themselves to a neoliberal cadastral logic for demarcating and individualizing the ownership of land. Similarly, by seeking ways to maintain historical practices of co-governance with political authorities in Canada and Quebec, the Crees, as Harvey Feit outlines, have worked to exploit some of the diverse, chaotic, and contradictory elements of neoliberal governmentality. They saw opportunities for maintaining practices of co-governance that had roots in pre-state relationships with European colonizers and their own cosmology. In effect, aspects of this governmentality such as self-reliance could be translated into self-government and, thus, collective autonomy. In the process, however, the Crees had to accede to further commodification of forests, minerals and, most notably, waterways in their territories. They also had to give ground on traditional practices to ensure economic livelihoods for their people in a resource economy now plugged into global circuits.

A similar type of commodification is occurring in the realm of intellectual property rights as pharmaceutical corporations comb Indigenous medicinal practices for new drugs. The progressive enclosure and cutting of relations is consonant with the imperatives of globalization, such as increasing individual autonomy and smoothing the flow of people, ideas, and goods. There is no doubt that (human or non-human) entities that are

divorced from the web of relations that constitute them and that have few considerations beyond short contractual terms between individuals and a single system of narrowly defined economic value can move without restraint and more efficiently. The denial of relationships is unsustainable, however, for it continually produces new grievances, social conflicts, and environmental crises.

Indigenous peoples must pursue their notions of autonomy in a discursive or conceptual terrain that is not their own. Feit worries about the long-term consequences for the Crees as they accommodate themselves to neoliberal governing technologies to preserve a pattern of co-governance established seventy years before to “manage” beaver trapping. In this case, the kind of autonomy offered to Indigenous peoples by globalizing modernity, with its strong emphasis on the individual and the social contract, can be a Trojan horse that debilitates rather than strengthens communities. Increasingly, members of Indigenous movements are aware of these traps and distinguish between a dominant (usually liberal) concept of autonomy and Indigenous aspirations (see Alfred 2005; Patzi 2004). The room within which they have to steer away from the “cunning of recognition” (Povinelli 2002) varies greatly from case to case, however.

For the Crees in Quebec, the direct connection between the development of hydroelectric resources and the global economy created room to manoeuvre not available to the Mapuche, as is shown in historian Pablo Marimán Quemenado’s chapter, which focuses on a recent episode of Mapuche political development in Chile. Hydro-Québec, the government corporation in charge of developing the resources; the huge, globally active construction firms engaged in dam construction; and the corporate and government clients who purchased the power could not live with a situation in which Aboriginal protests and non-violent civil disobedience disrupted energy flows. In their desire to establish “peace” in the region, they were prepared to agree to a system of co-governance that met many of the Crees’ demands.

In his analysis of the causes that led to the electoral defeat of a Mapuche autonomist agenda among an electorate that constituted an Indigenous majority, Quemenado recognizes that the “forces emanating from the system of ‘the other’ ... disperse the will of the Mapuche” with promises of integration. He underscores that absences (the invisibility of viable alternatives) also operate for Indigenous peoples subjected to the duress of colonizing processes. Quemenado’s chapter, and the work of the organization Wallontu Cholchol Mapu of which he writes and is a member, are

themselves accomplished examples of a sociology of absences. They analyze the processes by which the Mapuche way of organizing relations and conceiving the good life has been rendered absent in the face of neoliberal economic development policies for forests pursued by the Chilean state. Denaturalizing the present state of affairs, he seeks to open up the space for the recovery and revitalization of Mapuche institutions that are currently constrained from operating in small communities.

In this line of analysis, Quemenado traces the continuity that exists between the imperial process of military conquest and colonization of Mapuche territory by the Chilean state in the nineteenth century and the more recent processes of enclosure and dispossession fostered by what he calls neoliberal globalization. At the same time, however, he points out that Mapuche claims for autonomy are connected to the international Indigenous movement, which has brought the question of Indigenous rights into the United Nations and the Organization of American States. By doing so, and clearly expressing that Indigenous claims for autonomy go well beyond the rights currently recognized by these institutions, Quemenado points out that Indigenous struggles are the embodiment of alternative globalizations.

### **Fostering Emergences**

To understand Indigenous movements as an embodiment of, and contributor to, alternative globalizations, we need to understand their members' reflections on globalization and their strategies to deal with it. Based on the essays in this volume, we find that these reflections take three forms. First, Indigenous peoples have something to say in debates about whether globalizing processes are continuous with the past or constitute a distinct rupture. Two volumes in this series examine these debates (Streeter, Weaver, and Coleman 2009; Coleman, under review). The Indigenous perspective emphasizes continuity in the experience of globalization as opposed to discontinuity or rupture. Second, Indigenous peoples have played the autonomy game and worked within nation-states and, increasingly, the global political arena to define what is meant by autonomy and to secure control over their knowledges, capacity for self-representation, and ways of living. Third, Indigenous peoples have developed global collaborative arrangements among themselves that, intended or not, articulate the contours of an alternative globalization. This activism has often resonated

with members of non-Indigenous social movements who are contesting globalization on other grounds.

### Globalization: Continuity or Rupture?

When Indigenous peoples describe their experience of globalization and conceptualize their understanding of it, they see it as an exercise of power and subjugation that extends over centuries. They also see the potential for creating a different type of globalization, perhaps Earth globalization, as Rebecka Tabobondung calls it in her contribution to this volume. In his chapter, Marcelo Fernández Osco stresses the continuity by pointing out that from an Andean perspective the world has been upside down since the sixteenth century. The concept of modernity/coloniality he uses is shared with an expanding network of intellectuals connected to social movements in Latin America.<sup>1</sup> *Coloniality* refers to the system of ordering differences (of species, race, gender, religion, ethnicity, and epistemology, among others) according to a hierarchy that always justifies the dominance of those who are defined as modern over those who are defined as non-modern. Hence the term *modernity/coloniality*: the former does not exist without the latter. In this theoretical perspective, relations of domination and subordination are not moments of modernity — they have been intrinsic to it from the very beginning. The specific criteria used to organize the hierarchy that situates all that is deemed modern on top has changed through history, but the hierarchy itself has remained unchallenged. For example, although race may no longer be a criterion relevant to the establishment of hierarchies in Latin American law, Fernández Osco indicates that logocentric and Eurocentric criteria of justice maintain a hierarchy that permits the subordination of Indigenous understandings of justice in the modern state judiciary system.

Employing the concept of modernity/coloniality allows Fernández Osco to highlight continuities in Bolivian history even as the country shifted from the Spanish colonial system to a republic, from a republic to the left-nationalist period, and from the left-nationalist period to a neoliberal democracy compatible with the global order at the turn of the millennium. Tabobondung discusses a similar line of continuity in her chapter, albeit in a more schematic way. The Indigenous perspectives presented in this book reveal that there has been continuity in bearing witness to the decline in biological diversity — from the disappearance of whales, buffalo,

fish, and medicinal plants to the cutting and clearing of forests — and to the gradual pollution of the air, the waters, and the soils. It all started long ago. Viewed from a perspective that disregards the point that colonialism is constitutive of modernity, these transformations sometimes appear to be important discontinuities that mark the historical progression that was once called modernization and is now called globalization. Some of these continuities that lie beneath discontinuities are explored at length elsewhere in the *Globalization and Autonomy Series*. The volume edited by Stephen Streeter, John C. Weaver, and William D. Coleman (2009) focuses on empires and autonomy, and the volume edited by William D. Coleman (under review) looks at struggles over property rights in a globalizing context.

From the point of view that modernity is not possible without coloniality, there has been a continuous pattern of domination and repression of religious beliefs, including Indigenous cosmologies. In the Americas this attack on Indigenous spiritualities came largely at the hands of Christian missionaries, Christian churches erected and institutionalized by settler communities and, most recently, evangelical, often Pentecostal, Protestants. Richard Preston looks at these processes from the perspective of northern Crees and spirituality. He notes that Cree spirituality incorporated notions of autonomy shaped by the experience of living in small two- or three-family hunting communities, the solitude of hunters' experiences, and observations about animals who were communal (geese) as opposed to solitary (wolverines). Each creature was seen as a spirit person, as was each Cree. Preston suggests that Crees maintained their spirituality by adapting to and incorporating elements of successive waves of Christian intrusion, including the most recent wave of evangelical Protestantism. Crees found Christian ideas of value (for instance, baptism as protection from sorcery) and blended them into their own spirituality. Yet Preston also notes the destructive effects that competition among various Christian denominations had on Cree communal relations. He holds out hope that Crees may still resist this long continuous repression of their spiritual life by finding a transformed premodern Cree spirituality.

### Playing the Autonomy Game

Indigenous people have noted and studied the modern notion of autonomy and the growing legal arrangements around it that have developed over the past three centuries. Caught within colonial systems, whether

through imperialism as settlers arrived in their territories or through the nation-state system and its hierarchy of categories designed to protect and promote the powerful, Indigenous peoples have tried, when possible, to use these same systems against their colonizers. In the past forty years, international norms built on these same legal arrangements have opened new avenues for resistance. The chapters in this volume identify various forms of “within the system” resistance.

In certain contexts, particularly within South America, Indigenous peoples seek to increase their collective autonomy in electoral politics. Fernández Osco makes brief reference to the presidency of Evo Morales, an Aymara leader, in Bolivia. Morales is backed by highly mobilized Indigenous communities, which constitute the majority of Bolivia’s population. It is still too early to gauge the consequences of this startling development and how it may be used to regenerate Indigenous ways of living and build respect for their languages and knowledges. Pablo Marimán Quemenado offers his reflections on the fate of an Indigenous political organization, the Wallontu Cholchol Mapu, which contested local elections in a commune in Chile that also has an Indigenous majority. He describes how a political attempt to build a culturally distinctive autonomous region failed to inspire this majority and explores why. He notes the long-standing impact of colonialism and its effects on his people’s view of themselves and of politics.

Mobilizing population strength based on an Indigenous majority in a nation-state has taken a different form in Guatemala. Understanding the politics of majorities and strength in numbers, the Mayans have worked to develop a pan-Mayan identity to knit together diverse linguistic and cultural communities. Erich Fox Tree traces how the Western academic discipline of linguistics, long a tool of colonialism, has been co-opted by Mayan activists. Drawing on a notion of linguistic autonomy, the Mayans have worked to develop broader notions of social, political, and cultural autonomy; however, in so doing, they may have delimited their ability to exercise that autonomy. Fox Tree writes, “They have naturalized a one-to-one correspondence between languages, peoples, and territories that resembles the hegemonic ethnic and nationalist ideologies of most of the world.” He also argues that a new generation of activists is turning to other, more autochthonous and potentially less menacing, models of social relations and activist resilience.

Unlike the Maya, Mapuche, and Aymara, Indigenous peoples who are only minorities within modern nation-states have taken different avenues

in pursuit of collective autonomy. In some cases they have built on the needs of the nation-state and global capitalism. Harvey Feit reveals how these needs played out in both the beaver fur economy and the most recent arrangements of the resource-development economy and ended in a, perhaps fragile, system of co-governance between Crees and the government of Quebec. In other cases Indigenous communities have pursued autonomy by using the notion of rights that arise from their original position in settler states. Often drawing from imperial laws and related treaties or agreements, they have made the case that their autonomy follows from the right to possess land, resources, and social protection. The pursuit of these arguments has often pushed Indigenous peoples into the judicial systems of nation-states, where they have experienced only slow progress and many setbacks over the past 150 years.

These legal and rights-based approaches to securing autonomy have taken on an additional dimension because of commitments made by nation-states at the global level to human rights, minority rights, and political and civil rights, including most notably the right to self-determination (Niezen 2003, 40). Institutional interest in the concerns of Indigenous peoples began in 1971, when the United Nations Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights began to investigate discrimination against Indigenous peoples worldwide. The UN appointed a special rapporteur, José Martínez Cobo, whose extensive consultations with Indigenous communities and comprehensive reports of their circumstances over the next decade became the catalyst for thought and action in the UN (de Costa 2006, 127-29). This process culminated in the creation of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in December 2000 and the passage of a UN General Assembly Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007. The importance of this declaration is still an open question. Colin Scott and Monica Mulrennan are circumspect in their chapter on the difficulties faced by the Torres Strait Islanders in securing marine rights and how they might be affected by the declaration. In the Afterword to this book, Ravi de Costa explores the potential importance of the declaration more extensively and sees, perhaps, that developments at the UN have contributed to and parallel the growth of consciousness about being Indigenous well beyond the Americas, where there has traditionally been the greatest momentum on these issues.

As global concepts of Indigenous peoples' rights have matured, they have led Indigenous peoples and their supporting social movements to put pressure back on the nation-states to own, develop, and control their lands

and resources. The Crees in Quebec successfully reframed the economic “development” of large, powerful waterways within the context of environmental degradation and the destruction of biological diversity. By doing so, they were able to build alliances with environmental social movements that are not only active in Canada and the United States, as Kristina Maud Bergeron shows in her chapter, but also working with global institutions, including the United Nations. This international alliance exerted enough pressure to sideline a significant development plan that had failed to respect long-standing practices of co-governance.

In their chapter Colin Scott and Monica Mulrennan show how the Islander peoples of the Torres Strait have drawn on international self-government norms to pressure the Australian state to recognize their Native title in the seas, seabeds, reefs, and islets. Scott and Mulrennan also demonstrate the limits of a course of action that invokes international norms in support of Indigenous peoples’ autonomy. Governments can remain highly intransigent in the face of such pressures. The refusal of Canada, the United States, New Zealand, and Australia to sign the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007 was a blatant reminder of such intransigence. Moral suasion appears to be the only recourse in the face of governmental resistance. Australia relented and signed the declaration after the Labour Party came to power in 2007.

In summary, the utilization of modern electoral and legal strategies to carve out economic, cultural, and political autonomy has limits in the eyes of Indigenous peoples. On the one side, playing the autonomy game requires them to act as translators of their own cultures and cosmologies and the governmental rationalities that dominate in any given situation. When the translation takes place on unequal terms, Indigenous people experience challenges to their cultures and cosmologies from legalized, modern ways of proceeding. On the other side, after decades of struggle using these means to secure autonomy, successes, where they exist, have been minimal and equivocal.

### Project Identities: Contributing to Alternative Globalizations

In his discussion of identity in the information age, Manuel Castells (1997) distinguishes between *resistance* and *project* identities. He describes resistance identities as identities generated by communities that are in situations in which they are devalued and possibly stigmatized by the logic of domination. In response, they build “trenches of resistance and survival” on the

basis of principles different from, or opposed to, those that permeate the institutions of society (ibid., 8). These practices capture the actions of Indigenous people who are playing the autonomy game. In contrast, project identities form when social actors, “on the basis of whichever cultural materials are available to them, build a new identity that redefines their position in society and, by so doing, seek the transformation of overall social structure” (ibid.). In Castells’ analysis, project identities are those that give rise to hope: they do not involve resisting domination by building enclaves of protection against modernity but are built instead on conceptions of a new social order with different principles.

In this volume we learn that Indigenous peoples move beyond resistance and autonomy by defending and sustaining alternative ways of living in the world that contribute to alternative globalizations. Fernández Osco focuses on the Aymara concept of the *ayllu*. He describes the ayllu as an autonomous sphere that operates with an understanding of sociality that differs from those in Eurocentric or criollo-mestizo concerns and politics. Through the oral tradition that it maintains, the ayllu provides a path not only to deeper perceptions of the colonial order but also to decolonial knowledge necessary for a good life.

From this standpoint it is possible to conceive that, *pace* Anthony Giddens (1990) and others, there is something other than modernity all the way down. There is the prospect of an order in which differences (of any kind) are not translated into hierarchies but inspire negotiation and co-adjustment (that is, an order without coloniality) that automatically displaces modernity and neoliberal globalization as its continuation. Consider one of the most basic hierarchical distinctions of modern ontology — that of nature versus society — and all its ramifications in politics, ethics, and epistemology (see Latour 1993, 1999, 2004). Could we still speak of modernity in any meaningful sense if we were to do away with this fundamental distinction? We argue that we could not.

It is significant that most of the Indigenous contributors to this volume use the term *neoliberal globalization* to refer to the continuity of modernity/coloniality from the arrival of European settlers to the present. By using the term, they signal the possibility of other globalizations that are implicit in many Indigenous movements’ visions or projects of a good life. The problem is whether these movements and the visions and projects that inspire them can and should become global. After all, they tend to be embedded in particular landscapes and histories. Would globalization simply

replace the universalism of modernity with the universalism of a particular Indigenous world view? The contributors reflect on this question.

The contributors place emphasis on pluriversalism rather than universalism, on dialogue, negotiation, and coexistence between contrasting visions and projects that are replacing the universal imposition of modernity. A pluriversal world is one in which pre-established protocols of engagement between different life worlds (such as those implicit in liberal philosophies of multiculturalism or moral extensionism in environmental politics) are rejected. Pluriversity attends to the emergent and mutable patterns that arise through sustained interactions between conscious entities. It recognizes that mutual survival depends on respect for mutual differences.

The contributors also have some thoughts on how to pursue pluriversalism. Rebecka Tabobondung reflects on the possibility of autonomous media creation by Indigenous peoples as one means. By making alternatives more visible, this type of media creation can counter the self-serving representations of what is going on by actors that embody neoliberal globalization. In short, Indigenous media creation seeks to decolonize the way in which the world is conceived. Such a use of media can be seen as promoting a dialogue, a global conversation to which Indigenous peoples have much to offer, not only to improve Indigenous peoples own situation but also for the betterment or defence of all of Creation. Indigenous media creation helps to constitute space for multiple forms of knowing. Indigenous contributions to the dialogue in this space will be enhanced by the revitalization of languages and the customary practices in which those languages have been used. As Fox Tree remarks, the revitalization of languages can constitute an alternative globalization in its own right. Similarly, Tabobondung argues that a dialogue based on multiple knowledges and ways of living can deepen and enrich the ways in which we understand the world.

The viability of a global conversation of this kind through media is illustrated in some ways by Zapatismo and the social movements that have been sparked by the vision of the Zapatistas during their revolt in Mexico. In his chapter, Alex Khasnabish suggests that the actions of the Zapatistas resonated via their autonomous media creation with other social groups, particularly anti-capitalist groups. He suggests the metaphor of the rhizome to understand how this resonance sparked further dialogue — first between an Indigenous project and others seeking an alternative to neoliberalism and then among an even broader range of social movements.

Tabobundung's work implies that an alternative Earth globalization, as the construction of a space for dialogue, will avoid the risk of becoming simply another universalism to replace the universalism of modernity. Perhaps the most well-known rejoinder to this possibility is the Zapatista slogan "A world in which many worlds fit." In this case, pluriversalism replaces universalism; dialogue, negotiation, and coexistence between contrasting visions and projects displaces monologue, imposition, and colonization.

Autonomous media creation combined with global activism in international institutions has helped to foster linkages among diverse Indigenous peoples that are based on their very being or indigeneity. Kristina Maud Bergeron demonstrates in her case studies of the Cree in Quebec and the Saami in Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia that Indigenous people not only have an impact on the world through their activism, they also come to see themselves as Indigenous peoples and as part of a world family of Indigenous nations. While they recognize the particularities of each member in this family, they also come to understand what they share with other members from around the world. Ronald Niezen (2003, 23) suggests that these commonalities include "an attachment that all participants share to some form of subsistence economy, to a territory or homeland that predates the arrival of settlers and surveyors, to a spiritual system that predates the arrival of missionaries, and to a language that expresses everything that is important and distinct about their place in the universe. Most importantly, they share the destruction and loss of these things." Some of these commonalities, in turn, are reflected in the understanding of the rights of Indigenous peoples found in the UN's declaration.

These more inclusive identities, and the connections that they foster, allow Indigenous peoples to make more effective interventions in debates that affect everyone. These include, for example, debates about the shape of the present world order of nation-states or about the ecological demands of modern human societies or about how to achieve peace among peoples. Through their interventions, which are often facilitated by autonomous media creation and global activism, Indigenous people introduce ways of understanding the world into global debates that differ from those that predominate. Indigenous scholars, who are increasingly bringing insights from their own traditions of knowledge into their professional work, complement this global activism (see Battiste 2000; Cajete 1999; McGregor 2004; Smith 1999).<sup>2</sup> The overall contributions of activists and scholars advance pluriversalism.

## The Volume

Indigenous peoples' understanding of the complex relationship between autonomy and globalization are presented in this volume in the following way. Marcelo Fernández Osco's discussion of the ayllu in the Aymara community highlights the major themes of the book. It addresses the absence in the world of Indigenous knowledges and ways of living and traces in some detail an example of an alternative mode of thinking. It also highlights the hope that could come from a more pluriversal world that includes those knowledges and ways of living.

Part 2, "Emergences," begins with Harvey Feit's chapter on the Cree practice of co-governance with the settler state and how that practice is negotiated in a neoliberal world. He shows us that "peacefully" securing collective autonomy in contemporary times requires the Crees to employ neoliberal technologies such as individual self-reliance, private-public partnerships, and self-regulation. The long-term consequences of these peaceful engagements for Cree relationality, however, are far from clear. This lack of clarity is evident when we look at the uneven terrain of the relations thus established. Indigenous peoples can often sustain or gain degrees of autonomy peacefully only insofar as they can find ways to restructure relationships with non-Native societies. These changes can give them room to live in their own ways but not to fundamentally challenge the values and interests of dominant societies. In other cases, relations turn from peaceful to conflictual. In his contribution Erich Fox Tree also reflects on the particularities of striving for Indigenous autonomy under neoliberal conditions. He begins by showing the hopes that arise from concentrating on sustaining and enriching Indigenous languages through the use of modern theories of linguistics. He also recounts the dangers that emerge from such an approach as these tools of modernity become Trojan horses for neoliberal appropriation of lands and the imposition of individualist property rights. Nevertheless, both Feit and Fox Tree underline that we should never assume that neoliberal visions by hegemonic actors are automatically realized and achieved. What these actors seek and what they obtain are often different. The friction created in the making of global connections usually induces cultural changes on both sides, as Anna Tsing (2005) argues.

Kristina Maud Bergeron's chapter on the global activism of the Cree and the Saami peoples shows that activism can lead to the creation of

global Indigenous identities on the one hand and to contributions to alternative conceptions of globalization on the other. Like Feit and Fox Tree, she refuses to see neoliberal globalization as a monolith that cannot be challenged and puts forward the success of Indigenous global networks as an example. Rebecka Tabobondung's chapter on self-determination through autonomous media creation takes us farther along the path of our discussion of Indigenous peoples' experience of globalization as modernity/coloniality in neoliberal guise, their attempts to play the autonomy game, and their articulation of project identities that may contribute to global attempts to foster alternative globalizations through pluriversalism. Finally, Colin Scott and Monica Mulrennan offer some sobering evidence about continuing obstacles to pluriversalism. They show that the international norms that may enable Indigenous self-determination have little bite when they are opposed by political elites in nation-state governments. Playing the autonomy game can sometimes be fruitful; when it is frustrating, demoralizing, and perilous, however, it undermines hopes for the emergence of alternative globalizations.

In Part 3, "Absences," Pablo Marimán Quemenedo offers an example of an Indigenous group, the Mapuche, who attempted to address the absences that have arisen from the suppression of Indigenous thinking and ways of life by contesting local elections in Cholchol, Chile. The failure of this attempt leads him to reflect on the obstacles that Indigenous people face when they counter absences, including the impact of coloniality on their own internal relationships. Richard Preston's chapter explores absences through a study of the fate of Cree spirituality as it has confronted the Christian sects associated with European modernity. He remains optimistic that the survival of traditional Cree spirituality in the face of the Christian onslaught represents a continued possibility for countering absences.

Part 4, "Hope," concludes with a chapter by Alex Khasnabish and an Afterword by Ravi de Costa. Khasnabish examines the rhizomatic and resonant qualities of Zapatismo, the social movement sparked by the communication of the Zapatista revolt in Chiapas, Mexico. It provides an illustration of how the ideology of social movements in Latin America, particularly the struggles of Indigenous peoples, can have broader global impacts. He notes that the idea of a networked social struggle was self-consciously cultivated by the leadership of the Zapatista movement, making it an important example of collaborative transnational activism. In this respect, the Zapatista movement has offered hope to Indigenous and other marginalized communities that are seeking to create alternative pathways

to those laid out by contemporary, hegemonic globalization. Ravi de Costa provides some analysis of the origins and possible significance of the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, an event that took place as the research for this project drew to an end. De Costa examines the significance of the declaration and then links it to the overall arguments of this book.

## Conclusion

To sustain their life worlds in the face of globalizing modern institutions, Indigenous peoples have taken advantage of fissures within these institutions. This strategy has tended to create a peculiar form of invisibility. In effect, because of its relative weakness and high reliance on opportunity, Indigenous politics can appear to be opportunistic and reactive rather than the result of broadly understood socio-cultural practices (Blaser 2004). Some analysts therefore stress the contingent character of the politics of indigeneity by claiming that they are a response to global, national, or regional economic and political transformations (see Friedman 1999, 2002; Rata 2002; Yashar 1997). Through detailed historical analysis, other scholars have shown that the demands of Indigenous movements have been informed by their members' encounter with specific institutional constraints (Muehlebach 2003; Van Cott 2000). Certainly, these kinds of analyses can help us to understand the visions and actions of contemporary Indigenous movements. They often do so, however, at the expense of subduing their most radical and subversive dimension: the alternative globalizations that everyday forms of existence enact in myriad ways. We hope this volume will make a contribution towards the recognition of not only the historically contingent and evolving forms of Indigenous movement politics but also their unique socio-cultural motivations. The latter task is important if we are to counter the lack of alternatives to neoliberal globalization and foster the emergent globalizations immanent in Indigenous understandings of the world.

There is now a growing critical strand in mainstream political philosophy that seeks to unsettle the natural status of modern political institutions (Beier 2002; Ivison, Patton, and Sanders 2000; Tully 1995; Higgins 2004). Simultaneously, Indigenous scholars are highlighting the alternative political orderings that emerge from Indigenous political philosophies (Alfred 1999, 2005; Henderson 2000; Patzi 2004; Williams 1999; Young 2000). Between these developments is a growing space in which to rethink the

relationship between different traditions of thought and action. This space for rethinking, however, also highlights a central tension. On the one hand, there is a project that produces globalization as a slightly modified modern framework that contains and regulates differences conceived as essences. On the other hand, there is a series of open-ended and ongoing encounters and negotiations of differences and location emerging from a continuous web of life. If these intellectual encounters are to fulfill their promise, they must be accessible to everybody as they imagine and enact the world in which they live. As we have argued, making Indigenous visions available as viable alternatives does not mean constructing a new order based on a different kind of universalism. On the contrary, it means seeking an equal footing for the performance of different stories about how the world functions. In so doing, the universalist pretensions of modernity will, at the very least, be made more visible and perhaps contained.

The struggle to shape globalization is not a simple battle between neoliberal globalization and alternatives such as Earth globalization. Indeed, in the early twenty-first century, we have observed the emergence of several left-leaning counter-hegemonic projects of globalization, especially in Latin America. Nevertheless, most of these projects remain anchored in modernity, even as they are somewhat indigenized (see García Linares 2007). It could be argued that the appeal that Indigenous movements hold for other forms of struggle might be due in no small measure to a particular Indigenous agenda. This agenda is one that departs in many ways from the universalist narratives that grounded previous social movements and resulted in widespread disillusion by the 1990s (see *Notes from Nowhere* 2003). Alternatives to neoliberal globalization involve much more than redistributive social justice. A pluriversal project seeks to create a climate of sharing in which all can agree, disagree, explain, challenge, sigh, and nurture. In short, such a project involves acknowledging the relationships that sustain the web of life.