in the environmental movement or had long activist résumés of participation in community-based actions. The movement was young in the sense that a lot of my mentors, those Indigenous people who had decades of experience in struggle, were participating from the sidelines. Many of the voices and leadership emerging were new to political activism. This was both inspiring and frustrating, as basic organizing and media literacy at times was lacking. It is often said that the movement was led by women, and I think this is true, but I also think most resistance movements throughout Indigenous history have been led in various ways by women. There were also ally voices—predominately but not exclusively white. Social media played a critical role in providing a vehicle to bypass Indigenous representations in the mainstream media and self-represent our interest, our voices, and our movement to the Canadian public directly. But we didn't use social media just for self-representation. We used it as a tool through which to amplify, to organize, and to *build* the movement. Although the vast majority of actions during Idle No More took place on the ground, in the real world, the organization of those events took place using social media. In a sense, the movement, like other mass movements at the time, for the first time was built to some degree in cyberspace.

On one hand, that last statement isn't the full truth, and I need to be more nuanced. The Indigenous community, particularly the segment of our community that is engaged politically, is small. To some degree we know each other. More than once, I asked friends and family who so-and-so was, and most often they knew a friend or a cousin of the person I was asking about. In a sense, the networks that social media created between individuals were an overmapping of kinship networks that already existed, but not entirely. Indigenous agitators of the past, such as Nahnebahnwequay, Pontiac, Tkamse, and Yellowhead, spent large amounts of time, years in fact, movement building. Movement building was relationship building, and it involved traveling large distances to create a physical connection with other human and nonhuman beings. This privileged the power of human connection and intimacy and of being fully present in the

moment. Walking a great distance to spend significant time with people and the land builds empathy, trust, and the ability to give each other the benefit of the doubt. It connects bodies to land, and bodies to Ancestors. I was reminded of this during the great walks of Idle No More, with youth undertaking epic physical journeys to Ottawa, stopping to meet and visit communities of people along the way. The Nishiyuu walkers created a moment of unity in the movement because they physically walked on the land and connected to other Indigenous peoples.[16] These Cree youth, like Theresa Spence, did something *real*.

This movement-*building* step is critical in all movements, but it is particularly crucial to think this through in the age of the Internet, when a seemingly easy shortcut exists. Seemingly, because on a very basic level, I wonder how the Internet, as another structure of control whose primary purpose is to make corporations money, is at all helpful in building movements. I wonder if the simulated worlds of the Internet are *simulations* that serve to only amplify capitalism, misogyny, transphobia, anti-queerness, and white supremacy and create further dependencies on settler colonialism in the physical world. I wonder if this creates further alienation from oneself, from Indigenous thought and practices, and from the Indigenous material world. I wonder if this is a *digital dispossession* from ourselves because it further removes us from grounded normativity. The Internet is the ultimate Cartesian expression of mind and mind only. There are no bodies on the Internet. There is no land. Insertion of Indigeneity in cyberspace is not insertion of Indigeneity in the physical world. As much as it pains me to admit, grounded normativity does not structurally exist in the cyber world, because it is predicated on *deep,* spiritual, emotional, reciprocal, real-world relationships between living beings. Dispossessed from our Indigenous material worlds, our thought systems and our practices, are we losing the ability to be makers and to solve problems, or at the very least are we accelerating this loss because most of our time is spent on screens connected to the Internet? How are we generating theory as practice on the Internet? How are we building a movement that centers Indigenous

makers when Internet access is so unevenly distributed across our territories? How is the Internet anything more than a house of cards when the next distraction is just one second away? How would my Ancestors feel about me being so fully integrated into a system of settler colonial surveillance and control when I have very little knowledge of how any of this technology works? I can't "fix" my phone. I don't know how to set up alternative digital communication systems. I don't know how to protect myself from state surveillance. I do know how to do exactly what larger corporations—Facebook, Apple, Twitter, and Google—want me to do to make them money, and I do it for the most part uncritically. I do know how to engage in apps and software. I can even be a content provider, but I have no ability to *structurally intervene*. Yet, almost more than any other structure, the Internet has structurally intervened in my life. There is a tremendous asymmetry here. The Internet and digital technologies have become a powerful site for reinforcing and amplifying settler colonialism, and I see losing the ability to structurally intervene as highly problematic. Code and algorithms are controlling our (digital) lives, and capitalism is controlling code. For Indigenous peoples, this takes place in the wider context of colonialism as the controlling structure in Indigenous life. Every tweet, Facebook post, blog post, Instagram photo, YouTube video, and e-mail we sent during Idle No More made the largest corporations in the world, corporations controlled by white men with a vested interested in settler colonialism, more money to reinforce the system of settler colonialism. Our cyber engagements were also read, monitored, collected, surveyed, and archived by the state. They were also read, monitored, collected, and surveyed by the segment of Canadian society that hates us, and they used these to try and hurt us. This worries me. I think we must think critically and strategically about adopting digital technologies as organizing and mobilizing tools. What are we gaining? What are we losing? How do we refuse the politics of recognition, engage in generative refusal, and operate with opaqueness on the Internet? Can we operate from a place of grounded normativity on Facebook when the algorithm attacks its very foundations?

When I think of the consequences of Internet organizing, I return over and over to January 11, 2013—Indian Act chiefs in boardrooms, people on the streets. It was at this point that I began to realize that Idle No More wasn't a movement that we could sustain. Most of my comrades I had never met in person. While there were small groups of people meeting and strategizing about specific actions and events, we had no mechanism to make decisions as a movement because at this point social media had replaced organizing. Disagreements over analysis or actions occurred online, and because we had shallow cyber relationships, instead of real-world ones, the larger structure fell apart quickly. We tried to build a movement online through social media, and when we needed to trust each other, when we needed to give each other the benefit of the doubt, when we needed empathy and a history together that we could trust, we couldn't. When we were sold out by leaders who didn't represent us, we were not able to regroup and relaunch the movement.[17] This was the first significant pushback from the state, and it crushed us, and maybe without the state doing anything at all, we would have crushed ourselves. I wonder in hindsight if maybe we didn't build a movement, but rather we built a social media presence that privileged individuals over community, virtual validation over empathy, leadership without accountability and responsibility, and unchecked liberalism that has now left us more vulnerable to the superficial recognition of the neoliberal state.

I've returned a few times in this book to Nanabush's first journey around the world as a way of showing the relationship between place and internationalism within Nishnaabeg thought, and to explore how Nanabush is original, reciprocal recognition. Nishnaabeg leaders, organizers, those concerned with mobilizing our people throughout history, have also considered this story, particularly the visiting aspect of it. Nanabush visited with, that is, created, a personal, intimate relationship with all aspects of global creation as a prerequisite for the work Nanabush came to do on earth. Leaders, whether Tkamse, Pontiac, Nishnaabeg water walkers, or the Nishiyuu youth, re-created this journey when they physically and personally traveled to each

community in our territory to mobilize the nation. This act of visiting and recognizing was repeated over and over again through virtually every Indigenous mobilization up until Idle No More. Social media gave us an opportunity to skip the hard work of being present, of doing ceremonies together, of sharing food, and of standing face-to-face with our people, even when we disagree. I'm not sure it's an opportunity we should have taken.

Social media in many ways is the antithesis of Indigenous life. It is appealing, attractive, addictive, and apathetic. It amplifies fear, ego, and anxiety. It centers individuals within a corporate, capitalist, coded algorithm—an algorithm that we have no control over and that most of us don't even know how it works. It creates a false sense of power and influence. It scans our digital lives and then markets them back to us. Every piece of cyber resistance makes *them* more money and consolidates *their* power. The Internet creates false communities of like-minded individuals without presence, empathy, or trust. A relationship is not accepting a friend request and scrolling through photos and posts. A Facebook page is not a person, and a Facebook friend isn't a real friend.

Use of social media also has serious consequences for leadership within movements. Idle No More, at least initially, enjoyed a decentralized leadership model. This allowed for a diversity of tactics, politics, and localized actions that produced high levels of engagement. Decentralized leadership though, a cornerstone of Nishnaabeg leadership in the past, requires larger amounts of trust and truthful communication, shared accountability, and collective decision making. So again, if this kind of leadership is to be effective, the first steps of building a movement cannot be skipped, because in this process communications networks are built that enable secure, collective, principled decision making within the ethical processes of grounded normativity. The communication network in decentralized leadership models needs to be even stronger and more robust than in more centralized models. Conversations about leadership and strategy cannot take place online, because social media is *public* and Indigenous

peoples are spectacle, criminal, and easy targets for exploitation and violence in settler colonial public. In the absence of both movement-generated leadership and robust private communication networks, social media creates a vacuum. Its spectacle sparks and then amplifies infighting and lateral conflict. It allows white liberals to crown leaders for us through likes, shares, followers, and protest selfies, and spokespersons for our movements are chosen without regard to the movement itself, let alone grounded normativity.

It isn't quite as easy as saying the Internet is pure capitalist evil though, is it? Social media proved to be a power tool to amplify the movement. Social media enabled us to get bodies on the ground in real life quickly. Social media and blogging were also critical in the education of Canadians during Idle No More, by providing a direct link between Indigenous peoples and our audience, unmitigated by the mainstream media, and this is evidenced through the plethora of writing—writing that took place during the mobilization. We wrote the movement in real time from our own perspectives in an unprecedented act of self-representation.[18] This was the first time that this happened on such a grandiose scale. Blogging, podcasting, and spreecasting became critical tools of representing ourselves and our issues on our own terms, en masse, to the Canadian public. When we don't have content that accurately reflects our lives, being a content provider is important. This was powerful, maybe even if it was making the bad guys more money. It influenced, to some degree, the way the mainstream media reported on Idle No More and in the years now following, on Indigenous issues in general. It increased our visibility in Canadian society, at least on the terms that Canadian society was willing to afford us recognition.

In the aftermath of Idle No More, the wealth of Indigenous reporting, writing, analysis, and opinion has propelled at least some Indigenous voices, arguably those that conform to neoliberalism most easily, into the mainstream media. While that has certainly benefited individual Indigenous peoples, most of whom were not in it for career advancement or notoriety, myself included, I'm not sure how or if this has benefited us

collectively. We are certainly more visible in 2016 then we were in 2012. More Canadians read my work. There are more Indigenous peoples engaged in federal politics, and more Indigenous politicians in positions of power. We have more media celebrities. We have more Twitter followers and Facebook friends that have produced faux leaders that speak on our behalf with no accountability, and in some cases, no actual knowledge of the issues. I'm not sure, however, that I see evidence that we have advanced a decolonial political agenda, that is, a "radical decoupling of Indigenous life from the state's control and from the conditioning wrought by colonial society; a collective practice oriented toward the total reclamation of Indigenous life and land; a struggle for freedom."[19] I'm not sure I see that we've made much progress in terms of fundamentally shifting our relationship with the state, particularly in terms of a nationhood approach and in terms of resurgence. I'm not sure.

Again and again, it matters to me how change is achieved.

If I think back to my creation stories—whether it's the Seven Fires story, the story of Nanabush and the turtle's back, the story for Kinomagewapkong, the people that were created from the ocean, those spontaneous humans—the creation of the world within Nishnaabeg thought comes from struggle.[20] It was never easy. Mistakes were made. Prototypes were built. It came from a being or beings, fully engaged in a creative process that was a process of struggle. This is in stark contrast to Christian creation stories, where the world was made in seven days and then given to humans. Nishnaabeg worlds were created, collectively, out of struggle, and the process of creating and creation was given to us, not the results of that. The process, not the results.

The crux of resurgence is that Indigenous peoples have to recreate and regenerate our political systems, education systems, and systems of life from within our own intelligence. We have to create Indigenous worlds, not on the Internet but in physical reality. Our movements must respond to the basic social needs of our communities: relief from crushing poverty, clean drinking water, listening to youth and then doing what they tell us to create meaningful existences for them in their communities right

now, supporting harm reduction approaches to addictions, dismantling children's aid and supporting people recovering from the damage it has caused, setting up alternative accountability structures for gender violence so 2SQ people, women, and children are safe, and supporting midwifery, breastfeeding, and families with children. These "social issues" are not social. They are political. They are a direct result of state violence in the form of settler colonialism that maintains and accelerates dispossession. Organizing to support urban and reserve communities on these issues in a politicized way must be part of any radical resurgence project because within Indigenous grounded normativity, these are our first responsibilities. This means we collectively have a tremendous amount to learn from Indigenous youth because they are disproportionately impacted by all of these social issues and because they are therefore experts on the way out.

This isn't something any state government can do for us. If we don't want our communities to be governed by the Indian Act, we need to build our alternative. If the state education system is failing our kids and not reproducing Indigenous intelligence, then what is the alternative (freedom schools, language houses)? If capitalism is killing the planet, then how do we create for ourselves a material means through which to build nations (local, place-based, integrated Indigenous economies)? How do we eradicate gender violence and create systems of accountability outside of the police and inquiries? And we must not just ask what is the alternative: we need to do the alternatives over and over until we get it right. This is the work of decolonization and resurgence, and it is not work the state can do for us, because we are the experts, because we are self-determining. Coming to state power with working alternatives in place, with strong nations, is coming to the state with grounded, authentic Indigenous power. More important, engaging in the resurgent process of creating based on individual and national Indigenous intelligence builds stronger relationships between our peoples and our lands. The struggle, even if it is not successful according to the dominate colonial narratives of success, creates more connection, more engagement with Indigenous thought, a seeking

out of Indigenous expertise, and a stronger Indigenous present. These are the necessary prerequisites for an Indigenous future because the act of presencing is the act of creating the future.

If Indigenous peoples were engaged in resurgent organizing and mobilizing right now at the intensity they were at the height of Idle No More, through the election and through the first years of Trudeau power, if neoliberalism's electoral politics hadn't gutted the resistance, what would the landscape look like now? What's clear to me is that the work that goes into building relationships in the real world, building a movement of empathetic, caring Indigenous peoples, is how long-term mobilization was achieved in the past. It's the reason any of us exists today.

Constellations of Coresistance

In almost every classroom I find myself in and at the end of almost every talk, there is always a white person that asks the Indigenous instructor or speaker what they can do to help. It is usually an honest question with good intentions. It is not the worst question we all have to answer. I want to take a step a back from that question for a moment. I'm interested in thinking about who we are seeking solidarity from within the context of grounded normativity. Who should we be in constellation with? White "friends" and allies are seen as the promised land of the changed. If we can just get more white people to see that we are human, to see the state of poverty and inequality, they will pressure their governments and do the work they need to do in their own lives to bring about change. If the issue impacts everyone, maybe we can all be on the same side.

I think resurgent mobilization necessarily points us in a different direction because there is virtually no room for white people in resurgence. Whiteness is not centered in resurgence. If we recognize settler colonialism to be dispossession, capitalism, white supremacy, and heteropatriarchy, that recognition points us to our allies: not liberal white Canadians who uphold all four of these pillars but Black and brown individuals and communities on Turtle Island and beyond that are struggling in their own localities against these same forces, building movements that

contain the alternatives. These are our allies, yet during Idle No More, we had almost no relationship with any of these communities, not because these communities weren't interested in us, but primarily because, again, we hadn't done the work of relationship building before mobilizing.

I have been influenced throughout my life by Black feminists and womanists and by the Black Radical Tradition. As a second-year biology student at the University of Guelph, I took two courses in Black history taught by Dr. Clarence Mumford, who introduced me to Black Marxist traditions and Black liberatory movements. Professor Mumford gave me a tremendous wake-up call. He propelled me to find out who I was and live it. Dr. Mumford mentored me and a group of Black students and students of color for three years when we were on the university's presidential task force for antiracism, and he had a formative influence on my learning how to organize. He taught me how to speak back with fire.

Is there a basis for coresistance and solidarity between radical resurgence and the Black Radical Tradition? Black feminists and womanists? Black queer organizers and thinkers? How can Indigenous resurgence and nationhood make sure we are not replicating anti-Blackness without solid, reciprocal relationships with Black visionaries who are also cocreating alternatives under the lens of abolition, decolonization, and anticapitalism? Doesn't grounded normativity compel us to figure out how to act in solidarity with these comrades?

This is heightened for me in my own nation. Again, *how* is a pretty important concept in Indigenous thought because it reminds us that the outcome is different if Indigenous peoples create the alternatives on our own terms, on the ground, rather than by relying on the state. It also matters *with whom* we achieve liberation. Toronto, or Gchi Enchikiiwang, exists within Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg territory.[21] The largest community of Black people in Canada live in Toronto—the home of fierce and beautiful acts of diverse forms of Black people's resistance to white racism, erasure, and ongoing police violence, to name just a few. Yet, the lines of segregation between the resisting

Indigenous and Black communities for the most part remain intact, and in fact, I think are being reinforced by the mainstream Indigenous response to the Trudeau government.[22]

How am I accountable to the struggle of Black peoples in Kina Gchi Nishnaabeg ogamig? How am I responsible to them within the context of Nishnaabeg political and ethical systems? How do I ensure my nationhood and relationship to land on the north shore of Lake Ontario do not replicate systems that restrict Black spatialities or replicate geographies of domination? As Katherine McKittrick in her brilliant *Demonic Grounds: Black Women and the Cartographies of Struggle* writes, "Black matters are spatial matters. And while we all produce, know, and negotiate space—albeit on different terms—geographies in the diaspora are accentuated by racist paradigms of the past and their ongoing hierarchical patterns."[23] Within Nishnaabeg political thought, we have practices of sharing space with other nations and communities of peoples and respecting their autonomy to govern themselves over those lands.

In September 2015, when asked why violence against women remains a problem with young men today, Trudeau said music lyrics, pornography, and absentee fathers are factors in "a lot of communities." Several Black activists responded on Twitter, among them *Toronto Star* columnist Desmond Cole; one of his tweets read, "Is it a coincidence that two of the three factors Trudeau cited about violence against women are well-worn stereotypes about black people?"[24] A few months later, Trudeau announced the "most diverse cabinet in Canadian history," except there were no Black cabinet ministers. What does it reveal when the state seemingly holds Indigenous peoples issues in high regard while replicating anti-Blackness? What does it reveal about us when we are silent? You can't engage the Indigenous community with one hand and continue to erase Black Canadians with the other. It matters to me profoundly how change is achieved and with whom we achieve it.

Within Nishnaabewin, I have ethical obligations to the Black community. My people and the Wendat shared land and then respected each other's self-determination and jurisdiction,

and I believe Nishnaabeg political practices compel me to do the same. I think then we would have to figure out political mechanisms to respect each other's governance, sovereignty, and jurisdiction while committing to taking care of our shared ecosystem. I think we would have to figure out how we can support each other so both of our peoples could live free on the north shore of Lake Ontario. To me that's what solidarity could look like under grounded normativity. That's what a constellation of coresistance and freedom could look like under radical resurgence. That's a future I'm interested in building.

The creation of a radical resurgence practice seems critical to me, and we are in a stage of building a movement that rejects state recognition at its core and is committed to sacrificing and doing the hard and long work of rebuilding Indigenous nationhood one system at a time. We need to collectively figure out how to instigate and sustain mass resurgent mobilizations within nation-based grounded normativities. We need to radically uncouple ourselves from the state political and education system. We need to be willing to take on white supremacy, gender violence, heteropatriarchy, and anti-Blackness within our movement. We need to be willing to develop personal relationships with other communities of coresistors beyond white allies. We need to develop these as place-based constellations of theory and practice because when we put our energy into building constellations of coresistance within grounded normativity that refuse to center whiteness, our real white allies show up in solidarity anyway.