



Disrupting Settler-Colonial Capitalism: Indigenous Intifadas and Resurgent Solidarity from Turtle Island to Palestine

Chandni Desai

ABSTRACT

This article explores the resurgence of Indigenous/Palestine solidarity during the Wet'suwet'en land sovereignty struggle in Canada that took place around the same time Donald Trump's Middle East "peace plan" was released in early 2020. Historicizing this resurgence within a longer period of anti-colonial resistance, the article attends to the distinct historical, political-economic, and juridical formations that undergird settler colonialism in Canada and Israel/Palestine. It contends with the theoretical limits of the settler-colonial framework, pushing back against narratives of settler success, and shows how anti-colonial resistance accelerated economic crises that led both settler states to enter into "negotiations" with the colonized (reconciliation in one case, and peace talks in the other) as a strategy to maintain capitalist settler control over stolen lands. The analysis also sheds light on a praxis of solidarity that has implications for movement building and joint struggle.

KEYWORDS

settler colonialism; racial capitalism; Indigenous peoples; Canada; Israel/Palestine; solidarity; resurgence; social movements

IN FEBRUARY 2020, tactical units of militarized Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) invaded the lands of the Wet'suwet'en, a First Nations people composed of five clans¹ that live in the interior of British Columbia. The Wet'suwet'en, some of whom the RCMP arrested, were resisting a Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) injunction ordering them to evacuate their ancestral lands to make way for the construction of the Coastal GasLink pipeline. On 7 February, the RCMP raided Gitdumden camp before moving on to the Unist'ot'en, as land protectors held a ceremony honoring their ancestors as well as missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls, and two-spirit people. Monday, 10 February, marked a particularly powerful moment of anti-colonial resistance, as Unist'ot'en matriarchs and land defenders announced that reconciliation was dead and set the Canadian flag alight in a cremation ritual. (Reconciliation is a process initiated by the federal government of Canada to repair the damaged political relationship between the Crown and Indigenous nations. For the latter reconciliation is associated with a form of healing from the violence of settler colonialism.²) In a refusal of ongoing colonization, the five Wet'suwet'en clans' hereditary chiefs rejected the construction of the pipeline. As the repositories of authority in the unceded territory by virtue of Indigenous governance structures and customary law processes predating Canadian settler colonialism, the chiefs refused to consent to the state or the industry accessing their territory,³ whose sovereignty was affirmed in the 1997 *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia* case.⁴ To protest the government's violation of Wet'suwet'en law, mass uprisings took place across the country, and direct actions were staged to shut down the Canadian state.

Blocking critical infrastructure, such as railroads, highways, bridges, ports, city streets, and entryways to legislative buildings and political offices, protesters sought to disrupt supply chains, the economy, and settler governance. Social media posts with the hashtags #WetsuwetenStrong, #ShutDownCanada, and #ReconciliationIsDead flooded cyberspace. Rallies numbering in the thousands were held,⁵ and Palestinians and Palestine-solidarity activists throughout Canada (also referred to as Turtle Island)⁶ participated in various direct and indirect actions in solidarity with the Indigenous struggle. At around the same time that Indigenous nations were resisting this colonial encroachment within Canada, Palestinians were protesting the “Deal of the Century” devised by the Trump administration as a Middle East peace plan. Released on 28 January 2020, the plan has been described by legal scholar Noura Erakat as an “Israeli plan” that “consolidates all of [Israel’s] colonial takings.”⁷ Imposed on Palestinians under “duress,” Erakat has said, it would be “on the ground, tantamount to an apartheid regime.”⁸

This article explores the resurgence of Indigenous/Palestinian solidarity that occurred during the Wet’suwet’en protests against the construction of the Coastal GasLink pipeline in



Figure 1. Wet’suwet’en solidarity demonstrations in Toronto. (February 2020, May Ella)

Canada contemporaneously with the release of the Trump Middle East “peace plan” in early 2020. It historicizes this resurgence within a decades-long history of anti-colonial and anti-imperialist resistance across the two geographies, attending to the distinct historical, political-economic, and juridical formations undergirding settler colonialism in Canada and Israel/Palestine. It provides a textured analysis of the similar, albeit distinct, histories of settler state formation and ongoing settler colonialism in both contexts. And while settler colonialism is a generative and important analytic, it contends with the theoretical limits of the settler-colonial framework, specifically the settler-Indigenous binary that privileges narratives of “settler triumph” and “native failure”; conflates forms of migration with colonization without a full accounting for race and class differences within settler societies; and obfuscates the centrality of capitalist demands for labor in the development of settler-capitalist economies. In addition, the article argues that the use of the settler-colonial analytic alone is not sufficient for a complex examination of capitalist violence—whether labor regimes, forced migration, or war; race and class; or resistance and solidarity. Using a relational and comparative lens, the analysis that follows avoids collapsing the specificities of each of these settler-colonial geographies, contextualizing race, class, and gender relations, as well as differences between the two settler projects, all the while paying close attention to capitalist social relations. The article then shifts to a comparison of anti-colonial resistance, arguing that such resistance has contributed to accelerating economic crises at specific historical junctures, impelling both settler states to undertake negotiations with the colonized as a strategy to maintain capitalist settler sovereignty over stolen lands. Lastly, the analysis also sheds light on a praxis of solidarity that has implications for organizing, movement building, and joint struggle in the present.

The empirical data used here draws from my research on Palestinian resistance culture and internationalism. Other insights stem from my participation in political organizing based in the Dish with One Spoon territory (Toronto).⁹ In my use of the term Indigenous/Palestinian, Indigenous refers to the native people(s) of Turtle Island for the purpose of distinguishing them from the Palestinians. I use a forward slash to denote that many Palestinians also consider themselves Indigenous people.¹⁰ While I mobilize the term Indigenous as a political category, I acknowledge that “Indigenous,” “native,” and “aboriginal” are also colonial impositions. At



Figure 2. Tyendinaga Mohawk Territory during the Tyendinaga Canadian National Railway blockage in support of the Wet’suwet’en resistance against the Coastal GasLink pipeline. (February 2020, photo by author)

the same time, colonized people embrace the terminology of Indigenous to unify land-related struggles in resistance to ongoing colonization, dispossession, and erasure. This article draws on Palestine studies, settler-colonial studies, Indigenous studies, critical ethnic studies, and theorizations of racial capitalism in Black studies.

Resurgent Solidarity

RCMP tactical units invaded Wet'suwet'en territory in 2019, and again in early 2020, which signaled another moment of mass uprising in Canada, as the Wet'suwet'en and their allies launched protests against the construction of the Coastal GasLink pipeline. Palestinians and Palestine-solidarity activists mobilized to express their solidarity with Indigenous peoples by joining the call to shut down the state. The Palestinian Youth Movement (PYM), the Palestine Solidarity Collective (PSC), the Canada Palestine Association (CPA), and the national committee of the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) movement, BNC, all issued powerful statements that underscored the ways that colonial and imperialist forces undermine Indigenous political orders across geographies using similar structures (settler colonialism, apartheid), tactics (militarized police power), and technologies of violence for land theft, territorial expansion, resource extraction, repression, and criminalization of resistance. The statements amplified calls for the removal of the RCMP and urged Canada to respect Wet'suwet'en sovereignty and uphold the United Nations (UN) Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. The BNC statement also expressed gratitude to Indigenous communities for showing Palestinians how to resist colonialism, generation after generation; it called on Palestinians and their allies to stand with the Wet'suwet'en, and welcomed Indigenous people to Palestine in the spirit of building stronger ties and unity. The call to Palestinian political mobilization and the invitation to strengthen movement ties embodied what Steven Salaita has called "inter/nationalism," which articulates a commitment to mutual liberation, action, and transnational dialogue across borders.¹¹ Using a similar conceptual lens of relationship building and renewal across movements, Anishinaabe feminist Leanne Betasamosake Simpson talks about creating what she calls "constellations of connections" and the need for Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island "to build mass movements with radical labor, with Black communities, with radical communities of color."¹² For its part, the PYM-Toronto chapter affirmed: "Not only do our struggles parallel each other but our fates as peoples struggling against colonialism and oppression are indelibly tied together. Liberation will be achieved through a united front and together we are powerful enough to win."¹³ The statement suggests that Indigenous/Palestinian liberation is inextricably bound in what Nadine Naber describes as a "conjoined struggle" between different communities facing, in distinctive ways and forms, "the violence and brutality of global power structures" of oppression such as colonialism, militarism, imperialist war, neoliberal economics, and white supremacy.¹⁴ The PYM also referred to the Wet'suwet'en as "relatives," echoing the words of Lakota historian Nick Estes, who speaks of "the act of making relatives, of making those seen as different into familiars, [as] an important aspect of Indigeneity."¹⁵ Doing so foregrounds relations between groups through their respective ontologies, epistemologies, and relations beyond the colonial relationship.

Palestinian leftists¹⁶ and their allies also put their bodies on the front lines during the protests. Members of various organizations, including Students Against Israeli Apartheid (SAIA), Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP), Students for Palestinian Human Rights (SPHR), PSC,

Faculty for Palestine, University of Toronto Divest, the PYM-Toronto, Independent Jewish Voices, and the SPA all participated in direct actions such as blockades, rallies, sit-ins, and student walkouts. On 24 February 2020, after the SCC issued an injunction to dismantle a blockade along a section of the Canadian National (CN) Railway tracks, the Ontario Provincial Police raided the Tyendingaga Mohawk Territory and arrested several people. That day, after the Mohawks called for observers, SAIA, PSC, and SPHR sent activists to stand on the front lines with land protectors and act as witnesses. During the first few days of the CN Railway action at Tyendingaga, a Palestinian flag was hoisted alongside the Mohawk and Hiawatha flags on a truck used by warriors to block the tracks. Evoking the similarity of shared colonial experiences, Brendan L. from Tyendingaga told me: “We proudly hung up the Palestinian flag at the rail blockade because we recognize the Palestinian struggle.”¹⁷

Palestinian activist Rana Nazzal, who put her body on the line at three rail blockade sites (East and West Lakeshore lines, Tyendingaga, and MacMillan Yard) reflected on the actions as follows:

#ShutDownCanada meant shut down the Canadian economy. These direct actions were so significant because the Canadian government was scrambling to figure out how to stop it. One thing that was special about the blockade that happened in North Toronto was when the police served the injunction to the demonstrators, they burned it instead of keeping it. I thought that was so wonderful because the Mohawks had burned their [own] injunction earlier, and that [was] a moment of solidarity, truly.¹⁸

The Canadian government deployed economic justifications for the numerous injunctions enforced by the police, rationalizing the continuance of systemic oppression, exploitation, and dispossession of Indigenous people by the settler state and industry. (The entire economic foundation of the Canadian state is built on the conjoined violence of Indigenous dispossession and genocide, exploitation, slavery, anti-Black racism, and racialized (im)migrant labor.) The indiscriminate power used to criminalize resistance underscored that Canada is a grab, seize, and extract country for industry. Still, land protectors engaged in a fierce politics of what Kahnawake Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson calls “refusal.” That, she says, “comes with the requirement of having one’s political sovereignty acknowledged and upheld, and raises the question of legitimacy for those who are usually in the position of recognizing Indigenous peoples.”¹⁹ Burning the injunctions was a form of refusal, when colonial state orders, law, governance, and reconciliation at the barrel of a gun were rejected; this resonated with Palestinians who participated in the blockades, as they too deploy a politics of refusal before brutal forms of colonial and imperialist violence.²⁰

Rallies against the Trump “Deal of the Century” plan also took place the week before the Canada shutdown. Palestinian activist Hanna Kawas commented that Indigenous activists who participated in the Vancouver protest were demonstrating their solidarity with Palestinians against what he called “the theft of the century.”²¹ Also on the West Coast, Indigenous land protectors wore kaffiyehs as they protected Wet’suwet’en territory. A Six Nations warrior, Shilo Hill, who defended Gitumden camp told me, “As Indigenous people, our way of life goes against the political agenda of the wealthy and elite that want control of our homelands Many Indigenous land defenders wear the keffiyeh [*sic*] to show the oppressors that we stand in solidarity with our brothers and sisters across the globe because we share the same fight, seemingly against the same oppressor.”²² From Palestine to Wet’suwet’en, the solidarity expressed underscored how conjoined forces of global power structure Indigenous/Palestinian

oppression in distinct yet similar ways. As such, the basis of unity evidenced during the Palestine/Wet'suwet'en convergence demonstrates how activists perceive their struggles as conjoined against a common enemy and brutal global power structures. Such acts of solidarity gesture to a politics of anti-colonial recognition between colonized peoples, both politically and symbolically, as they contradict the forms of colonial state recognition deployed to further settler colonialism. In the various expressions and acts of unity during Indigenous/Palestinian convergence, notions of sameness were used to link settler projects and connect myriad forms of oppression, to construct analogies between shared pasts and in present contexts. While comparisons are necessary and generative, they can also be reductive at times, which this article will address, arguing that similarities cannot be collapsed.

The acts of solidarity reignited in 2020 commenced what I conceptualize here as resurgent solidarity.²³ Resurgent solidarity occurs at specific political moments, often during times of crisis, and it represents a commitment to building and renewing relationships between people and movements with similar histories of oppression and exploitation. Radical resurgent solidarity is more than a short-term alliance or coalition; it is rooted in deeper histories of relationality and/or intended to build longer-term strategic relationships between radical movements and people(s), based on principled stances that advance political struggles necessitating ethical practices of support. Such resurgent solidarity is, to use Robin D. G. Kelley's words, "not merely [a] spontaneous [response] to coincidental and spectacular violence but a result of years of organizing."²⁴ During the "shut down Canada" demonstrations, it was analogous to the resurgence of the Black-Palestine solidarity evident during the 2014 Ferguson/Gaza convergence, which was itself rooted in a longer history of Black and Palestinian internationalism. The resurgence of Indigenous/Palestinian solidarity in the Canadian context was also rooted in the joint fifty-year history of radicalism discussed below.

Historicizing Constellations of Co-resistance and Solidarity

The most recent resurgence of solidarity witnessed in Canada was predated and prefigured by the period of the 1970s, when the first significant wave of Indigenous/Palestinian solidarity developed during the era of Red Power, anti-imperialist movements, and third world decolonization in which the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) figured prominently. In 1970s Vancouver, the Third World People's Coalition (TWPC)—comprised of several organizations, including the CPA, the Native Study Group (NSG), the African Progressive Study Group, and the Indian People's Association in North America, among others—organized many actions and educational events. For example, it hosted a PLO delegation in 1976 that included Palestinian poet Mahmoud Darwish, Shafiq al-Hout, and Ibrahim Abu-Lughod, among others who were attending the UN Habitat conference held in Vancouver that year. Indigenous Sto:lo author Lee Maracle read some of Darwish's poems in translation during a public meeting in which PLO members encouraged revolutionaries, including Vancouver-based Red Power activists, to mobilize in support of the Palestinian revolution. A year prior, members of the NSG had attended the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs conference, where hundreds of individuals converged, and linkages were made between the struggle of native people and that of other anti-imperialist forces, especially the Palestinians. The conference's educational work included the showing of the 1973 film *We Are the Palestinian People*; circulating *My People Shall Live*, the autobiography of the Palestinian militant Leila Khaled; and distributing

a letter of solidarity addressed to the Canadian media in which NSG condemned the media's denunciation of the PLO.

Also, in 1976, Leonard Peltier—a leader in the American Indian Movement—had fled to Canada after being falsely accused of murdering two Federal Bureau of Investigation agents during the U.S. military siege of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota. Red Power activists organized weekly protests in Vancouver opposing Peltier's arrest and extradition, and Palestinians joined these protests in solidarity. Kawas, one of the activists who organized and built these ties, asserts, "Our solidarity, it was genuine internationalist solidarity, we didn't do it so they would support us or so that we would support them. We felt that it was essential."²⁵ Indigenous/Palestinian revolutionaries in this period, especially those involved in TWPC, embodied the commitment and ethos of third world internationalism, forging relationships based on shared principles of liberation. Linda Tabar suggests that the internationalism that bound the PLO to other struggles constituted a "different economy and praxis of solidarity," one "centered on advancing struggles through revolutionary praxis."²⁶ For the revolutionaries involved, "solidarity was neither a commodity to be exchanged, collateral to be held, nor a debt requiring repayment."²⁷ As Rabab Abdulhadi argues, for movements like the "the American Indian Movement, the Brown Beret, the I-Wor Kuen, the Red Guard, El Comite and the Black Panther Party, support for the Palestinian struggle was consistent and uncompromising."²⁸ Although the TWPC coalition in Canada disbanded in the 1980s, some of the relationships that were forged then remain alive, as evidenced by the rallying against the Trump plan by Indigenous activists in Vancouver.

In the 1990s, during the siege of Kanehsatà:ke and Kahnawake (commonly known as the Oka Crisis)—a seventy-eight-day armed standoff between the Mohawks of Kanesatake, Quebec police, and the Canadian Army—Palestinian activists affiliated with the PLO participated in direct actions at Oka. In a public talk referencing the event, Kwakwaka'wakw author Gord Hill stated, "A lot of the warriors . . . began to look at the Palestinian intifada, which began in 1987, and they said maybe that was a model that could be looked at and used [by Indigenous peoples in Canada] because it involved large numbers of people who weren't armed but were carrying out militant resistance in the streets of Gaza and the West Bank."²⁹

Indigenous revolutionaries examined the Palestinian context and looked to alternative models and tactics of resistance as well as to self-reliance strategies delinked from the settler state as a way to imagine different forms of revolutionary activity, and this informed their own praxis. As I have written elsewhere (with Tabar), "This formative historical period produced radical political thought, critical intellectual traditions and resistance culture that were generative of shared analysis of colonial and imperialist systems."³⁰ A decade later, in the mid-2000s, a new generation of Palestinian and Palestine-solidarity activists further developed their relationships with Indigenous struggles by making connections between apartheid systems. Activists developed and advanced a joint-struggle framework to connect settler-colonial displacement of Indigenous people across geographies, linking infrastructures of imperialism and colonialism (for example, the South African pass system, Israeli checkpoints, and apartheid walls, as well as carceral systems and police and military infrastructure) designed by settler states learning from one another. (One example of the latter was apartheid South Africa's study of the Canadian and U.S. reservation system to implement its own Bantustan system.³¹) In "Confronting Apartheid: The BDS Movement in Canada," Kole Kilibarda underscores that "Palestinian organizations and solidarity activists have actively participated in [I]ndigenous land-reclamations carried out by the Secwepemc nation at the

Sun Peaks Resort, and have assisted Anishinaabe land reclamations at Grassy Narrows, KI [Kitchenuhmaykoosib Inninuwug], Barrier Lake and Ardoch, and of Haudenosaunee land in Tyendinaga, Kanenhsatake and Kahnawake . . . This solidarity work has meant active support for native political prisoners Shawn Brant, the KI Six, and Bob Lovelace.”³²

Activists also engaged in direct action at the Six Nations land reclamation struggle in 2006, written about extensively by Mike Krebs and Dana Olwan.³³ In “On Assumptive Solidarities in Comparative Settler Colonialism,” Olwan offers a critique of the way “mobilization efforts in support of Indigenous people often function through the imperative of crisis and its logic of management . . . [r]ather than creating long term, sustainable, and ongoing relationships of solidarity.”³⁴ This critique encourages activists to consider more sustainable forms of relationship building, ones that foster radical relationality. Israeli Apartheid Week (IAW) organizers who dedicate programming to Indigenous struggles across Canadian campuses have sometimes been met with accusations of tokenism, and at times this has slowed down joint-struggle activities as activists took time to reflect, learn, address critiques, and build over the years. IAW has also been used as a model in developing Indigenous Sovereignty Week, a grassroots initiative to build relationships and raise awareness about Indigenous struggles.

During the Idle No More movement in 2012, Palestinians issued a statement of solidarity with the uprisings. In her critique of the statement, Olwan argues that “in the genuine desire to find solidarity . . . we often unconsciously disappear the particularities of one another’s histories. In this context, [there is] an overreliance on assumptions of inherent relationality, mutuality and connection”³⁵ by Palestinian and Palestine-solidarity activists. For her part, Naber reminds us that the framework of “shar[ing] a common enemy” cannot blindly assume unity on all fronts, given the differences between historical contexts and realities.³⁶ The pitfall of assumptive solidarity is evident when Palestine-solidarity groups engage in tokenism, when activists conflate distinct histories, and also when Indigenous leaders or individuals (in Canada) respond to invitations to participate in events on “parallel” experiences of genocide and Indigeneity by Zionist organizations and individuals. Appeals for collaboration with Indigenous people based on “shared experiences” of genocide or Indigeneity (Jewish/Indigenous) with Zionists is termed “redwashing” by Kanaka Maoli scholar J. Kehaulani Kauanui, making some Indigenous people complicit in Palestinian oppression.³⁷ Pointing to the limits of a “commensurate framework of solidarity,”³⁸ Olwan challenges activists to engage in more ethical and relational solidarity practices, as joint struggle can be messy and is often embedded with tensions, contradictions, and limits. Notwithstanding these criticisms, such constellations of co-resistance have been built over fifty years and were forged to reconfigure power relations across settler contexts in a global geography.

While scholars and activists have cautioned against collapsing histories across these contexts, few have engaged in underlining the distinctions. Brenna Bhandar and Rafeef Ziadah caution that comparative approaches should wrestle with the political-economic and juridical formations that subtend the process of colonization.³⁹ To avoid flattening the specificities of each context, in the section that follows I will discuss some key historical, juridical, and political-economic distinctions between the settler states of Canada and Israel; contextualize race, class, and gender relations and differences within these settler projects; and also attend to capitalist social relations. In addition, I will address some of the limitations of the settler-colonial analytic and suggest a nuancing of this analytic, something that has serious implications for developing tactics within social justice movements and solidarity activism.

Settler-Colonial State Formation and the Settler-Colonial Analytic

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, prior to the formation of the Canadian state, European colonizers relied on slave labor to build infrastructure and wealth for white settlers in Canada, with some four thousand Indigenous (known as panis) and Black individuals enslaved in New France and the British colonies in the pre-confederation period. In those colonies, the slavery system, which was both gendered and racialized, never took the form of large-scale plantations like those of the U.S. South, the Caribbean, or South America.⁴⁰ As the Metis historian Howard Adams has shown, during the fur trade era (roughly the seventeenth to mid-nineteenth centuries), “Indian communal society was transformed into an economic class of laborers by European fur trading companies, particularly the Hudson’s Bay Company . . . [because] businessmen of Europe realized they would need a large supply of labor to obtain resources. Natives furnished this large supply of cheap labor. . . . As the fur trade flourished, so did Indian slavery.”⁴¹ Although their theories differ from one another, settler-colonial studies scholars Patrick Wolfe and Lorenzo Veracini theorize settler colonialism as premised on the elimination—rather than the mere exploitation—of the native. Wolfe vividly theorizes how settler colonialism operates through a logic of elimination—whereby settlers destroy to replace Indigenous people, whose land they covet rather than their labor—and/or by assimilation.

While the concept of elimination is essential to theorizing native genocide as structural, the less-known history of Black and Indigenous slavery in Canada, albeit small in scale, shows that settler-colonial demand for land did not completely eclipse the demand for labor in the pre-confederation period. This was also the case of other settler colonies such as South Africa, Algeria, Southern Rhodesia, and Kenya, where “settlers came to stay and wanted both the land and [native] labor but not the people . . . they sought to eliminate stable communities and their cultures of resistance.”⁴² In Canada, the reliance on Indigenous labor shifted after the era of the fur trade because Indigenous labor was no longer central to the accumulation of capital as the industrial economy emerged. During the rise of industrial capitalism at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the absence of a large-scale pool of plantation-based slave labor led to the recruitment and use of what Iyko Day has termed “alien labor.”⁴³ Composed of mostly Black and Asian people, this racialized labor force experienced the exclusion, exploitation, expulsion (deportation), and disposability inherent to racial capitalism. Cedric Robinson reminds us that capitalism was a continuation of earlier European social orders that produced racial hierarchies and class structures (such as feudalism and racialism), which were exported to the rest of the world by Europe’s colonial enterprise and evolved to produce a modern world system of “racial capitalism.”⁴⁴ Thus, when using the settler-colonial lens, it is necessary to integrate the particular analytic of racial capitalism, since it provides “ways of understanding capitalist forms of dispossession that profit from and reinforce class hierarchies, patriarchal formations, and racist ideologies.”⁴⁵

European Jews were among the first racialized subjects of European racism and proletarianization to face persecution and erasure. In the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, many of them left Europe’s shores in the first major wave of Zionist immigration to Palestine during the decades before Israeli state formation. While there had always existed a small Jewish population in Ottoman Palestine, Jewish immigrants who arrived in Ottoman, and later, Mandate Palestine (during the so-called First Aliyah, 1881–1903) hired cheap Arab labor on which they were deeply reliant. During the Second Aliyah (1904–19), however, the settlers who founded Labor Zionism and became leaders of the Zionist movement talked about the

“conquest of labour,”⁴⁶ a strategy for Jewish labor to replace Indigenous Arab labor that envisioned the complete economic and spatial segregation of Jewish and Arab communities in Palestine, with Jews gradually replacing the country’s Indigenous inhabitants. As explained by Zachary Lockman, one of Labor Zionism’s foremost scholars, Gershon Shafir “characterised this model as the ‘separatist method of pure settlement’, in that it sought the creation of a homogenous, autonomous settler society that did not significantly depend on—indeed, that sought to exclude—[I]ndigenous labor.”⁴⁷ (The principle of Jewish labor eroded after 1967, mainly as a result of Israel incorporating a cheap Palestinian labor force from the occupied Palestinian territories [oPt] into its economy, thereby further undermining Palestinian economic self-sufficiency.)⁴⁸

Burgeoning scholarship in settler-colonial studies accentuates colonialism, as it should, but it does not sufficiently address how capitalist demand for labor in the development of settler-capitalist economies intersects with the logic of elimination. This is a necessary linkage as settler-colonial state formation and ongoing settler colonialism was/is not possible without the racial capitalism that is founded in violence, forced labor regimes, and slavery, as well as imperialism, genocide, and patriarchy. The heterogeneity of racial positions⁴⁹ anchored the distinction between the settler-colonial logics of the native’s elimination—from the land—and his/her socioeconomic exclusion—as exploited labor—underscoring that the two are not mutually exclusive but dialectically connected.⁵⁰

In the latter half of the eighteenth century, European settlers and Indigenous nations negotiated treaties in what is now Canada. Anishinaabe legal scholar John Burrows asserts that the British Crown formulated the 1763 Royal Proclamation/1764 Treaty of Niagara acknowledging Aboriginal rights and title to land⁵¹ and articulating a nation-to-nation relationship based on principles of coexistence, peace, friendship, and respect free of external interference.⁵² Despite these treaties, in the period of the 1700s–1900s, colonial policies were implemented to obliterate various Indigenous nations through the spread of disease, which killed half the Indigenous population, and by deliberately starving the people of the plains to make way for the CN Railway⁵³ (which was built on the extraction of surplus racialized, and primarily Asian, labor). Following Canada’s state formation (1867), the racist Indian Act adopted by the federal government in 1876 violated treaty obligations and effectively authorized Indigenous genocide using the law: it designated reserve lands; legislated a pass system; created Indian status through sexist provisions that limited claims to Indigeneity; and attempted to extinguish Indigenous self-governance structures with the Indian Band council system.⁵⁴ The act also attempted to assimilate Indigenous people by extinguishing cultural practices and placing Indigenous children in church-run residential schools and, during the 1960s, into the child welfare system.

In British Mandate Palestine, which preceded Israeli state formation, the Zionist project sought to acquire land through purchases undertaken by Zionist land corporations such as the Jewish National Fund and the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association. The Zionists used both legal and illegal coercive measures to obtain transfers of land from Palestinians, and they sponsored mass immigration of European Jews to Palestine. Unlike other settler projects, the Zionist project did not have an imperial metropole, although it was heavily supported by imperial powers, particularly Great Britain. The ideology of Zionism rested on the creation of an ethnonational Jewish homeland and, in the early years, collective land ownership was fundamental to that project, unlike other settler colonies where ownership of land was based on Lockean ideas of private property and ownership intertwined with profit.⁵⁵ Bhandar

suggests that “the notion of the *volk* as being of the land, rooted in the soil of their national homeland, forms the basis for entitlement to a state based on their natural ties to that territory,”⁵⁶ thus differentiating political Zionism from other settler projects. Since the Zionist project could not fulfill its ideology through land purchases or the 1947 UN Partition Plan, in 1948 Zionist militias conquered, dispossessed, and ethnically cleansed 85 percent of the Palestinian population, destroying over four hundred villages, cities, and towns, and usurping vast expanses of Palestinian land in what has come to be known as the Nakba. A primarily peasant population became refugees, many of whom were subsequently proletarianized in a process that the logic of elimination does not capture adequately.

Treaty agreements between the Canadian state and Indigenous peoples gesture to the fact that prior to state formation, coexistence agreements were made with Indigenous nations as part of the European settler strategy to access territory—even though these nations were eventually folded into settler-colonial structures following genocide and the privatization of lands collectively held by Indigenous nations. Although official discourses about reconciliation date back to 1998, since 2015 the Canadian state has called for renewed relationships of coexistence based on mutually agreed principles—despite the problematic and myriad contradictions such “reconciliation” encompasses—that have been strongly criticized by Indigenous scholars and activists. In the case of Palestine, racial purity and segregation were fundamental to the actualization of an ethnonational Jewish state. The desire for a Jewish homeland precluded integration, assimilation, or coexistence with the Indigenous inhabitants, requiring what the late Palestinian historian Fayegeh Sayegh calls the “racial elimination” of the native.⁵⁷ Sayegh suggests that the difference between the Zionist settler regime and other European settler regimes was that the former required the racial elimination of the native, while the latter required racial discrimination achieved through supremacist notions of “inferior natives” and the expression of supremacy over “‘inferior races’ within the framework of ‘hierarchical racial co-existence,’” which were not necessarily eliminatory.⁵⁸ Sherene Seikaly and Max Ajl argue that Zionist ideologues agreed with the racialized view of Jews as Europe’s “internal other[s],”⁵⁹ but they “turned it on its head,” arguing that “even if a low race,” Jews were “capable of uplift and in need of cleansing.”⁶⁰ Such a vision combined two contradictory strands. On the one hand, the salvation of the Jews through deracination and the approximation of whiteness, and on the other, the salvation of the idea of Europe by the Jews’ departure from its shores and their arrival in Palestine.⁶¹ As Nahla Abdo and Nira Yuval Davis emphasize, the Zionist project was primarily a movement of Eastern European Ashkenazi Jews, who constituted a majority of settlers before 1948 and continue(d) dominating the state after its establishment.⁶² Once the state was declared, Zionism secularized and nationalized Judaism, as Erakat says, crafting a modern “new Jew” from the old, religious Jew modeled on white European Enlightenment ideas, values, and culture in a deliberate counterpoint to the Eastern cultural markers carried by Mizrahi Jews, as well as Muslim and Christian Arabs.⁶³ Mizrahi Jews in Israel were consequently “forced to purify themselves of their ethnic, linguistic, and cultural constitution.”⁶⁴ Thus, in both settler societies, colonizers used race to manage and eliminate their native populations as political and legal entities, albeit in distinct ways: where Canada enforced assimilation, Israel imposed racial purity.

Unlike other settler jurisdictions, where title and land rights have been recognized by the state, in Israel, the Supreme Court has rejected any such possibility, preventing Palestinians from claiming recognition of their Indigenous rights.⁶⁵ In Canada, by contrast, the settler state

recognized and affirmed Aboriginal title to land and treaty rights in section 35 of the 1982 Constitution Act, following decades of First Nations resistance, though these constitutionally recognized rights are limited, as corporate and state interests can gain access to Indigenous land bases. Another distinction between the two geographies pertains to military rule and governance. In Canada, militarized policing has been used to incarcerate, repress, surveil, and criminalize people of color, Indigenous people, and their resistance, with the Canadian Army sometimes deployed against Indigenous nations. In Palestine/Israel, Palestinians who remained inside Israel after the establishment of the state lived under military rule from 1948 until 1966 and, since 1967, the Israeli state has occupied the West Bank and Gaza and governed the oPt using martial law. In Canada, the dominant instrument used in Indigenous elimination for territorial expansion has been biological and cultural warfare rather than military occupation.⁶⁶ Whereas Canada granted Indigenous people citizenship in 1960, Palestinians are not deemed citizens of the state in the oPt. There, the Israeli occupation regime routinely demolishes Palestinian homes and buildings, implementing *de facto* land annexation via settlement expansion while indefinitely imprisoning Palestinians under a military court system and enforcing a siege on Gaza, which is illegal under international law. Since Canadian citizenship contradicts and undermines Indigenous sovereignty, some Indigenous nations, such as the Haudenosaunee, for example, have overtly refused what Audra Simpson calls its “gifts.”⁶⁷ They insist on the integrity of their own systems of governance because the “logic of elimination rendered this right of citizenship conditional on the abandonment of ‘Indian status’ and accompanying right to live on a reservation.”⁶⁸ Nevertheless, and despite the state’s imposition of Canadian law on Indigenous peoples, Indigenous legal systems have survived intact and continue to be upheld, as is the case with the Wet’suwet’en. By contrast, in Israel the law has “bifurcated Israeli citizenship and nationality,” in the words of Erakat. In order to ensure Jewish nationalism, national rights have been extended only to Jewish citizens inside the 1949 armistice lines, but not to Palestinian ones.⁶⁹ As for the Palestinians living in the oPt, they have neither citizenship nor nationality rights, only travel documents issued by the Palestinian Authority (PA), a pseudo-state that enjoys no actual sovereignty, while hundreds of thousands of Palestinians continue to live in other countries as stateless refugees. Such distinctions notwithstanding, settler colonialism in both contexts has been structured in analogous ways on the basis of legal apparatuses; land theft; dispossession; restricted movement; segregation; national status; gendered and sexual violence; resource extraction; and racialized labor exploitation, policing, and incarceration.

The Settler-Colonial Framework: Limits, Critique, and Implications for Solidarity

Settler colonialism as a framework is beneficial in analyzing distinct forms of colonization and methods of structured dispossession. It has reoriented scholarship and activism, making it far more comprehensive, encompassing Palestinians living inside Israel as well as in the oPt and in the diaspora.⁷⁰ Yet the limitations of this framework gesture to the need for other analytical lenses, drawn not only from Palestine studies and Indigenous and native studies (both of which have theorized settler colonialism for over half a century), but also from Black studies, ethnic studies, and Marxist-feminist studies, which have also theorized capitalist expansion,

resistance, solidarity, settler decolonization, abolition, and liberation. As argued by Rana Barakat, settler-colonial studies scholars tend to accentuate the language of triumph (of the settlers) and failure (of the native), which is limiting when conceptualizing and theorizing Indigeneity and resistance.⁷¹ The settler-colonial analytic privileges a settler narrative and undermines Indigenous resistance—in the case of Palestine, for example, erasing Palestinian resistance and endurance—and Barakat consequently urges us to accompany the settler-colonial analytic with one from Indigenous studies.⁷²

Furthermore, an Indigenous-settler binary dominates scholarly work even within some of the fields alluded to above, obfuscating the myriad factors that structure power relations, which, in turn, pervade political organizing and foreclose formations of radical solidarity and co-resistance on a mass scale. One of the limitations of the Indigenous-settler binary is its elision of capitalist imperialism and war, both of which have precipitated an international refugee crisis and global migration. Adam Barker, Bonita Lawrence, Enakshi Dua, Candace Fujikane, Jonathan Okamura, and Wolfe,⁷³ all of whom deploy this binary in their work, suggest that all non-natives are settler colonists and/or occupiers, and in the specific context of Canada, Lawrence and Dua claim that “all people of colour are settlers.”⁷⁴ Barker views migrants as “seeking enhanced privileges,” thereby conflating European settlers with (im)migrants and refugees.⁷⁵ Along the same lines, Wolfe claims that settler identity is structural, and it therefore also applies to the enslaved people who were dispossessed against their will. Interrogating the Indigenous-settler binary, Nandita Sharma challenges the way that negatively racialized people (Black, Latinx, Asian) who have been excluded from white settler projects, and particularly migrants, are increasingly depicted as colonizers. Her analysis questions the politics of autochthony espoused by these scholars, wherein migrants are perceived as barriers to both white settler sovereignty and Indigenous sovereignty.⁷⁶ The Indigenous-settler binary at times flattens various people’s histories, and it obfuscates the dialectical social relations of settler colonialism, racial capitalism, and imperialism on a global scale, in which the key historical dynamics have been exploitation, expropriation, enclosure, dispossession, displacement, and involuntary movement across geographies.⁷⁷ Delinking binaries from slavery, imperialist occupations and wars, and other settler-colonial projects obscures capitalism’s global and violent transnational character.

The conflation of migration with colonization in some of the scholarship denies the migratory histories of other Indigenous peoples (particularly from the Global South) and the structural violence they have endured. Imperialism is not an abstract category. It extends state power through the acquisition of territory, in some instances; it is an inherent feature of modern state formation; and it is also a system of capitalist accumulation through financialization, labor exploitation, wage arbitrage, wage deflation, and war—all of which cause dispossession and migration. The border is a crucial pillar of modern-day racial capitalism, which the settler-colonial analytic rarely addresses. Harsha Walia suggests that “the border is a spatial fix for capitalist accumulation.”⁷⁸ Settler states depend on an exploitable, cheap labor force brought in from elsewhere (primarily the Global South), and those people become subjects of settler-state violence (deportability, incarceration, exploitation, and death). The conflation of migration with colonization conceals violence and is simplistic and problematic because, in most instances, refugees and (im)migrants who arrive and settle in settler states do not bring a collective sovereignty with them that is connected to an imperial metropole, nor do they seek as a group to destroy existing Indigenous life and political orders through their

arrival and/or settlement. While several scholars⁷⁹ have critiqued and/or made critical interventions particularly regarding the binary formulation, it continues to pervade political organizing and has caused identity politics to be misused and abused, creating hierarchies of oppression and victimization—so-called oppression Olympics—that foreclose the cultivation of radical solidarities and popular resistance on a mass scale.

In “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor,” Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang incorporate slavery in their analytic of settler colonialism, terming this the “settler-native-slave”⁸⁰ triad, and they briefly mention the role of U.S. empire in displacing people from elsewhere. Conceptually speaking, and similarly to theorists who deploy the binary, they too fold the experiences of migrants and refugees who are subjects of imperialism, war, and capitalist violence (including settler colonialism and the enclosure of the commons elsewhere) into the subject position of settlers considered to occupy Indigenous land. Such formulations obliterate the Indigeneity of migrants and refugees: turning them into settlers, which severs their relationships to their own lands and communities; the binary and triad frameworks at times erase the “settler” from other people’s histories. Some (im)migrants and refugees constitute what Naber terms the “diaspora of empire,”⁸¹ wherein the subject of imperialism resides within the imperialist state, and the empire and its subjects exist in a transnational and contemporaneous frame, encapsulated vividly in the saying “we are here because you were there.” Yet Tuck and Yang argue that by virtue of their resettlement, these imperial subjects’ struggles are incommensurate/incompatible with decolonization struggles in North America.⁸² While the two authors do suggest that settler colonialism fuels imperialism around the globe, they collapse the space-time distinctions between the colony and metropole. If settler colonialism in North America were placed within the spatiotemporal context of capitalist imperialism abroad, how might we see these structures and social relations as moving but conjoined parts of the imperial present?⁸³ What would holding settler-colonial empire and diaspora within the same spatiotemporal framework imply for those structurally dispossessed? Or for decolonization struggles and liberation movements? How would these struggles necessitate each other?

My own critiques or questions are not intended as a move to promote “innocence”⁸⁴ or deny the responsibility that “arrivants”⁸⁵—a term Jodi Byrd uses to describe colonial and imperial subjects that settle in settler colonies—have toward Indigenous nations. Nor does it deny the ways that arrivants benefit or are at times complicit in reproducing the state’s colonial and racial-capitalist logics. Rather, it is an invitation to create new analytics, terms, and lexicons that enable us to imagine innovative radical possibilities of relationality—what Edouard Glissant calls “a poetics of relation”⁸⁶—to dismantle oppressive structures and to form constellations of co-resistance between communities and movements based on principled stances outside the framework of the nation-state. Rather than foreclose what radical decolonization could look like in settler societies, this is an invitation to imagine through struggle a future and life beyond colonialism and racial capitalism.

In Canada, Palestinian leftists express a “poetics of relation” with other colonized and exploited communities across Turtle Island, particularly Indigenous people. Although they are forcefully dispossessed by Israeli settler colonialism and various forms of capitalist violence, they describe themselves as participants in a set of social relations embedded within a racialized colonial state hierarchy that enables them to benefit from settlement and citizenship in the Canadian state. During an interview, Palestinian refugee and feminist May Ella asserted: “Maybe you can hold more than one thing to be true at the same time. I’m a displaced person, I think of myself as a third-generation Palestinian refugee. I’m not able to return to my

homeland, though I would very much love to, and I'm a Canadian citizen, holder of a Canadian passport that benefits [from being on this land]. So, it's important to hold the government to account when they violate Indigenous sovereignty."⁸⁷ For Palestinians like Ella, this is a signaling of the moral and political responsibility to principally act in material ways against structural violence perpetrated by the colonial state, while contending with their dual positionality as subjects of multiple settler colonialisms—as a subject of Israeli settler colonialism *and* beneficiaries of settlement in Canadian settler colonialism. Most displaced Palestinians arrive(d) in Canada as refugees and/or (im)migrants from different geographical areas and class backgrounds through the Canadian immigration system, acquiring refugee or citizenship status inside the colonial state. For many, migration was not a choice, and upon arrival they become part of the diaspora of empire. Nevertheless, there is no homogenous identification that diasporic Palestinians in Canada have vis-à-vis Indigenous people or the Canadian state. Some Palestinians, mainly leftists, self-describe as “racialized settlers,” while others view themselves as subjects of colonial and imperialist dispossession who did not come to Canada voluntarily and have no nation-state to which they can return (yet). Still others consider Canada complicit in the Zionist colonization of Palestine and subsequent Palestinian dispossession because of the prominent role it played in the 1947 UN Partition Plan, influenced by the interests of the Zionist lobby and its Western allies, an allegiance that continues to this day. These Palestinians view their presence on stolen land as a consequence of shared imperialist intimacies between settler projects that structured the ethnic cleansing of Palestine. Some cannot conceive of themselves as settlers because of what an Israeli settler is to them: their colonizer. Yet others remain ambivalent about their position. Palestinian stances vary based on ideology, class interests, political orientations, historical knowledge, and generational differences. However, many have yet to contend with their positionality as beneficiaries of settlement on stolen lands. Moe Alqasem—a Palestinian refugee and activist—says, “We need to acknowledge. Palestinians cannot absolve [*sic*] their responsibility.”⁸⁸ He explains that a large segment of the Palestinian diaspora in Canada remains publicly apolitical because of fear: of state surveillance, deportation, and incarceration under Canadian terrorism laws that criminalize resistance, and even charitable giving, and that can lead to travel bans, forfeiture of employment, freezing of bank accounts, defamation, and Zionist harassment. In addition to fear, desires for upward mobility and the bourgeois class interests of elite Palestinians and Arabs, aspirations to whiteness, and identification with capitalism nurture neoliberal individualism and proximity to the Canadian state, producing political apathy in terms of action, whether for Palestinian liberation or the liberation of others. Kelley reminds us that political organizing is already difficult work within communities, that solidarity between peoples and movements is a “contingent political project rather than some kind of natural, essential, trans-historical alliance” or racial imperative.⁸⁹ Therefore, solidarity cannot be assumptive but has to be built politically. Palestinian leftists urge their community to acknowledge the benefits of settlement and emphasize that Palestinians also resist settler colonialism in North America and not exempt themselves from the struggles in Turtle Island.

Although refugees and migrants benefit from and are privileged by settler colonialism in making a new home on stolen lands, some of the conceptualizations discussed earlier abstract the racialized hierarchies that settler states structure through white supremacy and that subject refugee and im(migrant) communities—including Palestinians and Black people who are not descendants of the transatlantic slave trade (Somali refugees for example)—to multiple forms

of state violence, including murder. The binary pits racialized subjects of colonial and imperialist violence against each other, since it does not frame their struggles as part of anti-colonial decolonization movements. Although some social movements have defied this logic by building constellations of co-resistance (Indigenous/Palestinian) through anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-racist, and feminist relationalities, activists like Alqasem assert that “standing with Indigenous peoples here in Canada is an obligation rather than just an act of solidarity.”⁹⁰ Conversely, some Indigenous people also recognize the Palestinian struggle. For both the Indigenous and Palestinian political struggles, transforming the colonial configuration of power has required organized anti-colonial resistance to capitalist economic relations and forced dispossession. Lastly, any analysis that deploys a settler-colonial framing must contend with emerging class differences within settler societies. Neoliberalism has reinforced class hierarchies in which some bourgeois “natives” have become collaborators with their colonizers based on their shared market interests across settler states. We must therefore ask: how do the current classifications and categories within the settler-colonial framework reinscribe colonial logics and reproduce class and race?

Indigenous Intifadas, Crisis, and the Political Economy of Peace and Reconciliation

In what follows, I push back against notions of “settler triumph” in settler-colonial studies by showing how, across the two colonial geographies, decades of anti-colonial resistance accelerated economic crises that ushered in negotiations—for reconciliation, in the case of Canada, and for peace, in the case of Palestine. I argue that these processes have caused an ideological shift, with the veneer of reconciliation or peace replacing the focus on the colonial relationship so as to keep each settler-capitalist economy thriving through continued resource extraction, land confiscation, and dispossession. As resource extraction, land annexation and theft, and state violence in myriad forms continue unabated, I argue for understanding that comparative political-economic history as vital to developing tactics of resistance and solidarity.

Anti-colonial resistance undermines colonial states, particularly when it confronts them with economic crisis. Between 1973 and 1985, Israel was engulfed in an unprecedented economic slowdown with annual stagflation of 3 percent.⁹¹ During the same period, Palestinian resistance was conducted mainly in the form of armed struggle by the Lebanon-based PLO. After Israel drove the PLO out of Lebanon in 1982, Palestinian resistance shifted to mostly civil mobilization inside the oPt that culminated in the First Intifada in 1987. During that uprising, the Israeli state confronted a mass insurgency and a regional Arab boycott as well as anti-capitalist and economic self-reliance initiatives, described by Leila Farsakh as “economic resistance.”⁹² These initiatives included the boycott of Israeli goods and jobs, a commercial strike, a tax revolt, a large-scale return to agriculture, and the emergence of what Raja Khalidi termed the “household economy.”⁹³ This combination of factors deepened Israel’s economic crisis, compelling the Zionist state to develop strategies to control the ungovernable population. Israel’s capitalist interests also viewed the pacification of the Palestinians as a necessary condition to stopping political unrest from worsening economic contraction.⁹⁴ To mitigate the high costs of the occupation—vast military spending, Arab boycotts, impediments to foreign investment⁹⁵—the following measures were advanced to stem the crisis: an end to direct

military rule in the oPt by subcontracting security to a subservient PA; the surveillance and restriction of Palestinian movement through a system of closures, permits, checkpoints, and roadblocks; the cantonization of Palestinian communities into Bantustan-style enclaves on the South African model; and an expansion of settlement construction. All of these have continued apace to the present day.⁹⁶ By the 1990s, Israel had neoliberalized its economy and entered into negotiations with the Palestinians.⁹⁷ Regional and global power shifts, such as the fall of the Soviet Union, the first Gulf War, and the embrace of neoliberalization across the Middle East, had also weakened the PLO, which in turn shifted away from a revolutionary approach to liberation and embraced the neoliberal order ushered in by the Oslo Accords and accompanying peace process. The Oslo process further consolidated settler colonialism, deepened Israeli military control over Palestinian life, and outsourced securitization to an Indigenous police force. Aggressive Israeli settler expansionism coupled with neoliberal restructuring and the entrenchment of an international aid industry in the oPt resulted in the apartheid system that has emerged under the guise of limited Palestinian autonomy in the oPt, generating “extreme forms of inequality, racialized marginalization, advanced securitization, and constant crisis.”⁹⁸

A decade or so later, the Israeli state faced another economic crisis in the wake of the Second Intifada launched by the Palestinians in 2000. As documented by Adam Hanieh, Israel entered the longest recession in its history with per capita GDP contracting, unemployment rising, and the budget deficit reaching \$579 million in 2003.⁹⁹ International financial institutions and Israeli capitalists understood that without political negotiations with the Palestinians, the Israeli economy would continue to suffer. A growing consensus among the Israeli capitalist class, the U.S. government, and the European Union urged a political solution to the Second Intifada.

In Canada, 1960s and 1970s Red Power militancy and activism also created a tense political climate in the colony. Glen Coulthard suggests that three watershed events shaped Indigenous activism in this period: First, widespread opposition to the 1969 White Paper—a government policy paper that attempted to abolish treaty rights, convert reserve lands to private property, and assimilate Indigenous people under the state—set off an unprecedented degree of political mobilization.¹⁰⁰ Second, there was the *Calder v. British Columbia* decision, which led the hereditary chief of the Nisga’a to launch a land-claims case in the courts establishing that they had never surrendered title to their homelands.¹⁰¹ Third, there was widespread resistance to resource extraction and energy sector development in the wake of the 1970s oil crisis,¹⁰² with various Indigenous nations engaging in anti-colonial resistance to the state and the energy industry.¹⁰³ These events ushered in Canadian government policies geared toward Indigenous recognition and so-called reconciliation. Like the Israeli economy during the 1970s, Canada was plagued by stagflation, high levels of unemployment, and a slowdown in the rate of economic growth. The increase in international oil prices (1972–73 and 1979–80) contributed to the slowdown, causing GDP to fall (after 1973), business capital spending to decrease, and the price of key commodities produced by Canada to decline.¹⁰⁴ To boost economic growth and prosperity, the Canadian state developed policies based on capital-intensive, resource-extractive industries, to which Indigenous activism presented an obstacle. In the late 1980s, Coulthard argues, the rise in First Nations militancy and land-based direct action disrupted and “impeded constituted flows of racialized capital and state power from entering and leaving Indigenous territories.”¹⁰⁵ The culmination of the decade-long resistance

of this period ushered in two national crises: the first was the legislative stonewalling of the Meech Lake Accord; and the second was the Oka Crisis. Coulthard argues that Indigenous direct action challenged colonial sovereignty and the capitalist order, leading the Canadian federal government to establish the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples in 1991. The commission's report included 440 recommendations calling for a renewed relationship between Indigenous people and the Canadian government based on mutual principles of friendship, peace, and respect.¹⁰⁶ It addressed reconciliation and the future relationship between the government and Indigenous nations, informing the move toward the process of truth and reconciliation.¹⁰⁷

The widespread economic disruption intensified by direct action, Indigenous militancy, and mass insurgencies produced political-economic crises that provoked both colonial states, Canada and Israel, to enter into negotiations with Indigenous nations and Palestinians in an effort to maintain settler sovereignty and dominant capitalist economies. In Canada, the state's approach to Indigenous resistance has shifted under the recent government of Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, which has fully embraced the politics of recognition and its accompanying spectacle of reconciliation, shifting the focus away from Indigenous land claims and sovereignty to shared history and cultural recognition. This is why the recent Wet'suwet'en refusal of extractive industry projects such as the Coastal GasLink pipeline and the ensuing economic shutdown of Canada have been so significant: they exposed the veneer of reconciliation for what it is and pronounced reconciliation dead. In the case of Israel, the Trump plan explicitly revealed itself as an Israeli economic plan that simply perpetuates land theft, dispossession, and settlement construction, consolidates apartheid, and liquidates Palestinian aspirations to a state, self-determination, and return. Mass Palestinian rejection of the plan exposes "peace" for the facade it has been for a long time. Yet in the way that Oslo's impact continues to linger, even after the process has repeatedly been pronounced dead,¹⁰⁸ the effect of the Trump plan on the ground is an impending *de jure* Israeli annexation of the oPt that is devastating Palestinian lives.

An Indigenous feminist delegation from Toronto that traveled to Palestine in 2018 witnessed the preemptive logics of the Trump plan and its Israeli corollary in the annexation plan.¹⁰⁹ They observed the ongoing theft of water and land in the Jordan Valley and elsewhere, home demolitions and dispossession of Palestinians at Khan al-Ahmar,¹¹⁰ the closure of Palestinian roads linking Jerusalem to the West Bank, the relocation of the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem, the increased Judaization of Palestine's topography, the expansion of Israeli settlements, and the racialized terror enforced against Palestinians. The delegation's Indigenous feminists from Six Nations learned about the economic resistance strategies that Palestinians deploy to remain on their lands even amid the occupation, and the self-reliant and steadfast practices they follow, which originally inspired the Oka-era warriors during the First Intifada.

The history of anti-colonial resistance across these colonial geographies underscores the importance of organized resistance and its ability to disrupt settler-capitalist economies, as well as the tactics and discourses—such as reconciliation and peace—used by nation-states to suppress and pacify defiant opposition. While such tactics have at times been supported by bourgeois Indigenous/Palestinian leaders who have forfeited their commitments to a liberatory politics and have adopted an individualistic and neoliberal approach to decolonization that furthers settler-colonial capitalism, social movements nevertheless continue to critique and defy them, and build to alternatives.

Praxis of Solidarity

With global powers joining forces to structure capitalist violence, the past fifty years have offered many lessons from which to glean political insight, particularly the affirmation that our joint struggles in the form of direct action and popular resistance to disrupt settler economies are effective. Palestine studies scholars who have written about solidarity have emphasized that these struggles should look to one another not only on the basis of shared similarities but to uncover the linkages between them as they/we share a common oppressor—in other words, that joint struggle is imperative for mutual liberation.¹¹¹ Erakat, in particular, emphasizes that solidarity is not driven by identity but produced through struggle, a leftist analytic that attempts to understand what joint struggle tells us about the possibilities of freedom. Others, such as Olwan, warn against assumptive solidarity and tokenism in theorizing Indigenous-Palestinian solidarity, and both Barakat and Tabar caution against erasing Indigenous resistance. This article (and my conceptualization of resurgent solidarity) shares many of the analytics outlined by these scholars, and while it builds on their work, it also places more emphasis on the political economy of settler states, shedding specific light on the Canadian context, which receives little scholarly attention, including in discussions of transnational solidarity and activism that emerge within that settler state. Canada receives little scholarly attention in relation to Israel/Palestine despite the fact that Palestinian and pro-Palestine activists and scholars in Canada have been instrumental in forging solidarity with various struggles and have worked to mainstream broad analysis of apartheid, Zionist settler colonialism, and tactics such as BDS. Additionally, few studies engage in a comprehensive relational and comparative analysis of settler-colonial political economies in relation to tactics of anti-colonial resistance and transnational solidarity, a contribution this article makes to Palestine studies. The distinct analysis of the political-economic and juridical formations that subtend colonization across the geographic contexts discussed in this article enables an understanding of the limitations of our analytics and the need for capacious frameworks to further develop a praxis of radical (co)-resistance, solidarity, and joint struggle for liberation. This praxis goes beyond Indigenous/Palestinian solidarity and applies to movement building more broadly.

Radical resurgent solidarity is thus an urgent and necessary political project in the contemporary moment, as violence under the guise of peace and reconciliation intensifies in Canada, Palestine, and elsewhere. Based on shared principles of liberation demanding a commitment to mutual self-determination and collective visions for the transformation of society, resurgent solidarities are necessary aspects of co-resistance. They require the adoption of a joint-struggle approach that necessitates economic disruption, material and symbolic support, radical visions (anti-colonial decolonization abolition, and the right of return, for example), as well as cultural production to sustain our spirits amid violence, in addition to a politics that does not collapse distinct histories and contextual specificities through frameworks of sameness. Ruben Gaztambide-Fernandez reminds us that solidarity in relation to decolonization is also about “imagining human relations that are premised on the relationship between difference and interdependency, rather than similarity and a rational calculation of self-interests.”¹¹²

Activists and movements should also be mindful of their differential locations and of the complicity entailed in advancing colonial and neoliberal politics of recognition and peace. Radical solidarity requires activists and movements not to engage in hetero-patriarchal, gendered, sexual, and racial violence toward each other, or in redwashing, assumptive solidarity,

tokenism, neoliberal individualism, oppression Olympics, and colonial exceptionalism. Radical solidarity envisions worldmaking, to use Kelley's term. Rather than nation-state building, it imagines a world beyond borders, nationalisms, and all forms of violence—a horizontal form of connection that is nonhierarchical and anti-oppressive, that envisions an alternative apart from property relations in order to remake the world. History has taught us that when solidarity is rooted in a radical politics of internationalism, we are able to connect global power structures and their regimes of violence transnationally and work toward remaking global life by unifying peoples, movements, and political projects beyond borders—from Wet'suwet'en to Palestine and to the rest of the Global South. In this time of intensified resource extraction, territorial expansion, and violence, more is required of us to continue imagining alternatives, building, and making another world all together (and altogether).

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank the blind reviewers and *JPS* editors for their deep engagement and outstanding feedback.

About the Author

Chandni Desai is assistant professor at the University of Toronto. Desai is working on her first book, tentatively titled *Revolutionary Circuits of Liberation: The Radical Tradition of Palestinian Resistance Culture and Internationalism*. Her research interests include comparative settler colonialism, anti-colonial thought, resistance culture, liberation politics, state violence (carceral politics, securitization, and militarism), political economy, internationalism, abolition, and decolonization. She coedited a special issue on decolonization and Palestine for the journal *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*. Desai hosts the Liberation Pedagogy Podcast.

Endnotes

1. The clans are the Gilseyhu, Gitdumden, Laksilyu, Laksamshu, and Tsayu.
2. Glen Coulthard argues that reconciliation has four different meanings: first, Canada's recognition of Indigenous culture and practices; second, the restoration of damaged political relationships between the state and Indigenous nations; third, an attempt to address unsettled claims pursuant to competing sovereignty between Canada and Indigenous title to land; and fourth, the willingness of the state to partially confront the past.
3. See Office of the Wet'suwet'en, "BC and Canada Ignore Wet'suwet'en Title Holders to Push Pipeline Agenda," press release, 1 October 2018, http://unistoten.camp/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/October_1_2018_Press_Release.pdf.
4. For full details, see *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia*, [1997] 3 S.C.R. 1010, <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1569/index.do>.
5. For media coverage, see "Media Archive," website of the Unist'ot'en people, accessed 10 May 2020, <https://unistoten.camp/media/news/>.
6. Turtle Island refers to the entire continent of North America. It is a term used by Native American and First Nations people and is based on an Indigenous creation story. See "The Story of Turtle Island: Traditional Story of Onondaga," Turtle Island Native Network, <http://www.turtleisland.org/front/article3.htm>.
7. "Jadaliyya Co-editor Noura Erakat Interviewed by CNN on 'Deal of the Century,'" posted by *Jadaliyya*, 19 May 2020, YouTube video, 5:01, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Typ3HX-qcuZI&t=4s&ab_channel=Jadaliyya.

8. “Jadaliyya Co-editor Noura Erakat Interviewed by CNN,” YouTube video.
9. The Dish with One Spoon is a treaty between the Anishinaabe, Mississaugas, and Haudenosaunee by which they are bound to share the territory and protect the land.
10. Rana Barakat, “Writing/Righting Palestine Studies: Settler Colonialism, Indigenous Sovereignty and Resisting the Ghost(s) of History,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 8, no. 3 (2018): pp. 349–63, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2017.1300048>.
11. Steven Salaita, *Inter/nationalism: Decolonizing Native America and Palestine* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 2016), p. xv.
12. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, “Indigenous Resurgence and Co-resistance,” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 2, no. 2 (2016): pp. 19–34, <https://doi.org/10.5749/jcritethnstud.2.2.0019>.
13. The Palestinian Youth Movement, “The Palestinian Youth Movement Stands in Solidarity with the Wet’suwet’en!,” 24 February 2020, <https://www.pymusa.com/wetsuweten>.
14. Nadine Naber, “The U.S. and Israel Make the Connections for Us’: Anti-imperialism and Black-Palestine Solidarity,” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 3, no. 2 (2017): p. 17, <https://doi.org/10.5749/jcritethnstud.3.2.0015>.
15. Nick Estes, “Indigenous Studies: As Radical as Reality Itself” (lecture, Modern and Critical Theory Lecture Series, University of New Mexico, 13 November 2018). For a video recording of the lecture, see “2018 10 30 Indigenous Studies,” posted by Unit Fellows, 13 November 2018, YouTube video, 54:20, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iqrinGlPzQk&t=484s&fbclid=IwAR15KIWqbHNaGB_hLkv3IeVX_E_pZOZYf_YL21YQyvTlibUgX6CX_UiKiw.
16. Palestinian leftists in Canada typically subscribe to a politics of anti-colonialism, anti-capitalism, national liberation, and anti-imperialism, as well as critiques of hetero-patriarchy; some are affiliated with left-leaning political parties and/or with feminist and queer movements.
17. Brandon L., interview with author, 25 April 2020, Ontario, Canada. Interviewee’s last name is withheld for privacy.
18. Rana Nazzal, interview with author, 20 April 2020, Toronto, Canada.
19. Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014), p.11.
20. Chandni Desai, “Shooting Back in the Occupied Territories: An Anti-colonial Participatory Politics,” *Curriculum Inquiry* 45, no. 1 (2015): pp. 109–28, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2014.995062>.
21. Hanna Kawas, interview with author, 19 April 2020, Vancouver, Canada.
22. Shilo Hill, Onondaga Beaver clan, Haudenosaunee, Six Nations, online communication with author, 25 April 2020.
23. This conceptualization is informed by Simpson’s notion of “resurgence.”
24. Robin D. G. Kelley, “From the River to the Sea to Every Mountain Top: Solidarity as Worldmaking,” *JPS* 48, no. 4 (Summer 2019): p. 70, <https://doi.org/10.1525/jps.2019.48.4.69>.
25. Kawas, interview.
26. Linda Tabar, “From Third World Internationalism to the ‘Internationals’: The Transformation of Solidarity with Palestine,” *Third World Quarterly* 38, no. 2 (2017): pp. 414–35, quote at p. 417, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2016.1142369>.
27. Robin D. G. Kelley, “Solidarity Is Not a Market Exchange: An *RM* Interview with Robin D. G. Kelley, Part Two,” interview by Jack Amariglio and Lucas Wilson, *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture and Society* 31, no. 2 (2019): pp. 152–72, <https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2019.1592407>.
28. Rabab Ibrahim Abdulhadi, “Marching with Oscar López Rivera: A Long History of Palestinian-Puerto Rican Solidarity,” *Mondoweiss*, 19 June 2017, <https://mondoweiss.net/2017/06/marching-palestinian-solidarity/>.
29. Gord Hill, “From Gaza to Gustafsen: The Link between the Intifada and Indigenous Sovereignty” (lecture, Vancouver, Canada, September 2009). For a video recording of the lecture, see “Colonization and Apartheid,” posted by Ion Delsol, 26 September 2009, YouTube video, 9:44, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v8xvMoR4dXE&ab_channel=IonDelsol.

30. Linda Tabar and Chandni Desai, "Decolonization Is a Global Project: From Palestine to the Americas," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 6, no. 1 (2017): p. xiii, <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/28899/21542>.
31. Mahmood Mamdani, *Neither Settler nor Native* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020), p. 98.
32. Kole Kilibarda, "Confronting Apartheid: The BDS Movement in Canada," *Upping the Anti: A Journal of Theory and Action*, no. 7 (November 2009): n.p., <https://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/07-confronting-apartheid>.
33. Mike Krebs and Dana M. Olwan, "From Jerusalem to the Grand River, Our Struggles Are One: Challenging Canadian and Israeli Settler Colonialism," *Settler Colonial Studies* 2, no. 2 (2012): pp. 138–64, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2012.10648846>.
34. Dana M. Olwan, "On Assumptive Solidarities in Comparative Settler Colonialisms," *feral feminisms*, no. 4 (2015): p. 92, <https://feralfeminisms.com/assumptive-solidarities/>.
35. Olwan, "Assumptive Solidarities," p. 91.
36. Naber, "The U.S. and Israel Make the Connections for Us," p. 17.
37. Gale Courey Toensing, "'Redwashing' Panel Follows Academic Associations' Boycott of Israel," *Indian Country Today*, 31 December 2013, updated 12 September 2018, <https://indiancountrytoday.com/archive/redwashing-panel-follows-academic-associations-boycott-of-israel>.
38. Olwan, "Assumptive Solidarities," p. 93.
39. Brenna Bhandar and Rafeef Ziadah, "Acts of Omission: Framing Settler Colonialism in Palestine Studies," *Jadaliyya*, 14 January 2016, <https://www.jadaliyya.com/Details/32857>.
40. Robyn Maynard, *Policing Black Lives: State Violence in Canada from Slavery to the Present* (Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Press, 2017).
41. Howard Adams, *Prison of Grass: Canada from a Native Point of View* (Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Fifth House Books, 1989).
42. Robin D. G. Kelley, "The Rest of Us: Rethinking Settler and Native," *American Quarterly* 69, no. 2 (June 2017): p. 269, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2017.0020>.
43. Iyko Day, *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016), p. 36.
44. Cedric J. Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).
45. Bhandar and Ziadah, "Acts of Omission."
46. Nahla Abdo and Nira Yuval Davis, "Palestine, Israel and the Zionist Settler Project" in *Unsettling Settler Societies: Articulations of Gender, Race, Ethnicity and Class*, ed. Daiva Stasiulis and Nira Yuval-Davis (London: SAGE, 1995), p. 300.
47. Zachary Lockman, "Land, Labor and the Logic of Zionism: A Critical Engagement with Gershon Shafir," *Settler Colonial Studies* 2, no. 1 (2012): p. 12, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2012.10648824>.
48. Abdo and Yuval Davis, "Palestine, Israel and the Zionist Settler Project," p. 302.
49. Heterogeneity of racial positions considers the differential ways that people are racialized for land and labor. For example, Black people were considered chattel and were therefore enslaved and turned into property; Indigenous peoples were to be eliminated in order to access land; and migrants were deemed exploitable, deportable "aliens."
50. Day, *Alien Capital*, p. 29.
51. Aboriginal title is a concept crafted by settler states. While treaties recognize First Nations sovereignty, settler states simultaneously diminish it.
52. John Burrows, "Wampum at Niagara: The Royal Proclamation, Canadian Legal History, and Self-Government," in *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada: Essays on Law, Equality, and Respect for Difference*, ed. Michael Asch (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997), pp. 155–72.
53. National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls Report, *Supplementary Report*, May 2019, https://www.mmiwg-ffada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Supplementary-Report_Genocide.pdf.

54. The “Indian Band” is a governing unit of Indians in Canada instituted by the 1876 Indian Act. Bands hold reserve lands, and band councils are responsible for the governance and administration of band affairs. See The Indian Act, R.S.C. 1985 c.1-5, <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/i-5/>.
55. Brenna Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018).
56. Bhandar, *Colonial Lives*, p. 20.
57. Fayez A. Sayegh, *Zionist Colonialism in Palestine* (Beirut: Palestine Liberation Organization Research Center, 1965), p. 27.
58. Sayegh, *Zionist Colonialism*, p. 24.
59. Sherene Seikaly and Max Ajl, “Of Europe: Zionism and the Jewish Other,” in *Europe after Derrida: Crisis and Potentiality* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014), p. 120.
60. Seikaly and Ajl, “Of Europe,” p. 122.
61. Seikaly and Ajl, “Of Europe.”
62. Abdo and Davis, “Palestine, Israel and the Zionist Settler Project,” p. 294.
63. Noura Erakat, “Whiteness as Property in Israel: Revival, Rehabilitation, and Removal,” *Harvard Journal of Racial and Ethnic Justice*, no. 31 (2015), https://librarysearch.library.utoronto.ca/discovery/fulldisplay?context=PC&vid=01UTORONTO_INST:UTORONTO&search_scope=UTL_AND_CI&tab=Everything&docid=cdi_gale_infotracademiconefile_A431565327.
64. Erakat, “Whiteness as Property,” p. 71.
65. Bhandar and Ziadah, “Acts of Omission.”
66. National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls Report, *Supplementary Report*.
67. Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*.
68. Day, *Alien Capital*, p. 26.
69. Erakat, “Whiteness as Property,” p. 71.
70. Omar Jabary Salamanca et al., “Past Is Present: Settler Colonialism in Palestine,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 2, no. 1 (2012): pp. 1–8, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2012.10648823>.
71. Barakat, “Writing/Righting Palestine,” p. 8.
72. Barakat, “Writing/Righting Palestine,” p. 8.
73. See Adam J. Barker, “The Contemporary Reality of Canadian Imperialism: Settler Colonialism and the Hybrid Colonial State,” *American Indian Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (Summer 2009): pp. 325–51, <https://doi:10.1353/aiq.0.0054>; Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawaii* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008); Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua, “Decolonizing Antiracism,” *Social Justice* 32, no. 4 (2005): pp. 120–43, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/29768340>; Patrick Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): pp. 387–409, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240>.
74. Lawrence and Dua, “Decolonizing Antiracism,” p. 134.
75. Barker, “Contemporary Reality,” p. 80.
76. Nandita Sharma, *Home Rule: National Sovereignty and the Separation of Natives and Migrants* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2020).
77. Nandita Sharma and Cynthia Wright, “Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States,” *Social Justice* 35, no. 3 (2008–9): pp. 120–38, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/29768504>; Kelley, “The Rest of Us.”
78. “Border and Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism and Racist Nationalism,” posted by Haymarket Books, YouTube video, 11 February 2021, 1:25:45, quote at 55:58, <https://youtu.be/WRZNfkgSrXo>.
79. Jodi A. Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Day, *Alien Capital*; Tiffany Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019); Sharma, *Home Rule*; Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang, “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): pp. 1–40, <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630>.

80. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," p. 17.
81. Nadine Suleiman Naber, "Imperial Whiteness and the Diasporas of Empire," *American Quarterly* 66, no. 4 (December 2014): pp. 1107–15, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2014.0068>.
82. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor."
83. These questions are also posed by Naber in "Imperial Whiteness."
84. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor."
85. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*.
86. Édouard Glissant, *Poetics of Relation*, trans. Betsy Wing (Detroit: University of Michigan Press, 1997).
87. May Ella, interview with the author, 15 April 2020, Toronto, Canada.
88. Moe Alqasem, interview with the author, 15 April 2020, Toronto, Canada.
89. Kelley, "From the River to the Sea," p. 71.
90. Alqasem, interview.
91. Adam Hanieh, "From State-Led Growth to Globalization: The Evolution of Israeli Capitalism," *JPS* 32, no. 4 (Summer 2003): pp. 5–21, <https://doi.org/10.1525/jps.2003.32.4.5>.
92. Leila Farsakh, "Palestinian Economic Development: Paradigm Shifts since the First Intifada," *JPS* 45, no. 2 (Winter 2016): pp. 55–71, <https://doi.org/10.1525/jps.2016.45.2.55>.
93. Raja Khalidi, "The Economics of Palestinian Liberation," *Jacobin*, 15 October 2014, <http://www.jacobinmag.com/2014/10/the-economics-of-palestinian-liberation/>; Andy Clarno, *Neoliberal Apartheid: Palestine/Israel and South Africa after 1994* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2017).
94. Clarno, *Neoliberal Apartheid*, p. 13.
95. Hanieh, "From State-led Growth," p. 18.
96. Hanieh, "From State-led Growth," p. 18.
97. Clarno, *Neoliberal Apartheid*, p. 12.
98. Clarno, *Neoliberal Apartheid*, p. 13.
99. Hanieh, "From State-led Growth," p. 8.
100. Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).
101. Coulthard, *Red Skin*, p. 4.
102. Coulthard, *Red Skin*, p. 5.
103. Coulthard, *Red Skin*, p. 6.
104. Paul Davenport, "Economics," Canadian Encyclopedia, 7 February 2006, edited 29 June 2015, <https://thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/economics>.
105. Glen Coulthard, "Placing #IdleNoMore in Historical Context," *The Tyee*, 4 January 2013, <http://theyee.ca/Opinion/2013/01/04/IdleNoMore-Historical-Context/>.
106. Coulthard, *Red Skin*, p. 119.
107. Coulthard, *Red Skin*, p. 119.
108. Bhandar and Ziadah, "Acts of Omission."
109. An Indigenous-feminist delegation was co-organized by Linda Tabar, Audrey Huntley of No More Silence, May Ella, and Chandni Desai. The project emerged from a visit Tabar organized for Huntley at Birzeit University.
110. Khan al-Ahmar is a village in the West Bank that was slated for demolition in 2018 for the expansion of the settlement of Ma'ale Adumim.
111. Noura Erakat, "Geographies of Intimacy: Contemporary Renewals of Black-Palestine Solidarity," *American Quarterly* 72, no. 2 (June 2020): pp. 471–96, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2020.0027>; Naber, "'The U.S. and Israel Make the Connections for Us'"; Salaita, *Inter/nationalism*.
112. Ruben A. Gaztambide-Fernandez, "Decolonization and the Pedagogy of Solidarity," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): p. 49, <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/download/18633/15557/>.