

POLICING INDIGENOUS MOVEMENTS

DISSENT AND THE SECURITY STATE

**ANDREW CROSBY
AND JEFFREY MONAGHAN**

FERNWOOD PUBLISHING
HALIFAX & WINNIPEG

Copyright © 2018 Andrew Crosby and Jeffrey Monaghan

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer, who may quote brief passages in a review.

Editing: Fazeela Jiwa
Cover design: Tania Craan
eBook: tikaebbooks.com
Printed and bound in Canada

Published by Fernwood Publishing
32 Oceanvista Lane, Black Point, Nova Scotia, B0J 1B0
and 748 Broadway Avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3G 0X3
www.fernwoodpublishing.ca

Fernwood Publishing Company Limited gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the Government of Canada, the Manitoba Department of Culture, Heritage and Tourism under the Manitoba Publishers Marketing Assistance Program and the Province of Manitoba, through the Book Publishing Tax Credit, for our publishing program. We are pleased to work in partnership with the Province of Nova Scotia to develop and promote our creative industries for the benefit of all Nova Scotians. We acknowledge the support of the Canada Council for the Arts, which last year invested \$153 million to bring the arts to Canadians throughout the country.



Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Crosby, Andrew, author
Policing indigenous movements : dissent and the security state / Andrew Crosby and Jeffrey Monaghan.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Issued in print and electronic formats.

ISBN 978-1-77363-012-0 (softcover).—ISBN 978-1-77363-045-8 (EPUB).—

ISBN 978-1-77363-046-5 (Kindle)

I. Social movements—Canada—Case studies. 2. Native peoples—Canada—Politics and government—Case studies. 3. Police—Canada—Case studies.
I. Monaghan, Jeffrey, 1980-, author II. Title.

HN110.S62C76 2018

303.48'40971

C2017-907869-0

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....VIII

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... X

**PROJECT SITKA, POLICING, AND
THE SETTLER COLONIAL PRESENT1**

The Settler Colonial Present..... 6

The Security State and the “War on Terror” 11

*Extractive Capitalism, Critical
Infrastructure, and the Reproduction of Order..... 17*

Decolonizing the Canadian (Security) State..... 20

Access to Information and Themes of the Book 23

Notes 24

**1. “WELCOME TO ABL WORLD!!!!”: THE LOGIC OF
ELIMINATION AND THE ALGONQUINS OF BARRIERE LAKE.....26**

Logging, Resistance, and the Trilateral Agreement..... 28

Orchestrating Elimination Using All “Instruments of the State”..... 33

Security State Repression at Barriere Lake..... 39

Making the Algonquins into National Security Threats 43

Perpetual Surveillance and the Extractive Economy..... 45

The Ultimate Policing Tool: Section 74 Indian Act Elections..... 49

*Third-Party Management: “A Colonial State of Arrested
Development” 55*

*On the Front Lines of “Canada’s Low-Intensity Warfare
on First Nations” 58*

Notes 60

2. NORTHERN GATEWAY PIPELINES: POLICING FOR EXTRACTIVE CAPITALISM	62
<i>Extractive Capitalism and the Northern Gateway Pipelines</i>	64
A “Vested Interest”: Corporate–Security Collaboration Against “Aboriginal Sovereignty Concerns”	69
<i>Critical Infrastructure and the Threat of “Environmental Criminal Extremists”</i>	73
“Security Peers” Prepare for Enbridge Hearings.....	80
Pipeline Opponents Under Surveillance.....	83
“Laws of the Land”: Criminalizing the Unist’ot’en amid Intensified Surveillance	88
“A Touchstone for Opposition”	93
Note.....	96
3. IDLE NO MORE AND THE “FUSION CENTRE FOR NATIVE PROBLEMS”	97
<i>Idle No More Origins and the Social Media Scare.....</i>	99
<i>Mapping the Extensive Surveillance of Idle No More.....</i>	104
“First Nations 101” and Settler Colonial Divide- and-Conquer Practices	108
<i>Economic Disruptions and the Misnomer of Critical Infrastructure Protection.....</i>	116
Permanent Integration: A “Fusion Centre for Native Problems”	126
<i>Idle No More and Sovereignty Summer.....</i>	131
Notes	134
4. THE RAID AT ELSIPOGTOG: INTEGRATED POLICING AND “VIOLENT ABORIGINAL EXTREMISTS”	136
“Canada’s Natural Wealth Is Our National Inheritance”	136
Setting the Stage: Surveillance of Idle No More and Elsi Pogtog	141
SWN Illegal: The Eviction Order and the Integrated Response	144
The Mi’kmaq Warrior Society and the Treaty Relationship.....	151
“Out of Left Field”: The Mi’kmaq’s Eviction Notice and the Settler Colonial Response.....	154
The Raid: “Crown Land Belongs to the Government, Not to Fucking Natives”	160
Solidarity Protests and the Threat of an “Idle No More–Like Movement”.....	165

<i>“Run with the Horses We Have”: Criminalization at Elsipogtog and SWN’s Final Push</i>	169
<i>Elsipogtog Catalyst and “Violent Aboriginal Extremists”</i>	173
<i>Notes</i>	176

CONCLUSION: POLICING THE IMAGINARY

“ANTI-PETROLEUM MOVEMENT”178

<i>Canada’s Indigenous “Risk Forecast”</i>	186
<i>Surveillance and Criminalization of Social Movements</i>	188
<i>Settler Colonialism and Reining in the Security State</i>	192
<i>Note</i>	194

REFERENCES195

INDEX208

EXCERPT

ACRONYMS

ABL	Algonquins of Barriere Lake
ADM NSOPS	Assistant Deputy Ministers' National Security Operations Committee
ADM	Assistant Deputy Minister
AFN	Assembly of First Nations
AFNCNB	Assembly of First Nations Chiefs in New Brunswick
AIG	Aboriginal Intelligence Group
AIM	American Indian Movement
ALEA	Assistance to Law Enforcement Agencies
APTN	Aboriginal Peoples Television Network
ATA	<i>Anti-terrorism Act</i>
ATIA	<i>Access to Information Act</i>
BCCLA	British Columbia Civil Liberties Association
CAF	Canadian Armed Forces
CAPP	Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
CBSA	Canadian Border Services Agency
CSC	Correctional Services Canada
CSEC	Communications Security Establishment Canada
CFNCIU	Canadian Forces National Counter-Intelligence Unit
CI	Critical Infrastructure
CICI	Critical Infrastructure Criminal Intelligence
CIIT	Critical Infrastructure Intelligence Team
CJOC	Canadian Joint Operations Command
CN	Canadian National Railroad
CSIS	Canadian Security Intelligence Service
CTIO	Counter Terrorism Information Officer
DFO	Department of Fisheries and Oceans
DND	Department of National Defence
EFI	Energy Framework Initiative

FOI	Freedom of Information
FN	First Nations
FNCFCS	First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada
FNSB	First Nations Strategic Bulletin
FNFTA	<i>First Nations Financial Transparency Act</i>
GC	Government of Canada
GOC	Government Operations Centre
INAC	Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (formerly Indian Affairs)
INSET	Integrated National Security Enforcement Team
INM	Idle No More
ISL	Industrial Security Ltd.
ITAC	Integrated Terrorism Assessment Centre
JIG	Joint Intelligence Group
JRP	Joint Review Panel
NEB	National Energy Board
NDA	National Day of Action
NICC	National Intelligence Coordination Centre
NRCan	Natural Resources Canada
NSES	National Security Enforcement Section
NWMP	North West Mounted Police
OPP	Ontario Provincial Police
OSINT	Open-source Intelligence
RCMP	Royal Canadian Mounted Police
OPIRG	Ontario Public Interest Research Group
PCO	Privy Council Office
PMO	Prime Minister's Office
PROS	Police Reporting and Occurrence System
PSC	Public Safety Canada
RCAP	Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples
SIR	Suspicious Incident Report
SOI	Suspect of Interest
SCISA	<i>Security of Canada Information Sharing Act</i>
SPROS	Secure Police Reporting and Occurrence System
SQ	Sûreté du Québec
SWN	Southwestern Energy Company
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
VPIRG	Vancouver Public Interest Research Group

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Writing this book came at a time of widespread Indigenous resurgence against settler colonialism in Canada. We are deeply indebted to the communities and movements subjected to the pervasive surveillance and violent policing that we detail in this book. Your determination inspires this project and our desire to challenge the injustices of settler colonialism.

We have many individuals to thank for their support and contributions to the work we do. We relied on a lot of previous research for this book, and we would like to thank the many other researchers and activists who have been uncovering and challenging various aspects of settler colonialism and its various tentacles of policing. Our book would not be possible without the tireless and determined work of others. Thank you to all of those that have contributed to these important efforts and those whose work we've used to educate ourselves and further our analysis. In preparing this book, a number of people have assisted — both directly and indirectly — in the final outcome. In no particular order, we'd like to thank Kevin Walby, Ajay Parasram, Shiri Pasternak, Miles Howe, Tia Dafnos, Martin Lukacs, Tim Groves, Tim McSorley, and Jorge Barrera.

This book came about through work with different projects, our respective engagements, and years of talking shit during band practice. We have lots of people who have provided encouragement and support. You, of course, know who you are — thank you very much!

Andy: Thank you to all who have remained close, offered advice, and showed support over the years, including Ajay, Fuz, Eddy, Adam, Jen, Guillaume, Birch, and Steve, among many others. I would also like to thank the numerous independent journalists and editors, especially at the *Leveller* newspaper and the *Media Co-op*, who have helped shape me as a writer and thinker. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the late and very much missed Mat Nelson. I would also like to acknowledge

the tireless efforts of those at OPIRG who have never ceased to inspire and amaze me. I would further like to acknowledge those in the local social justice-oriented punk rock scene. I would also like to thank certain teachers over the years who helped shape my politics and focus into where it lies today — Marc Doucet, Labeeb Bsoul, Simon Dalby, William Walters, Abdulghany Mohamed, and Jai Sen, to name a few. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the support of my loving family and the inspiration of my adoring children.

Jeff: Thank you to many of my friends and colleagues at Carleton/UOttawa who have contributed in various ways to this work, including Nic Carrier, Evelyn Maeder, Lara Karaian, Maddy Santos, Dale Spencer, Justin Piché, Dawn Moore, Aaron Doyle, Kelly Fritsch, Valerie Steeves, David Moffette, and Mike Mopas. I would also like to thank David Murakami Wood, Jennifer Matsunaga, Kevin Walby, David Lyon, Adam Molnar, Lucas Melgaço, Özgün Topak, Emily Van der Meulen, Fahad Ahmad, Abigail Curlew, Etienne Turpin, DT Cochrane, Gordie and Karen, Pete V, Yavar Hameed, and the many others who have provided inspiration and support along the way. Special thanks to my family/ies, especially Ange and the kiddos.

Thank you to Fernwood Publishing and its dedicated staff for believing in this project, for giving us the opportunity to present this research. In particular, Candida Hadley for her guidance and wisdom throughout the editing phases, as well as Fazeela Jiwa for her keen-eyed copy editing and indexing. The support of other staff during this project has been invaluable and we are very grateful to the entire Fernwood team for believing in this project, including Beverley Rach and Curran Faris, among others who we might not have dealt with directly but whose work is very much appreciated. We would like to extend our appreciation to the two anonymous reviewers who provided thoughtful and thorough comments and suggested revisions. Through the editorial direction from Candida and the encouragements from reviewers, the book has been significantly improved. Thanks to Neal Shannacappo for his artwork for the website and Abigail Curlew for helping with organizing our ATI data on the website.

We hope the book is something that is both educational and provocative. Many of us engaged in social justice movements have long been accustomed to the proliferation of everyday surveillance practices, as well as the more covert and insidious surveillance that has targeted movements in Canada. This book details the driving forces, many of the

mechanics, and some specific cases with the aim of shedding light on these contemporary practices, the implications of which have yet to be fully revealed. While we provide many specifics through the documents of police and government agencies, what we narrate here is only a small window into the police's current efforts to demobilize movements that challenge settler colonialism and extractive capitalism. The expansion of surveillance against social movements has progressed in highly opaque and secretive ways. We hope our efforts to empiricize these developments contributes toward broader (and necessary) efforts that challenge policing and security powers.

EXCERPT

PROJECT SITKA, POLICING, AND THE SETTLER COLONIAL PRESENT

“Serious criminality associated to large public order events with national implications was designated a RCMP National Tactical Intelligence Priority in January 2014,” reads the introductory sentence of a secret Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) report on Indigenous activism (CSIS 2016-47: 16).¹ Uncovered in the process of researching this book, the report was the final product of an extensive, quasi-criminal investigation known as Project SITKA. SITKA demonstrates the extensive policing and surveillance powers—or as the RCMP say, the “national tactical intelligence priority”—directed toward a “small ‘core’ group of subjects” associated with “Aboriginal public order events” who oppose extractive capitalism or assert a politics of self-determination (ibid.: 15–16). According to the RCMP report, the investigation was launched as a response to a resurgence in Indigenous activism around prominent issues including “the ‘Idle No More’ movement, land claims settlements, missing and murdered Aboriginal women, and natural resource development” (ibid.: 14). “Overall, 313 individuals were identified and reviewed within the scope of the project” reads the executive summary, and “of these, 89 were found to meet the criteria for criminality associated to public order events” (ibid.: 15). From January 2014 to January 2015, the RCMP’s National Intelligence Coordination Centre (NICC) gathered intelligence on these 313 prominent Indigenous rights activists, creating profiles and assessments about their associations and their participation in various protests, as well as an evaluation criteria that assessed the level of threat associated with each individual on the watchlist.

Somewhat reminiscent of PROFUNC surveillance programs during the Cold War that aimed to weed out the prominent functionaries of the Communist Party, the RCMP’s year-long secret investigation has been

assisted by the rise of databanks and contemporary surveillance capacities that allowed police to compile vast amounts of intelligence on activists who challenge settler colonialism. To assemble a list of prominent Indigenous functionaries, the RCMP made a “request for assistance” to other RCMP divisions and “law enforcement partners.” At a minimum, this included consultations with “all” RCMP divisions, provincial police in Ontario and Quebec, as well as unidentified “law enforcement databank holdings” (ibid.). SITKA officers received an array of information regarding Indigenous-related events and activities from various partner agencies. The investigation went far beyond issues of crime and explicitly requested surveillance data on “protest event types” related to “land claims issues,” Idle No More, “anti-capitalist protest” such as those against the G8 and G20 meetings, and the Occupy movement “particularly in British Columbia, Ontario and Halifax” (ibid.: 20). Other activities under surveillance included “Demands for Missing and Murdered Women Inquiry — particularly [in] Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario” and events “such as speaking tours, disruption of political proceedings, and direct action training camps” (ibid.). With an ability to access surveillance intelligence in police databanks on a wide number of issues, the report says that SITKA gathered information from as far back as 2010. This staggering affront to activities protected by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* is eclipsed by Project SITKA’s final report that claims to have evaluated people based on “their *background, motivation and rhetoric*” (ibid.: 15, emphasis added). With near-absolute impunity, the RCMP engaged in these investigative activities with no notification to those under investigation, no venue to cross-examine or challenge the intelligence being used against these individuals, and no indication of when a “suspect” would cease to be under this quasi-criminal investigation.

To predict whether these individuals presented future threats of “serious criminality,” Project SITKA created protester profiles for 313 individuals and then evaluated them based on a methodology of “volatile, disruptive, or passive” developed by RCMP psychologist Dr. Eli Sopow (ibid.: 17). Based on these secret investigations, the RCMP officers involved with Project SITKA claimed that 89 of the 313 individuals investigated were considered threats that “meet the criteria for criminality associated to public order events” while simultaneously claiming that they found “no intentional criminal nexus” and “no known evidence that these individuals pose a direct threat to critical infrastructure” (ibid.: 15). Despite these confounding and

contradictory claims, eighty-nine individuals were classified as high-risk potential threats. Those deemed as high-risk threats were identified as “core subjects” whose “primary common interest ... was natural resource development — particularly pipelines, shale gas, and mining” (ibid.: 22). Over half were associated with the Mi’kmaw² resistance at Elsipogtog — thirty-five from New Brunswick and ten from Nova Scotia. SITKA documents reveal that the “protester profiles” for the eighty-nine were subsequently “made available to front-line officers, divisional analysts and law enforcement partners through the Automated Criminal Intelligence Information System” and the Police Reporting and Occurrence System (PROS) database (ibid.: 17–18). It remains unclear how widely available these profiles are across police agencies or how long these “investigations” remain open. From the SITKA files, it appears that police and security agencies will retain these surveillance catalogues to share among a number of agencies, departments, and industry “partners,” circulating volumes of personal information in police databanks *indefinitely*.

SITKA illustrates a new dynamic of policing that we call “the security state”: a sprawling array of national security and policing agencies, industry and corporate partners, and public bureaucracies that are increasingly integrated through surveillance, intelligence databanks and institutional partnerships in efforts to pre-empt or disrupt potential threats in the “war on terror.” Practices of the security state demonstrate how the “war on terror” has expanded the focus of policing efforts beyond any clear definition of terrorist groups or activities that aim to inflict violence against unknowing civilian populations. Instead, national security policing — and the expanding domain of the security state — harness their resources and capacities toward domestic groups. While a number of groups are targeted in a discriminatory way by the security state, the extensive policing of Indigenous Peoples or groups in the “war on terror” has been rationalized by the development of categories and labels such as “Aboriginal extremism” and “critical infrastructure” specifically to criminalize Indigenous movements that challenge extractive capitalism, demand self-determination, or contest federal and provincial claims to Indigenous lands.

While it is not new that security agencies would classify people involved in these Indigenous movements as criminals, extremists, or troublemakers, the context of the “war on terror” has given national security, policing, and social control agencies a host of resources and powers to intensify their efforts against Indigenous communities. Policing efforts

like SITKA are illustrative of a global trend toward data-driven security and surveillance, but the practices that we detail in this book are less about a “new profiling” based on algorithms and new calculations of risk (Leese 2014; see also Amoores 2011) and more about the ability to more effectively catalogue Indigenous activists that threaten Canadian material and immaterial interests. As an extension of settler colonialism, these practices use the labels and powers of national security to suppress efforts that challenge colonial control of land and resources. In doing so, the security state is not merely an objective or neutral policing entity but an active supporter of extractive capitalism and settler colonialism.

This book provides extensive, first-hand accounts of how the security state has developed a prolific surveillance regime that targets Indigenous Peoples as national security threats. We use first-hand accounts because we refer extensively to the records of police and security agencies to narrate this book. Compiled using thousands of declassified documents from dozens of government departments and hundreds of *Access to Information Act* (ATIA) requests, we believe this book is one of the most comprehensive accounts of contemporary government surveillance. Moreover, our aim is to report on these widespread and dubious surveillance practices as a vivid demonstration of how the security state actively delegitimizes and suppresses Indigenous movements that challenge settler colonialism. We examine four prominent case studies: the long-standing conflict involving the Algonquins of Barriere Lake, the struggle against the Northern Gateway Pipelines, the Idle No More movement, and the anti-fracking protests surrounding the Elsipogtog First Nation. Other researchers have shown how Indigenous movements have been policed through the discourses and resources of the “war on terror” (Dafnos et al. 2016; Monaghan and Walby 2017; Proulx 2014), and we extend this analysis by showing how the security state has monitored and aimed to suppress the Indigenous movements we have chosen for our illustrative case studies.

While the security state’s frames of national security or critical infrastructure are new discursive tactics of criminalizing Indigenous movements, we stress that these contemporary practices are part of a continuum of long-standing settler colonial efforts to target Indigenous movements. We view the security state as an extension or a new iteration of ways in which policing and social control practices have disrupted Indigenous activism, specifically types of activism that challenge Canadian sovereignty over land and resources. Acts that assert self-determination

and the treaty rights of Indigenous communities to control land and resources have always threatened settler colonialism and solicited violent reactions from Canadian authorities. This is particularly true when self-determination is used to disrupt the extraction of resources and wealth from Indigenous lands.

SITKA itself emerged explicitly as an effort to prepare a response to another set of mobilizations such as protests against tar sands pipelines, the resistance to shale gas exploration around Elsipogtog, or the Idle No More movement. These policing efforts are a response to growing momentum in the politics of Indigenous self-determination, meaningful efforts at settler solidarities, and the abilities to disrupt the status quo. As agencies that serve to protect the status quo of settler colonialism, they are also responding to the need to protect the wealth accumulated through the exploitation of Indigenous lands. Speaking to how Idle No More represents both a link to histories of Indigenous resistance and possibilities of future collective action, the Kino-nda-niimi Collective (2014: 21) have suggested that the Native Winter of 2012–13

will be remembered — alongside the maelstrom of treaty-making, political waves like the Red Power Movement and the 1969–70 mobilization against the White Paper, and resistance movements at Oka, Gustafson's Lake, Ipperwash, Burnt Church, Goose Bay, Kanonhstaton, and so on — as one of the most important moments in our collective history.

Momentum from these Indigenous movements have presented important opportunities to advance a politics of decolonization, yet these impressive movements have also provoked a counter-movement of the security state and extractive corporations that aim to disrupt our collective abilities to challenge settler colonialism. In the past, assertions of Indigenous sovereignty and efforts to disrupt settler colonialism have also been treated as criminal threats (A. Simpson 2014: 115–46). This book provides a contemporary account of how an extensive apparatus of settler colonial actors, from police to bureaucrats to the forestry and pipeline companies extracting from Indigenous land, engage in processes of surveillance and social control with the aim of safeguarding the settler colonial present.³

THE SETTLER COLONIAL PRESENT

To properly contextualize the policing of Indigenous movements, our analysis starts with an emphasis that Canada has never decolonized, and it cannot be regarded as a post-colonial society. In Canada, the notion that 1867 marks a new national beginning of a post-colonial society following quasi-independence from British rule serves as the source of a deeply held belief that Canada is free from the “burden” of colonial history. Evoking what Sunera Thobani (2007) calls “exaltations” of Canadian values, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau echoed this belief when he told a New York audience that Canada was “without some of the baggage ... [of] colonial pasts or perceptions of American imperialism” (Fountain 2016). Similarly, former prime minister Stephen Harper claimed — again to an international audience — that Canada had “no history of colonialism” (Ljunggren 2009). These exaltations recirculate the notion that Canada is a post-colonial society by reaffirming the commonplace belief that colonialism is a thing of the past. There is a strong repertoire of Indigenous histories, scholars, and activist interventions that confront these popular myths of Canadian post-coloniality.⁴ Our work is indebted to these efforts at confronting Canadian expressions of post-colonialism, and we focus on how contemporary policing and surveillance are integral components in the maintenance of settler colonialism.

A critique of the security state is especially relevant on two accounts. First, because of the popular historical imaginary of what Constance Backhouse (1999) has called Canada’s “mythology of racelessness” or what Eva Mackey (2002) calls the “benevolent Mountie myth” or what Jeff Benvenuto, Andrew Woolford, and Alexander Laban Hinton (2015) refer to as the “Canadian myth of peaceful colonization.” Popularized mythologies of Canadian colonialism and especially the role of the North West Mounted Police (NWMP) have generally relied upon smug contrasting with the brutalities of U.S. Indian policies to valorize a more humane history of colonialism.⁵ These hagiographies are especially potent in the histories of the NWMP (later the RCMP), as well as the Indian Affairs bureaucracies that aimed to civilize Indigenous populations. Critical retellings of these dominant histories have been recently popularized thanks to the activism surrounding residential school practices, yet historical beliefs that Canadian Indian policy was one of benevolence and assistance still persist.⁶ Claiming to assist with crime, poverty, or development remain dominant techniques used by contemporary colonial agencies to justify

targeting Indigenous movements. We highlight continuities in these logics that animate police activities against Indigenous Peoples, a key aspect of our settler colonial present.

The second aspect of our research's contemporary relevance relates to the powers of Canada's security state. The policing and surveillance practices that we detail are pervasive and have become highly normalized. Mass accumulation of intelligence and cataloguing of data within police and security databanks, and the sharing of this information with policing agencies and industry, has become an integral yet routine and mundane function of the daily work of the security state. These practices are highly acute when directed against Indigenous movements, and little — if any — oversight exists. Meanwhile, complaint systems are virtually non-existent (or ineffective). As an aggregate, the security state has become a large network of bureaucracies, with vast mandates and resources, who engage in the widespread monitoring and policing of Indigenous populations — as settler colonial an enterprise as there has ever been.

Our book is a critical illustration of these settler colonial security practices. As settlers supportive of decolonization struggles, we do not comment on tactics or strategies of Indigenous movements. Our attention is directed toward the institutions of settler colonialism, specifically the policing and security apparatus that remains so integral to maintaining these systems of exploitation. We do offer some comments in the book's conclusion regarding the challenges of confronting settler colonialism; however, our primary objective is to provide a detailed illustration of how agencies of the security state has normalized these pervasive practices of policing Indigenous movements. We also provide a critical framework for interpreting these contemporary illustrations of colonial rule in a broader context of land theft, economic development, and post-colonial imaginaries that consolidate and manage the social privileges of our settler colonial society.

In using the term settler colonialism to position our analysis and argumentation, we borrow from recent conceptualizations that highlight distinctions between colonialism and settler colonialism.⁷ This distinction rests on how colonial powers approach the management of Indigenous Others, with an emphasis on how colonial regimes extract wealth and manage majority populations while settler colonialism is more focused on settlement and the creation of a new settler-majoritarian polity. Glen Coulthard (2014a: 7) has argued that the settler colonial relationship is

a relationship of domination maintained to “facilitate dispossession of Indigenous peoples of the lands *and* self-determining authority” (emphasis added). Canadian settler colonialism has employed tactics of reform and management, but this happens within an unconditional assertion of Canadian sovereignty and the production of a Canadian post-colonial social imaginary that buries the lifeworlds of Indigenous self-determination and freedom under Canadian laws, customs, and identities.

In underlining how Canada is better understood as a settler colonial regime, we stress a distinction where modes of colonial domination are primarily structured around two intertwined rationalities: 1) the theft and acquisition of land (as opposed to reforming Indigenous Peoples as labourers); and 2) the production of a new, post-colonial subjectivity of Canadians (as opposed to reforming Indigenous subjectivities within a hierarchy of empire). In combining the theft of land with the production of a collective post-colonial identity among the non-Indigenous majority population, land theft and assimilation policies are rationalized through layered appeals to democratic rights, law and order, the assistance of undeveloped or uncivilized non-capitalistic Natives, as well as more explicit tenets of white supremacy. We have elsewhere focused on the liberal ideas of “assistance” and crime control in developing the concept of settler governmentality (see Crosby and Monaghan 2016, 2012; Monaghan 2013b), yet the key component for understanding the functioning of settler colonial regimes of governance is that they do not require Indigenous cooperation. In fact, the opposite is true: settler colonialism uses a diversity of mechanisms that aim to fully replace Indigenous societies with a new post-colonial order.

By using mechanisms of violence as well as reward systems of less-violent coercion, settler colonial practices operate according to rationalities that seek to eliminate self-determining Indigenous lifeworlds upon which Canada is built. In what Derek Gregory (2004: 7) has called the “elusive fiction” of post-colonialism, the logic of settler colonialism produces a post-colonial society (Canada) through the settlement of land and the displacement of Indigenous Peoples, the subsequent management of Indigenous populations, the fortification of legal regimes of sovereignty on top of Indigenous societies, and the myriad techniques that fall under what Patrick Wolfe (2006, 1999) has characterized as a “logic of elimination.” Wolfe’s notion of the logic of elimination has been highly influential, marking a point of departure in contrasting colonialism and

settler colonialism as well as in discussions about the distinct possibilities for the politics of decolonization in settler colonial societies like Canada (Park 2015). Centrally, Wolfe argues that settler colonialism possesses an eliminatory logic that can be characterized as genocide. A conclusion taken up recently by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and a number of scholarly texts (Patzner 2014; Sinclair 2017; Woolford 2015), the genocidal rationality of settler colonialism is, according to Wolfe, based on a desire to accumulate territory. Wolfe (2006: 388) writes that “territoriality is settler colonialism’s specific, irreducible element,” where settler societies “[erect] a new colonial society on the expropriated land base — as I put it, settler colonizers come to stay: invasion is a structure not an event.” Challenging the notion of genocidal practices as events, which can be narrated in the grammar of criminal law, Wolfe has emphasized how settler colonialism reshapes structural relations to make elimination normal, benign, and largely uncontroversial in the eyes of the majority population. Even if well meaning, as the residential schools have been described, eliminatory practices are embedded into social logics of settler society.

Focusing on the role of the security state in the broader regime of settler colonialism, we demonstrate how policing practices treat assertions of traditional Indigeneity as *abnormal*. Framed this way, any challenge to settler colonial authority is marked as potential violence against the post-colonial order. The result is that these expressions of Indigenous autonomy and self-determination are coded as threats to be neutralized and eliminated from the space of Canadian post-colonial society. As a rationality of majoritarian rule, policing practices that target potential insecurity seek to eliminate these Indigenous expressions of autonomy, independence, or collective identity that are at odds with the Canadian post-colonial imaginary. Elimination thus serves a dual purpose: to suppress challenges to Canadian sovereignty and to facilitate access to the tremendous wealth and prosperity that can be accumulated through the theft of land.

Indigenous politics that confront the vision and practices of the Crown’s assertion of sovereignty are translated by agencies of the security state as indications of non-acquiescence to the values of prosperity inherent in the settler colonial project. Indigenous assertions of autonomy are then interpreted as a challenge to the authority of the Canadian government. In addition to challenging the imagined post-colonial society, these expressions of Indigeneity disrupt Canadian political-economic dependence on

the exploitation of Indigenous lands and resources. Craig Proulx (2014: 83) has noted that Canadian police have a long tradition of targeting movements that challenge settler colonial control over land, capitalism, and governance because “non-indigenous peoples fear the economic and political costs of activism, protests and blockades,” which then leads to the representation of people involved in Indigenous movements as “potential insurgents, terrorists and criminals threatening the security of the Canadian state.” Canada’s history as a settler colonial society is founded on rationalizations that translate these expressions of Indigeneity into forms of “crime” in an effort to make an Indigenous politics of self-determination unspeakable. In casting Indigenous autonomy as an abnormal politics, a criminal politics, a politics that threatens the Canadian extractive economy, and as a politics that presents an existential threat to Canada as a post-colonial “home and Native land,” policing institutions have served as the ground-level enforcement of settler colonialism’s project of eliminating Indigenous sovereignties.

In the efforts to police and eliminate Indigenous self-determination, settler society often fixates on the notions of “tradition” or “culture” that demarcate aspects of Indigenous freedom from the imposition of settler sovereignty. In some instances during our discussions of police and security efforts against Indigenous movements, we are reporting on how settler society represents these notions of Indigeneity. We do not want to suggest that a specific Indigenous culture exists, that it is homogenous, or that particular cultures do not change over time. We aim to underline that what is most commonly narrated as “traditional Indigenous culture” is itself a knowledge production of settler society — often a marker of danger, crime, or threat to settler order. These notions of culture or tradition are not “real” in the sense of reflecting the lived experiences of Indigenous communities, but they are real in the sense that they inform a cultural imaginary of settler society. In other words, we are not speaking about Indigenous societies — we are speaking about realities within settler society that view Indigeneity and assertions of Indigenous freedom as a threat to post-colonial authorities. Moreover, our effort is to underline how perceptions of Indigeneity are often framed through a primary mechanism of colonial power: the police.

THE SECURITY STATE AND THE “WAR ON TERROR”

Contemporary policing institutions have extended the history of settler colonial law enforcement within the context of the “war on terror.” To illustrate the scope of contemporary policing, we use the term security state to capture the broad array of institutions engaged in settler colonial policing. Illustrating the integrated character of settler colonial governance, we show how many non-policing entities are engaged to maintain and do the work of security governance. While the convergence of multiple agencies under the banner of “security” does not exclusively impact Indigenous communities, there is a long history of controlling Indigenous communities through multiple arms of state agencies — often grounded in efforts to provide security, development, rights, or other impositions of colonial authority (Razack 2015; Shewell 2004; Woolford 2015). Given the history of settler assertions of security, the contemporary politics of the “war on terror” presents another layer in the use of security as a mechanism for policing Indigenous communities.

What is novel in the current policing of Indigenous movements is the infusion of national security resources and the dramatic extension of intelligence-led surveillance practices. We use the term security state to capture the current character of policing, which is comprised of what police agencies call “integrated” approaches that institutionalize the ways in which multiple agencies work collaboratively to pre-empt security threats. Called the “fusion centre” approach to security (Monahan 2010; Monaghan and Walby 2012), this includes public agencies as well as private corporations, and also refers to traditional policing and security agencies as well as social control agencies like Indian Affairs. Given the emphasis on pre-emptive policing, the security state is also networked through surveillance. As SITKA shows, surveillance information on activists can be stored in a myriad of databanks, which can be shared, recontextualized, and recirculated by numerous actors within the security state. These practices of widespread surveillance on social movements have been completely normalized among actors of the security state because of the centrality of protecting economic interests against supposed national security threats.

A number of other jurisdictions have moved toward “fusion centre” models of policing, and our examination of the Canadian security state shows how integrated practices of information sharing and surveillance have become a central organizing principle within the “war on terror.” Our efforts are to show the Canadian character of this trend. In using the term

security state, we do not refer to a singular entity but the fusion of varied governance entities that, despite the broad heterogeneity and competing interests of agents and institutions that comprise it, nonetheless operate in a unified and coordinated manner. Over the course of the case studies detailed in this book, readers will get a sense of the vastness of the Canadian security state. We suggest that the security state is best characterized as a top-loaded entity, where federal authorities have strong direction over its construction and management while provincial, territorial, and municipal agencies fit into lower (though also powerful) places in the hierarchy.

Our research deals primarily with the top elements of this hierarchy, beginning with the host of federal departments and agencies that have been fused through the growing network of security, surveillance, and information sharing. Central to this network are policing and security agencies like the RCMP, Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), and supporting bureaucracies like Justice Canada. We also highlight the role of Public Safety Canada (PSC) and their fusion centre known as the Government Operations Centre (GOC), which has emerged as a central hub for information sharing on social movements. Other policing agencies with important roles in the network are the Department of National Defence (DND) — who also operate an intelligence arm known as Communications Security Establishment Canada (CSEC) — and departments like Correctional Services Canada (CSC) and the Canadian Border Services Agency (CBSA), who have particularly active surveillance practices targeting Indigenous threats. Other departments and agencies detailed in this book include Transport Canada, who are fused through various “critical infrastructure” hubs, Natural Resources Canada (NRCan), the Privy Council Office (PCO), the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), as well as a litany of sub-agencies that have a high degree of autonomy under the larger departments. In total, a recent report from the Auditor General (2013) listed thirty-five departments and agencies that fund activities related to public security and anti-terrorism.

An additional and fundamental component of the security state’s policing and surveillance of Indigenous Peoples is the Indian Affairs bureaucracy. Now broken into two departments of Indigenous Affairs (one called the Department of Crown–Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, and the other Indigenous Services), we continue to use the term Indian Affairs (or INAC) in this book to link its current iteration with the long history of the department that, until very recently, had maintained

that name. As Indian Affairs features prominently in our narrative, it is worth noting how contemporary policing is shaped through its historical antecedents.

Scholars have detailed the exceptionalism that has characterized the surveillance of Indigenous Peoples in Canada (Comack 2012). Keith Smith (2009) has argued how Indian reserves have represented a system of segregation and surveillance that is unparalleled in the British Empire, with the possible exception of South Africa. Focusing on the settlement of the Prairies, he details the expansive network of surveillance coordinated by Indian Affairs and the NWMP. These settler colonists engaged in systematic observation, measurement, classification, and judgment of every aspect of Indigenous life. Far exceeding any aggregate of information in publicized census data, Smith (2009: 93–130) details the massive “tabular reports” created through this surveillance and how these practices produced representations of Indigeneity and post-colonial whiteness, ensuring that “the slightest deficiency, aberration, or stubborn endurance of ‘Indianness’ was singled out for further corrective action.” Smith (2009: 20) writes,

What appeared as the “Indian” was a collage of images that were often contradictory, but always inferior to Anglo-Canadians. The “Indian” was not mere fantasy, though, but an enduring political, economic, and social instrument. It was a device that bolstered the colonizers’ images of themselves as benevolently superior while at the same time ensuring the advancement of their material interests.

INAC’s historical framing of Indigenous inferiority juxtaposed with white settler superiority justified ongoing regimes of intervention and corrective measures under liberal notions of development. As a technology of rule, liberalism promotes notions of equality and inclusion, yet practices of settler colonialism have mobilized liberalism as an exclusionary force based on racialized hierarchies of progress and civilization. The extensiveness of the surveillance projects targeting Indigenous populations has served as the primary means of detecting and intervening in expressions of Indigenous autonomy or non-conformity with the settler colonial project.

An impressive repertoire of scholarship has detailed the magnitude of surveillance and policing of Indigenous populations as an aspect of settler colonialism. Our efforts are to detail contemporary surveillance practices that are entwined with these histories, specifically the ways in which the

“war on terror” has been mobilized to advance and further legitimize the scope of policing Indigenous Peoples. Not only has the “war on terror” produced a new lexicon of “extremism” for the security state to further entrench the targeting of Indigenous Peoples, but it has also flooded these security and policing agencies with new authorities and resources. Given the proliferation of security-related resources, it is illustrative how little public accounting has been published on the spending practices associated with this securitarian turn. In fact, our research has found only two detailed analyses of post-9/11 security spending: one from the non-profit Rideau Institute (MacDonald 2011) and the other from the federal Auditor General (2013). The Rideau Institute report, *Costs of 9/11*, is particularly instructive. Providing inflation-adjusted figures, they calculate the increase in spending within security-related departments. Their analysis from 2000 to 2011 shows that spending on security increased by \$92 billion (or \$69 billion when inflation is adjusted to 2011 values) based on spending projections had budgets remained in line with pre-2001 patterns. Though the figures compiled by the Rideau Institute include military spending — which dramatically inflate the overall figures — they detail how bureaucracies of the security state (our term) have tripled their budgets in a ten-year period. This burgeoning of the security bureaucracy creates conditions where security bureaucrats (or what Patryk Pawlak [2009] calls “securocrats”) justify their funding by finding newer and newer sources of threat.

Major beneficiaries of the security funding bonanza have been public police forces in Canada. By 2015, the total costs of policing in Canada have approached \$14 billion, up from less than \$7 billion in 2000 (Mazowita and Greenland 2015) and are likely to continue growing due to the entrenched powers of police unions and the political officials who do little to confront these interests. Meanwhile, the trend of accelerated police spending at the federal level will continue, as the Liberal government announced \$439 million in new security spending in their first budget (2015), which followed the passage of Bill C-51 in 2014 (the amended *Anti-terrorism Act*) by the Harper Conservatives immediately before the 2015 election. Moreover, despite making election promises to reduce powers given to security and policing agencies and curtail Bill C-51 (as lacklustre as the promises were), the Liberals are likely to follow the trend of granting more powers to policing and security agencies while pursuing modest reforms that allow a completely underfunded and under-mandated system of accountability and oversight to continue.

As the “war on terror” has gradually extended over the past decade, a spatial shift in its operations has gradually redirected the primary focus of its operations, resources, and attention from overseas (Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria) to domestic populations. While Muslim residents are the primary targets of this surveillance, the discursive expansion of “extremism” and “radicalization” has also been directed toward non-Muslim groups and actors as a means of rationalizing increased domestic surveillance.⁸ Given that we are living in what is increasingly a “surveillance society” that comprises layers of indiscriminate and systematic observation and classification practices (Bennett et al. 2014), the security state has expanded its practices of discriminate surveillance against those who are deemed suspicious. Much of this regularized surveillance takes place with no oversight or means of appeal. As we detail in this book, Indigenous movements are among the primary identities associated with “extremism”—although we also address how environmental groups have been lumped into the categories of extremism to rationalize routine surveillance.

Indigenous communities who challenge settler colonialism have always been labelled as treasonous outsiders, and the recent iterations of the “war on terror” have accelerated the practices of targeting Indigenous movements. In fact, the first known targets of a policing operation under the *Anti-terrorism Act* of 2001 was a joint RCMP–CSIS police raid against the British Columbia West Coast Warrior Society (Moore et al. 2015). Ostensibly the police were searching for weapons, and while no unauthorized weapons were found and no charges were laid, the two individuals targeted had participated in many years of Indigenous activism for organizations such as the Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs, United Native Nations, Native Youth Movement, Indigenous Sovereignty Network, and the West Coast Warrior Society (ibid.). Efforts to police Indigenous groups have intensified with the expansion of the “war on terror,” particularly as a result of the now widely invoked notion of “Aboriginal extremism.” As a concept, the notion of “Aboriginal extremism” was created by the national security agencies in an effort to expand their domain of surveillance and policing by using the language of the “war on terror.” Referred to as “mission creep” within criminological studies (Monahan and Palmer 2009: 624–28), the concept itself is a by-product of the “extremism” vernacular that has been invoked to rationalize the broader expansion of national security policing.

A key component of the category of “Aboriginal extremism” rests on its racialized character, itself a product of settler colonialism. As we detail

in our case studies, the category of “Aboriginal extremism” has been deployed against Indigenous movements that assert self-determination and challenge settler sovereignty as a delegitimizing tactic that has resulted in criminalization and systems of intensified policing. With an emphasis on intelligence collection and surveillance, Adam Barker (2009: 342) describes how “every [Indigenous] challenge [to settler authority] is met with increasing levels of control to the point that control becomes preemptive.” Surveillance practices like Project SITKA are undertaken by policing agencies with the unstated objective of mapping Indigenous activism, which allows for targeted police interventions to disrupt and/or criminalize prominent activists.

Scholarship on the policing of social movements has stressed how surveillance practices are often integral components of larger efforts at criminalization and movement suppression (Boykoff 2007; Earl 2011; Kinsman and Gentile 2010). Surveillance itself can promote a dangerous culture of suspicion and paranoia, producing cyclical patterns of (in) security. A consequence of these accelerators is that police use insecurity to rationalize increased “national security” resources; yet, we would stress that these policing practices have an additional productive impact in building closer relationships between the police and business community. By constructing the figure of a criminal and terrorist threat that is hedged against “Canadian interests,” the police reproduce their own image as the virtuous agents of control and position corporations as victims (and partners) who need protecting. These caricatures are amplified when the subjects of police scrutiny are racialized, particularly when police construct these protesters as unreasonable Natives or, as members of the RCMP have described them, members of Indigenous “sovereignty” movements or “Aboriginal extremists.”

In this book, we stress how policing entities have construed Indigenous movements as irrational, violent, and extremist threats, while simultaneously exalting themselves as reasonable and objective. Anchored in long-standing cultural repertoires of settler society, these processes code Indigenous claims as unreasonable and produce a common, shared attitude within the security state that perceives the unrelenting scrutiny of these movements as justified. Moreover, the inclusion of corporate partnerships within the security state under the rubric of “critical infrastructure protection” allows for the widespread surveillance against, and interventions in, Indigenous communities to become normalized as national security

practices aiming to protect economic interests and resource development. Through these relationships of the security state, policing and social control agencies have extended their roles as the protective arm of extractive capitalism.

EXTRACTIVE CAPITALISM, CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE, AND THE REPRODUCTION OF ORDER

Extractivism refers to a specific model of economic growth that prioritizes the extraction of resources to sell on international markets (Veltmeyer and Petras 2014). As a contemporary iteration of capitalism, an embrace of extractivism has particularly devastating consequences for the environment and the world's Indigenous Peoples who are being violently displaced in the drive to accumulate wealth from their lands. Canada has a long history of resource extraction and land theft, and the turn toward making Canada an "energy superpower" — as Harper put it — has intensified settler colonial efforts to control the land and resources of Indigenous communities. A push toward developing the tar sands and building pipelines to ship bitumen to foreign markets is a major element within this trend, and the security state has been an active player in advancing the development agenda of extractive capitalism through the widening domain of critical infrastructure protection.

As we detail throughout the case studies in this book, the umbrella of critical infrastructure has become a prominent element in the surveillance of social movements. Developed in the mid-2000s after the release of the National Security Strategy, the category of critical infrastructure expanded over the course of a decade to include numerous entities from railways and pipelines to nuclear factories (Monaghan and Walby 2017). Though critical infrastructure includes a wide array of sites, as well as natural disasters and "human induced" emergencies (Canada 2009a, 2009b), we document how security agencies and extractive corporations have used the umbrella to direct substantive resources toward issues of civil unrest — in other words, protest movements. As Tia Dafnos et al. (2016: 327) have noted, critical infrastructure has been invoked to pit "acts of indigenous sovereignty ... against acts of national security."

Prioritizing protest movements as national security threats under the umbrella of critical infrastructure is a product of integrating corporations into the expanded arena of the security state. Declassified notes from a "security briefing forum" between CSIS and the Canadian Association of

Petroleum Producers (CAPP) in 2007 detail how an unidentified CSIS agent told the group of corporate representatives that the changing domains of the “war on terror” meant “a transformed national security environment” that was moving “from national security to critical infrastructure protection” (CSIS 2012-27: 15). The CSIS presentation emphasized the move away from “national security” as military operations abroad toward the centrality of protecting domestic critical infrastructure through “enhanced information and intelligence sharing” between corporations and the security state (*ibid.*). Moreover, it is expressed as a means of establishing “partnerships” to integrate corporations into the security state. With a growing number of police–corporate collaborations, extractive corporations have the ability to supply intelligence to other partners of the security state, as well as a privileged position within the security state to influence the perception and labelling of certain threats. Given that 90 percent of what is considered critical infrastructure (pipelines, nuclear stations, hydro dams, airports, etc.) is owned by private corporations, our research shows how these corporations have become more than merely stakeholders — they are active policing partners.

Throughout our case studies, we highlight how an expanded security state actively delegitimizes Indigenous groups while also explicitly privileging the corporations and economic interests that profit from extractive capitalism. Although the police claim to be neutral and independent, we show how they actively support processes of Indigenous dispossession through the surveillance and criminalization of movements that assert Indigenous rights and claims to land. In many respects, the “war on terror” has further advanced a number of collaborative engagements between extractive capitalism and the security state, yet we also stress that policing and surveillance practices are constituted from their institutional histories and cultural repertoires. The current iterations of the security state are rooted in longer trajectories of policing, representing a current character of settler colonialism in a time that is increasingly defined by extractive capitalism and security governance.

Policing has long functioned as a technology to morally patrol these systems of values, particularly through the profiling of those “symbolic assailants” (Skolnick 1966) who do not fit the stereotypes of good citizenship. As a mechanism that has the ability to impose non-negotiated solutions backed by violence, policing is not only about the enforcement of criminal law but also the protection of a particular vision of Canadian

identities and values. This includes the promotion of capitalist development, the guardianship of moral notions of good and bad behaviour, the circulation of stereotypical images of enterprising youth versus troublesome youth, the perception of racialized gang or group behaviours, the monitoring of attitudes toward political or governmental authorities, and the ensemble of valourizations that are packaged into the stereotypes and expectations of being a “good Canadian.”

Building on critical accounts of policing, Elizabeth Comack (2012: 57–65) has borrowed from Richard Ericson’s (1982) work on police patrols to argue that the policing of Indigenous Peoples is a deeply racialized practice aimed at the “reproduction of order.” Comack (2012: 57) writes that, given the context of settler colonialism, the order that the police reproduce “is decidedly raced (as well as gendered and classed).” She explains this as a process of “surveilling the social spaces that they [police] are assigned to govern” and notes that “race and racialization are put into everyday policing practices as officers bring to bear the cultural frames of reference or stocks of knowledge that inform their work” (ibid.). In demonstrating that policing is about the reproduction of a settler colonial order (our term), Comack’s work borrows from Ericson’s insistence that police do not produce a “new” order. Rather, the order they are charged with reproducing is that of the status quo, and that status quo is fundamentally threatened by expressions of Indigenous autonomy that disrupt the settler colonial present.

Our aim in this book is to provide a detailed, empirical narrative of how the security state is a contemporary configuration that engages in the reproduction of settler colonial order. Animated by increasing practices at intelligence collection and pre-emption, pervasive efforts to control Indigenous populations are rationalized by notions of “law and order” but remain implicitly grounded in an eliminatory logic that desires to consolidate a post-colonial society without Indigenous counter-authorities. Particularly under the new discourse of “Aboriginal extremism,” we contend that the policing of these “extremisms” are far more illustrative of settler colonialism — and the anxieties of settler colonial authorities — than the groups and movements that the security state seeks to control. In fact, the Indigenous movements that are categorized as “extremists” have maintained a remarkable consistency in their politics and demands over the past five hundred years. These political demands are straightforward: self-determination, autonomy, nation-to-nation relations, and an end

to the violent interventions from settler colonial authorities and most importantly the institutions of the security state and the criminal injustice system. Those demands continue today, yet are met with the vilification and repression we document throughout this book. Instead of continued surveillance and additional funding for the security state, we suggest that there is only one pathway toward resolving the conflict between settler colonialism and Indigenous Peoples: decolonization.

DECOLONIZING THE CANADIAN (SECURITY) STATE

Decolonization in the context of a deeply rooted society of settler colonialism is a daunting challenge. As we demonstrate in this book, any movements that challenge the norms of settler colonialism will have to contend with the extensive powers of policing and surveillance from the security state, which is charged with the reproduction of settler colonial order. A transformative politics of settler decolonization has to contend with a consensus among Canadian political parties where Indigenous politics attain legitimacy only when they surrender claims of autonomy to the overarching authority of Canadian sovereignty. Moreover, the politics of settler decolonization will have to contend with pervasive racism in settler society that has long stigmatized Indigeneity as backwards, criminal, and a threat to the post-colonial fictions of progress and development.

Decolonization efforts are challenging because they must contend with the power of settler colonialism, which stems from its ability to translate unrelenting and uncategorically violent practices of governance into everyday, commonplace activities. In many ways, decolonization efforts remain politically diverse, located at multiple local sites of struggle, and indelibly impacted by colonial powers (Sium, Desai and Ritskes 2012). Likewise, settler colonialism is not a strategy of elite rule or a centralized mode of domination but a heterogenous form of domination. It draws its strength and continuation specifically from widespread and normalized feelings of what Mark Rifkin (2013) calls “settler common sense,” often producing mixed (sometimes contradictory) attitudes toward Indigenous Peoples and widespread complicity and complacency toward colonial systems of oppression. Often, the conflicting feelings can include empathy and a desire to assist as well as strongly ingrained notions of fairness and equality before the law, alongside cultural stereotypes of substance abuse, corruption, or dangerousness. An animating factor through these emotive dimensions of settler society is to regard Canadian governance