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Abstract

This article challenges political theorists to begin to rethink the global city as a space within which contingent encounters might be occurring in ways that are irreducible to the legacy of conquest within the system of nation-states alone, and which, paradoxically, might even become a venue through which indigenous peoples in general – and indigenous women in particular - could begin to achieve a greater degree of cultural autonomy than has so far been possible within a reservation or rural-based enframing.

Introduction

When the American Indian Movement (AIM) began to coalesce in the late Sixties, the main goal of the self-organized group was the protection of urban Indians from Civil Rights abuses at the hands of police, the courts and the prison system. Within a few years however, AIM and its affiliated groups could claim to have influenced a number of much larger successes, including the end of the Termination Act, and the official adoption of a policy of self-determination by the US government, which thereby sent out reverberations internationally, indicating that settler states could no longer simply determine policy without consulting indigenous peoples themselves and entering into government-to-government negotiations. What is most curious about this dramatic turnabout however, is how radically the spatiality from which it derived itself departs from the kinds of psychic clichés that are still routinely incorporated into social science scholarship, particularly that of International Relations (IR). While indigenous peoples are generally represented in such work as belonging to rural, parochial, 'out-of-the-way' environments (that are therefore irrelevant to global politics), what such images ignore is not only that the vast majority of Native Americans live in urban environments today - and that most of these 3 million have for several generations - but also that the entire late modern organization of Bureau of Indians Affairs (BIA) policy in the United States began not on the reservation, but in the place that Max Weber described as the site of the "settling together of the tribes", the space within which "International Relations" occur most often; the city.

As one of the primary metropolitan areas into which the hundreds of thousands of "terminated" Indians were relocated by the US government in the Fifties and Sixties, the Bay Area was one of the most important environments in which this now "diasporic" population arose. It was of course, the infamous 19-month occupation of Alcatraz Island in 1969-70 that initially drew attention to AIM, the plight of urban Indians, reservation Indians and the pan-Indian movement they hoped to inspire.

As Russell Means recalls:

Before AIM, Indians were dispirited, defeated and culturally dissolving. People were ashamed to be Indian. You didn't see the young people wearing braids or chokers or ribbon shirts in those days. Hell, I didn't wear 'em. People didn't Sun Dance, they didn't Sweat, they were losing their languages. Then there was that spark at Alcatraz, and we took off.4

Rather than reproducing the parochial image of Indianness that continues to invisibilize indigenous peoples within IR, in this paper I argue that the city is quite far from the antithesis of the "indigenous", and that, given its generally "cosmopolitan" sensibility, critical IR theory should begin to reorient its notions of what constitutes Indianness itself. If even the mayor of Philadelphia could note (in the wake of African-Americans rioting in the ghettoes) as far back as the early Sixties that “from here on in, the frontiers of the state pass to the interior of our cities”,5 surely critical IR theory can build on this to begin to recast our understanding of indigeneity. Particularly in an urban environment, the presence of indigenous peoples breaks down the prevailing ontopolitical distinctions that the "national", the "international" and the "subnational" rest upon, thereby confounding the very foundation of "IR" itself.

Perhaps it is no surprise then, that, in order to function, the discipline has seemed to require the discursive invisibilization of indigenous peoples as relevant actors within a world political order.6 Paul Virilio's argument that the mass migrations of the 20th century combined with the rise of globally-linked mass media has given rise to a "single global city" further confounds this invisibilization, since, like most other populations, contemporary indigenous peoples live primarily in the city rather than the country (while those who don't, do so virtually). With an urban Indian population of over 30,000, for instance, the Bay Area alone has more Native Americans living within it's political boundaries than any single reservation other than the Navajo in New Mexico. And the presence of "red ghettoes", populated by tens of thousands of displaced indigenous peoples throughout Western US cities like San Francisco, Los Angeles, Tucson, Portland and Seattle,
suggests at least as much conceptually speaking, as does the presence of displaced populations from other parts of the world.

While critical IR theory has its own trajectories (largely post-Marxist) that have periodically led it to consider indigenous peoples within the frames of world politics, notably, in the work of Michael J. Shapiro and Nevzat Soguk, this paper argues that the intersection of anarchism, indigenism and feminism is particularly well-suited as a conceptual tool to the relation of indigeneity and world politics, especially when considered within the framework of “the city” as the contemporary locale of the “frontiers of the state”. Because of the manner in which each of these threads confounds the binaries upon which IR relies (anarchism for liberty/equality, indigenism for nation/state and feminism for public/private) a powerful resonance machine is enacted between the three, through which the paradoxical reimagining of the city as indigenous, yet simultaneously radically pluralistic and egalitarian space, becomes possible.

Rather than suggesting only a different understanding of "International Relations" then, which would limit the approach to the affirmation of tribal sovereignty and cultural autonomy alone, I argue that urban indigeneity suggests an alternate form of relationality, one beyond the ontopolitics of "the nation" itself, but not necessarily in opposition to particular forms of it. Once the figure of "the Indian" has been rendered as irreducible to nature (as opposed to culture), to the country (as opposed to the city) and to the local (as opposed to the global), the multiplicity of Indianness, or, more exactly, of "indigeneity", becomes something that absolutely must be reckoned with by IR scholars, no longer as "international" or even "transnational", but rather, as transversal.

Anarchism

Rudolf Rocker, in his magnum opus Nationalism and Culture, famously defined anarchism as "the synthesis of liberalism and socialism, liberation of economics from the fetters of politics, liberation of culture from all political power, liberation of man by solidaric union with his kind". In order to clarify in what sense the liberation of economics from "the fetters of politics" could be described as "socialist", he goes on to cite Pierre Joseph Proudhon:

Seen from the social viewpoint freedom and solidarity are but different expressions of the same concept. By the freedom of each finding in the freedom of others no longer a limit, as the declaration of 1793 says, but a support. The freest man is the one who has the most relations with his fellow men.8
"The fetters of politics" then, are those forms of politics that, in Jaques Ranciere's terms, are actually antipolitical; they are those that seek to totalize a diverse polity under the rule of one particular group, whether that be white Afrikaaners in South Africa or party bureaucrats in the Soviet Union, rather than allowing for the necessarily messy, complicated, conflictual dynamics that coexistent multiplicity requires. Rather than economics being opened up to a truly popular governance then (which would require some commitment to freedom), in such an environment, it becomes the preserve of elites, who then 'plan' or 'market' the economy however they see fit. Rocker's argument for anarchism then, is that it resolves the problems that prevent liberalism and socialism alike from realizing their emancipatory capacities.

While socialism promises the realization of economic equality, it generally fails to deliver because it contains no clear commitment to social liberty. An anarchist perspective on the other hand, holds that "equality of economic conditions for each and all is always a necessary precondition for the freedom of man but never a substitute for it". And while liberalism promises the realization of social liberty, it too generally fails to deliver because it contains no clear commitment to economic equality. Thus, while a socialism influenced by liberalism necessarily leads to anarchism for Rocker, "liberalism alone could not attain this highest phase of definite intellectual development for the reason that it had too little regard for the economic side of the question". Interestingly, Rocker's definition of anarchism seems to overlap considerably with the term "radical liberalism" from contemporary American critical political theory, which has often used to describe the work of thinkers such as William Connolly (which already enjoys considerable influence within the critical wing of "IR theory").

However, just as the ontopolitical strictures of IR often render indigenous peoples invisible, so too has much of anarchist thought rendered its non-Western roots in the initial European encounter obscure. As Jack Weatherford argues in his book *Indian Givers: How the Indians of the Americas Transformed the World*, the respect for freedom that underpins liberalism and anarchism alike was by no means a "purely" European concept, if it was European at all. Giving the example of a pow-wow he attended in Fargo, North Dakota, Weatherford notes that, while the events may appear chaotic on the surface, underlying this more generally is a simultaneous respect for liberty and equality:

This seems to be typical of American Indian events: no one is in control. No master of ceremonies tells everyone what to do and no one orders the dancers when to appear. The announcer acts as herald or possibly as facilitator of ceremonies, but no chief arises to demand anything of anyone...the powwow grows in an organic fashion as dancers slowly become activated by the drums and the singing. The event unfolds as a collective activity of all the
participants, not as one mandated and controlled from the top. Each participant responds to the collective mentality and mood of the whole group but not to a single, directing voice”. Thus the differentiation between European and Native American notions of liberty: while Old World notions generally referred to collective freedoms, i.e., the freedom of one group from the domination of another, the notion of "individual" freedom as the freedom from the domination of the group itself (which also complexifies the meaning of equality) derived largely from European contact with Native Americans. As Weatherford puts it in relation to diary entries from the initial encounters, "for the first time the French and British became aware of the possibility of living in social harmony and prosperity without the rule of a king". This is particularly clear, he says, in the way that the European travelers' referencing of the lifeways of Indian tribes (such as the Hurons and the Iroquois) profoundly influenced the writings of political theorists such as Thomas More, Michel de Montaigne, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Paine and Alexis de Tocqueville, the initial thinkers to articulate the basic ideas of liberalism, socialism and anarchism alike.

Whether the accounts that were relied upon were completely accurate or not then, there is no doubt that the cultural and political differences between the Old World and the New World became the source of much inspiration for anarchism and statism alike. While thinkers like Thomas Hobbes referenced the New World as evidence for the necessity of the absolute power of the sovereign over those caught up in the "state of nature" (which, due to a racist image of Native Americans, he imagined as "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short"), others saw the possibility of living beyond law and money as something that could enable radically democratic ways of being. As Weatherford points out, Tocqueville, for one, argued that Native Americans showed more respect for liberty than had any of the ancient European polities, including that of Athens itself. And of course, Pierre Clastres' famous theory of the "society against the state" argued well into the twentieth century (based on his interactions with South American tribes), that the purpose of a tribal way of being was to ensure that no individual would come to prevail over any other. And while the signing of the Magna Carta in 1215 is sometimes cited as the origin of modern democracy, the manner in which it continued to privilege aristocratic authority suggests quite clearly that it was the contact between the Old World and the New World that consolidated the concept in Western political thought.

Thus, it is not enough to simply dismiss these theories derived from the image of the Noble Savage as "racist", because as Weatherford reminds us, "even though the picture grew romanticized and distorted, the writers were only romanticizing and distorting something that really did exist. The Indians did live in a fairly democratic condition, they were egalitarian, and they did live in greater
harmony with nature”. Modern liberal democratic ideals of “liberty, equality and fraternity” then, are irreducibly mestizo notions, deriving from the confluence of European and Indian ideas at once. And of course, much the same could be said for those that inspire the more radical variations on these same principles, which as Deleuze and Guattari have argued, “takes the criticism of its own time to its highest point”; these are socialism and anarchism.

One problem with many of the theories that have based their arguments on the images of Indianness that travelers brought back to Europe is that, while their images of the Noble Savage were not entirely “untrue” (in Weatherford’s sense, that is), they nevertheless did tend to relegate Indianness to particular sides of binary oppositions that have held sway within European worldviews ever since. For instance, the relegation of Indianness to nature rather than culture, to the country rather than the city, to the private rather than the public or to the local rather than the global, all serve to replicate this tendency. And while “nature” might be positively valued by a Rousseauian or negatively by a Hobbesian, the everyday dynamism of Indianness is lost in doing so, as is all of that which has developed out of their collective impact on Western political thought. What if, for instance, Indianness had been understood from the start as an irreducible composite of the cultural and the natural, the urban and rural, the public and the private and the local and the global, and what if that was what had been brought back to the Old World, so that Rousseau and Hobbes could develop their respective theories in response? If Weatherford is correct, we would certainly be living in a very different world today; and that is the task I would argue, that critical IR theorists are faced with by the specter of urban indigeneity, rethinking the prevailing images of Indianness, and the work they do to invisibilize that which, if it were completely integrated into the dominant social scientific thinking, would confound its most basic ontological principles, which emerged from the Old World / New World encounter in the first place.

One of the richest locations in which to begin such a project is the city; from Peter Kropotkin’s study of Mutual Aid in the Medieval City through Colin Ward’s The Child in the City and Murray Bookchin’s The Limits of the City, anarchists have often associated the urban with radical potentiality, which is interesting given the seemingly conflictual roots of anarchism with respect to the Noble Savage, insofar as it is understood as the antithesis of the urban. On the other hand, within those tendencies associated with deep ecology, such as “green anarchism”, the city has been eschewed as an anthropocentrizing instrument through which humans become separated from nature, alienated from the greater world of which they are a part.

Aside from Taiaiake Alfred’s work on anarcha-indigenism in Wasase: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom, the essay “Locating an Indigenous Anarchism” by Aragorn! is one of the most commonly read articles on the
intersection of anarchism and indigenism, and interestingly, it is one in which the status of the urban/rural relation figures prominently. The piece begins for instance, by imagining the burning of the cities, which he says have been made possible only by clear cutting, planting upon and paving over, as the first task an indigenous anarchism should take up (in a revolutionary situation). But what is interesting here is that, just as the infamous Alcatraz Occupation did, Aragorn! too begins in the city - not the reservation - even if it is the rural that he ultimately sees as more emancipatory. The reason that he cites for this is that the city is a kind of "non-place" (to cite a concept of Marc Augé), that alienates us from the natural world.

In contrast to this alienated non-environment,

An indigenous anarchism is an anarchism of place. This would seem impossible in a world that has taken upon itself the task of placing us nowhere. A world that places us nowhere universally. Even where we are born, live, and die is not our home. An anarchism of place could look like living in one area for all of your life. It could look like living only in areas that are heavily wooded, that are near life-sustaining bodies of water, or in dry places. It could look like traveling through these areas. It could look like traveling every year as conditions, or desire, dictated. It could look like many things from the outside, but it would be choice dictated by the subjective experience of those living in place and not the exigency of economic or political priorities. Location is the differentiation that is crushed by the mortar of urbanization and pestle of mass culture into the paste of modern alienation.17

And yet, as this essay demonstrates, the city has often become a "location" or a "place" of a different kind, one that at least potentially, allows for multiple ways of being-in-the-world to coexist in the same space, while, at its best, preventing sprawl and other such practices that might emerge (and that of course, presently do) when the city/country distinction is entirely broken down. Even if it has often been the case that coexistence within urban spaces has been hierarchically-ordered, there is no necessary reason for this, for, as Kropotkin has argued with respect to the medieval city in Europe,

No period of history could better illustrate the constructive powers of the popular masses than the tenth and eleventh centuries, when the fortified villages and market-places, representing so many 'oases amidst the feudal forest' began to free themselves from their lord's yoke, and slowly elaborated the future city organization...the more we begin to know the mediaeval city the more we see that it
was not simply a political organization for the protection of certain political liberties. It was an attempt at organizing, on a much grander scale than in a village community, a close union for mutual aid and support, for consumption and production, and for social life altogether, without imposing upon men the fetters of the State, but giving full liberty of expression to the creative genius of each separate group of individuals in art, crafts, science, commerce, and political organization.\textsuperscript{18}

The problem then, is not that Aragorn! does not imagine an indigenous anarchism to be pluralist or intersectional, as I would argue any serious radical politics must be. Indeed, he rather explicitly argues that an "indigenous anarchism" would not only be the anarchism of indigenous peoples themselves, but also of those non-indigenous peoples who especially value indigenous worldviews and lifeways. The problem that arises\textsuperscript{19} is the assertion that anarchism is only "part of a European tradition"\textsuperscript{20} rather than the result of a creolization of European thought, since, as Weatherford shows, it would never have become part of that theoretical legacy in the absence of the material encounter with North American indigenous peoples, whose various images became an avatar upon which Europeans deterritorialized their own legacy of political thought.

Further, when he makes the cogent point that decentralization requires a respect even for those forms of difference that make oneself uncomfortable, and that this would include racial and cultural instantiations of alterity, to my mind, this suggests the kinds of lessons more likely to be learned from urban rather than rural experience. Indeed, if any human creation has taught divergent populations the non-universality of their particular experience, it has been the city. And furthermore, because of the convergence of the most diverse lifeways and the most differentiated relations of power that it enacts, it is in the city that the liberty/equality dyad is most likely to be broken down, were such conflicts to actually occur.

\textbf{Indigenism}

Perhaps the abjection of the urban as always already indigenous within both IR and much indigenous theory then, can be explained by looking at indigenism more closely. In rejecting the nation/state binary, while asserting tribal sovereignty, much existing indigenous theory, such as that in Craig Womack's \textit{Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism}, seeks to argue for the primacy of the "nation" as opposed to the state, thereby effectively writing the "city" as indigenous space out of the argument altogether. Within Native American literary theory, over the course of the past two decades, another
strain of thought has arisen challenging this view, arguing in favor of a Native American literary criticism that, far from being "separatist", would be "cosmopolitan". Described by Matt Herman as the "Krupat - Warrior Debate", the argument of those supporting Arnold Krupat has been that Native American writing should not be sequestered to that of the local alone, but should also be considered both as part of the American and World literary canon.

While 'local' literature refers for him to tribally-specific writing, written for other Native American readers, 'indigenous' literature suggests writing that results from the interaction between tribal and non-tribal culture. In doing so, the hope of this "mixed blood strategy" has been that a polity that is necessarily interwoven with the coexistent multiplicity that marks everyday life today might be rendered as such, thereby increasing the likelihood that indigenous people's issues will be taken seriously rather than dismissed as "non-existent". For those who support Robert Allen Warrior, Jr. (such as Womack) however, indigenous cosmopolitanism is ultimately a non-alternative, insofar as it fails to procure the kind of group solidarity that would be capable of a truly decolonial politics; nationalism, of course, is the obvious alternative. This usually means support for traditional oral literature, rejection of Native American literature as "American" or "World" literature, and the valorization of contemporary struggles around tribal sovereignty, as opposed to more urban-oriented issues.

Thus, while Krupat argues for the value of Native American literature as a democratizing force that might well benefit indigenous people far more than nationalist approaches (by placing their issues not only on local, regional and national agendas, but also specifically global ones), Warrior holds that the earlier "resistance" model, tied to "Third World Literature" offers greater promise, because it doesn't give Indianness up to the national or global domain, thereby ostensibly allowing for greater cultural autonomy. But why this rigid distinction between autonomy and interconnectivity? Is it not possible to speak of Native American literature not only as representative of a Native America canon, but also of an American and World literature canon, without that "belonging" immediately signifying ownership? As Herman puts it, the problem with Warrior's argument is that it "commits two errors of underestimation...first, on the deconstructive capacity of the literary text, and second, on the potential for domestic solidarity-building across an ever expanding array of voices and interests that canonical status can enable". The emergence of Native American writers who embrace the cosmopolitan approach, in other words, renders such attempts to totalize what "indigenous" literature refers to, far more complicated. In short, rather than proceeding from the approach of declaring what it "is" or "is not", perhaps it would be more fruitful to consider the more open-ended one of "how it works".
How then, might reorienting the academic understanding of Native Americans not only as reservation-bound peoples, but also as urban cosmopolitans, change how they and other indigenous peoples are understood by critically-oriented scholars with respect to the ontopolitical commitments that underpin IR? Just as IR has often been concerned with issues of transnational migration, so too, might it be said that the tens of thousands of Native Americans living in a majority-minority metropolis like the Bay Area, regularly interact with immigrants from all over the world, while experiencing many of the same problems of acculturation (and resistance to it) that each of these groups do. And just as economic and other forces often compelled these populations to migrate, so too were Native Americans compelled, particularly with the BIA relocation program from the Fifties and Sixties, which were economic and political at once. As Susan Lobo’s book, *Urban Voices: The Bay Area American Indian Community* indicates, one of the primary ways that the “relocated” found some sense of solace was in the “cooperative, multi-tribal community” centered around the Intertribal Friendship House in Oakland, which was later reproduced in the form of the ad-hoc “United Indians of All Tribes” group that organized the Alcatraz Occupation and gave rise to the modern Native American rights movement.

And, not only was the community multiracial, but many of the younger urban Indians were themselves (after three generations of living amongst one another) multiracial, not to mention multiracial. One review of the book in *News From Native California* emphasizes the multiplicity of urban Indian lives as well as the cultural specificities that they often retained, perfectly: “written in multigenerational, polyphonic voices, the book captures the intricate web of relationships that have been tended to and cared for by generations of city dwellers who more often than not retain dynamic ties with their home communities”. And in the introduction, Lobo states that for urban Indians in the Bay Area, “the community itself is not fundamentally a place, but rather a network of relatedness, of people linked to one another because of family, tribe, shared experiences, and shared understandings about those experiences. Some have said, ‘we are all family’ or ‘we are the urban tribe’, and this is a part of what we mean when we say ‘all my relations’.”

More pointedly, and more revealingly for liberal social science disciplines like IR, she goes on to elaborate on the impetus for the project. In addition to the familiarity they expected many Native Americans to have with the subject matter,

[w]e also realized that people, especially non-Indian people, not involved in these communities were very frequently oblivious to the very existence of Indians in the city. Compared to the vast amount of written work regarding Indians in historical contexts and within specific cultural traditions, very little has been written about
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contemporary Indian urban experiences and almost nothing in the voices of those who have lived those experiences. We searched the social science literature—almost nothing; fiction—almost no mention of Indians living in urban areas; the popular press, media, and journalism—an occasional sensational and usually negative stereotype-laden account. Gerri, Marilyn, and Sharon on the editorial committee and others who work to provide services of all types within the Indian community have been confronted on a daily basis with the profoundly negative effects of the Indian community's "invisibility" to the population at large, including those people in federal, state, and local agencies, and those who might otherwise potentially fund and support Indian service programs and other activities. An urban Indian community countered all existing mainstream stereotypes: "Indians in cities, no way!" (Whispered and hardly ever said directly to one's face.) "But I thought all Indian people lived on reservations in rural areas or . . . were dead."26

In short then, what I am arguing here is that if one were to take seriously the origin of the term "indigenism", not so much in Ward Churchill's meaning (which is closer to Warrior and Womack's), but in that of the Mexican anthropologist Guillermo Bonfil Batalla, one would have to recognize the subterranean Indianness for instance, of the millions of Mexicans and other Latinos living in the area as well, not to mention the deep cultural fabric of the United States itself. The cultural recognition by the mestizo majority of the "Mexico Profundo", the Mexico deeper than its Eurocentric surface, that Batalla hoped would help to realize indigenismo's project of indigenous self-determination, could at the very least arrive at a more modest parallel within critical IR theory by recognizing the presence of Native Americans within urban space, that is, where, as Philadelphia's mayor insists, "the frontiers of the state" now reside, as a population that in its diasporic displacement, confounds the ontological commitments of the discipline itself.

**Feminism**

Once combined with the anarchist and indigenist sensibilities I have attempted to amplify here (which break down the liberty/equality and nation/state distinctions), feminism's critique of the public/private distinction becomes all the more powerful with respect to disciplines like IR, dedicated as they are to the ontopolitical commitments of late modern liberalism. Indeed, if Native Americans are routinely dismissed as merely domesticated, "subnational" populations (and thus irrelevant to such discourses), an obvious relation immediately extends to the feminized oikos, which at least since the time of Aristotle, has been understood as the site of the 'non-political'. Both, we might
say, are subject to a similar kind of “double exclusion” whereby, although in some manner they are included within the political, it is precisely in their inclusion that they are excluded, just as it is in their exclusion that they are included, insofar as, in the late modern period, both become the biopolitical object of administration. Thus, while there have been some gains amongst both Native Americans and women over the past several decades, the public/private distinction has only really changed insofar as the structures of inclusion and exclusion have become indistinguishable.

Indeed, as Kathy Ferguson notes in *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*, rather than decreasing the demands placed upon women, the primarily liberal version of the rejection of the "cult of true womanhood" ultimately expanded them, given that their integration into mainstream American society was predicated upon the marketization of "the political" (or to put it otherwise, the expansion of "the private" in the guise of the expansion of "the public"). As she explains, in this period, "the tendency to seek refuge in private pursuits is amplified even further as bureaucratization intensifies, because the routinization of work and the absence of avenues of participation and self-expression in bureaucracy further encourage individuals to seek refuge in off-work satisfactions".27

If anything, far from receding into the netherworld of a benighted patriarchal past, the Aristotelian domain of the oikos has dramatically expanded along with neoliberalism's disfiguration of "the public". In such a system, the very existence of Native American women in the city serves as a double threat to the relegation of femininity and indigeneity to the superfluity of the "private", thereby rendering their lives more precarious than ever. As one account of the post-relocation experience has it, "unlike their prominent role in communities back home on the reservations, urban Indian women were not even marginal; they were the unseen and received less respect from the urban mainstream. Feeling helpless and powerless, they became more dependent on their husbands until they could form circles of friends and relatives that took time to establish in urban neighborhoods and at Indian centers".28

It would seem then that, as would be appropriate for an entity of such complexity, the city has been both the bane and the boon of late modern indigeneity; for as we saw with the discussion of the Intertribal Friendship House, it was through the ethos of relationality and (in a diverse urban environment), the complexification of "Indianness" itself, that urban Indians began to overcome the difficulties of the metropolis, while building new forms of community and relationality that had not existed previously. Andrea Smith's book *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* is particularly relevant here, it would seem, especially in the manner in which she emphasizes the intersectionality (rather than the "additivity") of the different modalities of
power experienced by Native American women. Subjected to practices of sterilization and a culture of rape, these women are not merely scapegoated, she argues, but are "biologized" - they are rendered as "internal enemies", objects of state domestication, administration and eradication. Both “present”, in order to be rendered governable subjects and “absent” in order to render the founding violence of the nation-state imperceptible, Native American women are reduced to the precarious status of bare life, forced to perform these nuances of "present absence" as the situation requires. Whether marked as "unclean" and therefore in need of ethnic cleansing, or "sexually perverse" and therefore in need of reform, Native American women are never allowed to escape their "non-status status", lest either their eradicability or governability fall into question.

The police removal of homeless urban Indians from the core of Canadian cities such as Calgary and Saskatoon to their outskirts in the dead of winter (which has lead to their freezing to death on numerous occasions) certainly has its parallels in the cities of the United States, with their sterilization campaigns and other such activities. Indeed, the experiences of urban Indian women in particular, as the most vulnerable subjects of termination and relocation policy, necessarily introduce such intersectionalities, not only because they are Native, but even more because they are urban, and as such, they are both the greatest victims of and the greatest threats to the ontopolitical foundations of IR, which requires the relegation of both to the oikos. As Smith notes, "native women as bearers of a counter-imperial order...pose a supreme threat to the dominant culture". Her further argument then, that Native American ontologies "affirm the interconnectedness of all things" both enables a thinking beyond the nation-state and the seeming interminability of the United States itself (as well as IR), while implicitly articulating the possibility of the kinds of horizontal interconnectivities that enable social change and a form of political thought that is as radical as it is nuanced.

Dorothy Olkowski’s argument, that feminism should be understood as a critique of representation, in particular, the representation of women, is prescient here. Building on the work of Elizabeth Grosz and Gilles Deleuze, Olkowski argues that representation has historically served the political function of constructing an image of otherness as a "fixed model" (such as that of "present absence" mentioned above). By presenting monolithic identities as the basis from which a politics of difference should proceed (as though they were not themselves composed of difference), thinkers and actors often reify precisely those avatars that enable biopolitical governance. Rather, she says, the real challenge is to think both forms of difference as sites of the political at once, so as to both overcome the reification of those identities produced within contingent temporal and spatial power arrangements, and to enable the more practical task of emancipating those subjected through them. As she puts it, "what
interests me is linking the analysis of existing conditions to the critique of the structure of representation to produce the ruin of representation, the ruin of hierarchically ordered time and space".32

In the case of urban Indians, one might say that the representation of Indianness that leads Lobo’s non-Indian interlocutors in the Bay Area to assume that “all Indian people live on reservations in rural areas or . . . are dead”, is the same one that excludes urban Indian women from perceptibility at all. Indeed, urban Indian women are perhaps the most marginalized of all Native Americans, even while, given their precarious locus of enunciation, they may well possess the richest form of intersectionality of any minority group within the city as such, thereby enabling new forms of “interconnectedness” and, under the right conditions, resistance.

Although urban Indian women live some of the most precarious lives in the United States, perhaps Agamben’s argument that the city itself is a space within which bare life can “free itself” should be more carefully thought through - that is, if the state’s domesticating representation of “Indianness” is to actually be undone. As he argues so powerfully in Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life, “the decisive fact is that, together with the process by which the exception everywhere becomes the rule, the real of bare life - which is originally situated at the margins of the political order - gradually begins to coincide with the political realm, and exclusion and inclusion, outside and inside, bios and zoe, right and fact, enter into a zone of irreducible indistinction. At once excluding bare life and capturing it within the political order, the state of exception actually constituted, in its very separateness, the hidden foundation on which the entire political system rested. When its borders begin to be blurred, the bare life that dwelt there frees itself inside the city and becomes both subject and object of the conflicts of the political order, the one place for both the organization of State power and emancipation from it”.33

Conclusion

This paper began by positing that rather than essentializing what indigenous peoples "are", perhaps what needs to be argued today is that like most "minority" peoples, what unites their subjectivities with those of others currently taken seriously by IR, is the fact of having been "displaced", and that just as for them, this results from the global rise of the nation-state as the preeminent instrument of colonialism. Once a nation-state can intervene into what had previously been a shared space of indigenous peoples, and sometimes as in Mexico, of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples, it can then domesticate the remnant as colonized subjects while representing them as parochial and non-cosmopolitan. Carl Schmitt’s insight that if it hadn’t been for the colonial encounter with the New World, there would not have been an "Old World"
either, and thus no concept of "world" politics at all (since the earlier nomos of the earth as "particular" rather than "universal" would still prevail), speaks volumes here.34

The image of "authentic" indigeneity then carries over into disciplines like IR, which reinforce state authority by covering over not only the sizeable Native American diaspora in the global cities, or even the urban within the rural communities, as Virilio might argue, by way of print and electronic media, but also the historical continuity of the city as a major social form in the pre-Colombian era. For instance, the first major city in North America was not Philadelphia, but the trade and transportation center of Cahokia, which consisted of some 40,000 inhabitants over eight hundred years ago, whereas no more than 30,000 residents lived in even the largest of America's colonial cities until well into the Nineteenth century. In Mesoamerica, the half-million city-dwellers of Tenochtitlan constituted one of the world's largest urban zones as recently as the Sixteenth century, as was also the case with the Incan city of Cuzco, which boasted a quarter-million.35 Given that these early indigenous cities served as trading zones not only for a single tribe, but also for multiple tribes, the notion of the "global city" is not so foreign an element of indigeneity as it has been represented to be. Rather, just as Kropotkin argued with respect to Europeans, the city undoubtedly also served Amerindians as spaces that facilitated "a close union for mutual aid and support...[for] each separate group of individuals" inhabiting or passing through them. Just as William Cronon has argued with respect to the "frontier" then, that prior to the consolidation of a settler state's territory into an assemblage of regions, there is a period in which a "peculiar fluidity" between settlers and indigenous peoples will emerge, perhaps we might argue with Krupat, but in a manner that he himself did not, that within the global city itself, a "new frontier" is emerging that might point beyond the hegemony of the nation-state itself, of which the New Social Movements were the first indication.

If such an argument were to be made, and scholarly foci redirected as such, state-oriented disciplines like IR would have a much more difficult time reducing indigenous peoples down to just merely "subnational" rather than the "international", or even (as I would argue), "postnational" populations that like everyone else, they are today. Furthermore, Andrea Smith's argument that by questioning the nation-state as an institution, critical scholars enable the thinking of "nation" as separate from "state" can thereby be extended to the "city" as well, in which, as Philadelphia's mayor seems to have abruptly realized, multiple "nations" exist within a shared space, and which can also be thought as separate from "state".36

The challenge then, it would seem, is to begin to rethink the global city as a space within which contingent encounters might be occurring in ways that are
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irreducible to the legacy of conquest alone, and which, paradoxically, might even become a venue through which indigenous peoples could begin to achieve a greater degree of cultural autonomy than has so far been possible within a reservation or rural-based enframing precisely because of the coexistent multiplicity that the city entails. When we hear Means argue that AIM "really took off" in the wake of the Alcatraz Occupation of ’69-’70 in the San Francisco Bay, we should remember that this was the case, at least partially, because movements of multiple minority groups were occurring simultaneously throughout the nation’s cities, just as many different tribes were cooperating through ad-hoc institutions such as United Indians of All Tribes. Kropotkin’s celebrated medieval city then, as the space in which divergent groups were able to finally "begin to free themselves from their lord’s yoke" and create a common space "without imposing upon men the fetters of the State", is therefore particularly suggestive today, with respect to the global city.

While there is no doubt that in the wake of the so-called "revitalization" campaigns of the last few decades, the late modern city increasingly constitutes what Neil Smith calls the "New Urban Frontier" (in which moneyed "new pioneers" routinely colonize historically majority-minority neighborhoods), one cannot ignore that while the demographic constitution of neighborhoods is constantly shifting along with such processes, "majority-minority" is nevertheless the greatest trend in terms of the demographic constitution of the metropolis as a whole, and that, as we have seen, unprecedented, cross-cultural solidarities often arise out of this complex process of urban becoming. As Cronon has put it with respect to what I would call the "old frontier", "living at the edge of empire generally meant living where the power of the central state was weak, where economic activity was poorly regulated, and where cultural innovation met few obstacles. Far from bearing the iron imprint of empire, many frontier communities fostered a genuine mixture, or at least coexistence, of European and native traditions (and eventually African and Asian traditions as well) in which no side enjoyed clear cultural superiority". Michael J. Shapiro adds that what this suggests for contemporary critical theory (including it’s IR equivalent) is "a model in which the western frontier is a place of encounter between disparate meaning cultures [that necessarily] involved a coinvention, as whites and Indians alternatively fought and traded, struggled and cooperated to create ‘new landscapes, new property systems, new social relations’ [until] the fluid situation of encounter gave way to an imposed regionalization, based on the extension of Euro American proprietary practices and political economy, the coinvention ended, and autocratic and unreliable white words took over the West".

Rather than acquiescing to the narrative of Europeans unilinearly ‘discovering’ Native Americans then, such that the latter would possess no agency, Cronon’s and Shapiro’s more nuanced accounts enable an understanding of at least
some of the initial stages of the encounter as 'mutually' constituted. My question then is, could not a similar argument be made for at least some aspects of the majority-minority cities, such as San Francisco, in which the vast majority of diasporic indigenous peoples live today? If so, then IR, like the other social science disciplines, will have to face up to the history of the state's violent domestication of indigenous peoples and its subsequent representation of them as parochial and non-cosmopolitan, as this has always been part and parcel of the imperative to render them not only invisible, but non-existent as such.
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