Cultural Studies

Cultural Studies

ISSN: 0950-2386 (Print) 1466-4348 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rcus20

Introduction: Cultural production under multiple colonialisms

Dia Da Costa & Alexandre E. Da Costa

To cite this article: Dia Da Costa & Alexandre E. Da Costa (2019) Introduction: Cultural production under multiple colonialisms, Cultural Studies, 33:3, 343-369, DOI: 10.1080/09502386.2019.1590436

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2019.1590436

Published online: 17 Mar 2019.

CULTURAL STUDIES
2019, VOL. 33, NO. 3, 343–369
https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2019.1590436

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Introduction: Cultural production under multiple colonialisms

Dia Da Costa and Alexandre E. Da Costa

Humanities, Social Sciences, and Social Justice Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

ABSTRACT

In this introduction to the special journal issue, we elaborate a multiple colonialisms framework that allows us to examine the complex relationalities of multiple and converging colonial relations in historical and contemporary contexts within which cultural production does its work. Through examples of cultural production from the Americas and Asia, Special Issue contributors analyse rarely-recognized sites of colonialism that bear a palimpsestic relationship to other articulations that are more commonly legible *as* colonialism. Such an approach makes new analytical connections and gives greater depth to conventional theorizations of coloniality and decolonization. We also illustrate the centrality of the scholarship of Indigenous, Black, and Dalit-Bahujan scholars to the framework, especially the ways in which their work challenges our collective and accumulated racialized and colonial unknowings and illuminates what often remains unthinkable in conventional analyses of cultural production and the colonial contexts of their making. Overall, rather than analytically imply pluralism and equivalence among varied colonialisms, we argue that a multiple colonialisms framework enables cultural studies scholarship to dwell on the relationality, contradictions, and incommensurabilities generated within converging structures and multiple articulations of colonial and racialized violence across spaces. Weaving the various contributions into the framework, we invite readers to consider what histories, structures, and relationships help to explain why actually existing colonialities remain illegible as such in the particular context of each paper, and what that implies for solidarity and decolonization struggles. We hope that highlighting the specific creative methodological practices and significant spatial and temporal rethinking that a multiple colonialisms approach can generate incites conversations about how we might enrich theorizations of coloniality and decolonization.

KEYWORDS Multiple colonialisms; racism; casteism; colonial unknowing; cultural studies; Indigenous; Black; Dalit-Bahujan scholarship

Introduction

Colonialism is traditionally defined as an occupying foreign power that seizes Indigenous land and exploits the labour of the colonized, while imposing its

CONTACT Dia Da Costa ddacosta@ualberta.ca; Alexandre E. Da Costa adacosta@ualberta.ca

systems of governance, language, and culture. Although this broad definition is used as shorthand to apply across contexts, in fact, as scholars have demonstrated, it fails to capture the complex life of colonial forms, practices, and conditions across different and converging contexts, which as a result can remain illegible as colonialism. When Indigenous activists stand in solidarity with Muslim people against the travel ban in the United States to proclaim 'No ban on stolen land', they are arguably standing against multiple colonialisms – the colonization of Turtle Island and the histories of racialized coloniality upon which contemporary Islamophobia is founded (Monkman 2017). As a PoC residing in what is now Canada, at a teach-in in 2017, Dia Da Costa challenged non-Indigenous, non-Black PoC for our role in reproducing white settler violence on Treaty 6 territory (Alberta, Canada). After all, PoC are educated into anti-Indigeneity under multiple colonialisms. As Pakistani Muslim feminist Shaista Patel notes, 'some of us came here from post-colonies where we received a colonial education that instilled in us all the skills required for upholding white supremacy' (Patel et al. 2015, p. 12). We can be adept at upholding colonial white supremacy in settler states for various reasons: because we were taught how to do so under another colonialism elsewhere and we continue to carry that lesson in our histories, memories, and bodies, and perhaps because we aspire to belonging through a multicultural framework that racializes us as outsiders and allows racial discrimination to persist while also socializing us into settler narratives of meritocracy and anti-Indigenous practices. Learning to recognize multiple colonialisms, then, allows us to trace converging and coeval structures and histories within our lived experiences, analyses, and politics in the present.

In this Special Issue we articulate what is gained when we situate cultural production in the context of multiple colonialisms in order to examine the complex relationalities of multiple and converging colonial relations in historical and contemporary contexts within which cultural production does its work. Focusing on examples of cultural production from the Americas and Asia, we analyse rarely-recognized sites of colonialism that bear a palimpsestic relationship to other articulations of colonialism that are more commonly legible *as* colonialism. Rather than imply pluralism and equivalence among varied colonialisms, a multiple colonialisms framework enables us to dwell on the relationality, contradictions, and incommensurabilities generated within converging structures and multiple articulations of colonial and racialized violence across spaces. In foregrounding coloniality in the study of historical representations and relationships (Patel, Morton), visual culture (Hampton, Misri), popular culture (Upadhyay, Mays, Frauts), and contemporary challenges to decolonizing cultural production (Da Costa, Larasati, Mookerjea), the papers in this Special Issue collectively demonstrate the specific creative methodological practices and significant spatial and temporal rethinking such an approach can generate. Our introductory framing (alongside the papers in

this issue) brings Indigenous, Black, and Dalit-Bahujan scholarship into conversation to build a multiple colonialisms approach that enriches theorizations of coloniality and decolonization.[1] We believe that seeing coloniality as unexceptional and pervasive, as multiply-articulated in form and condition – historically and in the present – provides urgently needed direction for the field of Cultural Studies, because it allows us to develop a more extensive understanding of anti-colonial politics and decolonizing cultures across the contemporary world. After all, if we can't take a complex and multiple view of the contexts of colonialism, attending simultaneously to their relationality and their incommensurability, then we are unlikely to recognize moves to decolonize cultural production when we see them.

In the fall of 2015, when we began organizing the workshop at the University of Alberta that led to this Special Issue, our focus was on reimagining creative economy through a critical, regional, and transnational perspective grounded in feminist, development, area, cultural, and decolonial studies. We also imagined bringing work on the Americas and Asia into conversation, because Asia typically gets sidelined in analyses of Atlantic histories of colonialism and racism (Lowe 2015). Yet, the focus on creative economy revealed its limitations as contributors' work spoke to different histories and spaces of colonialism and cultural production. Coloniality, much more than creativity and 'creative economy', concerned participants. Indeed, colonial capitalism appeared centrally in papers that were otherwise focused on creative economy.

By the time the workshop took place in April 2017, the intersections of various temporal and spatial histories of colonialism and imperialism were driving our conversations. Various contributors took as central to their work an engagement with questions of Indigenous dispossession, anti-Black racism, casteism, and subaltern political struggles.[2] The dialogue at the workshop motivated us to foreground our collective contributions to the task of situating (decolonizing) cultural production within multiple colonialisms. We place the term decolonizing in parentheses not least because we follow those who have noted that 'decolonization is not a metaphor' (Tuck and Yang 2012), and because we view any context of decolonization as a complex, contradictory process of anti-colonial struggle without guarantees. Rather than delineate what should count as decolonizing cultural production in a definitive way, which we cannot do in any case as white and Brahmin scholars, our goal is modest and aims to collectively highlight the complex palimpsest of colonial relations within which such a question has to be posed in the first place.

Acknowledging complicities

Juxtaposing multiple contexts of colonialism and knowledge production requires that we acknowledge our complicities in multiple and related

systems of oppression by specifying 'the vectors of similarity, continuity, and difference' (Frankenberg and Mani 1993, p. 297). By naming complicity, we as the authors of this introduction mean to highlight how we are willy-nilly beneficiaries of multiple and intersecting structures of violence against the subordinated. Furthermore, we mean to highlight our particular positionalities, and the ways in which these play out in the frameworks we adopt and the analyses we generate. Rather than assert that there is racism but *we* are not racist (Bonilla-Silva 2010), that there is casteism but *we* are not caste supremacists, that there is colonialism but *we* are not colonizers, we, along with the authors in this issue, write from varied positionalities knowing that we occupy complex locations within multiple structures of intersecting oppressions. This approach is particularly crucial because our volume is dominated by contributions from scholars who would be readily categorized as people of colour in the North American academy.

Our volume also includes authors who identify as white settlers (A. Da Costa, Morton, Frauts), Black and Saginaw Anishanaabe (Mays), and Black (Hampton). These Black, Indigenous, and white positionalities and relationships have been the focus of much theorizing in the academy, and the authors in this Special Issue variously attend to the challenges of writing within and against histories of violence. Mays' work, for example, is grounded in an urban US landscape, and from the context of his history in this space, he writes about Indigenous and Black presence and absence, work and displacement, worldviews, and their deeply uneven legibility in Detroit, which demonstrates varied relations to colonization and racialization in general and specific terms.

Likewise, it is important to clarify that the white-identifying contributors, and the authors of this introduction, view whiteness as internally heterogeneous. That is, there is a difference between A. Da Costa's Latinx whiteness with roots in Brazil and its history under North American imperialism compared with Morton's Anglo North American whiteness, for instance. Nonetheless, despite this internal differentiation whiteness is paramount to violence within the larger processes that have brought and continue to bring differently positioned people into relation through multiple colonialisms. Noting the paramount violence of whiteness indicates that not all complicities are equivalent. The white-identifying scholars have sought to foreground the critical analyses and experiences of Black, Indigenous, and People of Colour (BIPoC) scholars in understanding the histories, mechanisms, and consequences of Indigenous dispossession, anti-Blackness, and racism in various local and global contexts (see, for example, Frauts and Morton). Despite thoughtful engagements that refuse to repeat damage-centred narratives of Indigenous (Tuck 2009) or Black peoples (Hartman 1997), the contradictions of white scholars using BIPoC scholarship are

many, including erasure, appropriation, and the risk of reproducing whiteness itself.

Beyond Black, Indigenous, and white positionalities, however, the editors also want to follow the lead of non-BI scholars of colour, Shaista Patel, Ghaida Moussa, and Nishant Upadhyay (2015), who poignantly highlight the importance of naming rather than evading the specific positionalities *among* people of colour. After all, in the context of multiple colonialisms, it matters that the non-Indigenous, non-Black People of Colour contributors theorize coloniality as Brahmins hailing from the casteist, anti-Muslim, and colonizing state of India (D. Da Costa, Misri, Upadhyay, Mookerjea), as Pakistani Muslim (Patel), and as an Indonesian Muslim immigrant (Larasati) whose family was targeted by the Indonesian state's political genocide during the Cold War. And all of us are citizens or permanent residents of the imperial, colonial capitalist, heteropatriarchal North American states of Canada and the United States. The broad and evasive label of People of Colour conceals much more than it reveals (Patel 2016, 2018, Upadhyay 2016). To take just one vector, understanding coloniality in India and its diaspora is inextricably linked to precolonial and still-colonial histories of caste. Using a multiple colonialisms approach from this positionality, then, calls for a richer account of coloniality itself. These distinct People of Colour positionalities, alongside Black, Indigenous, and white ones, inform our divergent approaches to studying cultural production under multiple colonialisms. Within these combined and varied engagements, we hope, lie the kernels of further conversation and resistance.

Multiple colonialisms

The colonial present: pervasive and obscured

By multiple colonialisms, we, the authors of this introduction, indicate first of all, that we live in a colonial present (Fanon 1968, Said 1993, Larocque 2010, Byrd 2011, Jackson 2012, Battiste 2013, Lowe 2015) and that this present is marked by multiple and varied articulations, times, and spaces of coexisting and converging colonialisms. As scholars living on Turtle Island, it is still not redundant to note that we inhabit colonized lands, since this acknowledgement is typically left to Indigenous scholars and scholars attentive to settler colonial logics to highlight. We also live in a colonial present regardless of the areas of the world our scholarship might focus upon, because so-called postcolonial lands remain colonized spaces in innumerable ways (Fanon 1968, Said 1993). In saying this, we follow the lead of several different strands of critique emerging within and against postcolonial theory (addressed in greater detail in the next section of this introduction). Attending to settler colonial violence, Indigenous scholars have highlighted the fact that

colonialism never ended in places like North America. Chickasaw scholar Jodi Byrd (2011, p. 132), for example, highlights with great clarity the problem with a term like 'internal colonialism' that 'acknowledges the colonization of Indigenous peoples at the same time that it disavows that colonization by making "economic disparity" stand in for "Indians" in the US context'. In other words, when Indigenous Peoples are categorized as just another instance of 'internal colonialism', the concept itself fails to get at the specificity of genocide and ongoing colonialism. Byrd insists that scholars not collapse processes of racialization and colonialism but rather attend to the specificities of each form of violence among the variously colonized and racialized (pp. 133–134).

We follow Byrd's lead in our attempt to articulate the specificities of multiple colonialisms and racializations with a view to furthering a *relational* understanding of ongoing settler colonialism with colonization via imperial war, military borders, colonization through enslavement and carcerality, colonization facilitated through changing state systems, colonization generated via corporate plunder, development projects, and conservation-led displacement, and various uneven forms of migration (forced, indentured, refugee, and voluntary) that foster ongoing settlement on Indigenous lands. Despite claims that, in particular spatial contexts, colonialism ended with decolonization, we live in a still pervasively colonial present constituted by enduring and entrenched forms of racialized exploitation, cultural subjugation, and dispossession and extraction within a system of global white supremacy (Mills 1997).

The point is not that racialization and colonial processes are one and the same, or that neoliberal capitalist development and colonialism are the same. Rather, we seek to trace the ways in which, for example, corporate extraction under the threat of militarized state violence refuses the label of colonialism because it is done in the name of the 'public good' of citizens' development, even if citizenship itself is severely tested if not entirely compromised in those nation-states that condone such occasions of violence. Race scholars challenge the notion of the contemporary moment being labelled as 'post-racial' because it disciplines conventional understandings into not being able to name and combat racism. Indeed, the label of 'post-racial' for the contemporary historical conjuncture dictates that racism be seen as something else, as prior and over, or as not present at all in the systematic ordering of populations (see for example Stoler 1997, Hesse 2004, 2011, Goldberg 2015, Lentin 2016, A. Da Costa 2016). Likewise, challenging the conventional vision of the present as postcolonial is necessary because of the ongoing conditions and outcomes of the takeover of land, disposability and elimination of racialized peoples, racialized exploitation of labour, mass incarceration and criminalization of poverty and protest, the colonization of representational practices, and so forth.

Because it resists viewing the colonial present as unprecedented or exceptional, we believe the multiple colonialisms framework, counter-intuitively perhaps, opens up the possibility of imagining potential in times that often inspire intense despair. In 2016, Sisseton-Wahpeton scholar Kim Tallbear noted that what Donald Trump, the President of the United States, embodies is not new but rather 'the clown version of white supremacy and anti-Indigenous sentiment', which has been pervasive since the inception of the settler colonial United States (TallBear 2016). She was arguing against liberal articulations of the loss of 'American national values' under Trump, values that fail to recognize centuries of white settler colonialism and racial violence in the US. Nor is Trump's violence unprecedented internationally, even in contexts conventionally understood as postcolonial like India where immunity for the casteist, fascist forces that regularly engage in Hindu majoritarian and heteropatriarchal capitalist violence is a normal part of governance. The recognition of coloniality as unexceptional is generative in such cases because it allows us to see, name, and challenge colonial violence wherever it is erased – erased, that is, either by normalization or because colonial violence is more readily legible as something else, such as nationalism. And nationalism is especially illegible as colonial violence when it is grounded in histories of anti-colonial resistance.

At least since Frantz Fanon (1968), we have known that one of the pitfalls of national consciousness is that it obscures the colonial-capitalist continuities that the national bourgeoisie hold onto. Development regimes and their inextricably-related debt traps in Jamaica (Frauts 2019) or the ways that Indonesia's military regime and postcolonial politicians have secured colonial mining, extractive, and agribusiness industries (Larasati 2019) speaks to the colonial continuities that Fanon wrote about (Toer 1980, *Life and Debt* 2001, Beckles 2013). Our point is not that these colonial continuities are all the same. Indeed, the ongoingness of colonialism in India or Indonesia is incommensurable with the ongoingness of settler contexts of the US and Canada considering that colonialism never ended in these latter places. Our point is that in India as in Canada, a nationalist common sense is deeply cultivated to make it near impossible to name the coloniality of Hindu or white nationalism as such. The uneven legibility of coloniality in these varied contexts results in different struggles too, including the struggle to make the fact of coloniality commonsensical. Moreover, by incommensurability we mean that attending to multiple colonialisms does not obviate but rather becomes the condition of possibility of the kind of solidarity that rests on deepened understanding of our differences and commonalities. This kind of solidarity is based on accepting others' opacity (Lugones 2006) and lives lived with/in radical alterities and autonomy (Guha 1983) whilst also committing to the work of border-crossing and struggling across differences and contradictions generated within and through the relationalities that connect

multiple colonialities to each other (Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981, Guha 1983, Lugones 2006).

Rather than seeing colonialism in everything and, as such, diluting its valence or analytical purchase as a focus of scholarship, we trace the ways in which coloniality has the capacity to obscure its workings under liberal democratic, advanced capitalist, multicultural regimes (e.g. the US and Canada, as Vine Deloria Jr., Winona LaDuke, Joanne Barker, Marie Anna Jaimes Guerrero, Jennifer Nez Denetdale, Sandy Grande, Audra Simpson, Glen Coulthard, Leanne Simpson, and so many others have shown) and in postcolonial ones (e.g. Guyana, as Shona Jackson has shown, or Taiwan, as Kuan-Hsing Chen has shown). This not knowing colonialism when we see it has been aptly named colonial unknowing by Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein (2016, para 1). For these authors, colonial unknowing 'endeavors to render unintelligible the entanglements of racialization and colonization, occluding the mutable historicity of colonial structures and attributing finality to events of conquest and dispossession', which are also entangled with the forces of commodification. As 'an epistemological orientation that works to pre-empt relational modes of analysis' (Vimalassery *et al.* 2016, para. 3), colonial unknowing produces 'incomprehensibility between different forms of colonialism, such as the comparative and connective nature of settler colonialism and franchise colonialisms, as well as differential and contingent racializations and racialized violence' (Vimalassery *et al.* 2016, para 6).[3] Through a multiple colonialisms framework, we seek to address the illegibility of colonialisms produced via unknowing and the analytical and commonsensical presumptions of non-relationality that obscures colonialism's converging temporal and spatial constitutions in any given place.

Our insistence on situating the analysis of cultural production in the context of multiple colonialisms allows us to foreground the complex production of colonial unknowing where critical cultural studies scholarship might typically pay greater attention to nationalist ideologies and capitalism's categories than to making commonsensical the knowledge of ongoing colonialisms. This complex production rests in large part on cultivating a common sense rule of private property (e.g. US, Canada) or natural claims of the 'integrity' of postcolonial national boundaries (e.g. India on Kashmir), rather than connecting the normalized rule of ongoing land seizures and eliminations of people to current theorizations of coloniality. Scholars in this Special Issue who focus attention on cultural production by the colonized variously reveal how heterogeneous ways of knowing coexist in complex relationship with regimes and practices of cultivated colonial unknowing.

It has been 25 years since Edward Said (1993) argued in *Culture and Imperialism* that we miss what is essential in the world if we do not attend to the interdependence of the terrains of cultural production of colonizer and colonized (p. xx). In that sense, there is nothing new in arguing for an analytical

framework that refuses culture's 'protective enclosures' afforded by its elevated, refined, emancipatory status – a status that demands that political critiques of coloniality, racism, or imperialism are checked at the door (Said 1993, pp. xiii–xiv). Our goal is to deepen engagement with decades of postcolonial, Black, and Indigenous feminist scholarship on the ongoingness of colonialisms, foregrounding these perspectives in the study of cultural production. While Said called it imperialism because it lingers compared to 'direct colonialism [which] has largely ended' (p. 9), the challenge of colonial unknowing reminds scholarly analysis that multiple colonialisms are pervasive and relational, and they converge in their direct and indirect forms in any given context in the contemporary moment. Thus, our initial efforts to articulate a multiple colonialisms framework remains important to the project of Cultural Studies.

Multiple articulations: relational and incommensurable

Postcolonial scholarship has long been challenged to delineate the when and where of the 'postcolonial', including in the pages of *Cultural Studies* (McClintock 1992, Shohat 1992, Frankenberg and Mani 1993). Most poignantly, critical Indigenous scholarship grounded in settler states such as Canada, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand has challenged postcolonial theory's temporal and spatial assumptions by highlighting the longstanding and living reality of Indigenous Peoples where colonialism is ongoing in the present (Deloria and Lytle 1998, Smith 1999, Larocque 2010, Byrd 2011, Byrd and Rothberg 2011, A. Simpson 2014, Moreton-Robinson 2015).

Chickasaw scholar Jodi Byrd's work specifically prompts us to take a relational view of settler colonial and post/colonial societies. A relational view is not simply a matter of considering the *relationship* between two qualitatively different forms of colonialism – settler colonies based on the logic of elimination (e.g. Canada) and franchise colonialism based on the logic of racialized labour exploitation (e.g. India under the British) – as Patrick Wolfe's (2006) influential account has it. The idea that one form of colony was an event in history, whereas the other (settler colonialism) is a structure in terms of 'a complex social formation' and 'continuity through time' is both clarifying and too simplistic, as critics have already asserted (Wolfe 2006, p. 390). We follow those who complicate this binary view (Saldaña-Portillo 2008, Byrd 2011, Jackson 2012, Day 2015, Vimalassery *et al.* 2016). We do not wish to force the multiple forms and contexts of colonialism that the papers in this Special Issue analyse onto one side of this binary or the other, hinged on structure/event and elimination/exploitation. After all, the imperial processes of capitalist development projects, for example, that centre on corporate-state collusion in land acquisition and labour exploitation, as well as questions of caste's collaboration with colonialism in British India and postcolonial India

makes the 'post' of franchise colonialism questionable, despite formal territorial sovereignty. Frankenberg and Mani's (1993) suggestion that decolonization was 'decisive' but not 'definitive' in India rests on the achievement of territorial sovereignty, which leads to being able to see imperialism in postcolonial societies but not colonialism itself. Our point is that the ability of the intersecting structures of casteist, racist, capitalist, heteropatriarchal state power to dispossess, occupy, rule, survey lands, and exploit labour draw into question whether what are presumed to be contemporary *imperial* practices can always in fact be considered rule from a distance. We believe it is crucial not to let colonizing practices hide behind the dominant label and presumption of our historical conjuncture, which sees direct colonialism as largely having ended whilst imperialism lingers (cf. Said 1993, p. 9).

Considering imperialism's many practices (not all of which engage in rule from a distance), in contexts of (former) franchise colonialism we might concede that decolonization should not be a metaphor (Tuck and Yang 2012), or rather that decolonization remains a metaphor, in so-called postcolonial contexts as well. The many ongoing resistances in these 'postcolonial' sites demand scholarly conceptualizations of the specific conditions that make the so-called postcolonial still colonial when understood *relationally* to specific conditions in ongoing settler colonies, even as these multiple colonial forms and practices also remain incommensurable. Thus, in this Special Issue, rather than place articulations of colonialism under binaries of settler and franchise colonialism, we attend to the actually existing/persisting conditions and practices of elimination, dispossession, inclusion, exclusion, exploitation, extraction, and more, to consider their palimpsestic regional and global relationships to prior and ongoing histories of conventionally-recognizable colonialisms. Consequent to the different historical contexts in which different papers in the Special Issue are grounded, their implicit or explicit theorizations of multiple colonialisms are not identical. Rather than reading each paper as a case study in multiple colonialisms, we invite readers to consider what histories, structures, and relationships help to explain why actually existing colonialities remain illegible as such in the particular context of each paper, and what that implies for solidarity and decolonization struggle.

Although the papers mobilize different theories, methodologies, and political arguments about violence and transformation, they also generate conversations across disciplines, geographies, theories, and political imaginings in ways that might refuse the reproduction of global hierarchies of knowledge, labour, and peoples. Within contexts of historical and contemporary violence, Indigenous and Black feminist scholarship has variously called for acknowledging, learning from, and a resurgence of unrecognized histories of creativity, resilience, refusal, survival, and thriving that proceed in everyday, ceremonial, archival, and institutional life (Hartman 1997, Simpson 2007, A. Simpson 2014,

L.B. Simpson 2014, 2016, McKittrick 2014a, 2014b, Sharpe 2016, Barker 2018). While Black, Indigenous, and Chicanx (cf. Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981, Anzaldúa 1999 [1987]) thinkers across settler societies have refused state violence and reimagined politics, so too has Latin American decoloniality's calls for delinking from European epistemes and border-crossing gained greater prominence (Lugones 2007, Mignolo 2007, Escobar 2008), anti-caste thinkers envisioned vital annihilations (Ambedkar 1936, Ambedkar and Rodrigues 2002, Limbale 2004), and Asian Cultural Studies scholars called for a de-imperializing vision that foregrounds relations of violence *within* Asia and among those within the global South (Niranjana et al. 2015, Fujikane and Okamura 2008, Chen 2010).

Our Special Issue attempts to think across the convergences and divergences, erasures and complicities, of these multiple political imaginaries that variously grapple with colonialism's specific spatial logics and place-based regional histories of power. These approaches offer ways to move 'horizontal histories of oppression' among the variously colonized and racialized beyond 'zero-sum struggles for hegemony' and toward modes of tracing complex complicities and careful solidarities (Byrd 2011, p. xxxiv, see also Day 2016). This is the case especially because thinking via multiple colonialisms demands that we do not privilege any given history of colonialism as *the* metastructure of violence in an *a priori* way. For example, rather than privilege histories of migration and postcolonial scholarship's meanings of nativism and nationalism over histories of indigeneity and Indigenous peoples' meanings of nationhood and movement (e.g. Sharma and Wright 2008, Sharma 2015), we believe in the possibility of analytical frameworks that simultaneously refuse anti-Indigeneity, anti-Blackness, and xenophobia.

Although critiques of postcolonial theory have made a mark within the field of Cultural Studies, including in the pages of this journal, we believe the *simultaneous* multiplicity, relationality, and incommensurability of *contemporary* colonialisms deserve greater foregrounding as the contextual and analytical framework for studying cultural production than they have received. Our attention to Dalit, Black, Indigenous, and Asian Cultural Studies scholarship is worth foregrounding within Cultural Studies in North America because each highlights crucial vectors that variously shape multiple forms of contemporary colonialisms, which in turn structure but remain unthinkable within conventional analyses of cultural production and the colonial contexts of their making.

Representing Blackness

Dominant conceptions of 'culture' as the mediation of material forces in the struggle for hegemony offered by Antonio Gramsci, Raymond Williams, Paul Willis, Stuart Hall, and Paul Gilroy remain crucial to our concerns. For

example, Gramsci and Williams's conceptions of hegemony as 'saturating' lived experience, consciousness, and common sense (Williams 1973, p. 8) is precisely what we are getting at when we note the pervasiveness of ongoing colonialisms and the hegemonic cultivation of colonial unknowing that ensures that our recognition of colonialisms remains limited. Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy, and others made a necessary intervention into this cultural Marxian tradition with studies of the Black Atlantic world since the former had largely neglected to focus attention on race as an interlocking structure of the violence of European capitalist modernity. Gilroy (1993) and Hall (1990, 2002 [1980]), building on previous anticolonial and antiracist thought, highlight that racism is constitutive of European modernity and liberalism, not just their unintended 'dark side'. They showed that capitalism in the Atlantic was fundamentally located in conditions of colonial slavery and as such, cultural production's relation to hegemony needs to grapple with the place of Blackness within European modernity. Gilroy's accounts of the Black Atlantic and Hall's accounts of racialized capital accumulation have been fundamental to North American Cultural Studies. However, Gilroy and Hall did not make 'any significant reference to Indigenous peoples of the Americas' and effectively assumed 'that Indigenous Peoples in the Americas no longer exist' (Lawrence and Dua 2005, pp. 128–129). As Shona Jackson (2012, p. 58) notes, Hall imagined the Caribbean identity as 'always-already' diasporic, which entailed a clear case of Indigenous erasure. This Indigenous erasure coproduces an erasure of ongoing colonialism, despite the keen attention paid to the vector of slavery and racial histories in diasporic and metropolitan contexts.

Despite these absences, Gilroy and Hall have built upon and incited profound and specific accounts of Black geographies, practices, and histories in contexts like North America and the Caribbean. For example, Black Canadian scholars have drawn attention to histories of slavery, segregation laws, legal inequality, nation-building, newer Black diasporas, Black resistance and cultural production, and more that precede and transcend the post-World War II moment of multicultural Canada. Such analyses trouble a national common sense that relentlessly obscures and contains histories and meanings of Blackness (Walcott 2003, Cooper 2006, McKittrick 2006, Hamilton 2007, Walker 2011, Maynard 2017). This significant scholarship shows how forms of colonialism rooted in slavery and anti-Blackness create intersecting structures of oppression and colonial unknowing in liberal, multicultural democracies such as Canada.

In such contexts of contemporary colonialism and anti-Blackness, Black scholars' attention to the challenges of representing Blackness and interpreting cultural practice are particularly poignant sites of analysis (Hartman 1997, 2008, McKittrick 2014a). When Black feminist scholar Saidiya Hartman (1997) highlighted the ways in which the post-emancipation period in the United

States re-elaborated the enslaved condition, she centred the 'unthought', that is, the slave (Hartman and Wilderson 2003) in order to deepen the challenge that Blackness poses to claims of emancipation, modernity, and freedom. Her work is foundational in prompting us to see the 'afterlife of slavery' where dominant historiography depicts emancipation. In this context, Hartman's work centres on the conundrum of practice itself (reading, writing, archival research, activism, theorizing, speech), considering even empathic identification with the enslaved obliterates the enslaved (Hartman 1997, 2008, Hartman and Wilderson 2003). In the wake of colonial slavery, she asks: 'How does one account for the state of domination and the possibilities seized in practice? How does one represent the various modes of practice without reducing them to conditions of domination or romanticizing them as pure forces of resistance?' (1997, p. 55).

Two papers in this Special Issue are particularly attentive to the conundrum of representing Blackness and Black cultural practice. In the first instance, Rosalind Hampton's paper examines how non-Black artists in Montreal mobilized Black representation for a community mural in order to represent and celebrate the increasing presence of racialized immigrants living in a neighbourhood. She draws attention to the racial and colonial violence of not just a vandalized mural (a Black woman's face painted over in white), but also to the racial and colonial violence underlying liberal conceptions of 'anti-racism' and iconic uses of representations of Black women. Anti-Blackness shores up the racial and colonial logics of a contemporary Canadian racial neoliberalism, post-racial multiculturalism, and the possibilities for belonging.

Hampton's concerns are similar to those of Black feminist scholar Tiffany Lethabo King (2016, p. 1023), who, following Saidiya Hartman among others, articulates Black fungibility as 'the capacity of Blackness for unfettered exchangeability and transformation within and beyond the form of the commodity, thereby making fungibility an open-ended analytic accounting for both Black abjection and Black pursuits of life in the midst of subjection'. As King demonstrates, the unlimited and 'infinite kinds of use' (p. 1025) to which Blackness has been put in 'the service of white self actualization' (p. 1026) has made Blackness an ideal frontier of colonial expansion whilst at the same time this very limitlessness also makes it a 'resource for Black freedom' (p. 1023). Likewise, as Hampton notes, despite the erasure of Blackness in the course of celebrating Blackness, the limitlessness of Blackness also constitutes a resource for struggle and freedom, and Hampton offers Black visuality as a practice of countervisuality alongside radical Black arts and Indigenous representational practices.

The simultaneities and tensions of Blackness that Hartman, King, and Hampton theorize are manifest in the coexisting present realities of police killings of Black and Indigenous peoples and the tremendous power of Idle No More and Black Lives Matter movements, and in the carceral, colonial

state's championing of 'diversity' and 'reconciliation' whilst Indigenous and Black Peoples carve out space for truth-seeking practices and solidarity politics against all odds. They are also apparent in the co-optation of Black resilience by neoliberal development discourse and the repurposed resilience of Black cultural practices as Meaghan Frauts's paper shows. Frauts reiterates what postcolonial scholars since Frantz Fanon (1968) have noted about the betrayals of decolonization. Her paper argues that national cultural policy in Jamaica, in alignment with a global development industry, is a palimpsestic articulation of accumulating conditions of colonial bondage, debt, and racial violence (Ford-Smith 1997). Frauts's methodological attention to both cultural policy and the practice of dancehall shows that while resilience gets instrumentalized by the very policies that facilitate displacement and undermine survival, it also gets repurposed as resistance in street dances and dancehalls. Frauts helps us reconsider the when and where of colonialism in Jamaica enroute to considering the ongoing entanglements of dominant colonial capitalist culture and resistant popular cultural practice.

Historical representations, contemporary popular culture, and incommensurable violences

Specifying the historical and contemporary relation of the Atlantic to Asia, Lisa Lowe's (2015) brilliant work demonstrates how imperial desires for labour and colonial modes of settling land produced flexible classifications of difference (e.g. the enslaved vs. the Indian and Chinese coolie vs. the 'free labourer') and colonial temporalities that pervade our contemporary imaginations (pp. 25–32). Against this, Lowe calls for a politics of remembering and affirming relations and temporalities that are coeval. In her poignant words:

> The operations that pronounce colonial divisions of humanity – settler seizure and native removal, slavery and racial dispossession, and racialized expropriations of many kinds – are imbricated processes, not sequential events; they are ongoing and continuous in our contemporary moment, not temporally distinct nor as yet concluded. (p. 7)

Our Special Issue seeks inspiration from the work of those who have drawn attention to the intersections of Red, Black, and white Atlantics, and the ways in which these transnational histories account for violence, antagonisms, and culture wars in the Americas (Wynter 1995, Wilderson 2010, Jackson 2012, Stam and Shohat 2012, Day 2015, 2016, Lowe 2015, Vimalassery *et al.* 2016).

Several papers grapple with the challenge of studying historical representations, cultural production, and popular culture in the Americas in ways that foreground an analysis of North America as a simultaneously colonized *and* racialized place (not just a racialized one), by taking into account the multiple precolonial and colonial encounters and subjective perceptions that have

shaped historical and contemporary representations and relationships (Patel, Morton, Mays, Upadhyay).

Shaista Patel's paper brings together seemingly discrepant figures, spatialities, and temporalities to re-examine and open up new insights into the entanglements of colonialism, capitalism, race, gender, and other social formations. Patel foregrounds European violence against Moors preceding 1492 to help us rethink the place of the Crusades, the time of Orientalist logics, and the valence of European encounters with Africans as these variously shaped European perceptions and production of 'Indian' in the New World, including in performances. Patel shows that precolonial racializations of Moors by Europeans intimately shaped conquest in the Americas and the terms of racialization of 'Indians' in the Americas, thereby challenging the time and space of European coloniality as we know it. Here, the framework of multiple colonialisms relies on a relational and feminist intersectional study that takes settlement and conquest seriously, whilst challenging the view that 'settler colonialism is a meta-structure of sorts' (Dhamoon 2015, p. 32). Patel's paper also lays out a complex groundwork for thinking through complicities and ways of forging solidarities in the context of spatially-differentiated and accumulated colonial unknowings since the time of the Crusades.

Erin Morton's paper complicates conventional historical representations of colonialism as a monolithic violent force by shedding light on property and kin relations in the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Canadian prairies. Morton's contribution to this issue demonstrates that settler state violence is founded on the creative means through which white (working class) imaginaries of (their) productive labour has naturalized Indigenous land as (their) private property. Focusing on Treaty 6 Territory (which covers portions of what are now Alberta and Saskatchewan in Canada), she examines the ways in which multiple and overlapping colonial histories obscure the cultivated violence of settler colonialism by framing it as nothing more than a composite of common sense models of liberal private property, white kinship relations, and capitalist productivity. This understanding, Morton argues, creatively presents the everyday colonial violence of private property as placid, making decades of white settler violence, including theft and killing, defensible and even just.

Other authors (Mays, Upadhyay) challenge the ongoing Indigenous erasure in contemporary popular culture. Kyle Mays's paper challenges Indigenous erasure by interrogating popular perceptions of Detroit as a quintessential white working-class manufacturing town, which erase Black and Indigenous history and a Black and Indigenous present. Situating these erasures within the multiple colonial histories that draw together settlement with gentrification and urban renewal, Mays analyzes Indigenous hip hop in Detroit for its simultaneously place-based and transnational commentary on the contexts

of colonialism and racialization in the US and Palestine. In so doing, Mays's work highlights the ways in which any given place-based decolonizing practice is deepened by its commitment to transnational solidarity with other place-based decolonizing practices – and this is especially true of places that are rarely recognized as colonized in the first place, namely the US and Palestine.

Nishant Upadhyay's paper highlights the importance of attending to racialization and colonization as divergent and intersecting relationalities in which different populations, including racialized peoples, are implicated. Studying drag show artists on a popular television series, their paper astutely demonstrates how racialized Asian performers project that racialization to deflect critique of their simultaneous erasure and appropriation of the contemporary life and creativity of colonized Indigenous performers whilst 'playing Indian' as a way to further their own belonging in North America. Upadhyay makes apparent the limits of popular, racialized queer cultural production that gains belonging at the cost of recolonizing cultural production. Thus, as non-Black and non-Indigenous scholars, Patel and Upadhyay's respective multiple colonialisms approaches leads them to foreground questions of complicity, thereby implicitly and explicitly highlighting simultaneously the continuities as well as the incommensurable violences at play when the formerly colonized come to inhabit still colonized lands.

Asia in/and Cultural Studies methodologies

Notwithstanding the recognition of Red, Black, and white Atlantics, and despite existing historical research on indentured labour from Asia (Kale 1998), Cultural Studies still prefers to tell the story of the Americas and Europe without considering Asia as an intimate part of the Atlantic world. Despite longstanding internal critiques, Cultural Studies scholarship still tends to ground its analyses and theories in histories of the West (Wright 1998, Chen 2010, D. Da Costa 2016). Nevertheless, Shona Jackson's *Creole Indigeneity* and Lisa Lowe's *The Intimacy of Four Continents* are proving to be influential models for changing this approach, even though they too are, ultimately, if justifiably, oriented toward thinking about the Americas. Tejaswini Niranjana's 2006 book *Mobilizing India* studies the comparative popular cultures of Trinidad and India with a view to considering how the subaltern diaspora in the Caribbean shaped anticolonial struggles in India. The work of Kuan-Hsing Chen, Tejaswini Niranjana, Xioaming Wang, Nitya Vasudevan, and the Inter-Asian Cultural Studies project not only decentred the domination of the Birmingham school of Cultural Studies thought and practice but also the tendency within Cultural Studies to begin, end, and orient all conversations about colonialism, nationalism, and imperialism to Europe and the West.

The Inter-Asian Cultural Studies project refuses the systematic cultivation of colonial unknowing generated by a hegemonic Cultural Studies grounded in histories and experiences of the West by attending to the material and inter-subjective relations *among* those colonized or formerly colonized.[4] Kuan-Hsing Chen's (2010) remarkable book *Asia as Method* highlights the inter-Asian relationships and histories that get submerged due to the tendency within Cultural Studies to focus on how anti-colonial (ethno)nationalism rejects Europe and gains independent nations. Chen persuasively argues that such anti-colonial thought and nationalist politics is hardly an antidote for the kinds of sub-imperialism that have become pervasive in formerly colonized places (from Taiwan to India). Chen notably neglects questions of land and settler colonial histories in Asia that are so powerfully accounted for by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura (inspired by the earlier formidable work of Haunani-Kay Trask) in their volume *Asian Settler Colonialism* (2008). Alongside Chen's work, Fujikane, Okamura, and others prompt us to attend to the shifting, messy, and relational regional histories and categories of imperialism, colonialism, and nationalism *within* Asia. Their work helps us (1) to challenge the North Americanness of discussions of coloniality and decolonizing culture; and (2) make mutually-intimate the knowledges grounded in colonial and racialized histories of Indigenous and Black peoples on Turtle Island, Dalit and Muslim histories in South Asia, and Intra/Inter-Asian histories.

Keeping in mind the necessity of attending to the intimacy between Asia and the Atlantic, as well as inter/intra-Asian relationships and conditions of ongoing colonialism, some of the papers in this issue conceptually connect Asia to North American histories of domination (Larasati, Mookerjea, Patel, Upadhyay) and others dwell more pointedly on Asia (Misri, D. Da Costa), but each of these also explicates varying articulations of multiple colonialisms. Beyond the artificial regional demarcations of Asia and the Americas, Hampton, Frauts, Misri, D. Da Costa, Larasati, and Mookerjea confront the challenge of considering what decolonizing cultural production can be in contexts of military, extractive, exploitative, neoliberal, and humanitarian captures of racialized and colonized aesthetic, knowledge, land, and labour relations.

Let's consider the case of India in terms that go beyond the conventional, monolithic view of colonialism. In India, once the foreign occupying power (the British) left in 1947, the country was considered decolonized even though British laws, systems of governance, language, and culture continued to colonize minds and material realities – indeed, they do so to this day. Caste-oppressed and Adivasi (India's Indigenous) peoples regularly demonstrate that they live in a still-colonial state as they have spent the better part of India's 'postcolonial' life demanding constitutional reforms and constitutional guarantees.[5] In so doing, they are effectively theorizing coloniality as a contemporary and ongoing feature of India's social formation, not a feature of

a bygone era. Their political actions demand deeper scholarly attention to the complex relationship between colonialism and casteism, which remains a neglected area for influential postcolonial scholars from India (Spivak 1988, Chatterjee 1993, Chakrabarty 2000), notwithstanding some notable exceptions (Tharu and Niranjana 1996, Sundar 1997, Dube 1999).

Considering the reality of precolonial caste, consolidated under colonial capitalism and dominant in postcolonial India, a highly-differentiated set of thought and political movements against casteist knowledge-production, the state, and society prompts us to ask whether a casteist contemporary India can be decolonized? How do we bear in mind that colonialism enabled certain institutions that brought a reprieve from casteism whilst at the same time we demand from our conceptualizations of decolonization better accounts of the ways in which colonialism also helped to entrench casteism? Our knowledge of how deeply caste has shaped the differentiated experiences of movement, settlement, successes of, and discrimination against the 'Indian' diaspora should also prompt us to ask whether Canada or the United States are casteist states, and whether decolonizing these states might also necessitate the annihilation of caste? Just as Saidiya Hartman challenges us to think about the unthought – the afterlife of slavery post-emancipation – Dalit politics challenges us to think about the unthought of colonial capitalism's ongoing life enabled through casteism in presumed postcolonial worlds, or in presumed caste-free worlds. Taking stock of caste in North American Cultural Studies then, is not just a South Asian matter, it is about how we can know coloniality when cultivated ignorance requires that we not see its varied forms and articulations at work in the world today.

As is well known, the subaltern studies scholarship that emerged from India sought to infuse the critical 'histories [of capitalism] from below' approach of British cultural historians such as E.P. Thompson by foregrounding colonialism and nationalism. Their intervention into Cultural Studies, tracing subaltern perspectives on colonialism and India's nationalist struggle, challenged the orthodoxies of Marxian articulations of political struggle and the derivative coloniality embedded in anti-colonial nationalism (Chakrabarty 1989, Chatterjee 1993). The charge that most scholars within this tradition paid scant attention to questions of caste, and the ways in which caste mediates colonial and nationalist domination in India, suggests the need for a decentring of Cultural Studies within the subcontinent (Rawat and Satyanarayana 2016). And yet having made this call to decentre Cultural Studies about the subcontinent, this Special Issue fails precisely to include Dalit, Adivasi, or Muslim scholars from India. This is in part because of the North American academy's own inadvertent casteist hiring of and knowledge production by racialized academics from South Asia. And in equal part, the exclusions from this Special Issue also result from the editors only belatedly realizing what it means to theorize

decolonization without attending to caste, a realization that emerged in conversations about the Special Issue and appear in this introduction. Dia Da Costa's contribution draws on Dalit cultural studies and Chhara (Adivasi) political thought and cultural practice in still-colonial and casteist India to consider lessons for challenging the optimism of contemporary creative economy discourses alongside imagining what it might mean to decolonize cultural production in ways that foreground questions of caste, rather than treating coloniality as a casteless structure of violence.

The case of Kashmir highlights another perspective on the colonial present, one grounded in specific histories and conditions. Kashmir is the most militarized place in the world with over half-a-million armed Indian personnel stationed there. India still presumes it to be an integral part of its territory notwithstanding Kashmiri struggles against the accumulating histories of Dogra Hindu, British, and Indian rule. Contemporary Kashmiri struggles for freedom must be understood as a critical theorization of what is legible as colonialism and what is not, and indeed what kinds of Indian colonialisms are obscured by India's 'postcolonial' status (Dar 2015, Osuri 2017).[6] This kind of cultivated language and representation is intimately linked, of course, to the monolithic theorizing of colonialism itself.

A multiple colonialisms approach allows us to be more expansive in considering the terms and conditions of occupation in various regional contexts. Thus, in the Kashmir case, considering the enfolding of Dogra, British, and Indian rule as a reality of the colonized Kashmiri present, Deepti Misri's attention to Kashmiri visual cultures of resistance to India's scopic regime and the latter's cultivation of colonial unknowing of Indian colonialism prompts significant questions about what counts as decolonizing cultural production in contexts that are barely recognized as colonized. She argues that we ought to conceptualize Kashmiri people's visual resistance not only as seeking recognition for the multiple colonial purveyors of Kashmiri humanity – Indians and Europeans – but also as producing Kashmiri subjectivity and self-determination. Readers of Misri's paper might be prompted to ask what it means to consider the Kashmiri fight for human rights as a decolonizing visual culture of Kashmiri self-determination if doing so rests on colonial recognition? This is part of the colonial violence in Kashmir, where killed and maimed Kashmiris have to be paraded in order for everyday Indians to recognize Kashmiri humanity (if such visual cultural resistance can accomplish this), whereas Indian recognition of Indian coloniality itself remains deeply elusive.

A final vector of our collective attention to multiple colonialisms falls on struggles against dispossession (from Indigenous struggles against the Dakota Access and Trans Mountain Pipelines to the Toraja struggle against mining in Indonesia) grounded in geo-political realities of corporate collusion with national governments to seize control of land, exploit labour, and impose representations of everything from 'nation' to 'development' to 'Indigeneity'.

If corporations cannot themselves be considered foreign occupying forces, a multiple colonialisms approach demands that we remain attuned to the colonial core of ongoing material and representational dispossession wherever nation-states remain beholden to capitalist extraction and accumulation. Thus, paying attention to the relentlessly appropriating, differentiating, and repressing work of development discourses – from resilience (Frauts, this issue) and heritage (D. Da Costa, this issue) to smart cities (Mookerjea, this issue) and Indigenous 'tradition' and resistance (Larasati, this issue) – a multiple colonialisms framework allows us to acknowledge the ways in which similar and still colonizing representational practices obtain across vastly different contexts but are made illegible as colonialism. The distance conventionally assigned to the conceptualization of imperialism when we think of it as colonization from a distance does not hold in these cases considering the immediate and gargantuan destructive powers of a corporation's bulldozers and poisoning chemicals, invariably backed up by national governments and armies and moving in concert with the commodification of indigeneity, resilience, and heritage.

It is because representations and narratives of colonial and imperial rule are inextricably linked with material conquests of land and labour that the mind has long since been theorized as a powerful site of coloniality within the 'post-colonial' condition (Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o 1986), making decolonization of the mind so crucial (Barker 2018). As Lenape scholar Joanne Barker brilliantly puts it, the struggle to decolonize her mind is the 'struggle to reclaim a future that is not about the future at all but a present in which Indigenous territories, stories, bodies, and sensualities are unoccupied and uncivilized: I want to live there; that is where I live' (2018, p. 209). This crucial articulation of an 'unoccupied and uncivilized future', in which the past and present of Indigenous peoples is actually valued because that is where they live and want to live, rails against the imprisoning colonial capitalist teleology of modernizing thought, as well as against the containment of what counts as radical cultural production and progressive futures and its attendant destruction of the reciprocal relationship among all of life.

Attendant to the relationship between the takeover of land and its colonized, commodified representation, Rachmi Diyah Larasati's paper does significant work to address the aesthetic capture of land accompanying ongoing colonial and corporate dispossession and its relation to the enduring aesthetic of people's embodied memory of landscapes. Herself a dancer of Indonesian forms, Larasati's deeply evocative article in this issue conceptualizes the contradictory commemoration of land in dance and embodied memory with the 'elegant' neoliberal aesthetic capture of dance and mourning as heritage and tourism in the cases of the Dayak in Borneo and the Ngaben death ceremony in Bali, respectively, as well as in the cases of Toraja and Kendeng-Sikep Indigenous peoples' performed

resistance to displacement from their land by mining projects and cement companies, respectively. Here, conceptions of performance or cultural production as labour cannot capture what the body holds as its commemorated relationship with the land that is being colonized and the people who are being killed. Indeed, we can read Misri and Larasati's contributions as identifying the steady 'logic of elimination' (Wolfe's phrase for the exceptional settler colonial structure of violence) and the acquisition of land at play in Kashmir and Indonesia. Our point is not to give these sites the label of settler colonialism, but to offer necessary disruptions of Wolfe's binary, despite noting at the same time the incomparable significance of 'recuperating the binary' (of settler and franchise colonialism) in the context of settler states (Wolfe 2016).

Sourayan Mookerjea's contribution furthers the task of thinking through a multiple colonialisms framework through an analysis of the contradictory politics of renewable energy transition and exploration of the counter-hegemonic feminist praxis of the sangham women in Medak, India. The author argues that theorizing multiple colonialisms must serve the purpose of considering ways toward a utopian collective political project. Mookerjea argues here for a non-Western 'social justice class politics from below' that foregrounds 'subaltern-multitude contradictions'. Such foregrounding accounts for the relationality of hierarchical subordination and colonial violence (subaltern) and its dependence on 'the reproduction of both common wealth and so common-being as well as the unprecedented scale and power of social cooperation operating in the global system today (multitude)'. The horizons of this politics are contradictory, but, as the author argues, we must face the challenges of thinking through and acting in these times if we are to address the current climate crisis, which expresses interlocking, oppressive relations of the modern capitalist system that while globally present, differentially affect us all.

Conclusion

Although our studies are limited to the Americas and Asia, we nonetheless hope that this collection of papers incites conversations about how we might enrich our theorizations of coloniality and decolonization with a view to making multiple and converging colonialisms legible. Bringing the contexts and conditions of colonialism in Asia into conversation with studies of colonialism in North America and the Caribbean allows us to make new analytical connections and give greater depth to conventional theorizations of coloniality and decolonization. We hope that it is clear why the efforts of Indigenous, Black, and Dalit-Bahujan scholars who have relentlessly worked to disabuse us of our collective and accumulated racialized and colonial unknowings are so central to the multiple colonialisms approach. In conclusion then, it is crucial for us to note that our attention to multiple colonialisms is expressly not

meant to treat all colonial violences as equivalent. Far from it. Instead, we have tried to stress a relational view of multiple, but incommensurable colonialisms – colonialisms that do not continue into the present in the same way, as well as colonialisms that are not spatially-organized and legible in their relation to imperial rule from a distance in the same way. We have done so in order to collectively ask if, when, in what ways, and in what diverse, related sites of our age-old and ongoing intimacies, violences, and solidarities, our multiple and incommensurable decolonizing struggles have converged and might yet converge.

Notes

1. Dalit-Bahujan refers to variously caste-oppressed peoples. Dalit means downtrodden and refers to those who were formerly considered Untouchable, because the Hindu caste hierarchy considered their caste-based occupations too polluting for them to be within the fold of the caste system. Other caste-oppressed people include Adivasis who are India's Indigenous Peoples and the lowest within the caste system, such as Shudras, who traditionally have working class and service occupations.
2. With any workshop and Special Issue, gaps often remain. We acknowledge here that a multiple colonialisms framework would further benefit from analyses of anti-Muslim racism and imperialism, as well as examinations of Indigeneity by African scholars of Indigeneity, and of racisms, (neo)colonialism, imperialism, and coloniality by Black and Indigenous scholars from Latin America. These gaps are a function both of our limited networks and initial framing of our project.
3. Vimalassery, Hu Pegues, and Goldstein critique, for example, tendencies within settler colonial studies to treat settler colonialism as a 'modular analytic that travels without regard to the specificities of location or social and material relations', and that, by emphasizing a binary of structure over event, limit 'analyses of settler colonialism itself to a descriptive typology', the effect of which is to elide and fail to engage 'multiple and distinct modes of colonialism' that exist in diverse spatial geographies, such as a more hemispheric examination of the Americas (Vimalassery *et al*. 2016, para 13). Deployment of the 'settler colonialism' analytic thus increases colonial unknowing rather than allow us to 'better grasp colonial, racial, and imperial simultaneities, as well as positions that do not easily fit into a settler/native binary' (Vimalassery *et al*. 2016, para 15).
4. Similarly, as one of the contributors to this Special Issue, Shaista Patel, commented on an early draft of this Introduction, how might beginning with African scholarship on Indigeneity, imperialism, colonialism, and nationalism (i.e. foregrounding 'Africa as method') shift the concerns, constructs, and frameworks of North American Cultural Studies? Although our Special Issue neglects this field, focusing instead on the Blackness of, and Black cultural production in, North America and the Caribbean, the multiple colonialisms approach invites attention to such reframings.
5. This status is readily apparent in peoples' struggles against contemporary experiences of stigma and violence owing to the legacy of the Criminal Tribes

Act (1871) and its postcolonial version, the Habitual Offenders Act (1952). Denotified tribals (those formerly labelled criminal tribes) have demanded constitutional guarantees that accrue to other tribes and castes, but not to them, owing to their presumed criminality. The demand for constitutional reforms (of Section 377 for example, British laws against sodomy) has also been ongoing, relentlessly fought for by queer communities and garnering a recent victory when law 377 was struck down in September 2018.

6. Likewise, India's occupation of Assam and other north-eastern states intensifies the need to rethink regional histories of colonialism, and who or what can be made legible as a foreign occupying force.

Acknowledgements

This Special Issue emerged from a Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada funded workshop. We are grateful to our funders and to the participants. We are also grateful to graduate students Ipek Oskay, Benjamin Denga, and Alleson Mason, who provided their expertise and support in the planning, organization, and execution of the workshop. Original participants who are not in this issue include Susan Cahill, John F. Collins, Kim Tallbear, Natalie Loveless, Geraldine Pratt, and Travis Wysote. We are extremely grateful to Shaista Patel, Nishant Upadhyay, and Erin Morton for their truly insightful feedback on earlier drafts of this introduction. Our thanks as well to Timothy Pearson for excellent editorial assistance for this Introduction and the issue as a whole.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This research was supported by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Connections Grant [grant number 611-2016-0001].

Notes on contributors

Dia Da Costa is Professor of Social Justice and International Studies in Education at the University of Alberta. She is the author of *Politicizing Creative Economy: Activism and a Hunger called Theatre* (University of Illinois Press, 2016) and *Development Dramas* (Routledge, 2009).

Alexandre E. Da Costa is Assistant Professor of Social Justice and International Studies in Education at the University of Alberta. He is author of *Reimagining Black Difference and Politics in Brazil: From Racial Democracy to Multiculturalism* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014). He has edited a special journal issue on 'Thinking 'Post-Racial' Ideology Transnationally in the Americas' for *Critical Sociology* and has published articles in *Cultural Studies*, *Race Ethnicity and Education, Third World Quarterly,* and *Policy Futures in Education*.

References

Ambedkar, B.R., 1936. "The annihilation of caste [online]." Columbia University. Available from: http://ccnmtl.columbia.edu/projects/mmt/ambedkar/web/readings/aoc_print_2004.pdf [Accessed 9 Mar 2018].

Ambedkar, B.R. and Rodrigues, V., 2002. *The essential writings of B.R. Ambedkar*. New Delhi; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anzaldúa, G., 1999. *Borderlands=La frontera*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Barker, J., 2018. Decolonizing the mind. *Rethinking marxism*, 30 (2), 208–231.

Battiste, M., 2013. *Decolonizing education: nourishing the learning spirit*. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Limited.

Beckles, H., 2013. *Britain's Black Debt: reparations for Caribbean slavery and Native genocide*. Kingston, Jamaica: University of the West Indies Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E., 2010. *Racism without racists: color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. 3rd ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Byrd, J.A., 2011. *The transit of empire: Indigenous critiques of colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Byrd, J.A. and Rothberg, M., 2011. Between subalternity and indigeneity. *Interventions*, 13 (1), 1–12.

Chakrabarty, D., 1989. *Rethinking working-class history: Bengal, 1890-1940*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chakrabarty, D., 2000. *Provincializing Europe: postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chatterjee, P., 1993. *Nationalist thought and the colonial world: a derivative discourse*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Chen, K., 2010. *Asia as method: toward deimperialization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Cooper, A., 2006. *The hanging of Angélique: the untold story of Canadian slavery and the burning of old Montréal*. Toronto: HarperCollins.

Da Costa, A.E., 2016. Confounding anti-racism: mixture, racial democracy, and post-racial politics in Brazil. *Critical sociology*, 42 (4–5), 495–513.

Da Costa, D., 2016. Cruel pessimism and waiting for belonging: towards a global political economy of affect. *Cultural studies*, 30 (1), 1–23.

Dar, H., 2015. Dear Prof. Chatterjee, when will you engage with the "discomfort" of Indian-occupied Kashmir? *Pulse* [online]. Available from: https://pulsemedia.org/2015/09/10/dear-prof-chatterjee-when-will-you-engage-with-the-discomfort-of-indian-occupied-kashmir/ [Accessed 4 Dec 2018].

Day, I., 2015. Being or nothingness: Indigeneity, antiblackness, and settler colonial critique. *Critical ethnic studies*, 1 (2), 102–121.

Day, I., 2016. *Alien capital: Asian racialization and the logic of settler colonial capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Deloria, Jr., V. and Lytle, C.M., 1998. *The nations within: the past and future of American Indian sovereignty*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Dhamoon, R.K., 2015. A feminist approach to decolonizing anti-racism: rethinking transnationalism, intersectionality, and settler colonialism. *Feral feminisms*, 4, 20–37.

Dube, S., 1999. *Untouchable pasts: religion, identity, and power among a central Indian community, 1780–1950*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Escobar, A., 2008. *Territories of difference: place, movements, life, redes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Fanon, F., 1968. *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Ford-Smith, H., 1997. Ring ding in a tight corner: sistren, collective democracy, and the organization of cultural production. *In:* M. Jacqui Alexander, and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, eds. *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, democratic futures*. New York: Routledge, 213–258.
Frankenberg, R. and Mani, L., 1993. Crosscurrents, crosstalk: race, 'postcoloniality' and the politics of location. *Cultural studies*, 7 (2), 292–310.
Frauts, M., 2019. Resilience and the creative economy in Kingston, Jamaica. *Cultural Studies*. doi: 10.1080/09502386.2019.1584905.
Fujikane, C. and Okamura, J.Y., 2008. *Asian settler colonialism: from local governance to the habits of everyday life in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
Gilroy, P., 1993. *The Black Atlantic: modernity and double consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Goldberg, D.T., 2015. *Are we all postracial yet?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Guha, R., 1983. *Elementary aspects of peasant insurgency in colonial India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
Hall, S., 1990. Cultural identity and diaspora. *In:* J. Rutherford, ed. *Identity: community, culture, difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 222–237.
Hall, S., 2002 [1980]. Race, articulation, and societies structured in dominance. *In:* D.T. Goldberg and P. Essed, eds. *Race critical theories*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 38–68.
Hamilton, S., 2007. *Little black school house*. Grand Pré, NS: Maroon Films Inc.
Hartman, S.V., 1997. *Scenes of subjection: terror, slavery, and self-making in nineteenth-century America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Hartman, S.V., 2008. Venus in two acts. *Small axe: a Caribbean journal of criticism*, 12 (2), 1–14.
Hartman, S.V. and Wilderson, F.B., 2003. The position of the unthought. *Qui parle*, 13, 183–201.
Hesse, B., 2004. Im/plausible deniability: racism's conceptual double bind. *Social identities*, 10 (1), 9–29.
Hesse, B., 2011. Self-fulfilling prophecy: the postracial horizon. *South Atlantic quarterly*, 110 (1), 155–178.
Jackson, S.N., 2012. *Creole indigeneity: between myth and nation in the Caribbean*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Kale, M., 1998. *Fragments of empire: capital, slavery, and Indian indentured labor*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
King, T.L., 2016. The labor of (re)reading plantation landscapes fungible(ly). *Antipode*, 48 (4), 1022–1039.
Larasati, R.D., 2019. Reclaiming the aesthetic of women: de-colonizing land ownership. *Cultural Studies*. doi:10.1080/09502386.2019.1585462.
Larocque, E., 2010. *When the other is me: native resistance discourse, 1850-1990*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
Lawrence, B. and Dua, E., 2005. Decolonizing antiracism. *Social Justice*, 32 (4), 120–143.
Lentin, A., 2016. Racism in public or public racism: doing anti-racism in 'post-racial' times. *Ethnic and racial Studies*, 39 (1), 33–48.
Life and debt, 2001. Film. Directed by Stephanie Black. Jamaica: Tuff Gong Pictures.
Limbale, S., 2004. *Toward an aesthetic of Dalit literature: history, controversies, and considerations*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
Lowe, L., 2015. *The intimacies of four continents*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Lugones, M., 2006. On complex communication. *Hypatia*, 21 (3), 75–85.

Lugones, M., 2007. Heterosexualism and the colonial/modern gender system. *Hypatia*, 22 (1), 186–209.
Maynard, R., 2017. *Policing Black lives: state violence in Canada from slavery to the present*. Halifax; Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
McClintock, A., 1992. The angel of progress: pitfalls of the term "post-colonialism". *Social text*, 10 (2), 84–98.
McKittrick, K., 2006. *Demonic grounds: Black women and the cartographies of struggle*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
McKittrick, K., 2014a. Mathematic black life. *The Black scholar*, 44 (2), 16–28.
McKittrick, K., 2014b. Wait Canada anticipate Black. *The CLR James journal*, 20 (1), 243–249.
Mignolo, W.D., 2007. Delinking: the rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural studies*, 21 (2–3), 449–514.
Mills, C.W., 1997. *The racial contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Monkman, L., 2017. 'No ban on stolen land', say Indigenous activists in U.S. *CBCNews.ca*, 2 February.
Moraga, C. and Anzaldúa, G., 1981. *This bridge called my back: writings by radical women of color*. New York: Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press.
Moreton-Robinson, A., 2015. *The white possessive: property, power, and Indigenous sovereignty*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 1986. *Decolonising the mind: the politics of language in African literature*. London: J. Currey.
Niranjana, T., Wang, X., and Vasudevan, N., eds. 2015. *Genealogies of the Asian present: situating inter-Asia cultural studies*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
Osuri, G., 2017. Imperialism, colonialism and sovereignty in the (post)colony: India and Kashmir. *Third world quarterly*, 38 (11), 2428–2443.
Patel, S., 2016. Complicating the tale of 'two Indians': mapping 'South Asian' complicity in white settler colonialism along the axis of caste and anti-blackness. *Theory & event*, 19 (4), muse.jhu.edu/article/633278 [Accessed 4 Dec 2018].
Patel, S., 2018. *The "Indian" of four continents: reading for horizontal relations of violence, complicities, and the making of white settler colonialism*. Thesis (PhD), University of Toronto.
Patel, S., Moussa, G., and Upadhyay, N., 2015. Guest editorial: complicities, connections, struggles: transnational feminist analysis of settler colonialism. *Feral feminisms*, 4 (Summer), 5–19.
Rawat, R.S. and Satyanarayana, K. eds. 2016. *Dalit studies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Said, E.W., 1993. *Culture and imperialism*. New York : Random House.
Saldaña-Portillo, M.J., 2008. "How many Mexicans [is] a horse worth?" The league of United Latin American citizens, desegregation cases, and Chicano historiography. *South Atlantic quarterly*, 107 (4), 809–831.
Sharma, N., 2015. Strategic anti-essentialism: decolonizing decolonization. *In:* K. McKittrick, ed. *Sylvia Wynter: on being human as praxis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 164–182.
Sharma, N. and Wright, C., 2008. Decolonizing resistance, challenging colonial states. *Social justice*, 35 (3), 120–138.
Sharpe, C.E., 2016. *In the wake: on blackness and being*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Shohat, E., 1992. Notes on the 'post-colonial'. *Social text*, 31/32, 99–113.

Simpson, A., 2007. On ethnographic refusal: Indigeneity, 'voice' and colonial citizenship. *Junctures: the journal for thematic dialogue*, 9, 67–80.
Simpson, A., 2014. *Mohawk interruptus: political life across the borders of settler states*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Simpson, L.B., 2014. Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation. *Decolonization: indigeneity, education and society*, 3 (3), 1–25.
Simpson, L.B., 2016. Indigenous resurgence and co-resistance. *Critical ethnic studies*, 2 (2), 19–34.
Smith, L.T., 1999. *Decolonizing methodologies: research and Indigenous peoples*. Otago: Otago University Press.
Spivak, G.C., 1988. Can the subaltern speak? *In:* L. Grossberg, and C. Nelson, eds. *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 271–313.
Stam, R. and Shohat, E., 2012. *Race in translation: culture wars around the postcolonial Atlantic*. New York: New York University Press.
Stoler, A.L., 1997. Racial histories and their regimes of truth. *Political power & social theory*, 11, 183–206.
Sundar, N., 1997. *Subalterns and sovereigns: an anthropological history of Bastar, 1854–1996*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
TallBear, K. 2016. Available from: https://twitter.com/kimtallbear/status/755645557532684289 [Accessed 13 March 2018].
Tharu, S. and Niranjana, T., 1996. Problems for a contemporary theory of gender. *In:* S. Amin, and D. Chakrabarty, eds. *Subaltern studies IX*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 232–260.
Toer, P.A., 1980. *This earth of mankind*. New York: Penguin.
Tuck, E., 2009. Suspending damage: a letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review,* 79 (3), 409–428.
Tuck, E. and Yang, K.W., 2012. Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, education and society*, 1 (1), 1–40.
Upadhyay, N., 2016. *'We'll sail like Columbus': race, indigeneity, settler colonialism, and the making of South Asian diasporas in Canada*. Dissertation (PhD). York University, Toronto.
Vimalassery, M., Pegues, J.H., and Goldstein, A., 2016. Introduction: on colonial unknowing. *Theory & event*, 19 (4).
Walcott, R., 2003. *Black like who?: writing Black Canada*. 2nd ed. Toronto, ON: Insomniac Press.
Walker, B., 2011. *Race on trial: black defendants in Ontario's criminal courts, 1858–1958*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Wilderson, F., 2010. *Red, white, and black: cinema and the structure of U.S. antagonisms*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Williams, R., 1973. Base and superstructure in Marxist cultural theory. *New left review*, 82, 3–16.
Wolfe, P., 2006. Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of genocide research*, 8 (4), 387–409.
Wolfe, P., ed. 2016. *The settler complex: recuperating binarism in colonial studies*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA American Indian Studies Center.
Wright, H.K., 1998. Dare we de-centre Birmingham? Troubling the 'origin' and trajectories of cultural studies. *European journal of cultural studies*, 1 (1), 33–56.
Wynter, S., 1995. 1492: a new world view. *In:* V. L. Hyatt, and R. Nettleford, eds. *Race, discourse, and the origin of the Americas*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 5–57.