TRANSVERSING SETTLER COLONIAL CAPITAL:

Indigenous Dispossession and Non-White Labour Exploitation

Roshon Singh Nandhra[*]

The central imperative of this article is to examine why relations of solidarity and insurgency between Black peoples, Indigenous peoples, and people of colour (BIPOC) are impeded in settler colonial contexts when it may appear that non-white peoples should share common political impulses against white supremacy. My main claim is that impediments to solidarity are produced and fostered by relations of capital that are intrinsically varied in scope and operation because of shifting racial and colonial formations. More specifically, I argue that processes of dispossession, advanced through capitalist expansion and (re)organization, produce overlapping and relational violence (i.e., physical, economic, racialized, gendered, and territorial violence) that adversely affect relationship-building between and among BIPOC in the Canadian settler colonial context. I draw on critiques of settler colonialism and the work of Dene scholar Glen Sean Coulthard in order to develop a concept I refer to as "transversal modes of life," which provides a theoretical framework within which to track these processes and to delve into the following interrelated lines of inquiry:

1. to better understand the ways that colonial-capitalist relations emerge to create an array of complex, varied, and uneven structural divisions between and among BIPOC.

2. to build a politics of action predicated on plural modes of being and becoming that transcend these processes and generate place-based relations that respect and actively support what Coulthard and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson refer to as "grounded normativity."[1]

---

[*] With sincere gratitude, my thanks to Rita Kaur Dhamoon for deeply engaging and supporting this article and my thought, as well as pushing the article to and beyond its limits from its very earliest conceptions. My thanks also to James Lawson for working with me through formative theoretical tensions in earlier stages of this work. I would also like to thank my closest friends and family, including Q Roxas, JJ Buermans, and Neesha Kaur Nandhra, along

In other words, transversal modes of life are both an *analytical concept* through which to understand how colonial-capitalist forces of power shape varied BIPOC relations in different ways and a *form of politics* driven by social change that seeks to transcend colonial-capital divisions and hierarchies. To be clear, I am not suggesting that racisms and colonialisms arise from capitalism alone but, rather, that within the settler colonial context, capitalist development is *embedded* in them and contributes to (re)producing recursive enactments of them.

Questions of solidarity between and among BIPOC are not new, and growing recent literature emphasizes contiguities of history, oppression, and co-resistance. For example, through an expansive framework of conquest, Tiffany Lethabo King states: “Black and Indigenous protest against conquistador ways of life have already been talking to one another in ways that exceed certain forms of humanist narrativity and intelligibility available within discourses of settler colonialism.”[2] In 2010, this was demonstrated when Indigenous peoples beheaded the statue of Christopher Columbus in Boston.[3] King identifies this defacement as representing “an (ongoing) act of revolt that confronts the murders and disappearances of Native women in the Northwestern part of Turtle Island, the ongoing destruction of Native life and the murderous onslaught against Black women, transpeople and all Black life forms in ways that traverse and inform one another.”[4] Dana M. Olwan further notes linkages of solidarity between “a large group of Palestinians from occupied Palestine and diasporic Palestinians from the settler-colonial states of Canada and the United States” through their “statement in support of the Idle No More Movement and Indigenous rights to sovereignty and self-determination.”[5] Furthermore, (contingent) collaborations between the Black/Land Project (BLP) and researchers from State University of New York (SUNY) New Paltz propelled an effort to take up theorizations of distinct but relational Black and Indigenous relationships to land

---

with many others whose generative conversations and love are invaluable to my thoughts and to this article. My thanks also to the reviewers for their insightful comments, which helped me to develop and clarify my ideas.

[1] Glen Sean Coulthard and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, “Grounded Normativity / Place-Based Solidarity,” *American Quarterly* 68, no. 2 (2016): 254.

[2] Tiffany Lethabo King, “New World Grammars: The ‘Unthought’ Black Discourses of Conquest,” *Theory and Event* 19, no. 4 (2016): n.p.

[3] King, “New World Grammars.”

[4] King.

[5] Dana M. Olwan, “On Assumptive Solidarities in Comparative Settler Colonialisms,” *Feral Feminisms* no. 4 (2015): 89.

"in a way that would be mutually informed and constructed."[6] My contribution to this literature on solidarities between and among BIPOC seeks (1) to illuminate how forces of domination targeting any one group in fact have implications for other subjugated groups, and (2) to propose some directions to build relations in ways that surpass colonial-capital ways of life.

First, I provide the epistemological and ontological orientation of transversal modes of life. This involves detailing the theoretical lens of transversality and how it is distinct from, yet formulated in relation to, Jasbir K. Puar's approach to concept work on the relationship between intersectionality and assemblage as well as the ontological map afforded by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's concept "rhizome." Following my description of transversality, I provide context and build on Coulthard's conceptual framing of "modes of life,"[7] presented in *Red Skin, White Masks*, in order to develop transversal modes of life.

Second, I pursue a critical inquiry into the salmon-canning industry in early to mid-twentieth-century British Columbia by using the concept of transversal modes of life to detail how relations of co-resistance are hindered by colonial-capitalism in two ways: (1) through the divisive structural mechanisms internal to capitalist industries during the Fordist period of rapid intensification of productive output, such as differential pay and labour based on racial(izing) and gendered forms of occupational segregation; and (2) through labour practices that attempted to eliminate Indigenous modes of life in favour of heteropatriarchal nuclear family structures, practices of exploitation, and racial hierarchies of non-white labour.

Third, in recognizing how exploitative modes of life relationships, described in the previous section, are antithetical to the way many Indigenous peoples and communities cultivate "land-based practices and forms of knowledge [and relationship] that emphasize radical sustainability,"[8] I interweave the varied and uneven positions of Black peoples and people of colour within processes of dispossession that contribute to the attempted elimination of Indigenous sovereignties. This propels a complex discussion on non-white settler and arrivant complicities, and involves pursuing and attempting to unravel some of the suspended puzzles that may complicate but *do not* alleviate the structural frame of people of colour as settlers.

---

[6] Eve Tuck, Mistinguette Smith, Allison M. Guess, Tavia Benjamin, and Brian K. Jones, "Geotheorizing Black/Land: Contestations and Contingent Collaborations," *Departures in Critical Qualitative Research* 3, no. 1 (2014): 57.

[7] Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 65.

[8] Glen Sean Coulthard, "For Our Nations to Live, Capitalism Must Die," in *Unsettling America: Decolonization in Theory and Practice*, 5 November 2013, https://unsettlingamerica.wordpress.com/2013/11/05/for-our-nations-to-live-capitalism-must-die.

Finally, after describing the interwoven processes strung together by the relational violence administered through settler colonial capitalism, I turn to transversal modes of co-resistance and the (counter)politics of active solidarity formulation. Specifically, I engage with the work of Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, and Coulthard and Simpson to propose co-resistance between and among BIPOC that is predicated on non-exploitative modes of life principles and practices developed through deep engagement with place-based praxes that respect and actively support grounded normativity.

I. EPISTEMOLOGICAL AND ONTOLOGICAL GROUNDWORKS OF TRANSVERSAL MODES OF LIFE

In this section, I first explicate my conception of "transversal." Then, drawing from Glen Coulthard's critique of liberal recognition politics, I describe "modes of life." This is followed by an overview of the analytic of transversal modes of life, along with its epistemological and ontological underpinnings.

Transversality

Before examining Coulthard's usage of *modes of life* and elaborating on the specific ways I operationalize it in providing a theory of (settler) colonial relations of capital – which includes theorizing modalities of resistance between and among BIPOC – I explain my approach to transversality. Etymologically, the word "transverse" has roots in Latin: "trans" indicates movement and proximity across, extending through and/or beyond an entity; and "verse" is a suffix that connotes the inflective motions of changing, turning, or moving. When combined, I understand *transverse* to mean to extend beyond, change, or shift through movement and action.

In geometry, the word "transverse" is typically referenced in terms of a transversal line – this line extends through *or* beyond a system of lines. Transversality, in this context, is primarily used to assess parallels among the intersected lines – specifically through studying the angles formed by the intersecting transversal line. These angles tell us about the relationships between each line. Furthermore, each of the lines hold direction. In drawing from this geometric definition, I use lines to signal processes of power (such as colonialism and capitalism) that move through one another to shape varying degrees of oppression and privilege.

On a one-dimensional surface, transversal lines may seem like straight, solid strips that simply intersect in a predictable and linear way; however, because processes of power can be unpredictable, nonlinear, fragmented, disparate, and unfixed, they reflect and are situated in what we might call "hypersurfaces" – namely, multidimensional spatial and temporal fields. These hypersurfaces shape the proportion, scope, and distance of angles that transversality produces, depending on where lines on the surface are situated. Reading transversality within a hypersurface signals that the relationships (angles) between and among lines variably (shape) shift, sometimes with incommensurable and contradictory transversal impacts on forces of power. The key point here is that transversality (oscillating, relational, criss-crossing processes of power) always operates and operationalizes hypersurfaces.

Transversality echoes the political transformative possibilities of other concepts, including intersectionality and assemblage. Kimberlé Crenshaw uses her groundbreaking concept "intersectionality" to theorize "the various ways in which race and gender intersect in shaping structural, political, and representational aspects of violence against women of color,"[9] challenging "the hegemonic rubrics of race, class, and gender within predominantly white feminist frames."[10] Assemblage – or the translation that Jasbir K. Puar finds more accurately reflective from Deleuze and Guattari, agencement – "means design, layout, organization, arrangement, and relations – the focus being not on content but on relations, relations of patterns."[11] Puar argues that, although scholarship has produced intersectionality and assemblage "as somehow incompatible or even oppositional," she claims that they are complementary in so far as the former provides a significant analytic import embedded in the relations of patterns (between bodies, power, space, and time) that assemblage theorizes when engaging with affective politics.[12] As such, Puar finds that the "big payoffs for thinking through the intertwined relations of intersectionality and assemblages is that it can help us produce more roadmaps of precisely these not quite fully understood relations between discipline and control."[13] Reading intersectionality and assemblage together not only provides analyses of state modes of control but also the modes of *becoming* that extend beyond state control. Although transversality can be read harmoniously with Puar's reading of intersectionality and assemblage in that the concern is with shifting processes and relations of power (transversing lines with varied angles/degrees of oppression and domination) and contexts in which power operates (hypersurfaces), it is differentiated by signalling the plural forms and directions of political action and movement that arise out of the (re)construction of relations of power (colonial-capital transversal incisions, its negations, and the complex relational webs and networks of interconnectivity that operate within and between them).

---

[9] Kimberlé Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color," *Stanford Law Review* 43, no. 6 (1991): 1244.

[10] Jasbir K. Puar, "'I Would Rather Be a Cyborg Than a Goddess': Becoming-Intersectional in Assemblage Theory," *philoSOPHIA* 2, no. 1 (2012): 50.

[11] Puar, "'I Would Rather Be a Cyborg Than a Goddess'," 55.

[12] Puar, 56.

[13] Puar, 60.

In conjunction with the groundwork provided by Puar's usage of assemblage, another of Deleuze and Guattari's concepts, *rhizome*, provides an ontological map that foregrounds connection, heterogeneity, ruptures, and multiplicities as well as the notion that "semiotic chains of every nature are connected to very diverse modes of coding (biological, political, economic, etc.)."[14] It emphasizes interconnected systems that cannot be completely elucidated but, when mapped, are responsible for differentiation between "regimes of signs" and "states of things of differing status."[15] In distinguishing rhizome from "tree" and "root" structures of analysis established within the history of Western philosophical development (and, as they note, also developed and elaborated upon by Noam Chomsky's grammaticality), Deleuze and Guattari maintain that "the rhizome is a *map and not a tracing*."[16] Significantly, in relation to both rhizomatic principles and the context within which transversing lines oscillate on hypersurfaces, the map they refer to "fosters connection between fields."[17] To highlight, *but not elucidate*, this connection, they note that "*between* things does not designate a localizable relation going from one thing to the other and back again, but a perpendicular direction, a transversal movement that sweeps one *and* the other away."[18] My focus on transversality illustrates that its movement is not only strictly perpendicular but also cuts across, affects, or transverses at *differing angles* between and through multiplicities of lines.

Transversality within hypersurfaces emphasizes connections that, in many ways, are similar to what we find in Deleuze and Guattari as this framework remains focused not on the points of intersection but on the distinctions and relations between and formed by transversing lines. Connections between transversality and rhizome help illustrate that, although my analytic emphasis is on relations and not points, this does not signal that empirical study is any less essential to my schema; rather, it signals that empirical *sufficiency* can never be entirely realized under rupturing, (re)connecting, and refracting rhizomorphic cartographies. However, transversality is distinguished from rhizome in its focal level of analysis – namely, by providing a theoretical framework intent on critiquing and transforming contingent relations of the so-called map and the processes conditioning "mapping." In efforts to promote a framework with an emphasis on relationality, I conclude the discussion on rhizome by noting, and adding to one of the many slogans afforded by Deleuze and Guattari: "Run [*transversal*] lines, never plot a point!"[19]

---

[14] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 7.

[15] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 7.

[16] Deleuze and Guattari, 12 (emphasis in original).

[17] Deleuze and Guattari, 12 (emphasis in original).

[18] Deleuze and Guattari, 25 (emphasis in original).

Modes of Life

Coulthard's work is an ideal entry to my project because it merges a radical anticolonial (specifically Indigenous nationalist) material approach with a Marxist class struggle against capitalism. First, Coulthard rejects the Eurocentric ontological separation of domains of life in favour of a more integrated approach. For Coulthard, "understanding 'culture' as the interconnected social totality of [a] distinct mode of life encompassing the economic, political, spiritual, and social is crucial for comprehending the state's response to the challenge posed by … land-claim proposals."[20] In other words, culture is a way of living in the world that does not separate domains of life (like law, politics, economics, ceremony, spirit world, nonhuman animals and plants) – because, for example, historically and in some cases in the present, Indigenous cultures intrinsically encompass non-capitalist bush modes of production (sustainable gathering and hunting). This is different from conventional Marxist thinking, which defines "mode of production" as everything that goes into the production of the necessities of life (i.e., productive forces such as labour, tools, and raw material and the relations of production such as the social structures that regulate the human production of goods) separately from other aspects of life. In other words, Coulthard builds on Marx but also ontologically departs from Marxism in that Indigenous modes of production are also modes of life; for Coulthard, how Dene people produce the necessities of life *is* a way of life or Dene culture. Modes of production, he says, encompass

---

[19] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 24.

[20] Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*, 65–66.

"two interrelated social processes: the resources, technologies, and labor that a people deploy to produce what they need to materially sustain themselves over time, and the forms of thought, behavior, and social relationships that both *condition and are themselves conditioned by these productive forces*."[21] As such, (trans)formations in the modes of production are ontologically and epistemologically attached to ways of being, connecting, and knowing as he claims that "this broad understanding of mode of production as a mode of life accurately reflects what constituted 'culture' in the sense that the Dene deployed the term, and which [their] claims for cultural recognition sought to secure through the negotiation of a land claim,"[22] even though the state-led land claims system "resulted in a significant decoupling of Indigenous 'cultural' claims from the transformative visions of social, political, and economic change that once constituted them."[23]

Second, Coulthard's definition of mode of life (or culture) as intrinsically bound up with mode of production, and vice versa, can illuminate ontological differences in how to make political change. Coulthard argues that Dene nationalist alternatives to colonial-capitalism require a rejection of the liberal paradigm. He states:

> [State recognition and accommodation of] "the cultural" through the negotiation of land claims would not involve the recognition of alternative Indigenous economies and forms of political authority, as the mode of production/mode of life concept suggests … [This is especially evident because] the state insisted that any institutionalized accommodation of Indigenous cultural difference be reconcilable with one political formation – namely, colonial sovereignty – and one mode of production – namely, capitalism.

Dene modes of life, he argues, are irreconcilable with recognition by settler society and instead entail connection to Dene epistemology, ontology, and land-based principles that "stress individual autonomy, collective responsibility, nonhierarchical authority, communal land tenure, and mutual aid."[24] In other words, an Indigenous mode of life is necessarily sovereign.

---

[21] Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*, 65 (emphasis in original).

[22] Coulthard, 65 (emphasis in original).

[23] Coulthard, 52.

[24] Coulthard, 65.

Transversal Modes of Life

In bringing "transversality" together with Coulthard's conception of "modes of life," I am seeking to theorize how to *analytically describe and critique* complex power dynamics between and among BIPOC on hypersurfaces where settler colonial capital transverses relations, and how to *politically change* those dynamics in ways that forge alternate non-exploitative relations between and among BIPOC.

As an analytic tool, transversal modes of life are multi-directional and multidimensional, with no singular or even obvious beginning or endpoint, and thus not directed by a singular *telos*. Rather, modes of life hold multiple pasts, presences, and futures that incorporate, connect, and reconnect on shifting hypersurfaces. The directions and aims confining or binding transversal modes of life, like colonial-capital, shift with the relations between and among them – for example, how nineteenth-century Chinese railway workers in Canada shaped Indigenous modes of life and how Indigenous modes of life shaped modes of life for mostly male Chinese temporary migrants will differ from colonial-capital formations of Punjabi workers in pulp mills and logging industries. Knowledge of those processes will inevitably be partial since there is constant movement across and between transversing lines, and the angles/scope are also shifting. However, because transversal modes of life are *always* relational and connected, we can use them to critique structural forces that create and/or exacerbate binds among subjects of colonialisms and racisms in order to effectively organize a radical politics of co-resistance and transformation.

The concept "transversal modes of life" invites a specific critique of Canadian settler colonialism. When modes of life are operationalized transversally, understanding capitalist development *practices* and how they are connected to the relationships formed between and among people(s) within and/or subject to them becomes partially revealed, and a theory of action and counter-politics of solidarity arises. Modes of resistance are borne at the advent of the opposing structure in so far as settler colonial capitalism is built and sustained through negating Indigenous sovereignties, epistemologies, ontologies, and economies. Therefore, the theory of transversality illuminates and derives from the empirical: as colonial-capitalist transversal modes of life emerge, relations (the angles) emerge or are transformed and illuminated, strung together (yet not reducible to) by arrangements of power, and are unwound through its negation – Indigenous solidarity and resurgence. Increasing our understanding of how our relations are affected by colonial trajectories through modes of life allows us to understand the depth of our relationships with regard to processes of complicity or solidarity that we form (and in the former, sometimes involuntarily or unwittingly). Although this perspective details that relationships and interconnections between modes of life are always shifting, I argue that transversally interpreting the multiplicities of mode of life arrangements and patterns between and among BIPOC signals *plural modes of being and becoming beyond, and that necessarily and actively counterpose, challenge, or transverse, (settler) colonial relations of capital.* The second way that I deploy transversal modes of life is as a framework or skeletal outline devoted to pursuing plural and connected forms of resistance to arrangements of domination and subjugation, whether between settler society and marginalized BIPOC or among privileged BIPOC and marginalized BIPOC.

II. TRANSVERSAL MODES OF LIFE: A CRITICAL INQUIRY INTO BRITISH COLUMBIA'S SETTLER COLONIAL SALMON-CANNING INDUSTRY IN THE EARLY TO MID-TWENTIETH CENTURY

In applying the lens of transversal modes of life, I provide a critical inquiry into settler colonial capitalism in early to mid-twentieth-century British Columbia. The lens of transversal modes of life illuminates that settler colonial capitalism generates rapid productive output and territorial expansion through: (1) the labour of Black peoples and people of colour in emerging settler territory; (2) Indigenous labour, bodies, lands, and waters; and (3) the relationships between them all. In the salmon canning-industry during this period, colonial-capital modes of life transverse all three. There are existing cases in which scholars have identified settler colonial relations to non-Indigenous communities of colour, such as Candace Fujikane's analysis of sugar plantations worked by violently exploited groups of Asian settlers, who were used as an "economic base for the American settler colony" in Hawai'i.[25] Another example is provided in Suzanne Mills and Steven Tufts's ability to identify that "the expansion of the Temporary Foreign Worker Program to include lower skilled occupational classifications and employer appetites for workers who were malleable and less prone to resistance" was necessary to facilitate the increased "use of migrant workers in oil extraction" on Indigenous lands, despite protests.[26] Iyko Day examines Mount Rushmore and "the contradictory logics of settler colonialism … [and] the labor exploitation and racial violence" practised against Chinese miners in the Black Hills of South Dakota.[27] I build on these works and extend such analysis by critically applying the lens of transversal modes of life to the salmon-canning industry of the early to mid-twentieth-century in British Columbia, with a specific focus on relations between and among BIPOC. I examine specific logics within the capitalist mode of life arrangements and patterns that produce material and immaterial divisions among BIPOC and facilitate hyperexploitative relations of difference in the attempt to displace Indigenous peoples and to dispossess them of their lands and modes of life.

---

[25] Candace Fujikane, "Introduction: Asian Settler Colonialism in the US Colony of Hawai'i," in *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i*, ed. Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008), 7.

The colonial fishing industry is an important settler capital formation because it has fostered the attempted and actual elimination of Indigenous modes of life. Patrick Wolfe shows that the fishing industry motivated the project of land acquisition.[28] He suggests that this industry is "inherently sedentary, and, therefore, permanent,"[29] or, perhaps more accurately, *attempts* permanence. Since colonial agricultural expansion in British Columbia led white colonizers to seek cheap exploitable non-white labour (whether as Black slaves, servants, porters; or Chinese railway workers; or Punjabi mill workers), limited and often temporary immigration was permitted, thus "enabl[ing] a [settler] population to be expanded by continuing immigration at the expense of native lands and livelihoods."[30] As Wolfe notes, the fishing industries that pursued an intensified productive output required canneries that served settler populations[31] – the entrenchment of these industries fundamentally stifled and/or prohibited Indigenous modes of production/life.

Labour in the canneries in the late nineteenth century advanced certain measures of exploitation that were guided by principles of segregation of jobs and pay along racial and gendered lines.[32] Dianne

---

[26] Suzanne Mills and Steven Tufts, "Innis's Ghost: Canada's Changing Resource Economy," in *Change and Continuity: Canadian Political Economy in the New Millennium*, ed. Mark P. Thomas, Leah F. Vosko, Carlo Fanelli, and Olena Lyubchenko (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2019), 122.

[27] Iyko Day, *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016), 102.

[28] Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): 395.

[29] Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," 395.

[30] Wolfe, 395.

[31] Wolfe, 395.

[32] Alicja Muszynski, *Cheap Wage Labour: Race and Gender in the Fisheries of British Columbia* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), 135.

Newell notes that, "as the industry spread northward along the coast in the 1870s, the canneries that sprang up were much like Adam Smith's classic pin factory: not only were the various operations separated from each other, but they were also assigned to different … tasks [that] were always allocated according to distinctions of race and gender."[33] In this way, the canneries were structured according to models predicated on profitability in relation to perceived racialized-gendered differential labour functions. This structure dominated salmon canneries from their beginnings through the 1940s.[34] A description in 1877 indicates that tasks were allocated in the following way:

> Chinese male contract laborers butchered and cleaned the salmon, cut it into can-sized pieces, soldered on the can tops, filled the boiling kettles with cans of raw salmon for cooking, vented the can tops, and then soldered closed the perforations, and washed, lacquered, and labeled the tins. The Chinese also fabricated a supply of handmade cans before the fishing season began. "White" males operated the cooking phase, and were usually in charge of running the cannery store, mess house, and net loft, and of keeping the cannery accounts and fish tallies. Native women and young girls washed and scrubbed the butchered fish (called "sliming"), filled the cans with "marvelous rapidity," and placed them on trays for topping and cooking. The fish butchering took place in a separate building (the "gut shed"), as did the can-making operation. All this was typical of the pioneer salmon canneries on the West Coast, where Chinese and Native seasonal labour abounded.[35]

Asian and Indigenous peoples in the canneries were a super-exploited class of workers as they had substantially lower wages and poorer working conditions than did white labourers.[36] Furthermore, tensions between Indigenous and non-white groups arose or were exacerbated due to their "direct competition" for higher wages.[37] Patricia Marchak notes that capitalist rules and norms of colonizer accumulation pit workers in the fisheries and its processes against one another through racial-ethnic, gendered, gear-type, regional, and class divisions.[38] The canneries particularly took advantage of and intentionally facilitated intergroup strife within the fisheries and the province by maintaining control of the working class through such divisions.[39] Furthermore, control mechanisms were also predicated on a type of calibrated efficiency dependent on forms of expanding racialization and were not merely meant for maximizing profit through justifying cheap wages. For example, technological advancement in the canneries unfolded through racist modalities of replacement as Chinese butchers were replaced by a fish-butchering machine named the "Iron Chink" in 1909.[40] The link between racism, dehumanization, and technological efficiency is also reflected in the 1902 *Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese and Japanese Immigration* in comments made by the company manager of the Anglo-British Columbia (ABC) Packing Company, Henry Bell-Irving – including that he "look[ed] upon [Chinese people] as steam engines or any other machine."[41]

---

[33] Dianne Newell, "The Rationality of Mechanization in the Pacific Salmon-Canning Industry before the Second World War," *Business History Review* 62, no. 4 (1988): 633–35.

[34] Muszynski, *Cheap Wage Labour*, 225.

[35] Newell, "Rationality of Mechanization," 635.

[36] Muszynski, *Cheap Wage Labour*, 225.

[37] Gillian Creese, "Class, Ethnicity, and Conflict: The Case of Chinese and Japanese Immigration, 1880–1923," in *Workers, Capital, and the State in British Columbia: Selected Papers*, ed. Rennie Warburton and David Coburn (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1988), 65.

Indigenous and Asian workers were frequently compared, and labour formation was primarily conducted by relationally expanding processes of racialization. Daniel Wright Clayton notes that, in the Skeena District during the 1890s, "most canners preferred Japanese to aboriginal fishermen" – although "Bell-Irving harboured racist views about the Japanese," claiming they were unreliable but noting in the same breath that they "favourably compare with whites, because they work hard when the fish are scarce"[42] – while British Columbia's fisheries commissioner claimed that the motivation to contract Indigenous fishermen hinged on the "the desirability of a particular Indian[,] … measured by the number of women his household w[ould] produce for the canneries as fish cleaners and can fillers."[43] Within this period, in the Aberdeen Cannery, divisions of labour were implemented based on the number of racial-ethnic canners belonging to each group:

> Aboriginal women and children made and mended nets before the start of the season, and during the canning season cleaned the fish,

---

[38] Patricia Marchak, "Organization of Divided Fishers," in *Uncommon Property: The Fishing and Fish-Processing Industries in British Columbia*, ed. Patricia Marchak, Neil Guppy, and John McMullan (Agincourt, ON: Methuen, 1987), 224.

[39] Muszynski, *Cheap Wage Labour*, 7.

[40] Newell, "Rationality of Mechanization," 649.

[41] Canada, Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration, *Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese and Japanese Immigration* (Ottawa: S.E. Dawson, 1902), 145.

[42] Daniel Wright Clayton, "Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830–1920" (MA thesis, University of British Columbia, 1989), 121.

[43] Quoted in Clayton, "Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830–1920," 122.

> carried them to the filling tables with the empty cans, and filled the cans. Chinese crews made the cans before the season, unloaded the fish from the boats, butchered them, soldered the filled cans and cooked them, labelled them once they were cool, and packed the cans in boxes. The tasks performed by these different … groups sometimes varied, *especially if there were more of one group than of the other* [emphasis added].[44]

Indigenous women who filled cans were usually paid piece rates of six cents per case, while wipers were typically paid eleven cents per hour.[45] Clayton notes that, by 1907, wipers' wages increased to twenty cents per hour, while fillers' wages had only increased to eight cents per case.[46] White workers were usually paid more and employed in positions that oversaw non-white workers, such as "managers, accountants, storekeepers, engineers, machinery overseers and floor supervisors."[47] As such, racialization at the angled junctions affected non-white groups differentially, calibrated fulfilments of relative labour shortages, and contributed to the assortment of the canneries' divisions of labour through racial-ethnic hierarchies. Such relational processes of exploiting non-white peoples and ways of life created barriers to collective resistance between non-white peoples within the working class.

This was not restricted to Asians labouring in Canada. The 1920s through to the end of the Second World War "saw an expanded focus on restricting Black presence" as practices of containment and control were unrelenting. Jobs available for Black men took on the form either of hyper-exploitation and dangerous positions in the Canadian Pacific Railway or of sleeping-car porters, emphasizing "the importance of public displays of Black submission."[48] Canadian-born Black women remained captive under the same forms of labour they performed under bondage, and the only employment available to them was domestic service, "a role which consisted of nearly twenty-four hours a day of submission and deference," and echoed the work Black women were forced to do as slaves for white owners.[49] These confinements expose the relational constitution of labour positionalities and the economic structural makeup underlying developments of the Canadian political economy. With rigid constraints on Black peoples' labour opportunities and economic advancement, racialized labour positions within the salmon-canning industry were to be filled by Chinese, Japanese, Indigenous peoples, and, in the mid- to late twentieth century, South Asians.[50] As such, the labour structuring of these industries was predicated on placements and perceptions of utility dependent on various forms of racialized and gendered hierarchies of hyper-exploitability.

---

[44] Clayton, "Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830–1920," 126.

[45] Clayton, 129.

[46] Clayton, 129.

[47] Clayton, 126.

[48] Robyn Maynard, *Policing Black Lives* (Halifax: Fernwood, 2017), 37.

[49] Maynard, *Policing Black Lives*, 39.

Through an expansive lens of settler colonial capital, I propose that modes of production and modes of life are in an analogous relationship because of the way that they are arranged by transversing labour and living divisions between and among BIPOC. For example, "cannery housing reflected the racial segregation [internal to the labour processes as] a special type of housing for each group [was] set up in a distinctive location that kept them all physically separated from one another."[51] These living quarters were characterized by differential living arrangements for each racial-ethnic group.[52] A designated quarter would be named after the corresponding racial-ethnic group it housed (i.e., Chinese Village, Japanese Village, Native Village, white Village).[53] Indigenous peoples camped and had to supply their own accommodations,[54] as living arrangements, too, were organized through racial hierarchies, mirroring labour arrangements. The lens of transversal modes of life illuminates that the division of Indigenous peoples and Asians internal to the labour processes within the canning industry extended beyond the confines of the work environment to influence divisions/segregation over housing as a characteristic inherent to settler colonial capitalist modes of life. Together, zero-sum cheap wage schemes and physical separation inside and outside of the workplace exacerbated transversing divisions.

Although modes of settler colonial division and control created barriers to resistance between and among Indigenous workers, workers of colour, and white workers along racial and gendered lines in the allocation of pay, tasks, and labour conditions, significant resistance to capitalist exploitation and conditions in the fisheries was facilitated through the work of trade unions. However, this resistance was not uniform or entirely collective, nor should it be categorized "under a single umbrella."[55] While various non-white groups and white workers organized together at times in the early to mid-twentieth century – such as between Indigenous and white fishers in the British Columbia Fishermen's Union in 1899,[56] and between Indigenous, Japanese, Chinese, and white workers in the Fishermen's Industrial Union and the United Fishermen of British Columbia in 1931[57] – transversal modes of worker life were contingent, discontinuous, and still contoured by race. In fact, the earliest documented organization of fishers in British Columbia occurred in 1893 and had its roots in excluding Chinese people from fishing the Fraser River, which "paralleled the wave of anti-Chinese feeling prevalent in British Columbia during that period."[58] Although some Chinese workers later joined white-led unions, such as the Fishermen's and Cannery Workers' Industrial Union in Barkley Sound,[59] "racism directed … toward [East Asian] persons … was widespread, permeating the fisheries as well as other industries" for the first half of the twentieth century.[60] In response to the exclusion of Japanese workers from "the Fraser River Fishermen's Protective Union" in 1893 and then the "BC Fishermen's Union in 1899[,] … [i]n self-defence, the Japanese organized a union … [named] the Fishermen's Benevolent Society." Conflict and tensions between Japanese and non-Japanese workers, "together with strikes over prices, generated violence in the strikes of 1900 and 1901."[61] Between 1893 and 1938, there were at least thirty-three fishing strikes that varied in intensity and duration,[62] depending on the various placements and differential (in)securities of racial-ethnic groups within the provincial political economy. For example, Japanese fishers went on strike half as much as Indigenous and white fishers, and there is no record of a strike from Chinese workers after 1901 because, in a restrictive labour market, they "could ill afford to lose access to salmon canning jobs."[63] In 1914, the Fraser River Fishermen's Protective Association was formed "with the sole intention of excluding the Japanese from the Pacific Coast fisheries."[64]

---

[50] Kamala E. Nayar, *The Punjabis in British Columbia: Location, Labour, First Nations, and Multiculturalism* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012), 167, 188, and 254–56.

[51] Muszynski, *Cheap Wage Labour*, 7.

[52] Muszynski, 7; Nayar, *Punjabis in British Columbia*, 146.

[53] Muszynski, 7; Nayar, 146.

[54] Muszynski, 7; Nayar, 146.

[55] Marchak, "Organization of Divided Fishers," 223.

---

[56] Marchak, "Organization of Divided Fishers," 223.

[57] Wallace Clement, *The Struggle to Organize: Resistance in Canada's Fishery* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986), 38.

[58] United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union Fonds, RBSC-ARC-1569, University of British Columbia Library Rare Books and Special Collections, 1982, v.

[59] "Deep Bay Cannery to Be Rebuilt," *Fisherman* 1, no. 9 (18 June 1937).

[60] Marchak, "Organization of Divided Fishers," 228.

[61] Marchak, 228.

[62] Percy Gladstone, "Industrial Disputes in the Commercial Fisheries of British Columbia" (MA thesis, University of British Columbia, 1959), 304–8.

[63] Devin Ainsworth Eeg, "Race, Labour, and the Architecture of White Jobs: Chinese Labour in British Columbia's Salmon Canning Industry, 1871–1941" (MA thesis, University of British Columbia, 2017), 29.

[64] United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union Fonds, v.

This does not diminish the fact that there was solidarity among some white and various groups of non-white workers but, rather, signals complicated contingencies and racist history within unions. As such, sites that are meant to promote collective liberation can sometimes still reinforce existing colonial and racist hegemonies.

The federal government acknowledged and exacerbated these divisions in the 1920s by issuing "a reduction in the number of licenses for Japanese [fishers,] … an indication of how important a role the government played in the organization of the industry."[65] Furthermore, Japanese fishers were "forbidden to use motorboats, although other [white] and [Indigenous] fishermen were allowed to use them."[66] According to Marchak, this pattern remained throughout the next two decades until 1942, when Japanese fishers and other Japanese residents were forcibly evicted and had their vessels confiscated from the coast of British Columbia, as most were forcibly interned in camps.[67] Furthermore, she states that "the expulsion of … Japanese [people] and the many forms of anti-[Asian] legislation over the first half of the twentieth century were official acts of governments, and were supported by workers in many industries and unions throughout British Columbia."[68] Wallace Clement also notes that, following Japanese expulsion from the coast, an account from *Canadian Fishermen* of April 1945 indicates that, in addressing two hundred delegates, "Vancouver mayor J.W. Cornet 'expressed his belief that it was better for the community generally that the Japanese had ceased to be a factor in this industry [, and that] BC had been faced with the Japanese problem for the past 40 years and that it did not want a return of these people after the war.'"[69] Although the mayor was reprimanded for his racism, and despite the fact that Alex Gordon reported on behalf of cannery workers "that 'half of the Chinese [workers] in the industry had already joined up, and that there were hundreds of women members of the organization,"[70] anti-Japanese racism for the first half of the century remained unaddressed, the government attempted to conceal or mitigate it by including Chinese people and women in unions, and it was a constituent part of union formation up until the federal government expelled Japanese people from the land and confiscated their belongings.

---

[65] Marchak, "Organization of Divided Fishers," 229.

[66] Japanese Canadian Research Collection, RBSC-ARC-1288, University of British Columbia Library Rare Books and Special Collections, 1996 [1975], 10–11.

[67] Marchak, "Organization of Divided Fishers," 229.

[68] Marchak, 229.

[69] Clement, *Struggle to Organize*, 38–39.

[70] Clement, 39.

The lens of transversal modes of life also highlights that the relational differentials between and among BIPOC generated by colonial capital can be examined in the context of the wider hypersurface, in which government policies abetted the movement of industry to curtail Indigenous economies while exploiting BIPOC workers. For instance, concomitant with the installation of canneries in the late nineteenth century was a federal government policy of segregation and a Crown Colony focus on assimilation in so far as the Government of British declared in 1875 that the "Dominion aim[ed] at a *concentration of the Indians upon Reserves,* while that of the Crown Colony … encouraged [them] to mingle with and live amongst the white population with a view of weaning them by degrees of savage life."[71] Muszynski notes that wage labour brought Indigenous peoples "into contact with the 'civilized races'" as a means of assimilation.[72] Driven by the logics of elimination and accumulation, practices of assimilation attempted to absorb Indigenous modes of life within the settler-colonial capitalist expansion project through a wage-labour system rather than a subsistence-economy system as "the emergence of industrial resource capitalism simultaneously relied upon and attempted to transform [I]ndigenous relations of production."[73] In this sense, settler colonialism functioned in the following way: "Indigenous fisheries were taken possession of by settlers for cannery purposes,"[74] which contributed to fulfilling the economic needs of the province,[75] and Indigenous peoples could either fill cheap wage labour positions within these industries or relocate and attempt to continue operating their economies on peripheral landscapes while European systems of commodification increasingly overshadowed Indigenous systems of relational economies. To further entrench settler models of capital, settlers established canneries and displaced Indigenous peoples and their economies while truncating the potlatch, an essential practice of economic exchange and diplomacy for some Indigenous nations.[76] As you may recall, Indigenous modes of life did not separate economic-ceremonial-cultural-political-legal life in the ways that dominant settler modes of life required.[77] Caitlyn Vernon notes that such forms of dispossession and displacement, coupled with the "size and location of Indian reserves[,] function to deny First Nations access to land and push them into the workforce."[78]

---

[71] Quoted in Muszynski, *Cheap Wage Labour*, 95.

[72] Muszynski, 95 (emphasis in original).

[73] Charles R. Menzies and Caroline F. Butler, "The Indigenous Foundation of the Resource Economy of BC's North Coast," *Labour / Le Travail* 61 (Spring 2008): 133.

[74] Menzies and Butler, "Indigenous Foundation of the Resource Economy," 94.

[75] Menzies and Butler, 97.

[76] Menzies and Butler, 95.

[77] Menzies and Butler, 95.

The push into economic labour processes oriented by capitalist values includes adopting the nuclear family model, which was/is predicated on hierarchically assigned gender-labour relations, while at the same time limiting the migration of Chinese, Japanese, and South Asian women to Canada for fear that they would literally reproduce more non-white peoples. Simpson notes that the patriarchal impulses of settler colonialism required (and continues to require) "dismantling the power and influence of Indigenous women … [in order to facilitate] the destruction of Indigenous nations."[79] Furthermore, Simpson notes that such assimilation and "domesticity – confining Indigenous women to heteropatriarchal marriage and the home – was an intense site of cultural genocide."[80] The economic processes and practices inherent in Indigenous communities posed a threat to settler colonial governmentality and economic practices established within emerging capitalism. Such a process of attempted elimination reinforces the structuring of capitalist development and settler colonial society as well as the absorption of Indigenous peoples into labour processes and relationships that are based on exploitation, individual gain, and hierarchy rather than on local Indigenous principles of cooperation, nondomination, reciprocity, and nonhierarchy.

Some may claim that, since "the canneries provided a nexus for [I]ndigenous trade and created avenues to maintain aboriginal networks in the emerging industrial economy,"[81] and that in so far as Indigenous culture and economy is "dynamic, not static, and, thus, capable of adaptation and change,"[82] there may be some compatibility and room for continuities between and within Indigenous economic development and the capitalist industrial resource economy. But when we examine the transversal modes of colonial-capital life beyond the borders of the nation-state, we can track global systems of power. Transversing the nation-state reveals that "the global market economy … played a significant role in the loss of political and economic autonomy of

---

[78] Caitlyn Vernon, "What New Relationship? Taking Responsibility for Justice and Sustainability in British Columbia," in *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous–Non-Indigenous Relationships*, ed. Lynne Davis (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 281.

[79] Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017), 111.

[80] Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, 111.

[81] Menzies and Butler, "Indigenous Foundation of the Resource Economy," 137.

[82] Gabrielle Slowey, "A Fine Balance? Aboriginal Peoples in the Canadian North and the Dilemma of Development," in *First Nations, First Thoughts: The Impact of Indigenous Thought in Canada*, ed. Annis May Timpson (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009), 230.

Indigenous societies," as Rauna Kuokkanen notes. In particular, she states, Indigenous modes of life have been directed to the "very [accumulation-driven] economic model that was largely responsible for undermining it in the first place."[83] As such, even though Indigenous cultures and economies are adaptable, this does not mean that shifts towards Western capitalist models that subject Indigenous communities to economic, social, and cultural dependency should be tolerated.

The lens of transversality brings together the dynamics of attempted Indigenous elimination with structures and legislation that involved and were structured in relation to people of colour – in this case, Chinese and Japanese workers – who were incorporated into facilitating curtailments of Indigenous modes of life. Indigenous fishing and salmon-canning practices that were "incorporated … into the existing web of familial and seasonal activities" were marginalized in the process of settler canning developments,[84] resulting in direct disruptions to their Indigenous modes of production/life. Attempts to eliminate Indigenous economies and exploiting non-white workers did not occur in isolation but, rather, mutually reinforced one another. The transversal relationships connecting these processes structurally embedded Asian workers in the displacement, dispossession, and marginalization of Indigenous peoples and their modes of life; while, at the same time, Asian workers were exploited and discriminated against through state and corporate racist, accumulative, and profit-driven labour relations and mechanisms.

I have demonstrated that the divisions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people of colour were fundamental characteristics of colonial-capitalist modes of life in British Columbia. These divisions were not only manufactured through imperatives of colonial expansion and settlement but were also essential to racial hierarchies that aimed to solidify white superiority. The lens of transversal modes of life specifically shows how racialization, exploitation, and dispossession are bound to one another in settler colonial contexts.

---

[83] Rauna Kuokkanen, "From Indigenous Economies to Market-Based Self-Governance: A Feminist Political Economy Analysis," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 44, no. 2 (2011): 277.

[84] Dianne Newell, *Tangled Webs of History: Indians and the Law in Canada's Pacific Coast Fisheries* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 4.

III. COLONIAL-CAPITAL MODES OF LIFE: THE QUESTION OF COMPLICITY ON UNEVEN HYPERSURFACES

Through a critical inquiry of transversal modes of colonial-capital life, my analysis of the salmon-canning industry reveals three points on relations between and among BIPOC:

> 1. In the development of the settler colonial state, although people of colour may not always choose their social positioning with Indigenous peoples, colonial-capital transversal modes of life function by making non-Indigenous non-white peoples complicit in formations that continue to dispossess Indigenous peoples from their lands and waters – colonial capital thus fractures relationships between and among BIPOC.
>
> 2. Capitalist development within the Canadian settler colonial context produces transversal modes of life that have developed by structurally exploiting and positioning Black peoples and people of colour within processes of dispossession that benefit whiteness.
>
> 3. Transversality draws attention to the dynamics between Indigenous dispossession and exploitation of non-white labour, which are always already relational.

The first argument emphasizes that, in so far as people of colour are structurally implanted in exploitative labour processes – processes that were and continue to be predicated on sustaining settler-colonial populations – our positionality situates and implicates us within practices and processes that contribute(d) to the subjugation, dispossession, and displacement of Indigenous peoples from their land and modes of life regardless of our intentionality. This does not mean that Indigenous experiences of exploitation and colonial domination are more salient than that of Asians, Black peoples, and other people(s) of colour, and in no way signals an Oppression Olympics. Rather, this details how oppressions within settler colonial contexts are interconnected and rest in precarious ways on uneven hypersurfaces and within inherently imbalanced structures of domination. It is also important to recognize that non-white settlers are at times *made* complicit in the settler colonial project and that "benefits of being a settler are accrued unevenly" to people of colour and that "privileges … are contingent on things like nationality, class, gender, and migration status."[85] Complicity, in other words, is complicated and requires non-binary approaches to culpability, but it does not alleviate communities of colour from responsibilities that arise from being situated within structures of settler colonial violence.

Insightful criticisms across "Indigenous, settler colonial, and Canadian/American studies" regarding ways in which settler terminology has been uniformly applied to "Black diasporas and Asian racialized migrants … forcibly brought into these colonial and racial capitalist societies" has been articulated in order to not "assign all newcomers the same level of colonial agency as historically egregious, violent colonizers."[86] Malissa Phung claims that, while it is necessary to recognize different categories and terminologies of settler/arrivant subjectivity in understanding different relationships between and among BIPOC and Indigenous lands and waters – such as Jodi Byrd's "arrivant" and "arrivant colonialism," Iyko Day's "alien" and "alien colonialism," and Fujikane and Okamura's "Asian settler colonialism"[87] – "most of these scholars would agree that non-Indigenous resettlement remains predicated on the displacement and dispossession of Indigenous peoples."[88] Communities that have been displaced and/or involuntarily brought to these settler colonial and racist societies can be "both active agents in the making of their own histories" *and* "unwitting recruits into the service of empire."[89] Because colonial-capitalist processes of dispossession structurally and relationally constrict relationships of solidarity between groups whose oppressions are interlocking, and because it relies on non-white labour exploitation, it also relies on the production or exacerbation of the complicity of people of colour in settler colonial processes. We need to direct further reflection and action towards shifting our placements out of patterns of settler colonial violence in order to transverse the processes of power that subjugate(d) Indigenous peoples, lands, and waters as well as BIPOC globally. This is what I take up in the subsequent and final section.

The second argument emphasizes that, when people of colour are structurally implicated in a process of dispossession, we become part of modes of life that are grounded in hyper-individualistic and extractive frameworks that dehumanize and commodify humans and nonhuman life forms; life itself becomes a resource whose commodification is predicated on settler colonial extraction. As Simpson argues, "extraction is a cornerstone of capitalism, colonialism, and settler colonialism," whereby processes, objects, gifts, and/or people(s) are taken "out of the relationships that give [them] meaning" and are placed in "nonrelational context[s] for the purposes of accumulation."[90] My point in deploying the lens of transversal modes of life is to illustrate that colonial-capital practices damage not only Indigenous modes of life but also relations between and among BIPOC.

---

[85] Beenash Jafri, "Privilege vs. Complicity: People of Colour and Settler Colonialism," *Equity Matters Blog for the Federation of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 21 March 2012, http://www.ideasidees.ca/blog/privilege-vs-complicity-people-colour-and-settler-colonialism.

[86] Iyko Day, Juliana Hu Pegues, Malissa Phung, Dean Itsuji Saranillio, and Danika Medak-Saltzman, "Settler Colonial Studies, Asian Diasporic Questions," *Verge: Studies in Global Asias* 5, no. 1 (Spring 2019): 21–22.

[87] Day et al., "Settler Colonial Studies," 21-22.

[88] Day et al., 21.

[89] Day et al., 7.

The third argument expresses that, as in all contexts, in settler colonial contexts each oppression necessarily reinforces another. These relational oppressions manifest themselves out of processes directed towards settler colonial territorial and capitalist expansion. The lens of transversal modes of life identifies the points at which formations of connection and disconnection are produced, altered, or sustained by group differences. Colonial-capitalist modes of life seek to limit forms of connection by *disconnecting* – binding the positions of BIPOC to reductive relations and competitive profit models that expand capitalist development. This form of disconnection requires the actual and/or attempted dispossession of Indigenous peoples from their lands, from their knowledge base, and from the relationships and contexts that give them meaning.[91]

IV. POETICS OF TRANSVERSAL CO-RESISTANCE: CONNECTION AND COLONIAL REFUSAL THROUGH GENERATIVE PLACE-BASED PRAXES

In this section I consider the political possibilities that arise from transversality when approached as a way to formulate multi-directional counter-political modes of life. I claim that engaging in and structuring models of *transversal co-resistance* is necessary in order to address and gain access to the power that multiple webs of solidarities can cultivate – a form of resistance in which acts of solidarity go against and transcend (settler) colonial-capitalist structures. This does not require uniformity among resistance praxes, nor can it be accomplished en route to other liberation struggles as a byproduct, or simply because "a system set by White supremacy … ultimately comes at the expense of *all of us*."[92]

---

[90] Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, 202.

[91] Simpson, 202.

[92] Dean I. Saranillio, "Why Asian Settler Colonialism Matters: A Thought Piece on Critiques, Debates, and Indigenous Difference," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, nos. 3–4 (2013): 291 (emphasis in original).

Rather, there has to be an intentional commitment to transversing settler colonial capitalism.

Transversal modalities of decolonial co-resistance must, first and foremost, be structured and practised through centring place. As Tuck and Yang emphasize, decolonization requires "the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted."[93] And because transversality reveals the sometimes opaque and fragmented (dis)connections that strangleholds of settler colonial capital produces through subjugation, I also emphasize the need for practices that centre generative relationship-building that respects and actively supports what Coulthard and Simpson refer to as "grounded normativity."[94] The latter evokes engaging with Phung's proposition that we should practise solidarity in ways that, "at the risk of cultural appropriation[,] … not only respect Indigenous peoples and their claims to sovereignty, assisting them in whatever ways are asked of us, but that we also unlearn colonial-capitalist ways of relating to the land and learn from Indigenous 'place-thought epistemologies.'"[95] In transversing colonial-capitalist patterns of (re)settlement, non-white migration, and colonial displacement, I suggest that praxes in active support of grounded normativity do not require dissolving modes of life at an impasse of cultural difference; rather, it requires activating and mobilizing relationships *across* and *through* plurality in ways that transverse relations of settler colonial capital that put BIPOC in relations of oppression *with one another*.

Furthermore, transversal co-resistance requires *relational*-oriented praxes in which "*reflection* and *action* [are] directed at the structures to be transformed."[96] This is consistent with Paulo Freire's point that revolutionary praxes are necessarily and deliberately antithetical to the praxis of the dominant elites.[97] There has to be an *active* negation of the settler colonial capitalist mode of life principles of hierarchy, exploitation, and extraction in order to develop *active* solidarity with Indigenous peoples and their modes of life principles of reciprocity, empathy, non-domination, non-hierarchy, and non-exploitation.

Through fundamental and active shifts to avert transversal modes of life developed from capitalist development in settler colonial contexts, we necessarily change the modes of production/life in our lives to align and reinforce the forms of thought, behaviour, and social relationships that generate reflection and action with regard to the structures to be transformed. These are generative praxes that necessarily shift our relationships to (re)articulate our place-based contexts in support of the variously affected communities of colour and Indigenous communities facing settler colonial subjugation.

---

[93] Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 7.

[94] Coulthard and Simpson, "Grounded Normativity / Place-Based Solidarity," 254.

[95] Day et al., "Settler Colonial Studies," 23.

[96] Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, 1968), 126 (emphasis in original).

[97] Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 126.

Emphasizing action is foundational to engaging with generative praxes that transverse (settler) colonial relations of division. Simpson articulates transformative action by emphasizing the *how*, the practice and epistemology within the context of Nishnaabewin:

> It became clear to me that *how* we live, *how* we organize, *how* we engage with the world – the process – not only frames the outcome, it is the transformation. *How* molds and then gives birth to the present. The *how* changes us. *How* is the theoretical intervention. Engaging in deep and reciprocal Indigeneity is a transformative act because it fundamentally changes modes of production of our lives. It changes the relationships that house our bodies and our thinking.[98]

I argue that a theoretical understanding of transformative action without practice not only fails to actualize praxis but also evades the epistemology that can sustain radical transformation. For example, a critical place-based politics can provide an awareness that is critical to the inflection point that can initially transform an understanding of complicity within settler colonial directionality, as Sedef Arat-Koç claims: "the concept of place allows for a political imagination that is based on a contextualized and historicized understanding of the relationships between the different peoples who have interacted and co-existed in places over time, as well as the relationships between the local, the regional, and the global."[99] Although she claims that this "allows ways to remember, acknowledge, and address historical tensions and injustices among peoples, while allowing for an imagination of peaceful co-existence,"[100] I argue that, without practice, this will not be an epistemology directed towards radical change and, thus, will not have enough force in and of itself to transform the capitalist modes of life that implicate(d) people of colour in processes of dispossession *in so far as transformational practice is the necessary epistemology.*

---

[98] Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, 19.

[99] Anna Stanley, Sedef Arat-Koç, Laurie K. Bertram, and Hayden King, "Intervention – Addressing the Indigenous Immigration Parallax Gap," *Antipode Foundation*, 18 June 2014, para. 39. https://antipodeonline.org/2014/06/18/addressing-the-indigenous-immigration-parallax-gap/.

[100] Stanley et al., "Intervention," para. 39.

Generative praxes aimed at the transversal modes of life to be transformed must be predicated on place-based principles with respect to grounded normativity. Coulthard and Simpson define grounded normativity as the following:

> The ethical frameworks provided by these Indigenous place-based practices and associated forms of knowledge. Grounded normativity houses and reproduces the practices and procedures, based on deep reciprocity, that are inherently informed by an intimate relationship to place. Grounded normativity teaches us how to live our lives in relation to other people and nonhuman life forms in a profoundly nonauthoritarian, nondominating, nonexploitive manner. Grounded normativity teaches us how to be in respectful diplomatic relationships with other Indigenous and non-Indigenous nations with whom we might share territorial responsibilities or common political or economic interests. Our relationship to the land itself generates the processes, practices, and knowledges that inform our political systems, and through which we practice solidarity. To willfully abandon them would amount to a form of auto-genocide.[101]

I contend that generative praxes actively supporting grounded normativity can transverse colonial capitalism and realign the ways in which people of colour are relationally positioned in structures of Indigenous dispossession – and, further, I contend that this is a potent form of colonial refusal. There are plural modes of life as there are plural ways of engaging grounded normativity. Multiple generative praxes can connect us along lines of solidarity that not only push back but also *transform* the transversal relationship through which our modes of life are disconnected and extracted from for the purposes of settler colonial dominance and control. Such action is linked to Simpson's notion that amplifying "all of the practices that make [Nishnaabeg peoples] Nishnaabewin … cognitively reverses the violence of dispossession" because the opposite of dispossession in Indigenous thought is *connection*, "a coded layer of intimate interconnection and interdependence that creates a complicated algorithmic network of presence, reciprocity, consent, and freedom."[102] Organizing generative place-based praxes can foster anticolonial practice and push us towards transversal modes of life that illuminate our inherently relational connections in ways that actively transverse histories and continuities of (re)settlement, migration, and dispossession.

---

[101] Coulthard and Simpson, "Grounded Normativity / Place-Based Solidarity," 254.

[102] Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, 185.

CONCLUSION

In providing a critical inquiry into British Columbia's salmon-canning industry in the early to mid-twentieth century through the analytical lens of transversal modes of life, I illustrate how the following relational mechanisms of colonial capitalism affect relations of solidarity: (1) through (re)settlement because non-white people(s) are structurally implicated in processes of dispossession and are therefore also structurally implicated in relations of inherent exploitation and division; (2) through relations of colonial capital that heightened and instrumentalized material and ideological (dis)placements and formations to advance "productive" and "efficient" economic output models; (3) through antithetical modes of life that were intentionally and forcefully polarizing with regard to dominant and marginalized subjects of colonialism; (4) through the management of Indigenous and non-white bodies, which was highly segregated (both inside and outside capitalist industries); and (5) through the exploitation and commodification of non-dominant peoples, as well as lands and waters, which was necessary to the settler colonial and capitalist development of British Columbia.

Throughout this article, I identify an intimately bound problem and response: the problem is that settler colonial capitalist contexts place Indigenous peoples and people of colour within the logic of elimination and within exploitative modes of life. The problem is illustrated in a more easily identifiable transversal mode of life – namely, the highly exploitative and dispossessive modes of life produced through capitalist development in the salmon-canning industry in early to mid-twentieth-century British Columbia. The response I propose not only challenges the logic of elimination and capitalist modes of life by necessity but also (1) articulates a positive affirmation of plural modes of connecting through place-based principles of reciprocity, non-exploitation, non-hierarchy, empathy, and mutual respect; and (2) requires firm commitment to *generative praxes* that respect and actively support Indigenous sovereignty. Through this kind of response, we can develop systems of relationship-building that (re)formulate transversal modes of life that, in themselves and in negation of colonialism, (counter)*pose* (dis)*connection*.