



Unsettling truths: modernity, (de-)coloniality and Indigenous futures

Yin Paradies

To cite this article: Yin Paradies (2020) Unsettling truths: modernity, (de-)coloniality and Indigenous futures, *Postcolonial Studies*, 23:4, 438-456, DOI: [10.1080/13688790.2020.1809069](https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2020.1809069)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2020.1809069>



Published online: 23 Aug 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1716



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Unsettling truths: modernity, (de-)coloniality and Indigenous futures

Yin Paradies

Faculty of Arts and Education, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia

ABSTRACT

In our world of fractured truths, unparalleled disparities and technological wizardry, it is vital that we interrogate the largely unquestioned political axioms that have brought us to the brink of extinction. In this article, I explore the broader landscape in which settler-coloniality is enconced through an examination of global modernity. I briefly outline some well-known, but largely subsumed, and mostly unremarked, realities of the contemporary world. I then argue that debt, property, institutions and nation states are the constituent devastations of modernity that we must simultaneously aver and avert. I suggest that the path towards decoloniality entails radical land-based re-localisation, revitalised communalism and embodied kinship with all life. This will necessitate an Indigenisation in which we, collectively across difference and distance, embrace fundamentally transformed relationships of mutuality so as to bring about flourishing egalitarian societies.

KEYWORDS

Indigenous; modernity; colonialism; futurity; climate change

The truth of modernity

For Indigenous nations¹ to live, colonial mentalities must die²

In CANZUS³ settler-colonial societies, interest in colonisation is often focused on relatively distant colonial pasts where Indigenous⁴ peoples were ‘displaced’ (and other euphemisms for slavery, rape, torture, murder and genocide), with relatively scant attention paid to ongoing colonial presence/presents in which systemic, structural, physical, epistemic and ontological violence continue to oppress, assimilate and eradicate Indigenous peoples. This has resulted in vast over-representation of Indigenous peoples among, for example, the impoverished, unhealthy, imprisoned and homeless,⁵ as well as even greater under-representation among politicians, administrators, the wealthy, influential and famous. For Indigenous peoples from around the world, the ‘slow violence’⁶ of colonisation exists alongside violent assaults and fatal neglect. There is also a growing realisation of the impossibility of justice through the law,⁷ of reconciliation,⁸ or of any answers at all from within settler-colonial states.⁹

Even in scholarship focused on contemporary manifestations of settler colonialism, the broader conditions of modernity¹⁰ are often neglected. These include the fact that 60% of

people globally live on less than \$5 a day, eight people have more wealth than half the world's population,¹¹ 1.6 billion people are without adequate housing,¹² one in four children worldwide are stunted from malnutrition, real Gross Domestic Product has tripled since 1980 while a billion more people now live in poverty,¹³ devastating wars and brutal dictatorships continue unchecked,¹⁴ an epidemic of loneliness is sweeping the Western world,¹⁵ and the United States is experiencing the longest consecutive decline in life expectancy for a century,¹⁶ with similar trends in the United Kingdom.¹⁷

Today, modern nation states, especially in the 'West', have become hyper-individualist, atomised, securitised societies existing within a deepening crisis of climate change and the sixth mass extinction.¹⁸ This includes toxic chemicals in everything from Antarctic ice¹⁹ to human breast milk;²⁰ microplastics throughout our bodies and environments; rising sea levels; extreme wildfires; super-typhoons; global pandemics; a 60% decline in vertebrate numbers since 1970;²¹ grave concern for insect populations;²² indiscriminate deforestation; extensive soil erosion; acidic oceans; toxic air; fresh-water shortages; and catastrophic global warming that will likely reach 4 degrees Celsius by century's end.²³ This is a consumptive world of rapidly dwindling fossil-fuel resources in which many human societies are dependent on highly vulnerable just-in-time global supply chains.²⁴ Despite this, there exists scant political will to steer away from civilisational collapse, an outcome now more certain than any alternative.²⁵

In such a world, truth telling means telling the unsettling²⁶ truth about the dangers of modernity for global life, including its deeply atrophied capacity to provide people with a collective existential purpose.²⁷ If 'truth is about the future as much as it is about the past',²⁸ then it is also equally about the present. Like most Indigenous political activists, I will consider the past, present and future as nested and folded together, encircling linear goal-centred dissected 'clock' time²⁹ through rhythmic, cyclical, spiral sensing³⁰ that necessitates 'a careful remembering of the future'.³¹ An understanding of modernity's wrongs means not only knowledge of its past impacts but also apprehending how it continues to destroy our present/futures, and then acting to prevent this in ways that are more than merely metaphorical.³²

Only 500 years ago, almost half the world's land remained unclaimed by nation states.³³ Since then, modernity has grown near-ubiquitous through the creation of national(ised) territory. This was achieved through the creation of property by the violent enclosure of peasants' land in Europe (i.e. the commons) as well as colonial usurping of Indigenous land throughout the world. It also involved concentration of the means of production into the hands of a small minority and the extraction of resources from the majority via industrialisation and wage labour. This process was also characterised by the development of, for example, fossil capitalism, bureaucracy,³⁴ monogamy and the nuclear family, unrealistic beauty³⁵ and success ideals,³⁶ and further enclosure of many individuals within hermetically sealed buildings, often to undertake 'bullshit jobs'.³⁷ Over longer timescales, the origins of modernity can be traced back to the formation of sovereign states (e.g. chiefdoms, kingdoms and empires) and the invention of institutions (e.g. religious, legal, military), patriarchy,³⁸ slavery and debt. These events, which I take as the birth of modernity, occurred in what is now the Middle East predominantly around 5000 years ago,³⁹ with the earliest trends evident up to 10,000 years ago.⁴⁰

While Eduardo Bonilla-Silva claims a 'race-class-gender foundation' to the 'contemporary house of inequality',⁴¹ Sara Motta refers to 'patriarchal capitalist-coloniality'⁴² and

Vanessa Andreotti et al. discuss the threads of ‘global capital, nation-states, and Enlightenment humanism’,⁴³ I suggest that modernity is constructed from four key building blocks: debt, property, institutions and nation states. I refer to these, in an ironic biblical fashion, as the four horsemen of the apocalypse; that is, the harbingers of modernity’s end, fashioned from its own essential elements. At a smaller scale, the ‘house modernity built’⁴⁴ is furnished with cartesian and other oppositional dualisms, rational universalism, separability, certainty, control, progress, entitlement, moral authority, duty and sacrifice (e.g. the tropes of heroes, martyrs, leaders, saviours, the righteous and the chosen).⁴⁵

These four materials of modernity are closely intertwined and interdependent. Debt, money, interest and currency co-occur with slavery, poverty, war and nation states.⁴⁶ Institutions are implicated in the rise of nation states and are necessary for their continuance. Here, I define an institution as a type of centralised organisation (i.e. ‘a specific group of individuals pursuing a mix of common and individual goals through partially coordinated behaviour’)⁴⁷ that is self-perpetuating and hierarchical in both its formation and operations, and which endeavours to apply specific rules and norms through regulation and/or sanction. This definition includes various non-state entities (e.g. organised crime), but excludes both egalitarian de-centralised non-hierarchical organisations and social conventions, customs, shared beliefs or practices, which are common to all human societies (e.g. I agree with Peter Rogers⁴⁸ that the family is not an institution). While some social institutions, such as the ‘institution of marriage’, developed in the context of capital, debt and patriarchy, and are unlikely to outlive modernity, I do not consider here which specific aspects of human cultures, customs or conventions should persist beyond modernity.

Through the action of some specific institutions as I define them, sovereign nation states are fundamentally maintained through property, debt, labour coercion and tax collection, from which stem various ‘rights’ enforced by legal violence.⁴⁹ The modern concept of property is often attributed to Hobbesian individualism and Lockean privatisation of nature.⁵⁰ However, these world views have older lineages; for example, Plato’s discussion of private property⁵¹ and claims by the first Chinese emperor about the benefits of his rule in relation to protecting private homes, both date to about 2500 years ago.⁵² Importantly, the creation and maintenance of property is deeply colonial⁵³ and underpinned by violence,⁵⁴ either within states (i.e. to protect the ‘rights’ of those who have against those who have not) or via state aggression against stateless societies (i.e. extracting resources as property, including exploitation of human resources).⁵⁵ Similarly, the very definition of a sovereign state is a body whose use of force is legitimate and sanctioned.⁵⁶

Modern societies are best described as parasitic,⁵⁷ not simply neglecting but actively exploiting the labour of the many (who would fare better in stateless societies) for the benefit of the few (who would not).⁵⁸ Additionally, there is evidence that states were key drivers in rapid population growth from previously stable smaller populations. Given that there is scant, if not contrary, evidence for increased lifespans following the advent of states,⁵⁹ the current human population explosion is due primarily to differential fertility norms within state and non-state societies. Such population growth continues to be a resource burden (especially among affluent nation states) that will soon overwhelm the global ecosystem.

The claim that only nation states can protect us from each other through law and order is nothing more than a justification for disadvantage and inequality.⁶⁰ In fact, even amid

catastrophe, people often spontaneously, even joyfully, form local communities of care and solidarity without, or in spite of, existing authorities,⁶¹ including during the COVID-19 pandemic.⁶² As such, I contend that the nation-state experiment is both a failure for human flourishing and, increasingly, failing as a form of social organisation, with countries classified as ‘fragile’ rising in number from 18 in 2005 to 58 in 2018.⁶³

It has been suggested that institutions have an impact on the human psyche akin to being in a sensory-deprivation tank.⁶⁴ This speaks to the strangulating effect on our capacity for creativity and self-expression that many people experience in their schooling, in workplaces, from law enforcement, from the media and so forth. Put another way, institutions engage in symbolic⁶⁵ and physical violence that constrains our modes of being.⁶⁶ Institutions (e.g. financial institutions) also have a key role in supporting universalising economic development and colonial expansion.⁶⁷

Despite the four rupturing wounds to human narcissism – the Copernican (i.e. displacing the Earth from the centre of the universe), Darwinian (i.e. showing that we are animals), Freudian (i.e. the unconscious overshadowing of the conscious mind) and Machinic (i.e. computers that outperform people)⁶⁸ – modernity’s advocates seem oblivious to these traumas.⁶⁹ Certainly, there is no evidence of attenuating hubris or growing humility among twenty-first-century societies. Charles Melman claims that modern societies have transitioned from desire regulated by scarcity and prohibition to *jouissance* – an unrestricted need for immediate satisfaction through constant abundance.⁷⁰ This has made both techno-culture and ‘nature’⁷¹ into what Martin Heidegger⁷² called ‘standing-reserves’ that decentre our moral selves and threaten our subjectivity through a perceived ‘right to alienate and dispose of the world’.⁷³ Both impending civilisational and ecological collapse are due to specific views of reality and the ‘good life’ that result in radical alienation from ourselves, other living beings and the environment.

I am arguing that we must relinquish the four horsemen of the apocalypse (debt, property, institutions and nation states) before it is too late, or as the most ethical action even if it is too late. This will require many of us to set aside deeply embodied, though generally unsensed, ‘feelings, sentiments and attachments’,⁷⁴ including *jouissance*, certainty, control, progress and entitlement, as well as the pernicious fantasy that we exist as individuals separated and divorced from our social and physical contexts. If freedom is the tension between human creativity and the rules such creativity generates,⁷⁵ then it would seem, as I detail below, that applying indigenuity⁷⁶ to the exceedingly ossified rules of modernity is long overdue.

Decoloniality as truthful futures

*Indigenous futurity ... does not foreclose the inhabitation of Indigenous land by non-Indigenous peoples, but does foreclose settler colonialism and settler epistemologies*⁷⁷

Decoloniality/decolonisation is about deep awareness of colonial pasts, cognisance of present colonial conditions and striving for ‘a future ... free from the colonial past’.⁷⁸ While acknowledging that Indigenous struggles should not be defined by colonisation,⁷⁹ it is nonetheless necessary to name colonisation to critique and dismantle it as well as to recognise its continuing impacts on Indigenous lives, even though such lives exceed the shadow of colonisation. While decoloniality requires ‘a profound dedication to the

dismantling of the settler state',⁸⁰ the 'hard work of decolonising Settler self and society is not an Indigenous responsibility'.⁸¹

Modernity can be conceptualised as a set of self-serving and fictional narratives that hide and disguise coloniality, such that 'the end of modernity would imply the end of coloniality'.⁸² As such, my call to end modernity is a form of decolonial action. More generally, decoloniality is related to, but not synonymous with, indigenisation. To remove the oppressive influence of colonialism from the world is to become open to a broad range of potential futures, some of which are continuous, to varying degrees, with past and existing Indigenous cultures, but others of which are not. Importantly, we must recognise and respect the vast diversity of both contemporary and historical Indigenous peoples,⁸³ many of whom do not, and never have, included all, or even any, of the characteristics I discuss below, and all of whom have complex 'patterns of weaving within, outside and in response to global modernity'.⁸⁴ Although we have much to learn from Indigenous peoples and life-ways, it is important to note the inappropriateness of writing⁸⁵ as a way of sharing Indigenous learnings, given that translating oral traditions to written form can lead to their abstraction, annexation and alienation.⁸⁶

While decolonisation is a necessary journey for many who are colonised, as it is for colonisers, both ancestral and newly (re-)invented (non-)Indigenous ways of being, doing and knowing can contribute to utopias that supplant identitarian essentialisms.⁸⁷ We need to focus on ways of living that are possible for all while letting go of an obsession with who is (authentically) Indigenous or not. Outside of modern identity categories (e.g. Indigenous versus non-Indigenous), decoloniality is a 'praxis of living' 'open to whoever wants to do it'.⁸⁸ As such, it does not preclude the possibility of settlers 'becoming' Indigenous⁸⁹ or Indigenous people becoming settlers. Rather, I aim to rupture the meaning of these terms in a proposed ex-modern⁹⁰ future that moves beyond both a questioning of nation states⁹¹ and an elusive⁹² 'tangible unknown'⁹³ decoloniality.

This is not a romanticised exhortation for us to become 'noble savages', nor is it an endorsement of an anarcho-primitivist perspective that rejects technology as inherently problematic. Much of my argument does, however, resonate with anarcha-Indigenism, including a distrust of institutions, governments and centralised hierarchies, combined with a privileging of Indigenous traditions.⁹⁴ I also suggest an accelerationist approach to the retention and communal repurposing of technological infrastructure as of potential benefit in enhancing communal capacity and capability.⁹⁵

My proposal does not constitute a demand for Indigenous sovereignty, which I consider to be an oxymoron, given the colonial meaning of sovereignty (i.e. lord, ruler, master, highest, supreme or chief). It is commendable when settler private-property holders,⁹⁶ institutions⁹⁷ or governments⁹⁸ give back land to Indigenous peoples. However, rather than a call to return all land to Indigenous peoples, I am asking that all people return to the land, in the understanding that the best way to make amends for colonial pasts is for everyone to mend and make decolonial futures in the present. Due to the ravages of colonisation, there are now too few Indigenous peoples to care for what has often become sick Country.⁹⁹ Even if there were enough Indigenous custodians of land, it is important that all of us attend to neglected Country, led by those with the most experience in doing so (often, but not always, Indigenous people). With the understanding that non-Indigenous people 'are always already in relationship with Indigenous peoples',¹⁰⁰ caring for Country must take precedence over pursuing

Indigenous 'extant rights of prior occupancy'¹⁰¹ per se or efforts to return 'stolen' land. Given that ownership is a modern sensibility, land was never owned by Indigenous people and so could not be stolen.¹⁰² To be clear, I am suggesting that ongoing destruction and neglect of Country are of more importance and concern than which humans claim possession.

Due to rapid acceleration towards hard resource limits, beyond which we will exceed the global ecosystem's carrying capacity, the near-certain demise of global civilisation is an opportunity for decolonial seeds to grow in, form and widen cracks and fissures in modernity.¹⁰³ The approaching cataclysm will almost inevitably lead to radical re-localisation¹⁰⁴ as large-scale systems fail. This could occur in various configurations, such as authoritarian militarism, anarchist collectives, nomadic bands or (neo-)peasants. To avoid the mistakes of modernity, one of the best outcomes would be a society formed of self-organising networks of small-scale¹⁰⁵ independent communities of 100–250 people.¹⁰⁶ These communities would ideally be based on non-hierarchical egalitarian anarchist political structures together with an ethos of down-shifted collective sufficiency and frugality where people seek meaningful mutuality of being and becoming with close-by (non-)human life. This would include a focus on resource and skill sharing, cooperation and limited accumulation or status seeking,¹⁰⁷ in contrast to our existing 'specialized, regimented and commercialized existences'.¹⁰⁸

Although participatory democratic organisation at relatively high population densities is not only possible, but likely pre-dated institutions and cities,¹⁰⁹ cities of today are not environmentally sustainable in their current forms. Furthermore, the importance of intimate interdependent connections to land in the Indigenous futures that I propose cannot be overstated. There exists very limited capacity for this in high-density urban areas. However, there is considerable potential to apply the principles of degrowth and transition in lower-density suburbs.¹¹⁰ As such, I am by no means advocating for immediate widespread mass urban exodus to rural and remote areas. Rather, a repurposing of existing infrastructure combined with gradual attenuation of population density is preferable.

As they were for the vast majority of our history as a species, these communities would epitomise a 'grounded normativity'¹¹¹ of loving, intimate, respectful, affirmative, complex and (re)generative place-based attachments¹¹² that require embodied 'morality through the land',¹¹³ rather than working against the land.¹¹⁴ Mutual need, responsibility, communication, creativity and care would be valued and, depending on bioregional and cultural fit, such communities could be partially or wholly unsettled – (semi)-nomadic. They would exist in mycelia-like networks¹¹⁵ that co-situate human habitats and bio-corridors, bringing flora and fauna around, up against, atop and within human dwellings. Subsistence self-sufficiency could be achieved on a small scale,¹¹⁶ involving scant waste.¹¹⁷

Despite the dominance of multinational agribusiness, small farms (up to 2.5 hectares) still occupy more than 40% of global agricultural land¹¹⁸ and retain the vast majority of the agrobiodiversity that is vital for food-system resiliency in the face of accelerating climate change.¹¹⁹ There is compelling historical evidence that small-scale communities can achieve low levels of violence, rape, homicide, depression, loneliness, self-doubt and suicide, combined with very high levels of social, economic and political freedom and equality; poverty, homelessness, famine, genocide and similar consequences of structural violence are virtually, or entirely, absent in such communities. This is something that has yet to be achieved by a single sovereign state in history.¹²⁰ While it is important to

acknowledge that life in small-scale societies can be very difficult, living in modern states is worse for a significant proportion of their populace,¹²¹ including a much higher proportion of racial minorities and Indigenous peoples.

Kent Flannery and Joyce Marcus¹²² suggest that we may be able to incrementally return society to equality within emergent small-scale, relatively simple, communities where everyone can participate equally in politics. In fact, widespread participation is required to produce meaningful politics outside the anonymity that characterises state societies. Such anonymity precludes the transparency and personal relationships required to avoid abuses of authority,¹²³ and, for Rousseau, produces the death of liberty through the dangers of representation.¹²⁴ If an ex-modern future were to be anything like pre-modern communities, there would be limited organised violence; some gender-¹²⁵ and age-based differentiation and discrimination; locally based ethnocentrism, but without either racialised systems of power or assimilationist nation-building based on moral judgements about other ways of life; flexible sexualities and diverse genders; adulthood at puberty; support for abortion; acceptance of ritual drug use; less distinct boundaries between science and spirituality¹²⁶ while respecting the utility of technology; strong social norms of sharing; hospitality for, but a need to develop trust of, strangers; and no long-term imprisonment. As money, barter and fungible/reciprocal¹²⁷ exchange arise out of impersonal interactions between strangers (including state agents)¹²⁸ in which there is the potential for violence,¹²⁹ these communities would exist without such phenomena, at least internally,¹³⁰ with limited non-quantified exchange (but no debt) in – as well as gift giving¹³¹ within and between – communities.

The redundancy of institutions within these small-scale communities would mean the end of workplaces,¹³² schools,¹³³ universities,¹³⁴ hospitals, churches, courts of law etc. as hierarchical institutionalised centralised forms of organisation. Of course, work, education, caring for health, religion/spirituality, judgements of wrongdoing etc. would continue, but without their associated institutional mantles. Continued maintenance of pared-back techno-infrastructure considered valuable (e.g. physical and digital¹³⁵ transport systems) could be undertaken locally, while collaborative endeavours across communities would arise organically and may involve temporary organisations with transparent consensual hierarchies. Small-scale diverse communities brimming with self-expression, skills, abilities and talent could use their surplus resources to nourish cooperatives and commons that specialise in essential and desired skills, equipment and technologies,¹³⁶ such as medical way stations, techno-wilds, mining grottos,¹³⁷ music yurts, sports weirds, engineering coves, philosophy dens or wisdom walks. Advanced education and training could occur via apprenticeships, novice–master relationships or similar approaches, within a diversified de-centralised reputational non-standardised skills economy. For example, academies or guilds may form in which entry occurs via endorsement by existing member(s).

Given the trend, which could be made more broadly available beyond affluent nations, toward 3D printing, micro-fabrication, automation¹³⁸ and block-chain technologies, a decentralised ex-modern technological subsistence model¹³⁹ could be utilised, repurposed for collaborative peer-to-peer anarchist modes of localised production, distribution and consumption.¹⁴⁰

In relation to property, as noted by Hannah Arendt,¹⁴¹ its abolition does not mean dispensing with privacy (i.e. private time/space) or forgoing assured access to the resources

required for both sustenance and meaningful participation in public life. Neither does it foreclose the possibility, or desirability, of meaningful entanglement with ‘things’,¹⁴² whether created by or for specific persons, experienced as kin, or otherwise imbued with social, cultural and/or spiritual significance. In the broadest sense, it is difficult to conceive of a society where the use of any object/material by anyone at any time would be consistently socially acceptable. Nonetheless, many societies have existed, and could exist, without the need for specifically formulated property rights per se. Instead, these societies foster subjectivities in relation to material objects that are radically different from predominant modern approaches to property, possession and ownership. For example, pre-modern humans would not have denied others access to resources that they needed to survive. Yet, in contemporary societies, many people at various points in, or throughout, their lives can only legally meet their basic needs by taking orders (e.g. in the education, work or prison system) from a minority who control access to the resources required for both survival and a dignified existence.¹⁴³

Through radically local living within interconnected networks of communities, we can easily improve on our so-called Western ‘democracies’ characterised by untrustworthy politicians, rampant corruption, limited political-party choice, media jingoism and declining civic participation. There is evidence that societies of 10,000 to 40,000 years ago regularly alternated (e.g. with the seasons) between markedly hierarchical and egalitarian political configurations.¹⁴⁴ In other words, these societies, and many into late antiquity, were heterarchical and anarchist,¹⁴⁵ giving them much greater flexibility in socio-political arrangements than is displayed by sovereign states. It is also now clear that early humans had considerable variability in their group sizes over time and place, based on expansive multigenerational networks that extended far beyond their immediate community.¹⁴⁶

This is not to claim that human societies can exist without social differentiation (e.g. markers of prestige or indicators of rank and authority based on age, ability etc.) but to say that societies can be configured without institutionalised non-consensus-based exploitative hierarchies that control the means of production and/or access to opportunities and resources that are not the result of one’s own labour.¹⁴⁷ Far from enforcing a stagnant conformity, many ancient societies valued self-realisation and freedom. As such, it is now clear that these societies were not a primitive evolutionary stage that we had to pass through but rather a deliberate rejection of authoritarianism by our early ancestors, who were at least our philosophical and intellectual equals.¹⁴⁸

To take but one example, Indigenous peoples on Sahul curated abundant, convenient, predictable and sustainable landscapes with as little as four hours a day of effort.¹⁴⁹ In various places, this included sowing, irrigating, tilling, weeding, cropping, storing grain, baking bread, altering rivers with dams, channels and weirs, as well as living in permanent grass and stone houses.¹⁵⁰ Across our very diverse tribal groups, we enjoyed a life expectancy of about 60 years¹⁵¹ and a largely peaceful and prosperous pan-continental system of social interaction and exchange, although with some collective conflict.¹⁵² This was achieved over tens of thousands of years through embodied autonomous constitutive interdependent relationships. This was a life that, despite the ravages of colonisation, continues to this day for many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. It is a life in which the impossibility of not sharing is widely and deeply felt.

My argument draws from Indigenous refusal,¹⁵³ resurgence¹⁵⁴ and separatist¹⁵⁵ movements, not as ‘extraordinary resources’ for re-inscribing state futures¹⁵⁶ but applied to

rupturing an insistent and incessant modernity. What Leanne Simpson calls ‘living with the purpose of generating more life’¹⁵⁷ is not just the continuation of any life, and certainly not ‘bare life’.¹⁵⁸ Rather, it is a vibrant interconnected living that recognises that ‘interiority is no place ... to build and spend our lives’.¹⁵⁹ Such living is that in which the distinction between ourselves and others can fade away, and is consonant with the fundamentally cooperative foundation of human thinking, being and doing,¹⁶⁰ where the ‘goal is balance, equilibrium and plenitude’.¹⁶¹ This is a life of striving to cultivate flourishing, and eschew diminishing, by knowing, doing and being with kindness and humility, recognising that the sheer actuality of existence is a balancing of discord and harmony while limping, walking, dancing, skipping or hopping with ‘respectful wonder’¹⁶² along one’s path, which can only ever be sensed rather than known, measured or controlled.

Radical (re-)localisation – like decolonisation, with which it shares much – is an option, not a mission,¹⁶³ and is clearly not something that should, or ever would be, planned centrally by a state or in a state-like manner. Rather, it is a kind of ‘metaphysical metamorphosis’ towards an Indigenous ‘ontological presence’¹⁶⁴ through which we can explore what humans could become outside modernity’s captive domestication.¹⁶⁵ Calling for the end of modernity is not a request or demand for recognition by it. Neither am I proposing a directly oppositional politics. Instead, I urge an ‘aggressive non-violent’¹⁶⁶ withdrawal, refusal and rejection of modern ways of knowing, being and doing through pursued alternatives.¹⁶⁷ To overwhelm the ‘West’ with large-scale organised violence¹⁶⁸ or revolution¹⁶⁹ would require resources, weapons and ruthless force that would inevitably coalesce into the very same modernity it opposes.¹⁷⁰ Rather, I call for an insurgent seeding of new worlds that will rapidly outgrow a withering late-stage modernity through ‘militant pluralist assemblages’¹⁷¹ grounded in Indigenous life-ways (e.g. Buen Vivir, the Zapatistas), as well as movements such as degrowth,¹⁷² transition, re-wilding, permaculture, frugality, voluntary simplicity/sufficiency and intentional communities. This is a prefigurative political approach¹⁷³ seeking to make space for initially small-scale ‘nowtopian’¹⁷⁴ alternatives to modernity, in the understanding that the future arises from what we already do¹⁷⁵ as well as a (re-)turn to what we have always done.¹⁷⁶

Now that the Rubicon of global civilisational and ecological collapse¹⁷⁷ has been crossed, any hope for the survival of humanity, and much of current life on Earth,¹⁷⁸ will depend on our renouncing debt, property, institutions and nation states to instead adopt radically re-localised self-sufficient (re)vitalised mingled resonant relationships and situated entangled response-abilities of co-becoming¹⁷⁹ in, with and to all life (including sentient land, air and seascapes). Such relationships emerge when people nurture generous, plural, attentive ways of doing, being and knowing. I acknowledge that we all have different capacities to divest from modernity (i.e. radical withdrawal), and many of us are very much trapped within it. In fact, within both ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ nation states, most people in the world are oppressed victims and targets of modernity rather than its recipients and beneficiaries. As such, dis-investing via seeding alternatives that ‘crowd out’¹⁸⁰ modernity is often the best option.¹⁸¹

From an Indigenous perspective, inhabiting the varied and diverse life-worlds that sustain us is a journey of re-enacting a ‘deep sacred connection’¹⁸² and palpable mutuality of being with all that is around, with, as and in us. The crucible of radical re-localisation and dissolution of modern selfhoods will require transformative pathways that carefully and respectfully unravel and then re-braid epistemologies, ontologies, axiologies and

temporalities into new storied realities that foster survivance,¹⁸³ kinship, attunement and accord with the rhythms of the living cosmos.

Conclusion

*A human community that lives in a mutually beneficial relation with the surrounding earth is a community ... that lives in truth.*¹⁸⁴

I have attempted to show that colonialism is inextricably intertwined with modernity, which is itself built upon debt, property, institutions and nation states as social configurations that have grown from non-existence to overwhelming ubiquity over the last 10,000 years. In the 200,000 years that humanity has existed, modernity represents a brief experimental sojourn in the history of our species. It is a trial that I contend will end soon as a result of its inherent social and physical unsustainability.

There is no evidence that modernity is better for those living within it than other potential forms of social organisation, and there is ample evidence that modernity has created and sustained oppression, destitution and destruction on an unprecedented scale. While recognition as a political theory begins with the presumption that cultures have equal worth,¹⁸⁵ it doesn't end there or, if it does, we need to move beyond recognition. While all people (but not all life-ways) within modernity are 'worthy' (i.e. they are capable of achieving balance with global life forms), the culture of modernity itself (i.e. debt, property, institutions and nation states) is not the equal of other actual or imagined modes of (co-)existence. In my view, modernity is not worthy of continuance, even if this were possible by further frontiers of expansion (e.g. colonisation of space).¹⁸⁶ Beyond vague gestures towards decoloniality and glibly utopic visions, I invite all of us to relinquish modernity, and instead engage in grounded re-localised socially and ecologically regenerative communities and profoundly reconfigured vulnerable relational subjectivities that open us to viable and vivacious ex-modern futures in which we decolonise to both survive and thrive.

Notes

1. For the difference between Indigenous nations and nation states, see Leanne Simpson, 'Indigenous Resurgence and Co-resistance', *Critical Ethnic Studies* 2(2), 2016, pp 19–34.
2. Taiaiake Alfred, *For Indigenous Nations to Live, Colonial Mentalities Must Die*, 2017. Available at: <https://policyoptions.irpp.org/fr/magazines/october-2017/for-indigenous-nations-to-live-colonial-mentalities-must-die/>.
3. Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States, where most scholarship on Indigenous peoples is focused, despite only a fraction of the world's Indigenous populations living in these countries.
4. Although woefully inadequate, I use this term in the absence of any better way to narrate the vast array of peoples who pre-date, continue to be distinguished from and/or resist modernity.
5. Ian Anderson et al, 'Indigenous and Tribal Peoples' Health (The Lancet–Lowitja Institute Global Collaboration): A Population Study', *The Lancet* 388(10040), 2016, pp 131–157; World Bank, *Understanding Poverty: Indigenous People*, 2019.
6. Rob Nixon, *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

7. Jacques Derrida, 'Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority', in Drucilla Cornell, Michel Rosenfeld and David Carlson (eds), *Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice*, New York, NY: Routledge, 1992.
8. Sharon Stein, "'Truth Before Reconciliation": The Difficulties of Transforming Higher Education in Settler-colonial Contexts', *Higher Education Research & Development* 39(1), 2020, pp 156–170.
9. Sarah Maddison, *The Colonial Fantasy: Why White Australia Can't Solve Black Problems*, Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 2019.
10. It is important to note that while I use 'modernity' in the singular, it is not a singular phenomenon but encompasses many manifestations of multiple interrelated configurations over extended periods and across distinct locations.
11. <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2017-01-19/do-8-men-really-control-same-wealth-as-poorest-half/8193332>.
12. <https://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/cities-grow-so-do-numbers-homeless#:~:text=Based%20on%20national%20reports%2C%20it's,population%2C%20may%20lack%20adequate%20housing>.
13. Jason Hickel, *The Divide: A Brief Guide to Global Inequality and Its Solutions*, London: Penguin, 2017.
14. <https://un.org.au/2014/05/14/who-hunger-statistics/#:~:text=Poor%20nutrition%20causes%20nearly%20half,in%20developing%20countries%20is%20underweight>.
15. Keming Yang, *Loneliness: A Social Problem*, New York, NY: Routledge.
16. <https://www.cnn.com/2019/07/09/us-life-expectancy-has-been-declining-heres-why.html>.
17. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/mar/07/life-expectancy-slumps-by-five-months>.
18. Kyle Whyte, 'Indigenous Science (Fiction) for the Anthropocene: Ancestral Dystopias and Fantasies of Climate Change Crises', *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 1(1–2), 2018, pp 224–242.
19. Joanna Potapowicz et al, 'Occurrences, Sources, and Transport of Organochlorine Pesticides in the Aquatic Environment of Antarctica', *Science of the Total Environment* 735, 2020, article 139475.
20. Martyna Pajewska-Szmyt, Elena Sinkiewicz-Darol and Renata Gadzała-Kopciuch, 'The Impact of Environmental Pollution on the Quality of Mother's Milk', *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 26, 2019, pp 7405–7427.
21. <https://www.wwf.org.uk/updates/living-planet-report-2018>.
22. David Wagner, 'Insect Declines in the Anthropocene', *Annual Review of Entomology* 65, 2020, pp 457–480.
23. David Wallace-Wells, *The Uninhabitable Earth: A Story of the Future*, London: Penguin Random House, 2019.
24. What has been called 'supply-chain capitalism': Anna Tsing, 'On Nonscalability: The Living World Is Not Amenable to Precision-Nested Scales', *Common Knowledge* 25(1–3), 2019, pp 143–162.
25. Pablo Servigne and Raphael Stevens, *How Everything Can Collapse: A Manual for Our Times*, Andrew Brown (trans), Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2020.
26. Unsettling in the sense of disturbing and upsetting, as well as in terms of the potential to shift us from our current places and positions.
27. Matthew Sarraf, Michael Woodley and Colin Feltham, *Modernity and Cultural Decline*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
28. Adrian Little, 'The Politics of Makarrata: Understanding Indigenous–Settler Relations in Australia', *Political Theory* 48(1), 2020, pp 4–29.
29. Vanessa Andreotti et al, 'Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Anticipation', in Roberto Poli (ed), *Handbook of Anticipation*, Switzerland: Springer Nature, 2019, pp 393–406; Kevin Birth, *Time Blind: Problems in Perceiving Other Temporalities*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017; Sara Motta and Norma Bermudez, 'Enfleshing Temporal Insurgencies and Decolonial Times', *Globalizations* 16(4), 2019, pp 424–440.

30. Bawaka Country et al, 'Gathering of the Clouds: Attending to Indigenous Understandings of Time and Climate through Songspiral', *Geoforum* 108, 2020, pp 295–304.
31. Michael Christie, 'Australian Indigenous Knowledge and the Globalising Social Sciences', *Journal of Global Studies* 2, 2015, pp 93–104.
32. Eve Tuck and K Wayne Yang, 'Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1(1), 2012, pp 1–40.
33. Karl Widerquist and Grant S McCall, *Prehistoric Myths in Modern Political Philosophy*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017.
34. David Graeber, *The Utopia of Rules: On Technology, Stupidity, and the Secret Joys of Bureaucracy*, New York, NY: Melville House, 2015.
35. Also known as scopic (or visual) capitalism, as the commodification and spectacularisation of bodies and sexuality: Eva Illouz, *The End of Love: A Sociology of Negative Relationships*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
36. Michele Lamont, 'From "Having" to "Being": Self-worth and the Current Crisis of American Society', *The British Journal of Sociology* 70(3), 2019, pp 660–707.
37. David Graeber, *Bullshit Jobs: A Theory*, London: Penguin, 2018.
38. Casper Hansen, Peter Jensen and Christian Skovsgaard, 'Modern Gender Roles and Agricultural History: The Neolithic Inheritance', *Journal of Economic Growth* 20, 2015, pp 365–404; Alba Latorre, Penny Bickle and Caroline Hamon et al, 'Sexual Inequalities in the Early Neolithic? Exploring Relationships Between Sexes/Genders at the Cemetery of Vedrovice Using Use-Wear Analysis, Diet and Mobility', *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, in press.
39. Kent Flannery and Joyce Marcus, *The Creation of Inequality: How Our Prehistoric Ancestors Set the Stage for Monarchy, Slavery, and Empire*, Boston, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012; David Graeber, *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*, New York, NY: Melville House Publishing, 2011.
40. Karl Widerquist and Grant McCall, *The Prehistory of Property: Prehistoric Myths in Modern Political Theory, Book Two*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020.
41. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, 'Race, Racism, & Utopia "for Real"', Denver, CO: Thematic session on 'race and utopia' for American Sociological Association meeting, 2012.
42. Sara Motta and Mike Cole, *Constructing Twenty-First Century Socialism in Latin America: The Role of Radical Education*, New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
43. Andreotti et al, 'Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Anticipation', p 400.
44. Sharon Stein et al, 'Gesturing Towards Decolonial Futures: Reflections on Our Learnings Thus Far', *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education* 4(1), 2020, pp 43–65.
45. <https://decolonialfutures.net/portfolio/mini-zine-house-mycelium/>.
46. Graeber, *Debt*.
47. Douglass North, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
48. Peter Rogers, 'Family Is NOT an Institution: Distinguishing Institutions from Organisations in Social Science and Social Theory', *International Review of Sociology* 27(1), 2017, pp 126–141.
49. John Protevi, *Edges of the State*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2019.
50. Iain Chambers, *Postcolonial Interruptions: Unauthorized Modernities*, London, and New York, NY: Rowman and Littlefield, 2017.
51. Anna Schriefl, 'Plato on the Incompatibility of Wealth and Justice: The Property Arrangements in the Republic', *History of Political Thought* 39(2), 2018, pp 193–215.
52. Yuval Harari, *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*, Old Saybrook, CT: Tantor Media, 2015.
53. Brenna Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018.
54. Stefan Andreasson, 'Stand and Deliver: Property and the Politics of Global Dispossession', *Political Studies* 54(1), 2006, pp 1–21.
55. Widerquist and McCall, *The Prehistory of Property*.

56. Widerquist and McCall, *Prehistoric Myths in Modern Political Philosophy*.
57. In the same way that 'formal order' in societies is always, at least partially, parasitic on essential, but unrecognisable and unenclosable, informal processes: James Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999.
58. Widerquist and McCall, *Prehistoric Myths in Modern Political Philosophy*.
59. James Scott, *Against the Grain: A Deep History of the Earliest States*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017.
60. Widerquist and McCall, *Prehistoric Myths in Modern Political Philosophy*, p 175.
61. Protevi, *Edges of the State*; Rebecca Solnit, *A Paradise Built in Hell: The Extraordinary Communities That Arise in Disaster*, London: Penguin, 2010.
62. Marina Sitrin and Colectiva Sembrar, *Pandemic Solidarity: Mutual Aid During the Covid-19 Crisis*, London: Pluto Press, 2020.
63. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/listofstateoffragilityreports.htm>.
64. Scott, *Seeing Like a State*.
65. Pierre Bourdieu, *Pascalian Meditations*, R Nice (trans), Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2000.
66. Graeber, *The Utopia of Rules*.
67. Taiaiake Alfred, *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*, Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
68. Nicholas Gane, 'When We Have Never Been Human, What Is to Be Done?: Interview with Donna Haraway', *Theory, Culture & Society* 23(7–8), 2005, pp 135–158.
69. As noted by Servigne and Stevens, *How Everything Can Collapse*, modernity will not die of 'its postmodern philosophical wounds but because it has run out of energy'.
70. Charles Melman, *L'homme sans gravité: Jouir à tout prix*, Paris: Gallimard, 2005.
71. The misconception that there is a 'nature' that is separate from us is a consequence of modernity itself.
72. Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings*, William Lovitt (trans), New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1977.
73. Chris Gosden, 'Possession, Property or Ownership?', in Alison Klevnäs and Charlotte Hedenstierna-Jonson (eds), *Own and be Owned: Archaeological Approaches to the Concept of Possession*, Stockholm: Publit, 2015, pp 215–221.
74. Hagar Kotef, 'Violent Attachments', *Political Theory* 48(1), 2020, pp 4–29.
75. Graeber, *The Utopia of Rules*.
76. Daniel Wildcat, *Red Alert! Saving the Planet with Indigenous Knowledge*, Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2009.
77. Eve Tuck and Rubén Gaztambide-Fernandez, 'Curriculum, Replacement, and Settler Futurity', *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 29(1), 2013, pp 72–90.
78. Ming Dong Gu, 'What Is "Decoloniality"? A Postcolonial Critique', *Postcolonial Studies*, in press.
79. Alex Wilson and Marie Laing, 'Queering Indigenous Education', in Linda Smith, Eve Tuck and K Wayne Yang (eds), *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View*, New York, NY: Routledge, 2018.
80. Shantelle Moreno, 'Love as Resistance: Exploring Conceptualizations of Decolonial Love in Settler States', *Girlhood Studies* 12(3), 2019, pp 116–133.
81. Adam Barker, *(Re-) Ordering the New World: Settler Colonialism, Space, and Identity*, PhD thesis, Leicester: University of Leicester, 2012, p 377.
82. Walter D. Mignolo and Catherine Walsh, *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018.
83. This includes 476 million Indigenous people living in ninety countries worldwide: World Bank, *Understanding Poverty*.
84. Andreotti et al, 'Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Anticipation', p 401.
85. Tyson Yunkaporta, *Sand Talk*, London: The Text Publishing Company, 2019; Joseph Gone, 'Considering Indigenous Research Methodologies: Critical Reflections by an Indigenous Knower', *Qualitative Inquiry* 25(1), 2019, pp 45–56.

86. Wendell Kisner, 'The Indigenization of Academia and Ontological Respect', *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy* 16(2), 2020, pp 349–391; Martin Nakata, 'The Cultural Interface', *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education* 36, 2007, pp 7–14.
87. Boaventura de Sousa Santos, *The End of the Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018.
88. Mignolo and Walsh, *On Decoloniality*, p 4.
89. Lorenzo Veracini, 'Decolonizing Settler Colonialism: Kill the Settler in Him and Save the Man', *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 41(1), 2017, pp 1–18.
90. Ex-modern means 'exit-from-modernity', following the term ex-colonial: Simone Bignall, 'The Collaborative Struggle for Excolonialism', *Settler Colonial Studies* 4(4), 2014, pp 340–356.
91. Andrea Smith, 'American Studies without America: Native Feminisms and the Nation-State', *American Quarterly* 60(2), 2008, pp 309–315; Maria Varela and Carolina Rojas, 'Epistemicide, Postcolonial Resistance and the State', *Postcolonial Studies*, in press.
92. Lorenzo Veracini, *The Settler Colonial Present*, New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
93. Aman Sium, Chandni Desai and Eric Ritskes, 'Towards the "Tangible Unknown": Decolonization and the Indigenous Future', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1(1), 2012, pp 1–13.
94. Alfred, *Wasáse*; Adam Lewis, 'Imagining Autonomy on Stolen Land: Settler Colonialism, Anarchism and the Possibilities of Decolonization?', *Settler Colonial Studies* 7(4), 2017, pp 474–495.
95. Alex Williams and Nick Srnicek, *#Accelerate Manifesto for an Accelerationist Politics*, Mexico City: Gato Negro Ediciones, 2017.
96. <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-11-03/spike-in-aboriginal-private-land-return-interest/11640808>.
97. Courtney Vaughan, *Reclaiming the Rapids: Evaluating the Reconciliatory and Decolonial Potential of Private Land Return*, 2019, thesis in Canadian Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.
98. Nathanael Ojong, 'Indigenous Land Rights: Where Are We Today and Where Should the Research Go in the Future?', *Settler Colonial Studies* 10(2), 2020, pp 193–215.
99. A term in Aboriginal English that denotes all aspects of living, sentient, caring and communicative place-times, including land, waters, sky, wind, plants, animals, people, ancestors, stories, songs, energies, spirits, feelings, dreams: Gay'Wu Group of Women, *Song Spirals: Sharing Women's Wisdom of Country Through Songlines*, Crows Nest, NSW: Allen and Unwin, 2019.
100. Elizabeth Strakosch, *Beyond Colonial Completion: Hannah Arendt, 'Settler Colonialism and the End of Politics'*, in Sarah Maddison, Tom Clark and Ravi de Costa (eds), *The Limits of Settler Colonial Reconciliation*, Singapore: Springer, 2016, pp 15–33.
101. Dominic O'Sullivan, *Indigeneity: A Politics of Potential: Australia, Fiji and New Zealand*, United Kingdom: Policy Press, 2017.
102. Robert Nichols, *Theft Is Property!: Dispossession and Critical Theory*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019.
103. Mignolo and Walsh, *On Decoloniality*.
104. Ted Trainer, 'De-growth: Some Suggestions from the Simpler Way Perspective', *Ecological Economics* 167, 2020, article 106436.
105. Not just small-scale but non-scalable unique dynamic and diverse frictive communities that can locally change world history: Tsing, 'On Nonscalability'.
106. Known as the Dunbar number for the largest number of meaningful relationships that anyone can have (see, for example, David Shankland, *Dunbar's Number*, Oxfordshire: Sean Kingston Publishing, 2019).
107. Cathryn Townsend, 'Egalitarianism, Evolution of', in Hilary Callan (ed), *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, 2018.

108. Dimitri Orlov, *The Five Stages of Collapse: Survivors' Toolkit*, Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers, 2013.
109. David Graeber and David Wengrow, 'How to Change the Course of Human History', *Eurozine*, 2 March 2018.
110. Samuel Alexander and Brendan Gleeson, *Degrowth in the Suburbs*, Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019; David Holmgren, *RetroSuburbia: The Downshifter's Guide to a Resilient Future*, Hepburn: Melliodora, 2018.
111. Glen Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.
112. Leanne Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.
113. Brian Burkhardt, *Indigenizing Philosophy Through the Land: A Trickster Methodology for Decolonizing Environmental Ethics and Indigenous Futures*, East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2019.
114. Yunkaporta, *Sand Talk*.
115. Similar to both thread-like archipelagos and Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's nomadic-rhizomatic utopic formations: Paul Carter, *Decolonising Governance: Archipelagic Thinking*, Oxfordshire: Taylor & Francis Group, 2018.
116. See, for example, <https://urbanhomestead.org/>.
117. Lauren Carter and Oberon Carter, *A Family Guide to Waste-free Living*, Plum, 2019.
118. Myroslava Lesiv et al, 'Estimating the Global Distribution of Field Size Using Crowdsourcing', *Global Change Biology* 25, 2019, pp 174–186.
119. Stephan Rist et al, *Variety Is the Source of Life: Agrobiodiversity Benefits, Challenges, and Needs*, Swiss Academies factsheets 15 (1), Swiss Academy of Sciences, 2020.
120. Widerquist and McCall, *Prehistoric Myths in Modern Political Philosophy*; Widerquist and McCall, *The Prehistory of Property*.
121. Widerquist and McCall, *Prehistoric Myths in Modern Political Philosophy*.
122. Flannery and Marcus, *The Creation of Inequality*.
123. Carolyn Smith-Morris, *Indigenous Communalism: Belonging, Healthy Communities, and Decolonizing the Collective*, London: Rutgers University Press, 2020.
124. Hanna Pitkin, *Representation*, Beresford Book Services, 1969.
125. Although there is evidence of small-scale matriarchal gender-egalitarian societies: Heide Goettner-Abendroth, 'Re-thinking "Matriarchy" in Modern Matriarchal Studies Using Two Examples: The Khasi and the Mosuo', *Asian Journal of Women's Studies* 24(1), 2018, pp 3–27, and that patriarchal family systems formed after the advent of states: Alexandra de Pleijt, Jan Luiten van Zanden and Sarah Carmichael, 'Gender Relations and Economic Development: Hypotheses About the Reversal of Fortune in Eurasia', in Claude Diebolt et al (eds), *Cliometrics of the Family*, Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2019, pp 149–172.
126. This blurring between science and religion/spirituality was present in Western culture as recently as the Enlightenment (circa seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) and some suggest that it continues as a strand throughout modernity via connections between politics and science as well as between nature and culture: Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, Boston, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.
127. Although reciprocity is often considered a cherished Indigenous value, its meaning of exchangeable, interchangeable, equivalent and correspondent is, to me, far too transactional and commodified to represent the sense of care, responsibility, relationality and gift-giving that is often intended; see, for example, Robin Kimmerer, 'The Covenant of Reciprocity', in John Hart (ed), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Religion and Ecology*, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons, 2017.
128. For example, 'taxes enable governments to provision themselves without the use of explicit force' but clearly with the implicit threat of such force: Stephanie Kelton, *The Deficit Myth: Modern Monetary Theory and How to Build a Better Economy*, United Kingdom: John Murray, 2020.
129. Graeber, *Debt*.

130. This has been shown to be feasible in contemporary intentional communities of a size within the Dunbar limit: Lars Heitmann, 'A Society After Money? Historical Position, Characteristics and Perspectives of Current Approaches to Post-Monetary Economic Activity', in Bernd Herzogenrath and Patricia Pisters (eds), *Society After Money: A Dialogue*, London: Bloomsbury, 2019.
131. Rauna Kuokkanen, 'The Logic of the Gift: Reclaiming Indigenous Peoples' Philosophies', Thomas Botz-Bornstein and Jurgen Henglebrock (eds), *Re-Ethnicizing the Mind? Cultural Revival in Contemporary Thought*, New York: Rodopi, Amsterdam, 2006, pp 251–271.
132. On the horror of contemporary working life for many around the world, see Elizabeth Anderson, *Private Government: How Employers Rule Our Lives (and Why We Don't Talk about It)*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2017; Graeber, *Bullshit Jobs*.
133. Which can be considered as a tool of domination focused on discipline and weaponised boredom: Yunkaporta, *Sand Talk*.
134. While universities are irremediably colonial (Edwin Mayorga, Lekey Leidecker and Daniel de Gutiérrez, 'Burn It Down: The Incommensurability of the University and Decolonization', *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis* 8(1), 2019, pp 87–106), it may be possible to replace them with social cooperative learning organisations: Gary Saunders, *Re-Imagining the Idea of the University for a Post-Capitalist Society*, Doctor of Philosophy, Lincoln: University of Lincoln, 2020.
135. Without the monopolies of 'platform capitalism' that currently exploit such infrastructure: Nick Srnicek, *Platform Capitalism*, Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2016.
136. Including Indigenous traditional technology: Julia Watson, *Lo—TEK, Design by Radical Indigenism*, Taschen, 2020, and 'after-modern' design principles and practices: Lisa Thomas, *Towards 'After-Modern' Design: A Practice-Based Inquiry*, Doctor of Philosophy, Lancaster: Lancaster University, 2018.
137. It is unclear to what extent mining will be desirable or necessary for communities of the future. Clearly, contemporary large-scale mining techniques (e.g. open-pit mines) cannot continue. However, aided by more recent technological developments, high-yield recycling of existing stock together with revival of somewhat lower-impact older techniques are possibilities: Estelle Camizuli et al, 'Trace Metals from Historical Mining Sites and Past Metallurgical Activity Remain Bioavailable to Wildlife Today', *Scientific Reports* 8, 2018, article 3436; Timothy Mighall et al, 'Did Prehistoric and Roman Mining and Metallurgy Have a Significant Impact on Vegetation?', *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports* 11, 2017, pp 613–625; Abigail Martin and Alastair Iles, 'The Ethics of Rare Earth Elements Over Time and Space', *HYLE – International Journal for Philosophy of Chemistry* 26, 2020, pp 5–30.
138. Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams, *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work*, London: Verso Books, 2015.
139. Christian Siefkes, 'A Critical View on the Criticism of Money', in Bernd Herzogenrath and Patricia Pisters (eds), *Society After Money: A Dialogue*, London: Bloomsbury, 2019.
140. Hannes Gerhardt, 'Engaging the Non-Flat World: Anarchism and the Promise of a Post-Capitalist Collaborative Commons', *Antipode* 52(3), 2020, pp 681–701.
141. Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1958, pp 61–65.
142. Recognising that we need to challenge 'the Western tendency to thingify every phenomenon': Shay Welch, 'Native American Epistemology', chapter 2 in the *Phenomenology of a Performative Knowledge System: Dancing with Native American Epistemology*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2019, pp 31–52.
143. Widerquist and McCall, *Prehistoric Myths in Modern Political Philosophy*.
144. David Wengrow and David Graeber, 'Farewell to the "Childhood of Man": Ritual, Seasonality, and the Origins of Inequality', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 21, 2015, pp 597–619.
145. Bill Angelbeck, 'Interpreting the Dialectic of Sociopolitical Tensions in the Archaeological Past: Implications of an Anarchist Perspective for Iron Age Societies', chapter 2 in Brais

- Currás and Inés Sastre (eds), *Alternative Iron Ages: Social Theory from Archaeological Analysis*, New York, NY: Routledge, 2020.
146. Douglas Bird et al, 'Variability in the Organization and Size of Hunter-gatherer Groups: Foragers Do Not Live in Small-scale Societies', *Journal of Human Evolution* 131, 2019, pp 96–108.
 147. Inés Sastre and Brais Currás, 'Reconsidering Egalitarianism for Archaeological Interpretation', chapter 1 in Currás and Sastre (eds), *Alternative Iron Ages: Social Theory from Archaeological Analysis*, New York, NY: Routledge, 2020.
 148. Wengrow and Graeber, 'Farewell to the "Childhood of Man"'.
 149. Bill Gammage, *The Biggest Estate on Earth: How Aborigines Made Australia*, Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 2012.
 150. Bruce Pascoe, *Dark Emu: Black Seeds: Agriculture or Accident?*, Broome, WA: Magabala Books, 2014.
 151. Greg Blyton, 'Healthier Times?: Revisiting Indigenous Australian Health History', *Health & History* 11(2), 2009, pp 116–135.
 152. Christophe Darmangeat, 'Vanished Wars of Australia: The Archaeological Invisibility of Aboriginal Collective Conflicts', *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 26, 2019, pp 1556–1590.
 153. Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*; Audra Simpson, *Mohawk interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014; Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*.
 154. Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel, 'Being Indigenous: Resurgences Against Contemporary Colonialism', *Government and Opposition* 40(4), 2005, pp 597–614.
 155. Sarah Maddison, 'Separatism as a Mode of Relations: Practicing Indigenous Resurgence and Nationhood in the 21st Century', in Sarah Maddison and Sana Nakata (eds), *Questioning Indigenous–Settler Relations*, Singapore: Springer Nature, 2020.
 156. Duncan Ivison, *Can Liberal States Accommodate Indigenous Peoples?*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2020.
 157. Leanne Simpson, comments made in the plenary panel at *Imagined Borders, Epistemic Freedoms: The Challenge of Social Imaginaries in Media, Religion and Decoloniality*, Boulder: University of Colorado, 10 January 2020.
 158. Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
 159. Edgar Cabanas and Eva Illouz, *Manufacturing Happy Citizens: How the Science and Industry of Happiness Control Our Lives*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2019, p 139.
 160. Michael Tomasello, *A Natural History of Human Thinking*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014; Protevi, *Edges of the State*.
 161. Mignolo and Walsh, *On Decoloniality*, p 3.
 162. Iris Young, 'Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy', in Seyla Benhabib (ed), *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996, pp 120–136.
 163. Mignolo and Walsh, *On Decoloniality*.
 164. Janine Gertz, 'Breaking Down the Colonial Structures: A Gugu Badhun Manifesto', *Sudo Journal* 1, 2019, pp 20–33.
 165. Yunkaporta, *Sand Talk*.
 166. Judith Butler, *The Force of Nonviolence: An Ethico-political Bind*, London: Verso, 2020. See also Gene Sharp, *From Dictatorship to Democracy*, Boston, MA: Albert Einstein Institution, 1994.
 167. This could also involve siphoning off resources from modernity to help create alternatives while accelerating modernity's demise.
 168. To be clear, my critique of violence does not equate to an indictment of ritualised symbolic or physical violence through, for example, sport, spontaneous play, physical punishment, ridicule, shunning, ostracism, exile, or even execution in exceedingly rare and extreme cases. Nor is it a request to eradicate consensual interpersonal physical conflict per se, as a mode of

- sociality. Rather, it is the repudiation of both institutional force (e.g. police and military) and intimate privatised domestic abuse as a means of (re-)producing coercion, intimidation or subjugation. ‘Every organism in existence does violence’ while ‘the damage of violence is minimised when it is distributed throughout a system rather than centralised into the hands of a few powerful people and their minions’: Yunkaporta, *Sand Talk*. Derrida makes a similar point about the intrinsic connection between life, violence and change: Jacques Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, Alan Bass (trans), London: Routledge, 1978.
169. Revolution itself can be considered as deeply rooted in, or even an accelerated form of, modernity: Hannah Arendt, *On Revolution*, London: Penguin Books, 1963.
 170. I acknowledge that, on a smaller scale, it is possible to defy the state’s monopoly on the use of force through radical anarchist violence: Stanislav Vysotsky, *American Antifa: The Tactics, Culture, and Practice of Militant Antifascism*, London: Routledge, 2020.
 171. William Connolly, ‘Staying with the Possibilities’, *Theory & Event* 22(3), 2019, pp 759–768.
 172. Samuel Alexander, *Entropia: Life Beyond Industrial Civilisation*, Melbourne, Vic: Simplicity Institute Publishing, 2013; Samuel Alexander, ‘Post-capitalism by Design Not Disaster’, *The Ecological Citizen* 3(B), 2020, pp 13–21.
 173. Which aims to manifest the future goals being sought in the present. See, for example, Theresa Petray and Janine Gertz, ‘Building an Economy and Building a Nation: Gugu Badhun Self-determination as Prefigurative Resistance’, *Global Media Journal: Australian Edition* 12(1), 2018.
 174. Federico Demaria, Giorgos Kallis and Karen Bakker, ‘Geographies of Degrowth: Nowtopias, Resurgences and the Decolonization of Imaginaries and Places’, *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 2(3), 2019, pp 431–450.
 175. Rebecca Bryant and Daniel Knight, *The Anthropology of the Future*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
 176. Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*.
 177. While the current apocalypse is singular in its global scope, apocalyptic endings have come before, and continue to occur, for Indigenous peoples – see Indigenous Action, *Rethinking the Apocalypse: An Indigenous Anti-futurist Manifesto*, 2020 – and, more generally, paraphrasing William Gibson, ‘the apocalypse is already here – it’s just not evenly distributed’: Bronislaw Szerszynski, ‘Epilogue: Indigenous Worlds and Planetary Futures’, in Rosalyn Bold (ed), *Indigenous Perceptions of the End of the World*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019, pp 203–209.
 178. It is important to be clear that this is not about ‘saving the Earth’. In deep time, the living planet will survive and thrive without (modern) humans.
 179. Bawaka Country et al, ‘Goŋ Gurtha: Enacting Response-abilities as Situated Co-becoming’, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 37(4), 2019, pp 682–702.
 180. Anna M Agathangelou, Dana M Olwan, Tamara Lea Spira and Heather M Turcotte, ‘Sexual Divestments from Empire: Women’s Studies, Institutional Feelings, and the “Odious” Machine’, *Feminist Formations* 27(3), 2015, pp 139–167.
 181. Beyond pondering the arrival of an ex-modern ‘magical future’, while decrying, as pointless, requests to ‘give up’ its affordances: Tess Lea, *Wild Policy: Indigeneity and the Unruly Logics of Intervention*, Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2020.
 182. Makere Stewart-Harawira, ‘Indigenous Resilience and Pedagogies of Resistance: Responding to the Crisis of our Age’, in Makere Stewart-Harawira and Jordan Kinder (eds), *Resilient Systems, Resilient Communities*, Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, 2018.
 183. Jacques Derrida, ‘Lyotard and Us’, *Parallax* 6(4), 2000, pp 28–48.
 184. David Abram, *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-than-Human World*, New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1997, p 264.
 185. Charles Taylor, *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.
 186. This is not to suggest that humans living in space or on other planets, asteroids, constructed habitats etc. is inherently problematic. Indeed, the introduction of living ecosystems on islands newly risen from the sea (including through action by human seafarers) has occurred

throughout history. As such, 'life in space', approached with humility, wisdom and respect, could well be consistent with continued flourishing and diversification of the living cosmos.

187. Also known as Healesville: <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-07-10/the-aboriginal-names-for-ten-melbourne-suburbs/9960092>.

Acknowledgements

My thanks to two anonymous reviewers and Melinda Hinkson for insightful comments on earlier versions of this article.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Yin Paradies is Professor and Chair in Race Relations at Deakin University, Naarm. He conducts interdisciplinary research on the health, social and economic effects of racism as well as anti-racism theory, policy and practice across diverse settings, including online, and in workplaces, schools, universities, housing, the arts and health. He also teaches and researches Indigenous knowledges. Professor Paradies identifies as Anglo-Asian-Aboriginal and is a descendent of the Wakaya peoples of the Gulf Country. He is a climate-catastrophe activist and lives in an off-grid intentional community near Woo-rite.¹⁸⁷