

Indigenous Resistance in the Digital Age. An Introduction

Our presence is our weapon, and this is visible to me at every protest, every mobilization, every time a Two Spirit person gifts us with a dance at our powwows, every time we speak our truths, every time we embody Indigenous life. It is visible to me in the Unist’ot’en camp, in the hearts of Moosehide Tanners Against Fascism in Denendeh, in the work of the Native Youth Sexual Health Network, in the forty years of mobilization against mercury contamination and deforestation at Grassy Narrows First Nation, in Elsipogtog, Kanehsatà:ke, Listuguj, and of course in the phenomenal mobilization against the Dakota Access pipeline in Standing Rock, North Dakota, by the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe and the Oceti Sakowin (The Great Sioux Nation).

Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*¹

To govern ourselves means to govern our stories and our ways of telling stories. It means that the rhythm of the drumbeat, the language of smoke signals and our moccasin telegraph can be transformed to the airwaves and modems of our times. We can determine our use of the new technologies to support, strengthen and enrich our cultural communities.

Ahasiw Maskegon-Iskwew, “Drumbeats to Drumbytes”²

In 1996, Mohawk multimedia artist from Canada, Skawennati, developed and curated a cultural project called CyberPowWow.³ The project consisted in a series of interconnected chat rooms designed to serve as a gathering place and also as a gallery where online Indigenous artworks could be displayed and where visitors could interact with one another in real time. The project ran from 1996 to 2004, inspired by the revolutionizing tools of digital interactions through avatars, animation and online storytelling. Every two years, CyberPowWow hosted an event during which visitors could log from their homes or from gathering sites scattered across North America. Indigenous artists like Melanie Printup Hope, Bradlee LaRocque, Ryan Rice, Audra Simpson, Paul Chaat Smith and Skawennati Tricia Fragnito displayed their artwork and were online to discuss their work. CyberPowWow unexpectedly offered a possibility for remediating the traditional powwow, an Indigenous ceremony and a dance circle meant to promote and preserve Indigenous cultures, identities and belonging across space. At the same time, it was a response to the dominant discourse of Internet-based art and a counter-force to the imperial structures of the Internet.⁴ Overall, CyberPowWow was the first aboriginally determined online territory.

The project sounded as a powerful response to the question posed by Métis and Cree scholar Loretta Todd,⁵ when she asked whether Indigenous narratives, languages and knowledge could find

¹ Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done. Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resurgence* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

² Ahasiw Maskegon-Iskwew, “Drumbeats to Drumbytes Origins”, *Drumbytes*, <http://drumbytes.org/about/origins-1994.php>.

³ Although both the project and the website are now inactive, some information can still be retrieved here <https://www.cyberpowwow.net/about.html>, accessed 2 November 2022.

⁴ Mikhel Proulx, “CyberPowWow. Digital Natives and the First Wave of Online Publication”, *Journal of Canadian Art History*, 36.1 (2015), 203-216.

⁵ Loretta Todd, “Aboriginal Narratives in Cyberspace”, in Mary Anne Moser, ed., *Immersed in Technology. Art and Virtual Environments* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1996), 179-194.

any meaning in this new territory that she called cyberspace. Todd saw the digital realm as a reenactment of western cultural consciousness, or a western product that replicates the hegemonies of whiteness. In other words, virtuality could be seen as a new *terra nullius* conquered and controlled by non-Indigenous peoples, where the violence of colonization is still perpetuated. *Terra nullius* is the foundational lie of each and every colonial setting. As such, it has always been a lie. The discursive construction of the empty land has justified centuries of colonial occupation across the globe. The occupation of physical and digital territories continues nowadays and it still governed by the violence of colonialism. Suffice it to think of how colonialism is embedded within the construction of infrastructures and systems of digital technologies right onto Indigenous lands;⁶ the weponization of social media and hashtag networks by far-right extremist groups enacting racist discourses online;⁷ or the ‘colonial algorithms’ that shape misguided perceptions of Indigenous people and identities.⁸

Despite being often politicized as universal and democratic, the digital world of social and digital media, and the Internet in general, mirror the colonial realm and its violent dynamics. The issue has been widely discussed by scholars engaged in postcolonial digital humanities. According to Risam,⁹ colonial influences in the digital humanities are replicated in the making of digital spaces. The risk is that while “digital humanities offers tremendous potential for democratizing scholarly knowledge, such possibilities are undercut by projects that recreate colonial dynamics or reinforce the Global North as the site of knowledge production” (80). So much so that Todd talked about the Internet as a place born of greed, fear and hunger, which risks to duplicate “what already exists – with virtual malls, as constructed by the world of commerce, and virtual museums, as constructed by the academy, or virtual arcades, as constructed by the entertainment industry...remember cyberspace started as a virtual war zone, as constructed by the western military”.¹⁰ Todd’s preoccupation with the digital world resonates in the question raised by Risam, who wonders how digital technologies can be used to undo the technologies of colonialism if humanities-based knowledge production has historically been employed as technology of colonialism in the first place.¹¹ Both authors conclude that the digital realm could possibly become “a place of nourishment”,¹² provided that Indigenous epistemologies are embedded in its design, that new sets of creative practices that resist settler colonialism are put forth, and that, in general, the transformative possibilities of technologies are used in service of decolonization.¹³

What happened first with CyberPowWow and then after 1996 went precisely in that direction. It is undeniable that the advent of digital and social media has deeply affected and radically transformed the interplay between politics, communication and new technologies, as new possibilities for Indigenous peoples to bring about decolonization and to decolonize the Internet are now available. In response to digital colonialism and cyber imperialism, but also to the stereotypical framing of Indigenous peoples as unmodern, stuck in the past, and then standing in opposition to technological advancements, Indigenous users of digital technologies have been working to establish their own territories in the

⁶ See Marisa Elena Duarte, “Connected Activism. Indigenous Uses of Social Media for Shaping Political Change”, *Australasian Journal of Information Systems*, 21 (2017), 1-12; Ashley Caranto Morford and Jeffrey Ansloos, “Indigenous Sovereignty in Digital Territory. A Qualitative Study on Land-based Relations with #NativeTwitter”, *AlterNative. An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 17.2 (2021), 293-305.

⁷ See Sarah Jackson et al., *#Hashtag Activism. Networks of Race and Gender Justice* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2020).

⁸ Bronwyn Fredericks et al., “Disrupting the Colonial Algorithm: Indigenous Australia and Social Media”, *Media International Australia*, 183.1 (2022), 158-178.

⁹ Roopika Risam, “Decolonizing the Digital Humanities in Theory and Practice”, in Jentery Sayers, ed., *The Routledge Companion to Media Studies and Digital Humanities* (New York: Routledge, 2018), 78-86.

¹⁰ Todd, “Aboriginal Narratives in Cyberspace”, 180.

¹¹ Risam, “Decolonizing the Digital Humanities.”

¹² Todd, “Aboriginal Narratives in Cyberspace”, 193.

¹³ Risam, “Decolonizing the Digital Humanities.”

digital world, or “decolonising digital geographies”,¹⁴ as McLean defines them. These are digital spaces that offer avenues for change.

As a matter of fact, digital devices have been appropriated by Indigenous peoples in ways that are creative, powerful and political, and that facilitate new modes of resisting to colonial hegemonies. By simply *being* online, Indigenous peoples enact a potent act of resistance that is profoundly political in that it subverts colonial and neo-colonial definitions of Indigeneity, it locates Indigenous peoples in the *here and now*, while also projecting them right into the future. In so doing, for instance, Indigenous peoples carving out digital spaces for themselves online address the practices of de-legitimation and invisibilization, push back against existing forms of representation and ultimately advance a decolonial agenda. The online presence of Indigenous peoples demonstrates that Indigenous users of digital devices can gain control over their own identities, as well as on their discursive production, so as to “challenge forces that define them in terms of what they lack, and to make possible other futures”.¹⁵

As a space of resistance, the digital world is therefore a place of possibility for imagining such futures, in that it allows Indigenous people to agitate, demand political recognition for Indigenous causes, and proffer contesting and challenging views that dismantle colonial preoccupations with Indigenous political unity.¹⁶ Cree/French Métis artist Ahasiw Maskegon-Iskwew, founder of Drumbeats to Drumbytes, a think-tank of Indigenous media artists and culture workers, highlighted that “the digital realm provides Indigenous communities with an autonomous platform to assert an online presence in the face of colonial catastrophe”.¹⁷ Indigenous users of digital technologies are therefore carving out a space for themselves as full participants in the shaping of the cybersphere,¹⁸ in ways that are empowering. For instance, Indigenous movements responding to social and political injustices have reclaimed online counter-discursive spaces of resistance by entering the public arena through social media platforms. This is the case of #idlenomore,¹⁹ a Canadian-based grassroots movement launched as an hashtag by four women in Saskatchewan to expose the threats to Indigenous land rights advanced by the conservative government led by former PM Stephen Harper; #SOSBLAKA AUSTRALIA, a campaign against a plan to forcibly close up to 150 remote Aboriginal communities in Western Australia;²⁰ #IndigenousDads, an hashtag that condensed the sharing of pictures and messages of Indigenous fatherhood challenging the colonial stereotype of neglectful Indigenous fathers;²¹ or the #NoDAPL movement at Standing Rock in the Dakotas, to contrast tar sands extractions and the Keystone XL Pipeline cutting through the Standing Rock Sioux ancestral lands.²²

¹⁴ Jessica McLean, *Decolonising Digital Technologies? Digital Geographies and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Palgrave, 2020), 91.

¹⁵ Bronwyn Carlson and Ryan Frazer, “‘They Got Filters’. Indigenous Social Media, the Settler Gaze, and a Politics of Hope”, *Social Media + Society*, 6.2 (2020), 4.

¹⁶ Bronwyn Carlson and Ryan Frazer, “Indigenous Activism and Social Media. A Global Response to #SOSBLAKA AUSTRALIA”, in Anthony McCosker et al., eds., *Negotiating Digital Citizenship. Control, Contest and Culture* (London: Rowman and Littlefield International, 2016), 115-130.

¹⁷ Maskegon-Iskwew, “Drumbeats to Drumbytes.”

¹⁸ Jason Edward Lewis, “Preparations for a Haunting. Notes toward an Indigenous Future Imaginary”, in Christine Ross et al., eds., *The Participatory Condition in the Digital Age* (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 2016), 229-249.

¹⁹ See Anna Mongibello, *Indigenous Peoples in Canadian TV News. A Corpus-based Analysis of Mainstream and Indigenous News Discourses* (Napoli: Paolo Loffredo Iniziative Editoriali, 2018); Alex Wilson and Zheng Corals, “Shifting Social Media and the Idle No More Movement”, in Bronwyn Carlson and Jeff Berglund, eds., *Indigenous Peoples Rise Up: The Global Ascendancy of Social Media Activism* (Ithaca: Rutgers U.P., 2021), 14-31.

²⁰ Bronwyn Carlson and Ryan Frazer, “Indigenous Activism and Social Media”, 115-130.

²¹ Bronwyn Carlson et al., “Trauma, Shared Recognition and Indigenous Resistance on Social Media”, *Australasian Journal of Information Systems*, 21 (2017), 1-19.

²² Nick Estes, *Our History Is the Future. Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* (London: Verso, 2019).

Some of these movements were organized and led by women and Two-spirit warriors, healers, and land and water protectors; although starting as largely spontaneous, they nonetheless transcended geographical boundaries and led to massive online/offline mobilizations, which, in cases as #IdleNoMore, turned into pan-Indigenous solidarities. They grew bigger and bigger in the face of the criminalization, sometimes even the demonization, of Indigenous fights by mainstream media and politicians. In Canada, for instance, the representations of Idle No More by mainstream media networks like CBC and CTV shifted the attention away from colonization and land occupation to focus on the chaos and violence allegedly caused by Indigenous protesters.²³ Such representations further crystallized Indigenous peoples' marginal position, delegitimized their requests, and worked through myths and assumptions that were codified in language. However, through the hashtag campaign #IdleNoMore, Indigenous peoples and their allies managed to overthrow the mainstream narrative by offering an alternative coverage, as well as by mobilizing and enhancing solidarity. Something similar happened with #SOSBlakAustralia,²⁴ when the protest against the policy that would see the closure of hundreds of small Indigenous communities across West Australia was framed as standing in the way of progress, or when the protesters at Mauna a Wākea in Hawai'i opposing the construction of a massive telescope on their sacred mountain were dismissed as "obstructions on a march to 'the future'".²⁵ Despite the de-legitimizing attempts to diminish the political impact of these campaigns, through online activism Indigenous peoples managed to legitimize their struggles and tell a different story.

Indigenous digital media innovators have also used Web 2.0 technologies and the possibilities offered by virtual worlds in highly creative digital projects such as Aboriginal Territories in Cyberspace, an Aboriginality determined research-creation network, co-founded and co-directed by Jason Edward Lewis and Skawennati, whose goal is to ensure Indigenous presence in the web pages, online environments and video games.²⁶ Video games, in particular, have had a long history of inaccurate representations of Indigenous characters, usually portrayed as human targets in games like *Red Dead Revolver* (2004) and *Gun* (2005), or as mystic chiefs and Indian princesses in *Oregon Trail: American Settler* (1985), that featured stereotypical Indigenous individuals wearing war bonnets and wielding tomahawks. In general, Indigenous peoples in video games have been either underrepresented or appeared as secondary characters,²⁷ usually stereotyped in ways that are diminishing and offensive. Digital media offer a new challenge in this sense, as video games are now produced and designed by Indigenous peoples to express the reality of Indigenous cultural contexts and to communicate Indigenous narratives. They are also used as adaptation sites hosting Indigenous storytelling and worldviews.

Such movements, projects and forms of individual and collective uses of digital media attest to the dynamic ability of Indigenous resistance to renew itself by drawing from its more traditional forms and being translated into digitally inspired initiatives. This is because Indigenous resistance goes way back before the advent of digital technologies, of course. Despite the enormous heterogeneity of its local realizations, Indigenous resistance worldwide has been characterized by years of struggles for defending Indigenous lands, relationships and ways of life. Indigenous peoples have always had to fight for their lives, being "a problem that needed to be fixed",²⁸ as they stood in the way of the quest for the white nation. They were an inconvenient reminder that "the land was not new, but was stolen

²³ Mongibello, *Indigenous Peoples in Canadian TV News*.

²⁴ Carlson and Frazer, "Indigenous Activism and Social Media".

²⁵ Noelani Goodyear-Ka'opua, "Protectors of the Future, Not Protestors of the Past. Indigenous Pacific Activism and Mauna a Wākea", *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 116.1 (2017), 186.

²⁶ *Aboriginal Territories in Cyberspace*, <https://abtec.org>.

²⁷ Dmitri Williams et al., "The Virtual Census. Representations of Gender, Race and Age in Video Games", *New Media & Society*, 11.5 (2019), 815-834.

²⁸ Bronwyn Carlson and Ryan Frazer, *Indigenous Digital Life. The Practice and Politics of Being Indigenous in Social Media* (Cham: Palgrave MacMillan, 2021), 168.

from others” (168). Today, as long before the advent of the digital age, Indigenous peoples are resisting the ongoing violence of colonialism and settler policies, as they have always done.²⁹

The translation of these practices of resistance into the digital realm implies that Indigenous online resistance now encompasses digital forms like networking,³⁰ the revitalization of ancestral languages and cultures through blogs, educational apps, interactive maps, social media etc.,³¹ the digitalization of traditional Indigenous knowledge and the promotion of online dissent, activism³² and solidarity.³³ As Pascua Yaqui/Chicanx scholar Marisa Duarte explains, “we also have to continually conceptualise how Indigenous peoples uses of social media are grounded in not just contemporary political exigencies, but also in the tribal philosophies, spiritualities, traditions, and historical legacies of peoples with memories reverberating through eras well before the founding of modern nation-states”.³⁴ The translation and re-mediation of Indigenous resistance online does not imply that the physical reality of resistance stands in opposition to the virtual realm where it takes place. On the contrary, online and offline dimensions converge into the creation of a stream of reality that is both virtual and physical at the same time. It is virtual because of the digital tools that are employed; it is physical because of the material outcomes that derive from the usage of digital tools. The affirmation of Indigeneity online is not less ‘real’ or less political than any other Indigenous identity affirmation taking place outside the virtual world. Therefore, in the digital age, Indigenous peoples are resisting power, domination and control, affirming their sovereignties and creating networks of anti-colonial solidarities in ways that collapse the traditional opposition online vs. offline, thus enhancing their possibilities of subverting contemporary colonizing systems. This does not mean simplifying or dismissing the complex intertwining between virtuality and reality, online and offline, nor that online resistance has an immediate, easier to achieve, material outcome. Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg scholar Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, for example, points out how, despite the significant amount of online activism towards eradicating Indigenous stereotypes, there have not been enough action or discussion about land issue. Condemning racist stereotypes is now an easy win, so much so that nowadays it is not acceptable to wear a headdress at a dance party. However, it is still acceptable to build pipelines over stolen lands, to target Indigenous women’s bodies and to undermine Indigenous body sovereignty and self-determination.³⁵

Far from wanting to provide a comprehensive account of contemporary Indigenous resistance, the special issue of *Anglistica AION* aims at offering some perspectives and insights into the processes, the outcomes, the languages and the discourses of Indigenous resistance, its different configurations in digital environments, as well as the political agenda underpinning these configurations. In so doing, we sought to suggest possible ways of looking into the way digital technologies are used to mobilize as well as to resist and subvert mainstream narratives about Indigenous peoples, their identities and their claims. Since the connections between Indigeneity and new technologies have recently been investigated from a variety of perspectives, employing several critical lenses and methodologies³⁶ in

²⁹ Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*.

³⁰ Monica Isabel González Arribas et al., “ViTu. A System to Help the Mexican People to Preserve and Celebrate Their Culture”, *CHI’11 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (New York: Association for Computing Machinery, 2011), 971-976.

³¹ Elizabeth Sumida Huaman, “Indigenous Language Revitalization and New Media. Postsecondary Students as Innovators”, *Global Media Journal*, 11.18 (2011), 1-15.

³² Duarte, “Connected Activism.”

³³ Joe Waitoa et al. “E-WHANAUNGATANGA. The Role of Social Media in Māori Political Empowerment”, *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 11 (2015), 45-58.

³⁴ Duarte, “Connected Activism”, 9.

³⁵ Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, 113.

³⁶ A non-comprehensive list of works dealing with Indigenous peoples and digital and new media, in addition to those that have already been cited in this introduction, includes Thomas R. Hilder et al., eds., *Music, Indigeneity, Digital Media* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2017); Kerry McCallum et al. “Community Business. The Internet in Remote Australian

the fields of Information Studies, Ethnic Studies and Media Studies mostly, our hope is to widen the current critical debate through contributions that approach case studies from Indigenous and ally perspectives. The issue explores the political dimensions of language, culture and the media as sites of resistance and mobilization where and through which Indigenous peoples in the digital age have disengaged from dominant colonial narratives. In this sense, we can see digital technologies as both a site and a tool where counter-discursive resistance to the dominant discourse of settler colonialism takes place.

The issue collects contributions by scholars with different backgrounds in a range of disciplines across the humanities and social sciences, who adopt a combination of theoretical approaches and methodologies that range from Indigenous Studies, Critical Discourse Analysis, Corpus Linguistics to Multimodal Analysis, Media Studies, Social Media Studies, Cultural Studies, Postcolonial Studies, among others. The authors engage with case studies initiated in Australia, Canada and USA, where the situated forms of resistance, individual or collective, took an online turn. The practices of resistance under investigation are also specific to the virtual realms where they occur, as well as to the digital tools and the technologies being employed. These are not only limited to the social media platforms TikTok, Facebook, Instagram and Twitter, but also include the strategic uses of digital resources to create archives of knowledge and video games as devices meant to readapt Indigenous storytelling. All the contributors explore the case studies herein included as political practices in the framework of decolonization, and therefore as counter-discourse or counternarratives, examined through qualitative and/or quantitative methodologies. Experiences of resistance emerge that disclose about the current situation of Indigenous struggles for social justice, against hegemonic grammars of representation, to affirm Indigenous responses to discourses of colonialism, racism, and hate, and to re-establish Indigenous sovereignty, both online and offline.

Our special issue opens with “The Queen Died, Colonisers Cried and the Walls Come Tumbling Down” by Bronwyn Carlson. Drawing attention to the overwhelming outpouring of emotion expressed across social media as the news broke of Queen Elizabeth’s death this article tries to make sense of the dominate pro-monarchy “Queen-mania” that engulfed the globe. As a counter to the frenzy, this paper brings responses from Indigenous and other colonised peoples who took to social media to highlight the extent of the violence and harm the British empire has caused around the globe. Following the #AbolishTheMonarchy movement across social media this paper asks, are the walls about to tumble on the British empire?

“Black Deaths in Custody. Digital Strategies of Indigenous Mobilization” by Chiara Minestrelli zooms into the online rhetorical and visual strategies used by Indigenous activists in Australia, following the brutal killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis (USA) to protest the loss of ‘Blak’ people in police custody. The analysis focuses on the website and Facebook page Stop Black Deaths in Custody as well as on the digital materials circulated on social media platforms by Indigenous activists. The paper foregrounds the interplay between visual and linguistic elements from a social semiotic perspective framed around Multimodality, or Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis. The results suggest that mobilisation is mainly conveyed through a rhetoric that evokes and directly addresses affective connections while strengthening international advocacy.

In “TikToking the Black Box”, Georgia Coe reports on the individual and collective digital strategies of two Indigenous Australians who identify as gender diverse as they navigate TikToks governing algorithms and looking at how algorithms drive political online activism. TikTok has

Indigenous Communities”, *New Media & Society*, 11.7 (2009), 1230-1251; Alopi S. Latufeku, “Remote Indigenous Communities in Australia. Questions of Access, Information, and Self-determination”, in Kyra Landzelius, ed., *Native on the Net Indigenous and Diasporic Peoples in the Virtual Age* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 43-60; Juan Francisco Salazar, “Self-determination in Practice. The Critical Making of Indigenous Media”, *Development in Practice*, 19 (2009), 504-513; Pamela Wilson and Michelle Stewart, eds., *Global Indigenous Media* (Durham: Duke U.P., 2008).

become particularly popular among Indigenous youth globally, as it is used to produce content that encompasses cultural practices, humour, and education. However, the platform faces continual accusations of unjust and inequitable racialised platform design. The article explores how algorithmic inequalities are collectively resisted by two popular TikTokers, Tilly and Q. in the digital protest #july31stwalkout. The paper also discusses the role of TikTok algorithm in amplifying queer voices. In doing so, it reveals some of the disparities and freedoms of the TikTok platform. Namely, the algorithmic silencing of Indigenous standpoints and algorithmic promotion of queer voices, which has unique implications for Indigenous gender/sexuality diverse people.

Anna Mongibello's paper “#alleyesonwetsuweten. An Analysis of the Wet'suwet'en protest on Twitter”, analyzes Indigenous online activism in Canada by focusing on how the Wet'suwet'en people have recently remediated on Twitter their protest against the Coastal GasLink pipeline, a 670-kilometre-long natural gas pipeline crossing their ancestral and unceded territories. The author's analysis was informed by qualitative and quantitative methodologies and was conducted on a corpus of 2588 tweets posted by the Wet'suwet'en protesters between January 2019 and November 2021. The results show that the Wet'suwet'en make use of specific forms of online activism which characterize Indigenous online discourse of resistance as a medium of positive self-representation, negative other-representation, Indigenous sovereignty affirmation, and digital resistance to neo-colonial practices. The discourses emerging from the analysis of the tweets are of solidarity, mobilization, land claim and Indigenous sovereignty.

The paper by Maria Cristina Nisco, “Practices of Resistance in Social Media Discourse. The Case of Grassy Narrows First Nation” focuses on one of the worst community health crises in Canada. The case came to public attention in 1970 when a number of residents were found to display symptoms of the Minamata disease, a neurological syndrome caused by severe mercury poisoning. It was later revealed that the source of the pollution was Reed Paper Ltd chemical plant operating upstream from the reserve. The paper examines, through a linguistic and discursive analysis, how Twitter users frame issues pertaining to Grassy Narrows First Nation. The results show that tweeters resort to some key topics and themes including mercury poisoning and health crisis, healing, justice and resistance. Overall, Grassy Narrows is still mostly framed as Canada's shame, and moral outrage seems extremely common in users' posts, protesting over past and present injustices, infringement of Indigenous rights, lack of healthcare resources, and assistance for vulnerable people.

Vincenzo Bavaro's paper, “Counternarratives of Maunakea: Crossing Digital Spaces, Claiming Ancestral Knowledge in Hawai'i” examines the Native Hawaiian or Kānaka Maoli resistance to the proposed construction of the Thirty Meters Telescope, the largest telescope in the Northern hemisphere, on the peak of Maunakea, the sacred mountain on the island of Hawai'i. The author explores the legal and cultural clashes behind the protests as well the strong social media presence of the Maunakea protectors, while two waves of protest took place, between 2015 and 2021. The paper shows how Kānaka Maoli have responded to this crisis and transformed it into a generational opportunity for resistance, decolonization, and solidarity.

Last, but surely not least, David Gaertner's paper on “‘A Game 10,000 Years in the Making’: *Never Alone/Kisima Ingitchuna* and Adaptation as a Future-Oriented Technology” provides an insight into the burgeoning field of Indigenous video game studies to show how the translation of Indigenous stories into video games foregrounds community sustainability, cultural flexibility and resistance. The author argues that adaptation is a future-oriented storytelling technology that offers an exciting and dynamic space to further a conversation in which Indigenous communities are gathering stories in video games. The paper investigates the case of *Never Alone*, which is an Indigenous video game by the Iñupiaq people. *Never Alone* is not a new story, but it is an example of *ikiaqtaq*, which means “a song that has been adapted.” In this sense, it shows how adaptation can be mobilize to retrofit digital space so that video game platforms can speak with and even as traditional technologies.

Overall, the papers collected in this issue look at Indigenous practices of counter-discursive resistance as counter-hegemonic affirmations of Indigenous realities. Despite the different perspectives, methodologies and analytical frameworks, all the papers present evidence of the disruptive power of these affirmations, while also proving, through critical examinations, how Indigenous resistance is experiencing an ongoing transformation, taking new directions that cannot be ignored. Most of all, the articles illustrate the dynamic, complex and heterogeneous intersections between Indigenous communities and digital media by focusing on the creative potential of such intersections, as well as on their ability to produce social, political and cultural change.

Note on terminology

There are many different terms that Indigenous peoples use to refer to themselves and their communities. These terms are as varied and diverse as their experiences, cultures, languages and struggles across the globe. Here we use the term ‘Indigenous’ when addressing practices of online resistance in general. This is to say that Indigenous resistance does have an internal pluralism and richness that makes it heterogeneous. Our intent is to highlight that Indigenous resistance has some common features, as for example the anticolonialism underpinning the different configurations of resistance, and the digital tools, platforms and technologies that are employed by Indigenous users. The particular uses of these tools by Indigenous groups in specific geographic locations, as well as the outcomes achieved, are diverse and vary depending on the struggles they are serving. In this issue of *Anglistica AION*, whenever possible, the names of Indigenous-identified communities and individuals are expressed to refer to the cultural contexts of production where Indigenous resistance takes place.