

Developing Dispossession: Infrastructure, Cultural Production and Legal Discourse in Treaty 3

by

Caolan Barr

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of Geography and Planning
University of Toronto

©Copyright by Caolan Barr 2018

Developing Dispossession: Infrastructure, Cultural Production and Legal Discourse in Treaty 3

Caolan Barr

Master of Arts

Department of Geography and Planning
University of Toronto

2018

Abstract

This thesis examines how dispossession was produced for Anishinaabeg communities of Treaty 3 through interlocking processes of legal discourse, cultural production and development. It traces the genealogical origins of infrastructure through a series of dams built across Northwestern Ontario from 1871 until 1926. In Treaty 3, the discursive foundations for infrastructure and development were laid through a series of expeditions and legal decisions that justified and facilitated settler expansion. Likewise, development involved a set of mutually constitutive and reciprocal forms of epistemic, ontological, symbolic and material violence. In this work, I argue that dispossession is structural to settler colonialism and the defining feature which ties a set of seemingly disparate histories and processes together in Treaty 3. Recognizing gaps in the literature and colonial archive, I call for the development of new practices of inquiry that allow us to provincialize and unsettle the normativity of colonial violence and narratives.

Acknowledgments

This work, for all its absences, would not be possible without the support of numerous individual and communities.

My supervisors Matt Farish and Michael Ekers have provided valuable feedback and always been there to listen, read and (re)read this, if we are honest, long work. My committee members Sharlene Mollett and Deborah McGregor read my work with care, challenged me and pointed me in productive directions.

My family has supported me throughout the process, especially my mother, Lynne Reside who was always there to help in whatever ways she could and for this I'm grateful.

This project began in conversations with Agnes Kabatay, Norma Peters and Ron Momogeeshiik Peters. I'm always deeply moved by the ways in which my partner's family has welcomed me into their lives and attempted to give me the tools to understand and enact my responsibilities within their communities and on their lands.

I'm deeply appreciative of the interview participants who shared their stories and knowledge with me. Leanna Marshall, Marilou Adams, Steve McGillis, Ron Momogeeshiik Peters and Quill Christie-Peters.

Finally, this project and my life would not be possible without the encouragement, love and teachings of my partner, Quill Christie-Peters.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements, iii

Table of Contents, iv

Introduction, 2

Chapter 1, Coming-to-Know, 17

<i>1.1 'Inquiry as Invasion'</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>1.2 Self-Location</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>1.3 Refusal</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>1.4 Responsible Intellectual Engagement</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>1.5 Methods</i>	<i>42</i>

Chapter 2, Production and Violence, 49

<i>2.1 The Production of Colonial Space</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>2.2 Colonial Violence</i>	<i>59</i>

Chapter 3, Representation, 68

<i>3.1 'Contact Zones'</i>	<i>68</i>
<i>3.2 The Invention of the 'Savage'</i>	<i>82</i>

Chapter 4, Erasure, 92

<i>4.1 St. Catherine's Milling's</i>	<i>94</i>
<i>4.2 Justifying Removal</i>	<i>100</i>

Chapter 5, Development, 106

<i>5.1 Powering Settler Expansionism</i>	<i>101</i>
<i>5.2 The International Joint Commission Hearings</i>	<i>116</i>

Chapter 6, Conclusion, 126

Bibliography, 130

Introduction

(((((((((((Beginnings))))))))))

Sketches of Colonialism: Three Vignettes

In 1857, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada commissioned an expedition to explore and map the area west of Lake Superior to the Red River Settlement with an eye toward establishing a transportation corridor through this relatively isolated region (Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1858). The expedition was tasked with mapping, measuring and cataloguing the territory, its geographic and geological features, and importantly, its Indigenous inhabitants. It was one of several outfitted in the next fifteen years that sought to connect the Prairies to the rest of Canada. These expeditions were involved in the production and communication of specific ideas of space, race and empire (Thomas 2015). Their published reports contributed to a literary genre of travel writing, producing and communicating culturally-informed representations of the lands and Anishinaabeg peoples they encountered to multiple colonial audiences (Pratt 1992). These expeditions laid the groundwork (literally and figuratively) for a host of infrastructure projects that opened up the country, powered industry and enabled the imagining of the Canadian nation. In their narratives, they produced images of Indigeneity for a hungry colonial public and spurred the territorial imaginings and ‘anticipatory geographies’ of an emerging settler state (Veracini 2010). The cultural productions and representations of these expeditions were mobilized toward a policy of Indigenous removal and the development of infrastructure in the region (Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm 1996). In the process, development and legal erasure dispossessed the Anishinaabe nations that made Northwestern Ontario home, inaugurating environmental violence and displacements that threatened the very survival of these communities.

By 1872, the imaginaries of the expeditions had begun to be materialized, written on to the landscape through a set of infrastructure projects, particularly dams that sought to expand settler territorialities and transform the landscape according to the imperatives of settler colonialism. In that year, a dam built on the Seine River at Lac des Mille Lacs, an Anishinaabe community in Treaty 3, flooded the

territory, submerged sacred sites and burial grounds, devastated *manoomin* (wild rice) stands, and damaged the habitats of sturgeon, muskrats, and other non-human relations (Adler 2010). The development of the dam produced conditions of precarity and rendered life on the land increasingly untenable (Nixon 2011; Butler 2009). Over time, development dramatically affected the ecology of the region and undermined the economic strategies, cultural practices and legal and political orders of the community (Lovisek 1996). Struggling in the face of these conditions of accretive and inexorable slow violence, the community of Lac des Mille Lacs was entirely displaced, forced off their lands by the 1950s. In 1909, dams built across the Rainy River in the towns of Fort Frances, Ontario and International Falls, Minnesota further extended this nexus of infrastructure projects (Dacey 1993:37). These dams flooded expansive tracts of land, powered extractive and contaminative industries, disrupted the rhythms of the watershed and led to the collapse of one of Turtle Island's largest sturgeon fisheries (Holzkamm, Lytwyn and Waisberg 1988). The dam produced conditions that would result in 'displacement-in-place' for the communities of Couchiching and Manitou Rapids (Mollett 2014:30), leading communities to experience "constraints on livelihoods and cultural practices" that left them "stranded in a place stripped of the very characteristics that made it inhabitable" (Nixon 2011:19). Taken together these dams initiated processes of slow violence that would result in conditions of precarity, abandonment, displacement and even, dissolution for Anishinaabe communities throughout Treaty 3. Dams then were an axis of what has been described as a de facto policy of Indigenous removal in the territory at the time (Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm 1996). The dispossessions resulting from development continue to resonate and shape the contours of the landscape and communities' lives to this day.

Finally, in 1885, a case that was to decide the shape and direction of Canadian law in regards to Indigenous title came before the courts in Ontario. Ostensibly about the jurisdictional claims of the provincial and federal governments, the St. Catherine's Milling's case ruled on the legal standing of Indigenous title through racist and dehumanizing discourses and arguments (Kulchyski 1994). Its final rulings negated Indigenous title and abjected Anishinaabeg personhood. Negotiations stemming from the

case resulted in the cancellation of reserves throughout the territory of Treaty 3, bureaucratically displacing these communities and initiating a wide-ranging policy of removal.

Setting the Scene: Making Connections

In this work, I am concerned with what connects the histories and developments of these vignettes. What are their points of overlap and what do we learn by examining these interstices and creases? I argue that what connects these histories is a structural and expansive dispossession and a consistent and enduring policy of removal. Settler colonialism is fundamentally structured by a logic of elimination (Wolfe 2006). Indigenous dispossession and perpetual territorial acquisition are its ‘terminal creeds’ (Coulthard 2014; Vizenor 1998). Yet, as Leanne Simpson argues, this dispossession is expansive and multiscalar and must be thought of in “more complex terms than just land loss” (2017:43).

Colonialism attempts to dispossess Indigenous peoples of their lands, their waters, their ancestors, their histories, their relations, their knowledge, economies, legal orders, nations and finally, from their very sense of self. Dispossession then always takes place on multiple terrains. It involves forms of physical, discursive, epistemic, ontological, symbolic and legal violence. It is mutable and adaptive, its features and characteristics shifting in response to historical contingency and political utility. Yet, its imperatives and objectives; land, territory and lives, remain persistent and enduring. This is all to say, that it in its quest for land and in its seeking of the ‘elimination of the native’, dispossession and its spatial expression takes different forms (Wolfe 2006). The logics of elimination can be mobilized through various forms of colonial violence and settler strategies including discourse, coercive force, law, ecocide and displacement (Short 2016). Yet, these strategies overlap and interpenetrate, mutually reinforcing and buttressing one another in a process that I describe as *intersectional settler colonial violence*. Returning to the question, we can ask again: where are the points of intersection between expeditions, colonial law, infrastructure and development?

Expeditions were characterized by forms of epistemic violence. As “machines for producing discourse” they generated representations of Indigeneity and territory that dehumanized Anishinaabeg, constructed their lands (and waters) as idle and justified expansion and conquest (Thomas 2015:16). They involved both cartographic and narrative mappings, producing circumscribed ideas about territory and Indigenous personhood that facilitated their incorporation into the expanding edges of empire (Harris 2004). Expeditions were a narrative technology that produced specific visions of space and Anishinaabe sovereignty that legitimized and motivated the displacements and policies of removal that attended the construction of legal discourses and development in Treaty 3. Expeditions then deployed discourse as a form of colonial violence to achieve dispossession. Through their representational strategies expeditions imagined Anishinaabeg out-of-place and rendered them less-than-human through a set of settler tropes and rhetorical strategies. These narrative productions opened Anishinaabeg lands to the territorial imaginings and seizures of settler colonialism.

Colonial law was another form of violence mobilized to dispossess Indigenous communities. It represented what Robert Williams Jr. describes as one of the most “effective instruments of empire” (1990:6). The St. Catherine’s Milling’s case ruled on Indigenous title, sovereignty and the legal status of Indigenous peoples. In many ways, it was a ruling on the very humanity of Indigenous communities. The ruling was structured by the logics of White supremacy and depended on the stories that colonialism told itself about the nature of Indigeneity. By legislating and ruling on the humanity and legal standing of Indigenous peoples, colonial law inscribed abjection onto the bodies of Anishinaabeg and rendered them vulnerable to a number of forms of physical violence and colonial interventions. The dehumanizing rulings of colonial law negated Indigenous title and served as the basis for settler sovereignties providing a veneer of legal legitimacy. The ruling vacated Turtle Island of legal subjects simultaneously producing and legitimizing the doctrines of discovery and *terra nullius* (McAdam 2015; Hunt 2014a).

Development performed its own acts of dispossession, dramatically transforming and physically altering the landscape in ways that produced life on the land for Anishinaabeg as untenable, eventually

displacing or disrupting communities. Infrastructure served to communicate ownership, materialize settler jurisdiction and produce landscapes denuded of Anishinaabeg presence (Cowen 2018). Development produced forms of physical and environmental violence that dislocated and disconnected Anishinaabeg from their territories. Displacement and development then served the same purpose of vacating the territory of problematic Indigenous sovereignties and presence as the expeditions' racist imaginings and narrations and the epistemic erasures of legal discourse. Through all three processes, dispossession remains the structuring feature, only the strategies have shifted.

However, these are not disparate processes. As Hunt writes, there is a “relationship between the epistemic violence of dehumanization and erasure and the relentless forms of physical violence which are a product of this dehumanization” (2014b:21-22). Robust understandings of settler colonialism and dispossession require that we remain attentive to the ways in which these processes are not disconnected, they always intersect and interpenetrate, shaping and buttressing one another. Material, epistemic and discursive violence are not so easily divisible. Dispossession and settler colonial power strike multiple poses, yet they cannot be separated (Vizenor 1994). Colonial violence is expansive in its connections, overlaps and entanglements. It is a networked, symbiotic and reciprocally constituted process that binds together epistemic, material and ontological violence. In the unmaking of Indigenous sovereignty and the production of colonial space, epistemic and material violence interact, produce and reproduce one another.

The processes of dehumanization and displacement can be seen as reflections of material and epistemic violence and are similarly structurally intertwined. The development of infrastructure in Treaty 3 relied on the racist and dehumanizing narratives of the expeditions and the setting of legal precedence. Development required productions of land that produced it as waste or understood it as idle, while displacement relied on the productions of Indigeneity as less-than-human and with no title or claims to territory that had been established in the earlier period through the narratives and representations of colonial law and the textual productions of the expeditions. Understanding dispossession and the

production of space in Treaty 3 involves making linkages between historical periods and between multiple forms of colonial violence and dispossession. It involves seeking the connections between narrative representations of space and Indigeneity and how they intersect with the physical transformations of development to produce dispossession and justify removal. To understand dispossession, we need to examine all of its axes.

While this project looks at infrastructure and development as spatial strategies of remapping territory, producing Indigenous dispossession and constructing settler hegemony, it attends to the expansive violence of colonialism by simultaneously examining the discourses and cultural productions that underwrite and mobilize dispossession, the production of space and a de facto policy of Indigenous removal in Treaty 3. Orienting our analyses to include the discursive underpinnings of colonialism allows us more robust understandings of how dispossession operates, and thus strengthens our capabilities to disrupt and upset these processes. To understand how dispossession functioned through development we need to simultaneously look at infrastructure as an ideological and territorializing architecture, colonial law as an intensely disciplinary and regulatory force, expeditions as sites of cultural production, and the context in which these processes interact, in an analytical framework that I describe as ‘systems-encompassing’ or *mise-en-scène* (Whetung 2016).

If colonialism’s violence is expansive, adaptive and mobile, then our inquiries have to be as well. In seeking connections, I attempt to forward what Leanne Simpson describes as non-linear inquiry that “spirals into and then out of a core series of arguments” (2017:199). This process could be described as one of constellatory inquiry, a networked methodological practice that attempts to make linkages and to understand connections rather than compartmentalize histories and theory in linear or reductive ways. This work’s inquiries then are necessarily mobile, tracking between a number of sites and processes to chart the contours of dispossession and the logics that underwrite it. This analytical movement across multiple and overlapping locations allows us to “intervene in the containerization process of settler colonial scales” (Recollet 2016:94). It disrupts the linear and causal histories of settler colonialism which

temporalize colonial violence and silo its effects in a distant colonial past or to specific and bounded locations. In Treaty 3, colonial histories and territorializations are not past, not over, constantly intersecting with one another interceding and showing up in unexpected places (Deloria 1998). As such, mobile inquiries as an analytic, trouble colonial practices of compartmentalization and allow us to make connections and give shape to the nebulous forms that dispossession takes.

This work then is a story of settler colonial power (in both senses of the word) and Indigenous dispossession, but also of Anishinaabeg nationhood and resilience. In this telling, I seek to examine the complex processes through which colonial geographies and Indigenous dispossession are produced, imposed and reproduced. Taking infrastructure, development, colonial law and cultural production as points of departure allows me to engage with how they are entangled with the transits of colonial power, intersecting forms of settler violence and the production of colonial space. In this work, I offer a schematic, preliminary and gestural account of the sites, processes and structures through which settler colonialism has articulated and extended itself by examining infrastructure, settler discourse and cultural productions in the Anishinaabe territories of Treaty 3 to pose a set of interrelated questions that begin with: what ties these processes together?

Charting the Territory: Project Questions and Objectives

This project attempts to answer a number of overarching questions that derive from the histories of Treaty 3. How has dispossession been produced through development and infrastructure? How have cultural production, colonial law and discourse underpinned and abetted this dispossession? Taken together, how do these violences interact to extend settler colonial terrains? Finally, it asks how can we attend to dispossession, draw connections and disrupt colonial compartmentalizations through research?

In this work, I am concerned with articulating and analyzing the ways in which epistemic and material violence interact, what the mechanisms are that colonial power uses to produce space and dispossession, and to what ends colonial spatializations are mobilized. To pursue these questions, I look

at how cultural production and discourse interacted with developmental and legal violence to produce Indigenous dispossession and colonial geographies. In Treaty 3, colonial infrastructure, law and cultural production have been critical and entangled sites for the exercise of colonial power intended to dispossess Anishinaabeg nations in order to eliminate their prior and unsettling claims to land, water and territory on Turtle Island.

Infrastructure represents a generative site to understand the production of colonial geographies and Indigenous dispossession. It is critical to the functioning and imaginings of settler polities and nation-states. Indeed, in Canada, the settler state was predicated on it, with entry into Confederation based on the construction of the railroad to tie the colonies together (Cowen 2018). By facilitating circulation, infrastructure produces both the material and conceptual conditions of possibility for settler life and the settler nation. Both the settler state and the Canadian nation as political formations are unthinkable without it. Recognizing the importance of infrastructure to settler polities and spatial imaginings, I follow Jodi Byrd (2011) in understanding infrastructure as a ‘site of transit’, both a place and a concept through which settler colonial power extends its material and cognitive territories. It is a site through which settler colonialism *moves*, violently traversing the lands, waters and bodies of Indigenous nations. By facilitating the movement of goods, of people, of ideology, of energy; colonial infrastructure in Treaty 3 produced the conditions for the possibility of colonial life on Indigenous territories. The extension of settler power and the process of colonial worlding are not possible, materially or conceptually, without infrastructure and its attendant ideologies of development to undergird and buttress it. Yet, what lays the conditions for infrastructure? In a settler state, it is always Indigenous dispossession, and a necropolitics predicated on the creation of conditions of *impossibility* for Indigenous life (Mbembe 2003). As Lorenzo Veracini argues settler colonialism is intimately concerned with the making of colonial geographies through the unmaking of Indigenous geographies (2010:179). The possibility of settler life is predicated on the negation of Indigenous life; the social death of Indigenous communities as political and sovereign nations

(Short 2016). As we will see, in Treaty 3, the development of infrastructure simultaneously expanded settler territorialities and dispossessed Indigenous nations.

Multiple disciplines have concerned themselves with how development and infrastructure have served to structure the shape of global landscapes (Escobar 1995; Kaika 2006; Weizman 2007). Likewise, a number of scholars have approached the development of infrastructure within Treaty 3 and the devastating effects that it had on the territory and the Anishinaabeg nations who make their homes there (Adler 2010; Lovisek 1996). However, in the context of settler colonialism, gaps remain in addressing both the role of discourse and cultural production and the ways in which they interact with material violence to produce colonial geographies and Indigenous dispossession (with exceptions, see Griffith 2017; Neckoway 2007).

In this work, I follow scholars like Howard Adler who have produced expansive and robust histories of development in Treaty 3, in particular his community of Lac des Mille Lacs. Adler's work has been critical in contextualizing the development of the Lac des Mille Lacs dam alongside the Fort Frances/International Falls Dam complex as well as situating development with the St. Catherine's Milling's decision and within a larger process of what Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm (1996) describe as a "policy of Indian removal". I seek to build on these works by further contextualizing dispossession, displacement and removal through a focus on the cultural productions of the expeditions, a discursive analysis of the hearings of the International Joint Commission on Boundary Waters and a close reading of the St. Catherine's Milling's decision and its appeals. I hope that this will further illustrate the multiple strategies and the complex web of intersecting colonial violences that dispossession takes place within. If settler colonialism is always structured by logics of dispossession and elimination our question then becomes how did dispossession work through infrastructure, development, law and cultural production in Treaty 3? I argue that colonial space and Indigenous dispossession were produced through both the material violence of development, flooding, environmental degradation, and displacement, and the epistemic violence of discourse, law, and colonial representation. In particular, I want to address the

fundamental role of narrative, discourse and epistemic violence in facilitating Indigenous dispossession and displacement. So, while there is an extensive literature examining the consequences and outcomes of development and infrastructure, and even a literature (although slimmer) examining settler colonial infrastructure and Treaty 3, here I am seeking to look at the foundations and genealogical origins of infrastructure and development in the settler state. To do so, I take an expansive view of what the constitutive components of infrastructure are, arguing that development cannot be understood outside of its entanglements with discourse, cultural production, and colonial law and the sites through which these processes found expression. The project then seeks to chart the discursive, ideological and legal *infrastructures of infrastructure*, what underwrites them and produces their conditions of possibility (Cowen 2018).

Locating Research: Scope and Sites of Inquiry

To make my arguments, I examine a range of sites, practices and discourses that circulated around development and the production of space in Treaty 3. Signed in 1873, Treaty 3 territory is located in Northwestern Ontario stretching from just outside of the city of Thunder Bay along the American border and into the Eastern edge of Manitoba. It encompasses an area of almost 140,000 km². Grand Council of Treaty 3 represents the 28 signatories First Nations and around 25,000 members of the territory. While this project looks at infrastructure across Treaty 3, it focuses in particular on the communities of Lac des Mille Lacs, Couchiching and Manitou Rapids. This focus is not intended to suggest that these communities' experiences are aberrant in the history of Treaty 3. Many other communities, including Ochiichagwe'Babigo'Ining and Wabaseemoong, have also experienced slow and environmental violence from the development of dams and infrastructure within the territory (Luby 2015; Wagamese 2011:57). This project is centered on three periods: a period of exploration and colonial expeditions ranging from roughly 1857 to 1873, a liminal period stretching from 1873 to 1905 in which the St. Catherine's Milling's decision was handed down and a de facto policy of removal initiated, and a

period of development ranging from 1905 to 1926. These periods are not discrete but for my purposes they will be treated as nominally distinct.

The project focuses on sources from three sites of colonial violence: expeditions, infrastructure and the colonial legal system. In understanding development, I take an expansive view in genealogically tracing its origins and parsing its effects. This leads me to examine the reports of the Red River expeditions of 1857 and 1858, the British North American Exploring Expedition from 1857 to 1860 and the Red River Military Expedition of 1870. Members of the expeditions published a series of narratives, written reports and newspaper articles that produced representations of the relatively isolated territory for both a settler public and colonial governments. These expeditions laid the foundations for understanding, representing and producing the territory as a colonial possession and thus, represent generative sites of inquiry into the spatial imaginaries and productions of settler colonialism. Tracking these expeditions allows us to understand the expectations and desires that underwrote development but also how cultural productions were explicitly and implicitly entangled with the spatializations that would attend development.

To recognize the larger context of removal in which displacement takes place and to understand how legal decisions found consonance with the narrative constructions of the expeditions, I engage in a close reading of the St. Catherine's Milling's decision of 1885 and its appeals, the most important case on Indigenous title in the early years of Confederation and an example of the ways in which dehumanizing discourse structured dispossession and facilitated development. I couple these examinations with an analysis of the development of dams at Lac des Mille Lacs in 1872 and 1926 as well as the construction of the International Falls and Fort Frances dams from 1905 to 1909. To understand and analyze the logics that underwrote development I also look at the ultimately unsuccessful attempt to expand infrastructure within the territory by the Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company chairman, Edward W. Backus through an analysis of reports commissioned and published by the International Joint Commission on Boundary Waters. I pursue these avenues to analyze how infrastructure and development relied on the

legal and discursive foundations produced in previous periods to facilitate dispossession and encode the ideologies of the settler state and capitalist development onto the lands and waters of Treaty 3. Finally, I engage with Anishinaabeg community members in an attempt to contextualize how colonial spatializations have been produced and reinforced in the region and to provide a counterpoint to colonial narrations of space. Taken together these lines of inquisitive flight bring this work through the colonial archive, the built environment of infrastructure, into the dusty boxes and folders of antiquated legal documents, into conversation and engagement with Anishinaabeg activists, and to the lakes, rivers, marshes and forests of the Anishinaabeg territory of Treaty 3.

Conducting Research: Mapping the Silences of Dispossession

Conducting this research has proven exceedingly difficult. In attempting to draw connections between the various apparatuses of colonialism, to establish a *mise-en-scène* and pursue systems-encompassing and holistic research, I have encountered multiple silences, loose threads and disjunctures. This work seeks to excavate the logics that underwrote development and dispossession, to make connections between seemingly disparate or discrete colonial processes and to examine how settler discourses interact with forms of material violence in colonial productions of space. Yet, in its expansive violence and dispossession colonialism has produced multiple gaps and erasures which render such avenues difficult. Dispossession and its logics are so structural to settler colonialism that they become “assumed not debated” by colonial actors (Harris 2004:170). Hegemony then produces unspeakable discourses. This hegemony troubles our ability to interrogate and deconstruct colonial violence, dispossession and discourse. The silence of the archive provides us with little to kick off of, to push back against in excavating and reconstructing the discourses and processes that abetted dispossession. Similarly, in attempting to draw connections between colonial violences, establishing concrete causal links was elusive. This work then has been unsuccessful in a number of ways. Yet, failures can be generative and serve to reorient us (Simpson 2017). These failures have led me to develop methodologies to contend with colonial silence but also to reframe my objectives in this work.

Acknowledging the gaps I encountered in research led me to conceptualize a dual focus for this work. While I remain committed to illustrating the discourses, histories and interconnections of violence that combined to constitute Indigenous dispossession in Treaty 3, this work is also about the *process* of pursuing research which attends to the gaps, omissions and lacunae produced by settler hegemony and expansive colonial violence. It serves as a preliminary attempt to illustrate how research into these expansive dispossessions and erasures could be generatively pursued; to provide a framework for research that seeks to unravel colonial inscrutabilities. It is a sketch of methods and analytics that could be developed further to contend with the erasures and expansive violence of colonialism. It is preliminary, exploratory and gestural, pointing towards future orientations and directions for inquiry. I have been influenced in this project by Karyn Recollet (2016) and her work on gesture. Gestures are acts which are directional, in that they signal or point us towards something. As ephemeral motions gestures are always fugitive and resistant to compartmentalization or concretization. In this they are heuristic, the tools at hand, and represent a processual working through of problems, a map towards potential *otherwise*s, other avenues of inquiry (Crawley 2015). Gestural work gives shape to our analyses without circumscribing, delineating or bounding future directions. This work then is simultaneously meant to serve as an exploratory, tentative and contingent guide into settler hegemony, colonial dispossession and epistemic erasure.

Towards these ends, I spend extended time on my methodologies to illustrate the ways that the work hasn't come together, to demonstrate the challenges I have faced and to indicate potentially generative frameworks for moving forward. Similarly, in Chapter 2, I provide an analytical framework for understanding colonial violence, dispossession and the production of space in Treaty 3 that I hope will have utility beyond this study. I emphasize my process throughout the work incorporating my methodologies, my stops and starts, the refusals, turnarounds and dead ends that I encountered in conducting research. In the end, this work turned out to be as much about the process, the learning and the coming-to-know as it is the content. I hope in this sense that it can make a methodological contribution to

decolonial scholarship at the same time as it pursues the histories and particularities of dispossession in Treaty 3.

To attend to these two objectives, the work is loosely separated into two parts, although they do overlap and inform one another. Part 1 is focused on the process of conducting research, wherein I outline my methods, process and the analytical frameworks that I have employed to conduct research into dispossession and colonial violence. Part 2 is concerned with the localized histories of development and dispossession in Treaty 3 and analyzes the expeditions, colonial law and infrastructure to draw connections and shine a light onto the invisibilized processes of colonial violence.

Project Outline

The work begins with Chapter 1, *Coming-To-Know*, an analysis and articulation of how knowledge has been produced for the purposes of this study; what methodologies and methods are employed and toward what objectives. This chapter attempts to contend with the ongoing colonial nature of research and to offer strategies to obviate and disrupt these practices. In Chapter 2, I outline and develop analytical frameworks for understanding the production of settler space and the nature of colonial violence. Chapter 3 examines the production of colonial space during what I describe as an era of exploration through a close reading of the texts of the expeditions. This leads me to argue that the expeditions performed discursive acts of Indigenous removal, imagining Anishinaabeg out-of-place in ways that intersected and were politically expedient in future attempts to dispossess Anishinaabeg. Chapter 4 analyzes a liminal period after Treaty in which a policy of Indigenous removal was inaugurated through a close reading of the St. Catherine's Milling's decision to understand the ways in which the case relied on the narrative representations of the expeditions and presaged and facilitated the development of infrastructure (Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm 1996). Chapter 5 engages with what I term an era of development, from 1905 to 1926, by reading the hearings of the International Joint Commission on Boundary Waters in Regards to the Levels of Rainy Lake to parse the logics that underwrote development

and how it relied on the cultural productions and legal discourse of earlier periods. I conclude by outlining some of the difficulties of the research, acknowledging Anishinaabeg resistance as a practice which provincializes the hegemony of colonial territorializations and by offering some directions for future inquiry (Chakrabarty 2009).

Conclusion

In beginning this work, I want to make sure that in focusing on the contours of colonial power the project does not enact its own erasures of the ongoing ways in which Anishinaabeg communities continue to actively resist colonial violence and spatializations. For all its power, Indigenous nations have continuously disrupted settler colonialism's movements and imperatives through practices of grounded normativity, radical resurgence and *survivance* (Coulthard 2014; Simpson 2017; Vizenor 1994). As oppressive spatial configurations, colonial geographies, while violent, consistent and enduring have never been totalizing nor met their genocidal objectives of elimination, assimilation and replacement due to centuries of creative and resilient resistance practiced by Anishinaabeg communities.

While this project focuses on colonial productions of space I want to avoid casting Anishinaabe communities as 'ungeographic subjects' or spatial actors understood only through their antagonistic relationships to colonial power (McKittrick 2006; Whetung 2016). Rather, as Simpson (2017) argues Anishinaabeg communities have constantly been active in producing their own spatialities, legal and diplomatic relations and systems of knowledge, *as they have always done*. However, recognizing my position as a non-Indigenous academic, I leave articulations of how Anishinaabeg spatialities are produced up to Anishinaabeg scholars and community members. In the organizing and resurgent practices of Treaty 3 community members and the exciting work of scholars like Howard Adler (2010), Jane-Rae Yerxa (2014), Brittany Luby (2015) and Madeline Whetung (2016) we can see how Anishinaabeg continue to live through their legal and diplomatic relations to enact and embody the alternative spatialities I reference and necessarily gloss in my own work. Understanding how space on Turtle Island

is produced through the dialectics of colonial violence and dispossession, and Indigenous resistance and radical resurgence necessitates reading this work in concert with scholars like Adler, Yerxa, Luby and Whetung as there are aspects of these processes I cannot speak to. My work on dispossession, colonial infrastructure, settler cultural production and space is necessarily limited and partial, one part of a larger story. I hope that reading this work in conjunction with Anishinaabeg scholars is part of a process of theorizing in concert, where researchers have differing, yet hopefully complementary, responsibilities and sites of inquiry.

Chapter 1

((((((((((((((Coming-to-Know))))))))))))))

1.1 'Inquiry as Invasion': The Politics of Representation and the Problematics of Research

Before beginning to analyze how colonial space has been produced through infrastructure, cultural production and colonial violence in Treaty 3, it is necessary to unpack and analyze research itself as a critical modality of colonial control. Here, I want to problematize some of the unquestioned and under-examined assumptions and expectations of research conducted from within colonial institutions deeply structured by the dispossessive logics of settler colonialism. Linda Tuhiwai Smith's assertion that "research is a significant site of struggle" reminds us that its meanings and objectives are not intrinsic, inherent, or value-free, rather they are constantly contested, negotiated and reference dominant configurations of power (2012:2). How colonial power relations affect the production of knowledge, and the ways in which this knowledge is understood are too often glossed or omitted entirely. This chapter is an attempt to grapple with the ongoing legacies of colonial research, the politics of representation and the production of knowledge by settler scholars from within colonial institutions.

Influenced by the work of Eve Tuck (2009b), I want to take space to pose some questions. What are our 'theories of change'? What do we expect research to do? How can it tangibly contribute to process of decolonization? Answering these questions requires posing another set of interrelated questions. What *is* research? How is it constituted by dominant relations of power? How do these power relations structure how knowledge is produced, understood and consumed? In this chapter, I outline the methodologies I have employed in this work. I begin with a brief description of the power-imbued processes that have informed research conducted in the context of settler colonialism. I then outline some of the theories, methodologies and structuring concepts designed to address and obviate these practices in this work. I conclude by describing the project's orientation, my process and the methods I have employed to attempt to answer this project's set of analytical questions.

Colonizing Knowledges: Research, Dispossession and Settler Colonialism

How does research link to ongoing processes of colonization? Research is always a power-laden practice, never objective or value-free. In settler colonial contexts, research has simultaneously mirrored and produced dominant configurations of power and evidenced specific, violent and recurrent features that manifest in particular representational practices designed to facilitate ongoing Indigenous dispossession, colonial expansion and settler hegemony. As Audra Simpson has argued, research has *always* “accorded with the imperatives of Empire” (2007:67). The territorial projects of imperial and colonial expansion are unimaginable absent research practices which produce governable subjects and mappable terrains. These practices render Indigenous communities, bodies and lands legible, coherent, and efficiently manageable through colonial governance. Likewise, misrepresentative research justifies and legitimizes conquest and colonial domination through a number of dehumanizing representational strategies. These research practices justify colonial interventions into Indigenous communities by pathologizing and producing forms of damage that necessitate expansive forms of colonial management (Tuck 2009a).

‘Knowing’ Indigenous communities in specific and misrepresentative ways has facilitated strategies of rule, control and dispossession and allowed colonial regimes to take proprietary control of bodies, territories and philosophies (A. Simpson 2011). Research then, is a critical modality of colonial control and a ‘technology of rule’ that dehumanizes, circumscribes and delineates Indigenous communities and fosters the expansion of both material and conceptual terrains (A. Simpson 2011:67). It is deployed in tandem with other settler technologies of rule, from colonial law and legislation to coercive force, to produce, delineate and manage Indigenous bodies, communities, and lands (Foucault 2013). These strategies of control are mobilized towards the imperatives of settler colonialism: the acquisition and occupation of Indigenous land and waters, and the elimination, assimilation or containment of Indigenous nations as sovereign political communities. The correlation between colonial research practices, Indigenous dispossession and territorial expansion is made explicit when academic institutions

mimic the language and discourse of settler colonialism, as Tuck and Yang argue “most research rhetoric waxes the poetics of empire: to discover, to chart new terrain, to seek new frontiers, to explore, and so on” (2012:14). Researchers are framed as ‘pioneers’ on the ‘frontier’ of expanding proprietary knowledge territories looking across a landscape of epistemic *terra nullius* ready to be colonized, commodified and possessed.

What Tuck and Yang describe as ‘inquiry as invasion’ has been “built into the normalized operations of the researcher” (2014:811). Indigenous communities consistently experience research as invasive, extractive, misrepresentative, worthless, and violent (Smith 2012). Consent and the ability of Indigenous communities to say no are not countenanced within colonial research frameworks structured around the unquestioned assumption of unbounded and limitless knowledge production. These institutional paradigms and research practices have provided the foundations for the ongoing territorial and conceptual dispossession and assimilation of Indigenous nations. Colonial research frameworks and paradigms operate under logics that are antithetical to the epistemologies, axiologies and ontologies of Indigenous nations. From the capitalist commodification of knowledge into individual intellectual property rights, to the neoliberalization of universities that attempt to streamline and bureaucratize knowledge production in ways that do not enable the construction of long-term, meaningful and ethical relationships (Menziés 2001; Menziés 2004), to the ontology of colonial research which functions under the assumption that the expansion of territories of settler colonial knowledge regimes is a beneficial and desirable objective (Tuck and Yang 2014:812), these practices serve to further both material and conceptual Indigenous dispossession and colonial expansion. Research that seeks to confound the expectations of the colonial academe by refusing extractive, misrepresentative and invasive inquiries (coded as ‘deliverables’) finds itself inhibited, blocked or devalued by a range of institutional practices. These representational systems have engendered multiple material consequences for Indigenous peoples as they “condense complex images of other societies” producing representations of Indigeneity which fit settler colonial assumptions, desires and territorial objectives (Smith 2012: 44).

Research also serves to manage and contain Indigenous communities and problematic differences within a framework of a liberal multiculturalism while obscuring the unsettling facts of ongoing colonial dispossession. Such practices work along the lines of a politics of recognition wherein token acknowledgements of Indigenous history and presence are deployed to manage and contain the inconvenience of Indigenous sovereignty without addressing or altering the structural roots of injustice and inequality within colonial institutions (Coulthard 2014). This tokenization is a practice which manages and compartmentalizes dissent and alterity. If social changes are advocated they tend to locate deficiency within Indigenous communities themselves not in the very fabric of colonial society. These research practices tend to call for more intervention, more management, more surveillance and more policing of communities.

Settler scholars are privileged within these systems. We profit and make careers out of our ability to gatekeep, to translate, to understand and to manage Indigenous communities and knowledges. In the work of many settler scholars, the lives, bodies and knowledges of Indigenous communities are commodified and offered for sale to the academy in ways that render them vulnerable to colonial interventions and violence. In short, research continues to protect the privileges of settler scholars and to serve the eliminatory imperatives of colonial power. Beyond simply mirroring the iniquitous relations of power between researcher and subjects, research can serve to actively reinscribe, replicate and reproduce settler colonial power relations. Yet, the social and political context and objectives of research are routinely and systematically excised, contained or managed in the work of settler scholars in the colonial academe. Without situating research “within a colonial expansion framework, our approaches to working with marginalized communities run the precarious risk of reproducing colonial/imperial power relations” (Calderon 2016:5). How then can we address the politics of representation and conduct research in ways that do not simply replicate colonial power relations?

Research in the Colonial Present: Where do We Take it from Here?

Research within settler colonial contexts cannot be disassociated from these practices, paradigms, histories or contemporary realities. Engaging with the colonial roots of research and the politics of representation means acknowledging and addressing the histories, discourses and structures which have led to heteropatriarchal White supremacist settler colonialism. It means acknowledging Indigenous dispossession and settler colonialism as the field upon which our analyses are grounded. It means centering power and the context of its articulations in our analyses and submitting them to what Tuck and Yang describe as a “denuding, indeed petrifying scrutiny” (2014:223). Critical inquiries that seek to engage settler colonialism and collaborate with Indigenous communities need to acknowledge the practice of research as historically and contemporarily power-laden in order to strategize and contend with these problems. Researchers have a responsibility to situate and politicize the work that they do and acknowledge that “research is not an innocent or academic exercise but an activity with something at stake and that occurs in a set of political and social conditions” (Smith 2012: 5). Finally, researchers have a responsibility to reflexively ask ourselves who the production of knowledge serves, to ask how our work furthers the practice of decolonization, and to theorize strategies to unsettle research practices that have naturalized violence, extractivism and invasion. How then do we intercede and upset colonial research paradigms? How can we transform research into an ethical praxis?

Strategies of Decolonial Inquiry and Research

Thinking through the ways to disrupt the expansion of settler colonialism leads us to a praxis of decolonial research. Through the methodologies I employ in this project I attempt to put such a decolonial research paradigm into practice. As Tuck and Yang (2012) describe, decolonization is not a metaphor; a stand-in or euphemism for a range of other social justice projects. While it may bear things in common with social justice and human or civil rights movements, decolonization is just as likely to find itself incommensurable to the objectives of these projects (Tuck and Yang 2012). While inclusion and equity have been the goal of (some) abolitionist, migrant, queer and feminist struggles, without acknowledging Indigenous dispossession and sovereignty these movements risk naturalizing and reproducing settler

legitimacy and the authority of the settler state. Appeals that seek the recognition of the state for legitimacy reproduce and strengthen the hegemony of the settler state and the logics of Indigenous dispossession (Coulthard 2014). For Indigenous communities, coercive and forcible assimilation has been the expression of violence that colonialism forces upon communities. Inclusion within the settler state is what decolonization pushes back against, not what it strives towards. This is what leads Tuck and Yang to argue that “there are portions of these projects that simply cannot speak to one another, cannot be aligned or allied” (2012:28).

Decolonization as a praxis seeks specific and tangible objectives particular to the experiences and histories of colonization on Turtle Island. It seeks the repatriation of Indigenous lands and lives. It does not seek symbolic acts of recognition or reconciliation, or limited forms of self-government under the auspices of a thriving settler state. It seeks the unconditional return of Indigenous lands and waters. It follows that decolonial research needs to further these objectives. When pursuing decolonial research we need to ask ourselves how it interrupts settler colonialism and furthers the unconditional repatriation of Indigenous lands. To repatriate Indigenous lands we need to first interrupt the ongoing extension of settler colonial territorialities. As we have seen, research has been a critical practice through which colonial power extends itself and dehumanizes and dispossesses Indigenous communities. I offer here a necessarily incomplete and schematic set of methodological guidelines, or what Shawn Wilson describes as ‘strategies of inquiry’ that attempt to respond to and disrupt the histories of colonial research outlined above in order to obstruct the extension of colonial terrains both material and conceptual (2012:40). These methodologies, while far from comprehensive have served to guide my analytical orientations and praxis while conducting this research.

- 1 Practice Self-Location to Recognize the Situated Nature of Knowledge
- 2 Contend with the Politics of Representation through a Praxis of Refusal
- 3 Redirect the Analytic Gaze Towards the Structures of Settler Colonialism and White Supremacy

to Avoid Damage-Centered Paradigms

4 Responsibly Engage with Systems of Indigenous thought and Challenge Colonial Citational Practices

5 Build Relationships of Accountability between Researchers and Community Broadly Conceived of as Including Human and Non-human Relations and Entities

6 Decenter Authoritative Research Practices through Participatory and Collaborative Research Frameworks

7 Benefit and Take Project Guidance from Communities

In what follows, I attempt to develop some of these concepts further and describe what they have looked like in practice throughout the course of this work. In particular, I focus on reflexive and ongoing practices of self-location which recognize the situated and power-laden production of knowledge, an analytical reorientation away from pathologized perspectives of Indigenous communities towards the processes of settler colonialism, a responsible intellectual engagement with Indigenous knowledge systems and thought, and a praxis of ongoing methodological and political refusal. I begin by grounding the project, locating myself within it and attempting to address the vexing question of how to account for oneself.

1.2 Finding Our Points of Moorage: Self-Location and Coming-to-Know

Following Butler (2005), this work asks, how do we give accounts of ourselves? As social actors, as researchers, as lovers and partners, as allies and accomplices, as colonizers and occupiers? How do we make sense of these heterogeneous and complex identities? To understand how this project has coalesced, its limitations and possibilities, it is necessary to attempt to account for how I've come to this study, the concerns that drive and shape it, and the multiple subject positions that animate and shape my work.

There is an enormous literature written about the situated nature of knowledge, the ways in which our various social positionings and subjectivities form specific loci of articulation that influence the ways in which knowledge is produced and understood (Haraway 1988; Said 2003; Collins 2002; Mohanty 1991). This collection of thought has coalesced around the term standpoint theory. A critical methodological tool for contending with situated knowledge from within standpoint theory has been the practices of ongoing self-location, positionality and reflexive self-study (Kovach 2009; Haraway 1988; Krenshaw 1991). These practices attempt to make transparent the particular places, social and physical, that we speak from, what we can and cannot speak about and how our own experiences and subjectivities shape how we produce and represent knowledge. Nicole Latulippe describes this as an “accounting for the coming-to-know process” (2015:7). As Wilson explains, a researcher is always “a part of his or her research and inseparable from the subject of that research” (2008:77). We are always involved and implicated in our own research and the knowledge we produce. By acknowledging the situated nature of knowledge production through self-location we are better able to contend with its partialities, limitations and potentially generative possibilities (Steinhauer 2002).

Troubling the Waters: Towards an Ongoing Practice of Self-Location

However, standpoint theory and practices of self-location have their own limitations that require a reflexive unpacking. I am concerned with what happens when our engagement of positionality, what it means, how it is always shaped by power and in process, ends with our naming of these positions. Flattened and declarative practices of self-location can operate as distancing tactics, what Tuck and Yang describe as “settler moves to innocence”, if our complicities within these processes, are not simultaneously and robustly engaged (2012:9). If self-location is reduced to a static proclamation that elides the processual and performative nature of relations and structures of power, it can serve to reify and naturalize these structures, foreclosing and circumscribing an ongoing engagement with the implications of situated knowledge and positionality. This may obfuscate the ways in which, while these structures and discourses are enduring and precede us, we actively engage in reproducing them through our

acquiescence and participation. The structures of Whiteness, misogyny, heteronormativity and colonialism are produced through our performances of them in complex ways that are obscured when we frame these institutions as something we inherit and inhabit rather than actively produce. As such, it is not enough to name these structures and our position within them, we must upset their hegemony and their sense of inevitability and actively and reflexively unpack how we are privileged, complicit within them. The question then becomes; how do we say no? As settlers, how do we say no when we profit, excel and thrive through our open and veiled enunciations of yes in response to the question of Indigenous dispossession and genocide?

In this work, I am seeking an expanded and ongoing praxis of self-location that acknowledges the performative, complicit and participatory nature of our multiple subjectivities. I hope to engage with practices of self-location that move us beyond static declarations towards active processes of reflexive inquiry and action, a working through of what these loci of articulation and subject positions mean in practice. To think through the ways that self-location can be the beginning of conversations and further inquiry rather than their foreclosure and circumscription, of how we can open ourselves up to the messy realities of complex lives. The generative possibilities of practices of self-location are derived from the ways they incite us to unpack these subject categories, what it means to be a settler, what it means to be White, how we continue to perform and inhabit these subject categories and how these subjectivities and locations inflect and shape our interpretations. Self-location is not an end in itself but rather a strategy towards further inquiry and action and a reflexive and ongoing practice that affords other possibilities. Such an ongoing practice of self-location could signal a shift from a dispossessive reconciliation politics to a politics of reckoning wherein settler scholars take stock of their participation in colonial projects of genocide and take up their responsibilities to dismantle these systems. Acknowledging privilege is not the end goal of self-location, dismantling it is, and we have to find ways to embody this in our research. Self-location then is a practice that anchors us, to our particular responsibilities and obligations to the places and relationships that we inhabit, for better or worse. So, while our complex histories cannot be

adequately outlined in flattened proclamations it is still critical that we attempt to contend with subjectivity and the positioned nature of knowledge in the work that we produce by unequivocally placing ourselves within it and that we attend to and analyze how power and privilege operate in material ways in our everyday lives and during the course of research. With these articulations and potential interventions in hand I attempt to give an account of myself in relation to this work and these communities.

Accounting for Oneself: Narrating Our Personal Histories

I write as a White heterosexual cis-gendered and able-bodied settler man. I was born on the unceded territories of the hə̀nqəm̀nəm̀- speaking, x^wmə̀θk^wə̀yəm̀ (Musqueam), sə̀lilwə̀tə̀ʔl (Tsleil Waututh) and Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish) to a single mother of predominantly Anglo, Scottish and Irish heritage. I was raised in the unceded territory of the nsə̀lxcin- speaking Syilx nations. As a geographer, my work revolves around addressing and dismantling settler colonialism and the entangled violence of its epistemologies and spatial imaginaries. I am concerned with how knowledge, space and power interact to produce colonial geographies. Yet, as a White cis-gendered settler scholar I speak from within the structures of colonialism, White supremacy, and heteronormative patriarchy. My position within these structures shape the perspective I bring to my work, and how I produce and understand knowledge. I have recently moved to Thunder Bay, the territory of the Fort William First Nation, with my partner, an Anishinaabekwe from the Treaty 3 community of Lac des Mille Lacs, the focus of this work. The slow violence and displacement resulting from flooding at Lac des Mille Lacs has meant that she did not grow up on her territory. Our move to Thunder Bay has been part of an intentional project to represence and foster ongoing relationships to the land, water, human and non-human entities on my partner's territory. While my partner has carried her ancestors and homelands with her on her journeys across Turtle Island, a subject which she has spoken to eloquently in some of her own work (Christie-Peters 2017), I am only beginning to foster relationships to the places, people, land and waters I hope to call home. I am slowly discovering my responsibilities to these relationships, to understand what is expected of me and what an ethical decolonial praxis could look like for me in this place.

I am enmeshed with this work, these communities and these histories in intricate and intimate ways. I do not approach these issues as a disinterested observer. In this research, I am attempting to trouble the reductive divisions between our academic obligations and our personal responsibilities by examining and working through subjects which cannot be divorced from affective, intimate and emotional relations or ‘passionate attachments’ (Butler and Athanasiou 2013); subjects which compel a politics of the everyday in which decolonization is enacted in our daily lives through our most intimate relations (Hunt and Holmes 2015). I take the responsibility of communicating and understanding these stories very seriously. My proximity to these histories and processes shape how I understand and produce knowledge about the dams, water, intersectional violence and settler colonialism. The work cannot be compartmentalized. It is necessarily always personal, emotional and affective at the same time as it is rigorous and analytical. Yet, the work is also shaped by how my Whiteness, a settler subjectivity insulates and protects me from these histories and processes, limiting the ways in which I can understand and speak to them. As a White settler man, I am not only entangled in this story, I am also implicated in uncomfortable ways that compel different responsibilities. My commitments, my allegiances and my responsibilities lie with my partner, her family, her nation, the lands and waters of her territory that I occupy here. It is to these relationships that I strive to become accountable. However, as a White cis-gendered and able-bodied settler man, I must acknowledge how I am also committed to oppressive and violent structures, have possessive investments and attachments to them, am privileged by and participate in them (Butler and Athanasiou 2013; Moreton-Robinson 2015). I speak from sites and structures of violence and oppression which I continue to participate in and enjoy the benefits and privileges of. My very capacity to speak in this context, about these issues, derives from these structures. Recognizing personal entanglements and responsibilities cannot elide our participation in the violent and oppressive structures of settler colonialism. I enter into Anishinaabeg territories and relationships as an active participant in the structures of settler colonialism which seek the dispossession, assimilation and

elimination of Indigenous peoples, and this has to be recognized and contended with.

Desirous Research: Project Origins and Ethical Seeking

This work stems from desire. A desire to labor, to engage, to participate and to understand. A desire for me to understand and embody what my responsibilities are to my partner, her community, and the lands and waters that hold us. A desire to disrupt the violence that development continues to manifest for my partner's family and community broadly conceived. It is motivated by a desire to reciprocate the gifts that have already been shared with me by the lands, water and communities of the Anishinaabeg of Fort William, Thunder Bay and Treaty 3, to bring something of value to the people and places that have already given us so much. It began in informal conversations with my partner's family about the impacts of dams and development on their territory, family and communities. On our move east to Ontario, we visited my partner's family at the community of Stanjikoming. What we expected to be a visit of a few hours turned into four days of teachings, listening and learning. Over the course of these four days, the topics of hydro, development and environmental violence continuously arose in our conversations and their teachings. Dams, development and displacement were issues that preoccupied my partner's family and that they felt strongly that we had to understand as we tried to ground ourselves in the territory. However, we were always allowed the autonomy to work through these issues, what they meant and what differing responsibilities or action they compelled from us. Through ongoing conversations with my partner and her family I began to understand the enormous effects that dams and hydro had had on her family and community and to think through ways that these histories could be addressed. After sitting with what had been shared with us over the course of these four days and through continuing conversations with my partner, I decided to pursue research into the colonial practices that have continued to inflict harm onto Anishinaabeg communities in order to disrupt these practices in whatever small way possible. I hope from the bottom of my heart that this work honours and reciprocates the ways in which we were called into community by my partner's family's generosity, courage and resilience in discussing

and surviving the violence of colonialism, development and dispossession and that this work might produce something of value for them, particularly.

While I was drawn into this work through conversations with my partner and her family reflecting their desires for us to understand the histories that shaped their lives in intimate and devastating ways, there have also always been implicit and explicit refusals and deferments. I take these refusals, these digressions as a sounding of what can be shared, of marking the boundary between our responsibilities. I mark it as a demand that I be present, while acknowledging that there are also times I am expected to remain on the periphery or absent altogether. I hope that this tension, this push-and-pull represents a reciprocal desire, to bring me in, to share, while also representing an act of sovereignty; a marking of my particular obligations and what they expect my role to be within these relationships. So, while I see their act as one of generosity, a part of bringing me in to their lives, I also recognize the limits of the ways my participation is appropriate or desired by these communities.

This work then is an attempt to walk and embody this fine line, to engage, practice accountability and take up the work without overstepping the desires and needs of my partner's family and those I work with. It is an attempt to intercede into the histories and processes of hydraulic development that meant my partner has not grown up on her territory, to disrupt the intersectional violence that targets her community for 'elimination', to expose the ways in which colonialism erases its own violence. Tuck (2010) describes a form of desire-based research as an informed and ethical seeking that attends to the messy complexities and contradictions of daily life. This desirous research values ambiguity, contradiction and unsettled, fugitive meanings and interpretations (Sium, Desai and Ritskes 2012). Throughout I have struggled to understand the desire that motivates this research. Is it a colonial desire to intervene, to be centered, to know, to enclose? Or is it the desire that Tuck forwards, a means to strengthen and deepen the relationships with my partner, her family and community in ethical and responsible ways? This ambiguity and unresolved tension flows throughout the course of this work and engenders a number of questions. How do we speak back to structures in which we have abiding possessive investments in? How do we

disrupt settler colonialism and enact a politics of accountability within research and our daily lives? How can we mobilize discomfort and unsettled expectations?

Discomfort, Responsibilities and Obligations

The shared stories and the generosity of my partner's family act as a call to witness, and witnessing compel us to be accountable and responsible in differing ways (Hunt 2014a). There are reciprocal expectations in the relaying of these narratives and the calling in to a web of relations and histories that they enact. My partner's family gave me the seeds to understand my responsibilities but it is up to me to enact these obligations in an ethical and generative way. My research and production of knowledge then is always shaped by the incommensurate and irreconcilable tensions between objectives that seek to dismantle colonialism and the discomfiting ways in which I continue to participate in these structures. However, for settlers, the discomfort produced through the acknowledgement of our acquiescence and participation can be a generative point of departure, a conceptual space (likely the only conceptual space) from which we can work. Discomfort involves talking about things we might rather not, admitting things we might rather not, finding the means to work productively to dismantle settler colonialism and White supremacy from these spaces of discomfort and dispossession. For settler scholars, this work needs to be uncertain, uncomfortable but critically responsive, open to others and the potential or necessity to be unsettled; "willing to revise and reconceptualize research as it unfolds" (Tuck and McKenzie 2015:636). For settlers, destabilizing normative and normalizing structures and power relations which we have deeply embedded possessive investments in will always be a process of discomfort (Lipsitz 2006). We need to allow ourselves to sit with this discomfort, rather than attempting to resolve and dissipate it, to open ourselves up to the notion of dispossession that Butler and Athanasiou (2013) introduce, dispossessed of our very concepts of possession. We must accept the necessity of being continually unsettled, of our expectations, our investments and our possessions whether material, conceptual or affective (Mackey 2016; Regan 2010). Discomfort, uncertainty, and being unsettled are

generative places for settler scholars to begin with and to conduct research. For settlers, these feelings can be, need to be, productive.

Settlers need to take up some of the labour of dismantling settler colonialism, to be there to support; present in decolonial struggles without recentering ourselves within these movements. We need to unlearn specific behaviours, to let go of our maps and to enter uncharted and unchartable territories, to recognize the limits of what we can know, of what can be mapped. We need to cede the territories, conceptual, material and emotional, that were never ours to begin with. To reconceptualize our relationships to knowledge as something other/more than possession/possessable and to stake our own limits across which we will not transgress. So, while there is unresolved tension in this work that results in discomfort; a feeling of being unsettled, throughout I attempt to value the ambiguities, messiness and discomfort; to make “room for the unanticipated, the uninvited, the uncharted, and unintended” (Tuck 2010:641). These emotions can only be approached with good intentions, care, and humility. It is in this spirit that I attempt to tentatively and uncertainly work through the complex legacies of dispossession through development that are so personal and entangled for me.

1.3 Saying No: Refusal as Methodological and Political Praxis

The second methodological intervention that this project pivots around is refusal. Refusal is a robust and expansive concept. It represents a stance, an action and a methodological praxis; it is both a political practice and an analytical framework (A. Simpson 2017). As a political practice, refusal has been central to hundreds of years of resistance, *survivance* and Indigenous critiques of colonialism. As a methodological practice refusal has emerged as a critical strategy designed to limit the colonizing gaze of settler institutions, academics and research practices.

Tuck and Yang (2014) describe a methodology of refusal, as a praxis denying accounts that objectify and fetishize the stories and lived experiences of Indigenous communities as fodder for the edification of the settler academe, the profit of its researchers and the territorial imperatives of colonial

power. This methodology revolves around a refusal to be objectified for consumption or to be assimilated into what Tuck and Yang (2014) describe as the becoming-claims of researchers. Settler colonialism has been perpetually acquisitive in both its territorial and conceptual projects (Coulthard 2014; Wolfe 2006). It has consistently sought to enclose, domesticate and assimilate Indigenous land, bodies, stories and systems of thought. A methodology of refusal challenges these enclosures and settler demands to know, to expand its representational territories in the service of colonial ends. It challenges the unquestioned and unbounded prerogative of researchers to produce knowledge about Indigenous or marginalized communities and the institutions of academia to consume it, and refuses accounts that naturalize colonial violence, locate it within Indigenous communities and map this violence onto Indigenous bodies. Refusal revolves around the sovereign ability to consent, to say no. Refusal as a methodology then is a means to object; to interrogate and intercede into research practices that reproduce and replicate colonial configurations of power. As a research practice it asks a foundational question about proliferating studies that pathologize Indigenous communities: how exactly do the unquestioned production of knowledge and the objectifying becoming-claims of colonial research benefit Indigenous communities or forward the imperatives of decolonization?

Bearing these interventions in mind, what does methodological refusal look like in practice? How do we mobilize these insights into ethical research practices? For Tuck and Yang “refusal is a generative stance, not just a “no,” but a starting place for ethical and decolonial qualitative analyses and interpretations” (2014:812). Refusal then is both/and, simultaneously an ending, to the expansion of the representational territories of colonial power, and a beginning, to further ethical analysis and decolonial inquiry (Hunt and Holmes 2015). This methodology is generative, refusals rather than impediments to knowing, “may be expansive in what they do not tell us” (A. Simpson 2007:78). Refusal as a methodology is an opportunity for unsettling reflexivity that encourages a radical reorientation of our analyses to the practices and institutions through which settler colonialism consolidates and exercises power (Calderon 2016). This requires an understanding of how refusal is situated in relation to the

ongoing histories of settlement and configurations of power reproduced through colonial research and demands that we unsettle the ways in which we make becoming-claims through the bodies, lands and lives of Indigenous communities (Tuck and Yang 2014). It asks us as researchers to honour and respect the ways in which Indigenous refusal stakes its own boundaries and to think long and hard about what we will and will not ask, what we will and will not represent. It asks us to learn to recognize refusal when we encounter it as the boundary to invasive inquiry, a drawing of the curtain to analyses that do not further decolonization or benefit communities. This requires that we actively pursue a politics and praxis of refusal through a reorientation that takes the institutions and practices of settler colonial power as its subject of inquiry and that examines relationships of power rather than the communities over who it is exercised. How then do we refuse to participate in, to acquiesce to projects that expand the terrains of settler colonialism? How can we utilize methodological refusal to intercede into colonial practices of knowledge production?

Saying No: Refusing Damaged-Centered Research Frameworks

To address these questions, we can follow Tuck's (2009a) call for a moratorium on damage-centered research frameworks. Settler scholars need to reorient our analyses away from over-researched and surveilled Indigenous communities and back to the sites, structures and processes of colonial power. In an open letter to communities and researchers, Tuck asks us to consider the ways in which research within Indigenous communities that fixates on violence, lack, fragmentation and disconnection means that Indigenous spaces become "saturated in the fantasies of outsiders" (Tuck 2009a:412). Projects directed toward the structures and practices of settler colonialism allow us to contextualize, locate and name the violence Indigenous communities experience. As Tuck and Yang argue, this requires "a deliberate shift in the unit of analysis, away from people, and toward the relationships between people and institutions of power" (2014:816). This shifts the burden and responsibility for violence from communities themselves to the sites, structures and actions of settler colonialism. This orientation represents a research paradigm which seeks to "decode power and uncode communities" (Tuck and Yang 2014:814). As settler

researchers, we cannot simply offer Indigenous lives for academic consumption incorporating them into our becoming-claims. Instead, we need to focus uncomfortably on ourselves and on the structures of colonialism, Whiteness and patriarchy. This involves a practice that refuses to stake claim to their stories, to their experiences, rather it redirects the analysis back towards the institutions, structures and practices of settler colonialism through an engagement with Anishinaabe community members as well-versed theorists intervening and upsetting the hegemony of colonial narration and spatializations. Such an orientation avoids reproducing or naturalizing colonial violence and can be a generative way to begin the process of dismantling and prizing apart the interlocking architectures of colonialism. We learn more by taking honest looks at ourselves than we do by directing dishonest and disingenuous and invasive scrutiny towards Indigenous communities.

1.4 Responsible Intellectual Engagement

Refusal and analytical reorientations produce distinctive tensions within research attempting to theorize and contest settler colonialism. While following a moratorium on damage-centered research involves a turn away from Indigenous communities as the subjects of invasive inquiry, it still requires a responsible engagement with Indigenous geographies, critical theory and thought. Reorienting our analyses cannot involve recentering Eurocentric thought and settler scholars. Moving away from the becoming-claims of colonial research cannot absolve us of our responsibilities to engage, forward and hold up Indigenous thought in our scholarship and decolonial organizing. Questions that arise from these tensions include: How do we uncode communities without reinscribing erasure? How do we engage with Indigenous resistance, sovereignty and thought without taking possession?

While attending to the structures that constitute settler colonialism, the emergent field of settler colonial studies has been critiqued for its solipsistic tendencies to reinscribe erasure onto Indigenous communities through a recentering of colonial structures as the *only* geopolitical forces of consequence and a re-empowering of settler scholars to analyze and speak to these processes (Kauanui 2016; Tuck and

Rowe 2017; Macoun and Strakosch 2013; Snelgrove, Dhamoon and Cornstassel 2014). Rather than encouraging an ethical and ongoing engagement with Indigenous thought the field of settler colonial studies can also serve to sequester analyses of settler colonialism from the practices, theorizing and lived realities of Indigenous nations. These analyses can serve, inadvertently or otherwise, to negate the agency of Indigenous nations as historical and political actors. In our research, enacting our obligations cannot mean arbitrarily sequestering an emergent settler colonial studies from a robust tradition of critical Indigenous thought and praxis. As J. Kēhaulani Kauanui (2016) argues, “to exclusively focus on the settler colonial without any meaningful engagement with the indigenous... can (re)produce another form of “elimination of the native.” Articulating robust or useful analyses of settler colonialism is not possible outside of dialogue and engagement with Indigenous nations that having been doing this work for over 500 years. In turning our ‘petrifying gaze’ towards settler colonialism Indigenous resistance and *survivance* cannot be rendered invisible (Carlson 2017; Makoun and Strakosch 2013; Tuck and Yang 2014). Settler colonial theory cannot be a move to reoccupy the center of analysis, of theory, of our imaginable worlds. Ethical research then must involve a refusal, an analytical reorientation *and* a commitment to engaging, forwarding and holding up Indigenous thought and scholarship in responsible and appropriate ways. In engaging with settler colonialism or Indigenous thought scholars must “cite and quote Indigenous thinkers directly, unambiguously and generously” in an effort to disrupt practices that recenter non-Indigenous scholars in discussions surrounding decolonization or appropriate and misrepresent Indigenous knowledge (Todd 2016:7). Within decolonial theorizing and practice, Indigenous theory and thinkers cannot be simply relegated to the margins of scholarship, an addendum to canonical colonial analytical frameworks, but rather must be centered in decolonial theorizing to the extent to which it is appropriate. Further, a practice of intellectual engagement that decenters the colonial academe as the only legitimate site of knowledge production is necessary. Scholarship that engages Indigenous activists, artists, land defenders, hunters, rickers and sugarbushers, as well as academics is imperative, in order to disrupt and intervene into the reproduction of colonial configurations of power, practices of erasure, and

bastions of hegemonic knowledge production. As Elizabeth Carlson argues “settler colonial research which would promote anti-colonial, decolonial, and solidarity content and aims must occur in relationship and dialogue with Indigenous peoples, involve meaningful consultation with and oversight by Indigenous scholars and knowledge keepers, and draw upon work by Indigenous scholars” (2016:6).

However, there are tensions in taking up the imperatives that Todd (2016) articulates. The potential for appropriation or misrepresentation is always present in settler engagements with Indigenous knowledge, legal systems and political theory. While I acknowledge and attend to Todd (2016) and Ahmed’s (2013) call for more ethical, transparent, purposeful and generous citational politics, I try to remain attentive to the ways in which non-Indigenous scholars must forge “a path between acknowledging and honoring Indigenous ontologies and being mindful of the capacity for academic appropriation, misrepresentation, and manipulation” (Cameron, de Leeuw and Desbiens 2014:21). What does it mean for settler scholars to engage with systems of thought outside of their own experiences? What happens when Indigenous theory is open to settler interpretations?

Decontextualizing Indigenous thought and forcing it into transit and away from its place-based articulations and the relationships that give its meaning can be a fraught and dangerous undertaking (Nadasdy 2003; Wilson 2008; Watts 2013). Some concepts do not travel, a notion Todd (2017) herself is aware of and has taken up elsewhere. Wilson asks what happens when Indigenous knowledge “is stripped of its relationships and used without accountability” (2008:114). What are we left with when Indigenous knowledge systems are deployed by settler scholars and understood through colonial frameworks and epistemologies? In her work on how knowledge is generated through Indigenous Place-Thought, Vanessa Watts (2013) argues that when Indigenous cosmology is translated through Euro-Western paradigms the result is a colonized interpretation of both place and thought. Colonial knowledge systems distort and decontextualize Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee knowledge systems in their attempt to understand and apply them through their own particular onto-epistemological frameworks. In her analysis of Watts’ work on Indigenous Place-Thought, Todd herself argues that “the appropriation of Indigenous thinking in

European contexts without Indigenous interlocutors present to hold the use of Indigenous stories and laws to account flattens, distorts and erases the embodied, legal-governance and spiritual aspects of Indigenous thinking” (2016:9). The result then of an uncritical engagement with Indigenous knowledge systems is not more robust analyses but rather distorted interpretations that further epistemic violence and Indigenous erasure. As settler scholars then how do we take up Todd’s admonition to cite generously and directly without appropriating, distorting or taking ownership of Indigenous knowledge systems?

Anchoring Engagement

The line between acknowledging and engaging with Indigenous thought and appropriating Indigenous knowledge is not always clear and often involves a contingent, contextual and ‘situational appropriateness’ antithetical to the unequivocal and rigid protocols demanded by the institutions of colonial knowledge production (Kovach 2009; Watts 2013; Todd 2016). Intellectual engagement with Indigenous theory must be practiced with responsibility, care and an acknowledgement of one’s own positionality within networked structures of power and knowledge systems. In this work, I describe this process as a *responsible intellectual engagement* with Indigenous thought. What this responsibility looks like in practice is dependent on context, our multiple subject positions and our relationships to a number of institutions, structures and places. In Leanne Simpson’s (2017) latest work, *As We Have Always Done*, she offers a framework for what an ethical and intellectual engagement with systems of thought we are not embedded within could look like. She emphasizes a practice of reflexive self-location and asks herself where she stands in relation to these concepts. What are her relationships to this knowledge? Does she have the consent of the communities she hopes to engage with to utilize their intellectual labour? Simpson’s articulation of ethical engagement revolves around relationality, reflexivity, consent and responsibility and offers us a praxis which is contingent, contextual and attends to ethics and positionality.

There are no manuals on how to approach engagement with Indigenous theories, rather there are requirements about how we carry ourselves when we do engage. What responsible intellectual engagement looks like is not always clear and only proceeding with care, being open to revision and criticism and rigorously acknowledging Indigenous thought can help us to mitigate the potentials of knowledge appropriation. As settler scholars, we need to learn to engage without staking claims to possession. For settler scholars while this may limit our range of interventions “it remains a moral and ethical responsibility” (Carlson 2017:5). And perhaps, a limiting of our interventions is exactly what is called for. I reflexively take into account my own positionality when deciding whether to invoke Anishinaabeg concepts and spatial knowledges. The necessity of engagement with Indigenous theory and critiques of colonialism must be held in balance with the potential for these processes to become appropriative and enact their own erasures. As such, this project has unfolded in generative dialogues with Indigenous scholars, activists and participants, not to render Indigenous communities subject to invasive inquiries but rather to responsibly engage with their critical theoretical interventions and understandings of settler colonialism as a structure. The work then is an attempt to theorize in concert, and with responsibility.

Asking the Right Questions

To understand this project’s orientation and objectives it is necessary to understand how it coalesced. There have been many stops and starts to this research. Getting at the questions I wanted to ask (never mind the answers) was difficult and involved a lot of worry, conversation with friends and family, hand-wringing, thinking and rethinking. It took many twists and turns as I tried to uncover what an ethical and appropriate research objective and practice would look like for me as a White settler. While I knew that I wanted to address dispossession and the structures that led to the experiences of my partner’s family, thinking through the right questions to ask and how to approach this work proved exceedingly difficult.

I had initially thought that it would involve participatory action research in an effort to decenter me as the author of the work and forward and hold up other perspectives and knowledges. However, while this project is informed by my partner's family's teachings, it is still researcher-initiated. I could not resolve the contradictions of a researcher-initiated project directing Anishinaabeg community members towards objectives I had set out. This led me to reconceptualize and reorient the work. I then tried to pursue an avenue wherein interviews with Anishinaabeg would be used to provincialize and illustrate the contingent nature of colonial spatial productions. However, absent a participatory component, this too involved interpretations and the incorporation of interview participants into my becoming-claims that I eventually came to see as overstepping my abilities to speak to. I worried that forms of epistemic violence could be effected through my attempts to interpret Anishinaabeg spatial understandings and place them within my own analytical frameworks. Rethinking my relationship to Anishinaabeg knowledge challenged me to rethink my research practice and the most effective and ethical way to make interventions into settler colonialism. In the end, being new to the territory and still in the process of fostering trust and relationships with these communities limited the interventions I was able to make. Rather than forcing these relationships I decided to respect these limitations as the boundaries to invasive inquiry. If the relationships to conduct the work were not there, then the work was not ready to be conducted. As Halberstam (2011) and Simpson (2017) argue, failures can be generative. I hope that I have learned from these realizations, taken productive direction and allowed them to guide me to ethical research practices that can still illuminate and inform.

Systems-Encompassing Research

These realizations led me to focus more explicitly on colonialism's own productions. Recognizing dispossession as fundamental to colonial projects I sought to ask "how did colonialism dispossess?" (Harris 2004). This question was motivated by the working idea that understanding the logics which underwrite colonial spatializations help us to disrupt, upset and intervene into these productions. How communities had been affected by displacement was inescapably, spectacularly evident

in the lives of my partner and her family and the fractured community of Lac des Mille Lacs. A deeper, and for me as a non-Indigenous scholar wary of producing damage-centered and pathologizing accounts, more generative question was: how was the process of displacement affected? What underwrote and enabled it? Simpson's (2017) articulation of settler colonial violence as expansive helped me to understand how colonial violence operates through multiple vectors and on multiple scales. Likewise, Hunt's articulation that epistemic violence always underwrites the "relentless forms of physical violence" that communities endure led me to see that material and epistemic violence are always connected in colonial productions of space (2014a:22). There is more to displacement than meets the eye.

Following these lines through research into the history of Treaty 3, I came to see how the relationship between material and epistemic violence was manifested in the connections between dehumanization and displacement. However, pursuing this orientation also involved a number of challenges, dead ends and failures which necessitated reorientations, reframings and rewrites, rewrites, rewrites. In the records of development Anishinaabeg dehumanization tended to be hegemonic, taken-for-granted and implicit in colonial policy, legislation and actions. Like pictures of complex Indigenous personhood, within the archive colonial violence was obfuscated as natural. Over the *longue durée* of slow violence colonial productions of space have come to be seen (by some) as settled, naturalized through epistemic violence and erasure. Over the course of almost 150 years, the spatialities, jurisdictions and narratives that development initiated have come to be seen as settled, normative, their violence effaced through the passing of time and colonial hegemony. Likewise, the expansive violence that development initiated has made it hard to ask questions about it as the community of Lac des Mille Lacs remains a dispersed community. The almost total destruction that development left on communities like Lac des Mille Lacs makes it difficult to hear stories outside of the one that colonialism tells itself.

Drawing an empirical tie between these two processes of removal and dispossession was difficult as they were coded into the normative orderings of colonial society. How to make these processes clear? What sources could be drawn upon to provincialize dehumanization and make these connections? How to

illustrate dehumanization as a foundational violence central to colonial productions of space, pursuit of territory and practices of development and improvement? How to name this violence, how to seek it and how to illustrate it through research?

Stumbling upon the expedition reports and the St. Catherine's Milling's decision helped me to answer some of these questions. The reports and decisions were revelations because through them I could see and draw the connections between discourse, cultural production and dispossession. In the reports and decisions, we see colonial actors caught in the act of producing the foundational violence of colonialism: dehumanization. Through these narratives, they produced an abjected Indigenous subject through references to land use, sociality, sexuality and biology.

In the end, the project has centered on the cultural productions of the expeditions and the powerfully regulatory legal discourse as fertile sites for deconstruction and scrutiny. This has allowed me to address what the stories behind the story are; the code beyond the code (Tuck and Yang 2014). If infrastructure lays the foundation for settler life, what lays the foundation for infrastructure? While there is no one clear process for this, the expedition reports present a particularly fecund site to analyze the colonial imaginaries and discourses which facilitated development, dispossession and displacement. While the relationship between the expeditions, law and development is not necessarily always causal (although it often is) they provide generative windows onto the colonial logics which structure development. They are one aspect of larger discursive formations through which dispossession was produced and justified.

To address these formations and the imbrications of dehumanization, displacement and dispossession I take a holistic and systems-encompassing approach which attempts to contextualize development; dehumanization and dispossession within wider processes of settlement and colonization (Whetung 2016). This holistic approach attends to interaction, and the affective capabilities of multiple, histories, structures and discourse. For Indigenous peoples, dispossession is produced in the interaction,

intra-action and entanglements of a multiplicity of processes (Barad 2007). This approach is defined by an analytical *mise-en-scène*, a concern with how all of the elements of a particular picture work together and interact. Just as material violence cannot be disentangled from epistemic violence, development and infrastructure cannot be compartmentalized from the expeditions or the legal violence of colonial law. To understand dispossession, we need to account for displacement and dehumanization and how both of these processes found life in the histories of development. The connections I draw through analysis are not always causal, but make sense within a structural and systems-encompassing understanding of dispossession. My inquiries attempt to attend to the field across which settler colonialism extends itself, rather than simply accounting for its elements. If settler colonialism's violence is expansive and mobile then our inquiries and analysis must be too; textured and thickly rendered, yet scaled out enough to see the patterns, systems and structures through which dispossession is mobilized. Thus, this work casts a wide net in attempting to understand colonial geographies and spatial imaginaries. This expansive and systems-encompassing framework certainly engenders a messier approach but I hope that it also encompasses the complexities and interconnections between multiple productions of space and forms of violence. In this movement, I am looking for the linkages that tie the 'structure of processes' of settler colonialism together (Simpson 2017).

1.5 Methods

This project employs a mixed-methods approach that utilizes archival research and a limited number of interviews with Anishinaabeg from Northwestern Ontario. This approach is designed to understand and contextualize the histories of the dams as well as to analyze, unpack and provincialize the hegemony of the colonial spatializations they engender. It follows James Clifford's (1997) call for scholars to chart both the roots and the routes of colonial narratives, discourses and spatialities; their origins and their movements through time and space. The work is genealogical in attempting to trace back the discourses that have underwritten colonial spatializations and development. Towards these ends, this work constructs a historical sketch of development in Treaty 3 through archival research that seeks to

situate and contextualize colonial spatializations and their provenance while simultaneously engaging with how space is contested, provincialized and understood through conversation with Anishinaabeg community members (Foucault 2003). Below, I outline both of these methods, their objectives, their nuances and their limitations.

Archival Research: Objectives, Locations and Practices

The objectives of my archival work are twofold: to construct, assemble and tell the stories of infrastructure and development within Treaty 3 and to parse and excavate the spatial imaginaries, expectation and desires of settler colonial agents and institutions that have underwritten these spatial projects through close readings and discourse analysis of key texts. This archival research charts a genealogy of development both in the ways that it materialized on the landscape and in the history of the ideas and assumptions that underwrote these projects. In conducting archival work, I am aware of the limitations of searching for complex pictures of either Indigenous nationhood or settler violence within the colonial archive (Medak-Saltzman 2010). The colonial archive has been a site of epistemic and discursive violence and a fundamental component in settler governance practices (Stoler 2009). As Rachel Buchanan (2007:44) argues, “archives are part of the architecture of imperialism.” They are sites in which colonial power is not only reflected but also produced and enacted. For Indigenous peoples, they are often sites of erasure. Likewise, settler violence is obfuscated in the particular and subjective narrations that arise through an engagement with colonial archives. Archives give the illusion of neutrality while simultaneously foregrounding particular narratives, histories and experiences that sustain dominant power structures (Genovese 2016: 34). Uncritically reading the archive makes us complicit in the reproduction of its erasures (Trouillot 2015). Thus, they are fraught spaces through which to attempt to destabilize and unsettle colonial narratives and hegemony. However, there are ways that we can turn the power of the colonial archive back on itself. Through a critical reading of the archive we may still glean or excavate important insights about the architecture of settler colonialism and the occluded spatial imaginaries of its territorial projects.

In conducting archival research, I followed two critical and interrelated methodologies, reading against the grain of the archive to excavate what is actively placed under erasure, and reading along the archival grain to understand and discern the internal logics of colonial governance. Reading against the grain involves re-presenting and centering what is omitted, unspoken or erased within the colonial archive. It involves an active, intentional and conscious reading of the archive that expose the roots of power and its invisibility. This has involved seeking alternate sources, reading between the lines and alternative or resistant readings of the archive. In this work, this has involved finding and naming colonial violence in places where it has been transformed into development; to be able to see the colonial violence that lies within the bureaucratic language, the statistics of Indian Agents, industrialists or surveyors. To see the violence that lies behind bureaucratic descriptions of lands flooded or colonial narrations of encounter.

Reading along the archival grain involves “following the logic of the archive in order to discover what the content, organization, and structure of the archive can tell us about the colonial powers that maintain them” (Falzetti 2016:137). This method allows me to unpack and interrogate what is implicit, common sense or taken-for-granted in colonial records to understand the epistemic and ontological foundations of the settler state, colonial territorialities and colonial power. Reading ‘thickly’ along the archival grain in this way allows us to tease out the assumptions buried in colonial discourse, actions and interactions and calls on us to critically analyze the origins and complex transits of such assumptions about the order of the world (Medak-Saltzman 2011; Stoler 2011). Both of these strategies encourage researchers to deconstruct and interrogate the colonial archive and to question the epistemic and ontological underpinnings of colonial knowledge production and violence as a mechanism of settler colonial power.

Archival research was conducted at Library and Archives Canada in Ottawa and the Archives of Ontario in Toronto. In these trips, I looked at the ledgers, accounts and practices of Indian Affairs and its Indian Agents, the correspondence between state and commercial interests (particularly the Minnesota and Ontario Pulp and Paper Company regarding the development of dams), and travel accounts of

colonial agents, orders-in-council, reports to the legislature, and occasionally, the voices of Anishinaabeg able to petition and assert themselves through the limited apparatuses of the state for redress. However, save some glinting insights I found it difficult in these records to find the answers I was looking for, to get a sense of the imaginative geographies that underwrote colonial productions of space, or to see how Indigenous dispossession related to colonial discourse. The archive was at times characterized by too large of erasures, of gaps in representation too great, to read either along or against the grain.

Through Imperial Eyes: Expeditions, 'Contact Zones' and the Colonial Imaginary

The discovery of the expedition reports and the record of proceedings for the St. Catherine's Milling's decision helped to ameliorate this and reorient the project to the intersections between cultural production, legal discourse and the violence of development. Together these reports opened a window onto how colonial agents understood the territories and nations they encountered in Treaty 3. I spend time on the expeditions in particular, as they represent critical moments in the production of colonial space that would lay the foundation for the radical respatialization of the Treaty 3 landscape and foster Indigenous dispossession through their representational strategies. In charting the spatializations that dams and infrastructure initiate it is important to start here to unpack the implication of the expeditions for the material and conceptual landscape of Treaty 3. These spatial projects illustrated a number of recurring discourses, tropes and practices that have been used to dispossess Indigenous communities through discourse, ideology and material and epistemic violence. We can learn a lot by interrogating the narratives produced by colonial agents in the 'contact zone' (Pratt 1992; Mawani 2009). By focusing on a range of historical actors encountering and responding to new landscapes, I am able to parse spatial expectations that might otherwise remain unstated or taken-for-granted and the knowledge systems that fueled their geographic imaginaries. The narratives produced through expeditions, travel writing and government surveys were critical in constructing national and colonial geographies, subjects and subjectivities and to communicate these concepts to targeted and specific audiences (Byrd 2011; Pratt 1992). They were the means through which disparate and wide-ranging populations were able to imaginatively lay claim to

lands and waters through the power of narrative and to construct their own stories and understandings of self and their position within these newly produced spaces. Expeditions served to usher in cultural understandings of the moral and cultural deficiencies and inferiorities of Indigeneity that would justify development and displacement.

Similarly, the St. Catherine's Milling decision and its various appeals have proved particularly fertile grounds to interrogate the legal mechanisms through which colonial space is produced and the assumptions and expectations that underwrite the settler state's territorial imaginings. In understanding dispossession, we need to attend to law as one its primary axes as Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark argues "Western law served as a violent tool for the United States and Canada to strip Indigenous nations of a vast majority of their lands and much of their political authority" (2016). In the reasonings of the provincial government, the dehumanizing logics of colonialism are exhumed and brought to light. Further, analyzing the decision allows us to understand the processes that would lead to removal and the logics that would structure colonial law in regards to Indigenous title for almost a hundred years.

Finally, the International Joint Commission hearings have likewise been productive sources that refract the logics that underwrote dispossession and the development of the Lac des Mille Lacs and Fort Frances dams. In the reports, we are afforded an opportunity to hear Edward W. Backus justify and explain development and the reterritorialization of the territory. While many erasures remain inscribed in these narratives they do provide fleeting and tantalizing glimpses into the colonial logics that structure dispossession.

Interviews: Contrapuntal Perspectives on Colonial History

As my objectives shifted during the course of research and the project became more historically-oriented, I shifted from seeing the interviews as my primary methodology to a supplementary method. In the end, I was only able to interview five participants and the shifting focus of the research meant that the bulk of the material did not make it into the written thesis itself. However, the interviews were always

enlightening and illuminating and helped to shape how I carried myself through this work. In the hopes that it will be useful in further inquiries and recognizing the time and care that participants shared with me, I outline my process for approaching the interviews below.

I conducted five semi-structured interviews with Anishinaabeg community members from Treaty 3 or Thunder Bay. Interviews were conversational and open-ended, allowing participants to identify and elaborate on their interpretations and emphasize issues that they felt were important or salient. Interviews centered on participants' own understandings of colonialism, dispossession, and space. Questions were designed to direct the focus towards the structures of settler colonialism while allowing an autonomy of responses and still engaging with Indigenous embodied theoretical practice. Through this framing and the ongoing affirmation of free, prior and informed consent, participants were engaged as discerning (geographic) agents active in the production of (spatial) knowledge, rather than the subjects of study from whom knowledge is extracted. Conversations were wide-ranging and illuminative. Many of the conversations centered beautifully on water in ways that I have not been able to adequately address in this work, but that nevertheless shaped how I came to understand space, this research and my role within it.

The interview process also presented challenges. While I had initially conceptualized interviews as central to the research, the project's shifting focus led me to scale back the number of interviews I conducted to recognize my own limitations as a settler scholar and researcher relatively new to this area and these communities. I realized that I had not established the relationships and trust that would be necessary to conduct these interviews appropriately.

The disruptions and ruptures that development and colonialism initiated were evident throughout the course of these interviews. Most participants began by insisting that they did not know the history of the dams or infrastructure within their territory. I tried to frame the effects of development as expansive which meant many of the questions asked in interviews did not even relate to dams or development specifically but rather to wider experiences of settler colonialism more generally. This was done in part to

emphasize the pervasive nature of settler colonialism and its productions of space but also meet participants where they were they were at, and to recognize and value the knowledge they did carry. Similarly, I tried to frame the dams, their spatializations and the meanings they engendered as mobile, moving beyond dam-affected communities. So, while participants may not have been directly displaced (although some were), they could relate to how settler productions of space had come to colonize their territory, the city of Thunder Bay and their lives down to the minutest detail. While not everyone had a lot to say about dams, they all had something to say about settler colonialism and its violence. Every interview participant was generous, insightful and shed light on some aspect of the work or theoretical problem. What could have been a seeming limitation turned into generative exchanges which encouraged new avenues and directions.

Recognizing the role of refusal in incorporating Anishinaabeg lives into our becoming-claims I have tried to focus on the role of expeditions and colonial discourse in facilitating displacement and dispossession rather than trying to interpret, frame or forward Anishinaabeg stories and history. While not wanting to center the colonial archive as the only legitimate source of knowledge, recognizing the disruptions that development produced led me to utilize the interviews as more of a check and balance to research conducted through the archive. To create a cogent history from the interviews alone would have been very difficult and beyond the scope of this work. The interviews then provide nuance and a contrapuntal perspective but the bulk of the work was conducted through the archive both because of the intrinsic problems of the research and because of my limitations as a settler scholar new to the territory. Interviews have been utilized to speak back to the erasures and lacunae of the archive, to give context and to provincialize or otherwise complicate constructions of settler common sense. If archival research has been deployed to construct a narrative of colonial development, spatial imaginaries and anticipatory and expectant geographies, the interviews disrupt the potential to read the production of colonial space as totalizing. As Anishinaabeg creatively live their lives, practice grounded normativity, their *survivance* and

resilience is a marker of the failures of settler colonialism as a project. With these methodologies in hand I now turn to an exploration of the analytical frameworks I have employed in this research.

Chapter 2

((((((((((((Production and Violence))))))))))

Analytical Frameworks for the Road Ahead

To unpack and interrogate the logics of development and dispossession we need to engage with both the production of colonial space and an expansive conception of colonial violence. In this chapter, I offer an extended engagement with these processes in order to construct an analytical framework through which we can understand the multiple and complex histories of Treaty 3. First, to understand colonialism's territorial projects and how they abet, facilitate and rely on dispossession, we need to examine the imaginaries, imperatives and objectives that compel colonialism across the globe. This involves engaging with the histories, knowledge systems, ideologies and power relations that give it its particular shape. Towards this end, in this chapter, I offer an heuristic outline of colonial understandings of space, the processes that underwrite its geographic productions and the objectives that colonial spatializations are oriented towards.

Finally, to understand how dispossession has functioned in Treaty 3 we also need robust and nuanced understandings of colonial violence. As we have seen, colonial violence is expansive, multiscalar and constituted along a number of intersecting axes. Understanding these scales, multiplicities and the ways in which numerous forms of violence intersect, buttress and reciprocally constitute one another, is imperative in understanding the shape that dispossession has taken through development and infrastructure in Treaty 3. To map these contours, outline and explain the concepts of slow and intersectional violence, two colonial processes which have been fundamental in the shape and contour of dispossession in Treaty 3.

Taken together, these analytical frameworks supply us with the tools necessary to approach and deconstruct dispossession development and their intersections with a range of processes in Treaty 3. I begin with an examination of the production of colonial space.

2.1 The Production of Colonial Space

To paraphrase and extend Katherine McKittrick's (2008:xii) argument, colonial matters are always spatial matters. Settler colonialism is a geographic project. It involves both the acquisition, seizure and occupation of space, as well as the production of specific kinds of space. These two projects are inseparable. The acquisition and occupation of territory is not possible without the production of certain forms of space and certain forms of understanding space that legitimize and facilitate conquest and possession. Settler colonialism is structured around a particular spatial relationship and revolves around particular spatial constructs: namely, land and territory. However, these concepts represent contingent understandings of space, place and land fraught with a set of colonial expectations and produced through emergent settler technologies, ideologies and knowledge systems (Goeman 2008). Examining how colonial states seek to occupy and acquire land and territory necessitates that we attend to how these particular spatial concepts are produced and understood.

Mishuana Goeman (2008) has drawn attention to the fact that land and territory, while fundamental spatial concepts in neoliberal, colonial and Indigenous political orders, are often portrayed as essentialized concepts with intrinsic meanings in ways that elide the histories and various social, political and cultural formations that contribute to constructing them as concepts. The concepts of space, land and territory mean very different things from within colonial epistemologies and Indigenous knowledge systems and we cannot afford to take their meanings for granted. Very different productions of space materialize out of these disparate understandings. Rather, in contesting the spatial politics and imaginaries of colonialism, it is critical that we interrogate the logics that underwrite colonial geographies, the techniques through which colonial spatialities are produced and the objectives that motivate colonial mappings to avoid naturalizing and reproducing colonial spatialities and projects.

Settler colonialism is characterized by a certain kind of territoriality that defines, delineates, encloses and stakes claim to space through physical and discursive processes and tactics. Colonial

territoriality has involved remapping land as property and transforming space from a dynamic and dialectical set of relations into an alienated, external, bifurcated and static object open to possession. Colonial territorialities are necessarily concerned with the production of a particular kind of commodified space and these are encoded in the ways that space, place, land and territory are understood from with colonial epistemologies. Decolonial scholarship then needs to concern itself not only with colonialism's material practices of land grabbing but also the productions of space that discursively and ideologically open land to the possibilities of being 'grabbed' (Peluso and Lund 2011). What are the ideologies and spatial expectations that lay the groundwork for possession? Answering this question involves charting a genealogy of both the global and local discourses and processes that contribute to constructing colonial geographies and spatial imaginaries. Understanding colonial productions of space enables us to clap back and avoid replicating colonial territorialities in decolonial research, movements and interventions that seek the material rematriation of lands, waters and homes.

In this work, I examine infrastructure and intersectional colonial violence as the sites and mechanisms through which dispossession and colonial geographies are initiated. To understand how these are operative within Treaty 3, we first need to interrogate the colonial assumptions, expectations and knowledge systems that underwrite the production of the colonial space across Turtle Island and how these geographic knowledges are mobilized towards settler colonialism's objectives of acquisition, possession and elimination. I pose a series of questions intended to provoke and incite further inquiry without hoping to encompass or exhaust their possibilities. What is a colonial understanding of space? How are colonial geographies manufactured? What ideologies and discourses do they encode?

These questions allow me to "confront colonialism's simultaneously localised and transnational nature," engaging with global spatial discourses and how they have been articulated and made material at local levels (Veracini 2010:180). Colonial spatializations have evinced the dialectics and particularities of place while also evidencing the global discourses, political and economic formations and knowledge systems of a 'European planetary consciousness' (Pratt 1992). Understanding colonial productions of

space means engaging with its global and imperial roots and the discourses that motivated and justified expansion and conquest, but also with how local meanings responded to and transformed these discourses both through the dialectics of Indigenous resistance and the shifting strategies and technologies of colonial power.

The Alchemy of Geography: From Networked Constellations to Manufactured Colonialscaapes

As Glen Coulthard argues “settler colonialism is territorially acquisitive in perpetuity” (2014:52). Dispossession is structural to settler colonialism. It is the engine that allows colonialism to move through the territories of Turtle Island. As a geopolitical formation, a structure of processes, or a network of spatial projects, settler colonialism finds its ontological imperative with the seizure, acquisition and occupation of land (Said 1993; Coulthard 2014; Wolfe 2006). It is concerned with manufacturing geographies which facilitate these spatial and territorial imperatives. These imperatives motivate a specific relationship to space and represent the impetus for a range of colonial spatial practices. Indigenous spatialities, bodies and sovereignties have always stood in the way of these imperatives; of colonialism’s refashioning of the landscape in its own image according to its spatial expectations and imaginaries. As such, settler states and colonial power have consistently been “concerned with the making and unmaking of places”; a geographical alchemy through which Indigenous geographies are simultaneously subsumed and foreclosed through the imposition of colonial territorializations (Veracini 2010:179). As Wolfe succinctly argues “settler colonialism destroys to replace” (2006: 388). Colonialism seeks to unmake prior and ongoing Indigenous spatialities, occupancies and legal and political orders, in order to replace them with its own contingent territorialities, spatial expectations and understandings of the world. Settler colonial objectives then do not end with the physical possession and occupation of space, land and water, but extend to include the proprietary rights to the meanings and possible meanings of these spatial concepts. What is at issue in the dialectics between Indigenous and colonial spatializations is not only who possesses land, but also a contestation over what land, water, space and place *mean* and could *possibly* mean.

The expectations and understandings evinced in colonial spatialities have deep roots and can be traced genealogically to their origins in Enlightenment and Renaissance thought, expanding mercantilism, and nascent capitalism (Mignolo 2003). Yet, they are also always in process, in the act of becoming; coalescing, fragmenting and reforming (Massey 2005). Capitalism, development, infrastructure and the contemporary demands and desires of colonialism continue to interact and combine to form settler understandings, imaginaries and productions of space. In this way, the history of Treaty 3 is not only shaped by colonial geographies and spatial imaginaries, it helps to produce them through an entangled process of interpellation.

Productions of colonial space are always the manifestation of relations of power; they mirror, reflect and structure political relations between settlers and Indigenous nations. Colonial spatializations then as the making of colonial worlds through the unmaking of Indigenous spatialities involve transforming understandings of space and place from an embodied, reciprocal and networked constellation to an abstracted map of surveys, grids, property and ownership. To answer how colonialism attempts to affect this transformation we need to interrogate the set of spatial concepts and master narratives that underwrite colonialism's geographic imaginaries.

The Geographic Imaginaries of Settler Colonialism

The alchemy of transformation is initiated by a set of colonial logics which spur the geographic imaginaries of settler colonialism. These logics derive from the interlocking systems that structure settler colonialism: capitalism, White supremacy, the nation-state, possessive individualism and heteropatriarchy, and the spatial concepts they both engender and require. Colonial geographies cannot be disentangled from these systems and their structuring logics. Space within colonial epistemologies is understood through a set of master narratives and axiomatic concepts that arise from these interconnected systems. Colonialism is structured by deep-seeded investments into these concepts that allow or ease its expansion and distribution across the globe. These concepts have a history. The ordering of space along

national lines, into gendered, heteronormative and racialized categories and according to the cultural logics of property and capitalism are the product of specific and ongoing histories and ideologies. They are contingent rather than immutable; constructed rather than natural, dynamic rather than static. Space then is necessarily an unfinished project; always in the process of becoming, always open to contestation and re-imaginings (Massey 2005). Attending to the history and genealogy of spatial concepts allows us to prize apart their constructedness, their contingencies, and their *raison d'être*. This attention to the historicity of colonial productions of space allows us to “denaturalize geography to ask how spaces come to be but also to undermine worldviews that rest upon it” (Razack 2002:5).

The geographic imaginaries of colonialism then are both the product and the impetus of these histories and derive from the imperatives and expectations of its interconnected systems of capitalism, White supremacy and heteropatriarchy. The hegemony of these systems and underlying logics and ideologies naturalize colonial productions of space as common sense or universal when they are in fact contingent, particular and historical formulations informed by the cultural and ideological concepts of race, nature and science, and the economic relations of property, land and labour. These contingent concepts activate the colonial geographic imaginary and compel its transits across the globe.

Imagining Space

So, what are the foundational concepts that structure colonial spatialities? While it is impossible to outline the innumerable histories and discourses that go into the formulation of colonial geographies I attempt an heuristic description of some of the fundamental structuring concepts and axioms that contribute to colonial understandings of space. The geographic imaginings of colonialism are predicated on Eurocentric traditions of Enlightenment thought and regimes of private property that arose in conjunction with the birth of global capitalism. Through the Cartesian logics that were a part of inaugurating the complex set of political and discursive processes that constitute the cultural concept of modernity, space was understood as absolute, Euclidean and geometric (Lefebvre 1991:2). It was seen as

a container; “a field within which material events occur” (Smith 2008:2). This is what Katherine McKittrick describes as “the idea that space “just is,” and that space and place are merely containers for human complexities and social relations” (2008:xi). Within these understandings then, space is objectified and actively produced as an externality from which the subject is necessarily separated, excised and disassociated. These imaginaries encourage a conceptualization of space as fixed, *a priori*, surficial, inert and passive; a static ground or plane to be traversed, occupied or acted upon. In short, they code space as an object, rather than a process or a set of complex relations (Massey 2005). Through the emergent ideologies and technologies of modernity, science, rationality and positivism, space was understood to be observable, measurable and divisible. These productions attempted to impose a static legibility onto space that would dovetail with the geopolitical and economic formations of global capitalism and colonialism that cohered during the period.

Fundamental to these geopolitical formations were the cultural logics of property and its attendant technologies. The logics of property consolidated particular ways of seeing and understanding space (Bhandar 2018:3). These logics were premised on and produced a conception of space as bounded, coherent and discrete (Blomley 2011). Understood through the framework of private property, space was alienable, divisible and commodifiable; an *a priori* object rather than a complex set of relations (Blomley 2003:127). According to Blomley, this view of space produces it as “a stable set of coordinates, detached from social and political processes” (Blomley 2011:204). A number of technologies and interrelated knowledge systems have served to codify these spatial imaginaries and write them onto the landscape. As ideologies positivism, rationalism and scientific objectivity attempted to fix space in place, to deny its dialectical evolving and dynamic processes and to measure and delineate its boundaries. The technologies of property such as the map, the survey and the grid also helped produce these understandings. As Cole Harris argues, “maps conceptualized unfamiliar space in Eurocentric terms, situating it within a culture of vision, measurement, and management. Employing a detached vertical perspective, this cartography rendered space as a plan—as a surface” (2004:175). This vertical cartographic perspective involved an

omniscient, abstract and disembodied top-down perspective. This vantage point structures what McKittrick describes as “traditional geography,” which functions under the assumption that “we can view, assess, and ethically organize the world from a stable (white, patriarchal, Eurocentric, heterosexual, classed) vantage point” (2008:xiii). Blomley calls the development of these perspectives “the inauguration of a particular view of space as detached and alienable” (2003:135). Space is territorialized as the stage on which human agency is played out rather than an encompassing, agentive and relational entity itself. Capitalism can only proceed from this conception of alienated and alienable abstract space. These technologies do not simply measure space but rather produce it as contingent concept. The disciplines of geography and the practice of cartography then have been critical modalities of the production of colonial space through “the technologies of objectification that have rendered the world inanimate and consumable” (Goeman 2013:185). As Goeman argues emergent technologies and the political formations of “capitalism and colonialism produce new ways of experiencing fundamental ontological concepts like time and space” (2013:28).

As geopolitical formations, capitalism and colonialism necessitated productions of space that would allow them to function. To these ends, space was produced as an object and an externality in order to lay claim, manage and occupy it. The social construction of space and the power dynamics inherent in its production are ignored or elided in spatial understandings which objectify and externalize space, and position it as natural, common sense, a given. Likewise, the logics which frame space as inert, passive and static elide the ways in which space itself is dynamic and agentive, as capable of affecting as it is of being affected, an understanding rarely countenanced or attended to in the common-sense understandings of colonial space. Space from within a colonial framework is understood as “the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile” and as we shall see, these remappings serve a specific function within the projects of settler colonialism (Foucault 1980:70).

To What Ends? Manufacturing Space for Empire

These imaginaries and the spatial productions they engender are not innocent. The logics and axiomatic concepts that undergird colonial productions of space are directed towards specific imperatives and objectives and they compel certain relationships to space and place. Settler colonialism requires the production of certain spaces to achieve its aims of occupation. To possess and occupy space, it has to be produced in a means that open it to the possibility of being claimed. As Goeman argues “prescribing the shape of land in colonial history was largely done with intent to claim land and make it readable as property” (2008:25). Colonial territorializations seek to code space as property, facilitate the seizure, possession and occupations of Indigenous lands and manage relations within discrete and delineated space. Settlement and colonial spatialization were “premised on, and facilitated through, a process of creating spaces which were orderly, easily commodified and clearly defined through the imposition of Western socio-legal property regimes” (Hunt 2014a:62). Imaginaries which externalize and objectify space further capitalist and colonial projects, expunge and bifurcate humanity and nature and produce a “conceptual distance and detachment that allows for the commodification of the material world essential for capitalism” (Herman 2008:74). The territorial project of settler colonialism is unthinkable without this dissociation and its attendant spatial construction that opens the lands of Turtle Island to seizure both materially and conceptually. Colonial geographies rely on anticipatory and proprietary imaginings wherein land and water are *tabula rasa*, ready to be transformed into the ‘familiar geographies’ of colonial space through the cultural logics of property in order to be claimed and possessed (Veracini 2010). Unmaking space as a set of embodied relations and an agentive entity and remaking it as a static, external object open to possession was and continues to be foundational to the colonial project of settlement and occupation.

However, neither the imaginaries nor the production of colonial space are static. Settler conceptions of space did not arrive fully-formed but rather shifted to meet the needs of settler colonialism in remarkably adaptive and destructive ways. Settler spatializations found and produced meanings in their localized articulations across Turtle Island in ways that affected and shaped both the colonial imaginary

and the material landscape. Colonialism's spatilizations and territorialities are dynamic, shifting and responsive to the exigencies of place. This process is ongoing as colonial spatialities transform themselves in relation to contemporary processes of globalization, neoliberalism, multiculturalism and recognition and reconciliation politics. While colonial spatialities are always inflected and responding to the histories and institutions I have outlined here, they are also always evolving in response to both the shifting demands of neoliberal capitalism and multicultural liberalism, and the ongoing *survivance* of Indigenous nations and their conceptions of space.

I also want to trouble linear or causal understandings of the relationship between colonial epistemologies, spatial imaginaries and settler productions of space. The complex and entangled relationship between knowledge, space and materiality is integral to colonial spatialities as it is to all understandings and productions of space. There is a complex and dialectical, rather than causal, relationship between settler spatial imaginaries and colonial constructions of space. Space is dialectical; both 'produced and productive' (Goeman 2009:171). Settler productions of space do not simply proceed linearly from the spatial imaginaries of colonialism. Rather, colonial spatilizations simultaneously and dialectically both proceed from and produce colonialism's distinctive, contingent and particular understandings of water, land and space in a complex process of co-becoming (Suchet et al. 2016:25; Blaser 2014:54). The imaginaries of colonialism compel the material transformation of the landscape at the same time as these material transformations produce these imaginaries. One does not predate the other. Rather, they are called into being simultaneously in a complex and entangled nexus of knowledge, power and materiality.

The final salient feature of colonial productions of space is the ways in which they naturalize themselves through the unmaking and foreclosure of alternative spatialities. Through epistemic and material violence that seeks an emptying and erasure of anything that challenged colonial imperatives, imaginaries or territorialities, colonialism imposes a form of settler common sense to its contingent productions of space (Rifkin 2014). As Scott Lauria Morgensen contends, "colonialism attains

universality by containing and eliminating difference” (2011:58). Settler spatialities render themselves universal and come to fill the frame through their violent eradication of other ways of relating to, understanding or experiencing space. They are teleological spatial practices, in that they produce and normalize the relations and geographies their own imaginings have conditioned them to expect. Colonial geographies are structured to appear natural through their violent elimination of alternative spatialities that might provincialize or draw attention to their contingent nature (Chakrabarty 2009). The ongoing and comprehensive unmaking of Indigenous geographies then is what makes colonial productions of space appear universal.

2.2 Analytical Frameworks for Understanding Colonial Violence and Dispossession

Thinking through Violence and Dispossession

Violence is fundamental to all colonial productions of space. To understand how dispossession was affected in Treaty 3 we need to forward some analytical frameworks for understanding colonial violence. As we have seen, dispossession is multiply constituted and expansive. It involves multiple forms of violence spread across wide temporal and spatial scales. Constructing analytical frameworks to understand these violences and their relationship to dispossession is critical to this work and the work of decolonial scholarship generally. In this section, I offer two analytical frameworks for thinking through this violence that will be critical in understanding development, dispossession and the production of space in Treaty 3. First, I engage with and explore Rob Nixon's concept of slow violence to understand how this process has been materialized through development and infrastructure in the context of Treaty 3. I then outline a working definition of intersectional settler colonial violence and its defining features through an examination of epistemic violence and intersectionality as analytics. By combining these analytics' complementary features, we can explore how dispossession is operationalized through the framework of intersectional settler colonial violence. These lines of inquiry allow me to address a number of interrelated questions in the following chapters. How do multiple forms of violence interact to produce dispossession?

How was colonialism's production of space predicated on this dispossession? These questions will set the stage to ask how development was constituted by a nexus of interlocking colonial strategies and violences.

Slow Violence

To understand development and the histories of Treaty 3 we need to engage with the concept of slow violence. Rob Nixon describes it as “a violence that occurs gradually and out of sight, a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all” (2011:2). This violence “is neither spectacular nor instantaneous, but rather incremental and accretive, its calamitous repercussions playing out across a range of temporal scales” (Nixon 2011:2). Through the lens of slow violence, we are better able to understand how displacement, dispossession and removal operated in Treaty 3 wherein the effects of development have certainly been slow, attritional, out-of-sight and accretive, one piling on top of the other in often invisibilized ways constructing conditions of precarity that slowly rendered life on the land untenable. In Treaty 3 slow violence has resulted in both displacement and what Sharlene Mollett describes as “displacement-in-place” the process in which the resources and relationships fundamental to social and biological life are displaced and dislocated while marginalized and socially-differentiated communities are immobilized and stuck in place. (Mollett 2014). In an argument that echoes Simpson's articulation of the expansive violence of colonialism, Mollett states that such productions are also expansive in their consequences, resulting in the displacement of the very notion of a future for marginalized communities (2014:30). Slow violence then is a particularly elusive and damaging form of dispossession assailing the very foundations of social life and the possibility of its imagining. It invisibilizes itself and takes place incrementally in ways that make it difficult to see, let alone contest. As we will see, slow violence has been particularly damaging in Treaty 3 devastating communities but also circumscribing their possibilities for redress or restitution. It displaced not only communities but also any sense of blame, culpability or responsibility on the part of colonial actors and institutions.

Intersectional Settler Colonial Violence

Intersecting forms of material and epistemic violence have been critical in producing dispossession in Treaty 3. In this work, I am particularly concerned with how multiple mechanisms of settler power combine and interact to produce Indigenous dispossession. What is the connection between dehumanization and displacement? Between narrative mappings and dispossession? Between law and development? What do these connections allow for colonialism? What do they produce? Attending to the intersections of these processes and their violence has been a productive way to unpack and deconstruct dispossession. As we will see, development relied on the combination of dehumanization, the abjection of Anishinaabeg tenurial systems, the erasure of their legal and political orders and finally, a negation of their very personhood. Developing a framework to understand these processes has been critical to this project. In producing both dispossession and space, colonialism deployed forms of discursive, symbolic, legal and material violence. The analytic of intersectional violence allows us to attend to how these processes buttress and support one another. While attending to the ways in which discourse is critical in the production of space may not be revolutionary, placing an explicit focus on the interconnections of multiple forms of violence is productive in understanding how dispossession was produced and operationalized. A lot goes on in these interstices and creases. This emphasis allows us to make connections between processes which the compartmentalizations of colonialism encourage us to see as disparate, divisible and discrete. I offer an extended engagement with the concept of intersectional settler colonial violence to frame my own arguments around infrastructure and development in Treaty 3 and in the hope that it can be developed, reworked and critiqued in the work of other scholars analyzing dispossession and settler colonialism.

Epistemic Violence: Erasure, Foreclosure and Occlusion in the Quest for Colonial Possession

To understand intersectional settler colonial violence, we first need to engage with epistemic violence as one its foundational axes. A deep literature deriving primarily from postcolonial and feminist

thought exists on the concept of epistemic violence (Hunt 2014b; Kuokannen 2008; Spivak 2010; Moreton-Robinson 2011). Scholars have variously positioned it as a matter of sanctioned ignorance (Spivak 2010; Kuokannen 2008), a problem of reciprocity or exchange (Dotson 2011), or an issue of discriminatory, distributive or testimonial injustice (Fricker 2007). However, articulations of epistemic violence which position it solely as a problem of exchange or even of ignorance, can have the unintended effect of naturalizing epistemic violence as the consequence of two mutually unintelligible systems of thought coming into contact. In this work, I emphasize the agentive nature of epistemic violence as the process of *pushing* certain knowledges beyond the margins of intelligibility; the ways in which other knowledges are actively *placed* under erasure. I do this to attempt to denaturalize both colonial violence and productions of space. Epistemic violence is not inevitable. It involves the rendering silent of other knowledges, other voices, and other worlds. It is a political strategy of dominance and control and is tied to the colonial imperatives of dispossession.

Epistemic violence refers to the necessarily power-laden, systemic and active process of occluding, erasing and foreclosing subaltern or marginalized ways of knowing by hegemonic knowledge systems, institutions and actors. It is the negation, invisibilization and delegitimization of other knowledges *as* knowledge. It is the process of having one's stories, experiences, and knowledge silenced, abjected and negated. This silencing "is enabled by the power of Western knowledge and its ability to be the definitive measure of what it means to be human and what does and what does not constitute knowledge" (Moreton-Robinson 2015:12).

This violence is always structured by material relations of power. It takes place in a field of power relations; in the interactive dynamics between marginalized and dominant actors, populations, institutions and structures. Its violence may be discursive but it relies on and produces real world disparities and social differentiations between populations. In many ways, it serves to construct and structure this field; of who and what can be present, be heard or seen. Thus, it is intimately entangled with the process of subject formation, the constitution of political and social subjectivities and the

construction of colonialism's perpetually silenced Others. It creates this difference as much as it mirrors it. This violence serves the interests of hegemonic power, simultaneously constructing and protecting the hierarchical ascendancy of those in power and their knowledges, discourses and ideologies.

Through epistemic violence other-than-dominant knowledges are subsumed and rendered unintelligible by the refusal of hegemonic structures, institution or actors to code such alterity as legible or recognizable from within the limited logics of their own knowledge systems. In "Can the Subaltern Speak?" when Gayatri Spivak (2010) poses her provocative eponymous question, she is not questioning the abilities of marginalized communities to articulate knowledge, but rather raising a question of exchange and directing us back towards the sites of power. Since communication is a reciprocal exchange which requires a listener, what does it mean if the listener is not adequately able to receive and interpret such communicative acts? What if they were in fact conditioned to anticipate, expect and even, produce silence? What happens when knowledge is articulated in a horizon beyond that of the intelligibility of hegemonic power? These questions are critically important in understanding how colonial power produces dispossession through the exclusion, erasure and foreclosure of Indigenous spatialities, political orders and subjectivities. Dominant colonial structures refuse to countenance difference, other ways of understanding or being in the world and thus, alternative epistemologies or spatialities are rendered invisible; unspeakable within dominant idioms. This form of foreclosure, through epistemic violence then renders other spatialities, ways of knowing or ways of being, not only marginal, but unimaginable from within dominant systems and serves to structure colonial spatializations and political/economic configurations as natural. For colonialism, this violence is utilitarian. It is through this epistemic violence that the acquisitive and genocidal objectives of colonialism are able to be transformed alchemically into 'progress' and 'development,' that the dispossession, displacement or elimination of entire communities, entire nations can be recast as progress, inevitable because epistemic violence discursively renders Indigenous nations and their citizens less-than-human.

Intersectional violence is formed at the interstices, in the overlaps of multiple forms of violence. To understand how colonial space has been produced through these mutually constitutive forms of settler violence, we can productively turn to intersectionality as an analytic well-positioned to deal with the interstices of power and colonial violence. Intersectionality is a robust and complex concept and analytical lens. It has a deep history but achieved prominence in the legal frameworks of Black feminist scholars contending with how interlocking and reciprocally constructive systems of power combined and interacted to produce oppression, social inequality and marginalized subjectivities (Crenshaw 1989; Crenshaw 1991; Collins and Bilge 2016). It developed from the insight that the structures of racism, misogyny, homo/transphobia were not singular or divisible but rather ‘multiplicative’; mutually constitutive and reinforcing (Wing 1991). Intersectionality as an analytic spoke back to Whiteman feminism’s own forms of epistemic violence and the ways in which women of colour and their particular concerns and struggles had been forcibly excluded in the flattening and homogenizing categorizations of women in hegemonic feminisms (Arvin, Tuck and Morrill 2013). While intersectionality has often been framed solely as a means of theorizing identity and the multiple axes of difference which combine to construct social inequality and complex subjectivities, leading intersectional thinkers emphasize it as an analytic, a means of understanding and interrogating power and its operations (Nash 2008; Collins and Bilge 2016). Intersectionality provides a means for deconstructing and interrogating the structures of power and the overlapping and mutually constitutive ways that they function. It is in this sense that I take it up to analyze the numerous vectors of colonial power and how violence is multiply constituted. I draw on this interstitial aspect of intersectionality to interrogate the concatenations and reciprocally constructive aspects of epistemic, discursive and material violence. An intersectional analysis of disparate, but not discrete, forms of power and violence allows us to better understand the connections between knowledge, materiality, power, and space and how they operate in mutually constitutive ways to produce Indigenous dispossession in the settler state.

Dispossession and Intersecting Forms of Violence

With understandings of both epistemic violence and intersectionality in hand, we can begin to explore the concept of intersectional settler colonial violence and its role in dispossession and the colonial production of space. Intersectional settler colonial violence refers to the ways in which epistemic, material and ontological violence are fundamentally and inextricably entangled. These multiple forms of violence buttress, produce and reproduce each other. They are inseparable and unimaginable without one another. Epistemic violence lays the groundwork for material violence and is itself reliant on material relations of power. In seeking what Patrick Wolfe (2006) describes as the “elimination of the native” settler colonialism has always twinned material violence with epistemic and ontological violence which has served to not only justify and legitimize colonial violence but to render the concept of settler violence unimaginable, pushed beyond the pale by colonial foreclosures and occlusions. Through its deployment of intersectional violence, colonialism seeks not only the destruction of otherworlds, but also the very possibility of their imagining. These are what Hunt, Holmes and Piedalue describe as “the material and ideological relations through which certain types of violence are made invisible in the context of ongoing colonialism in white settler societies” (2015:540)

Intersectional colonial violence is fundamental to the expansive project of dispossession that colonialism seeks to enact. Colonial violence targets the land, bodies and minds of Indigenous communities. It is concerned with the elimination of Indigenous communities as sovereign and political bodies. Just as Veracini (2010) argued that colonial geographies were predicated on the erasure of Indigenous geographies, settler life and sovereignties are predicated on the negation of Indigenous life through elimination, assimilation or whatever other strategies are at hand. To accomplish this expansive dispossession, colonial power deploys diverse forms of violence and multiple technologies. These processes interact and shape one another. In this work, I look at the interplay between discourse, representation, law and development to understand the particular features of dispossession in Treaty 3. These processes evidenced forms of epistemic, material, ontological and symbolic violence that buttressed and relied on one another. Understanding dispossession means examining it holistically,

searching for the connections and the processes that tied multiple forms of violence together. In Treaty 3, multiple colonial strategies of dispossession and rule interlocked to facilitate colonial occupation and settlement, from the displacements due to flooding, dehumanizing discourses which rendered Anishinaabeg less-than-human, the legal violence of colonial law and policy and stadia and land tenure theories which devalued their relationships to their lands and waters. In this work, I gesture towards some of the ways that these practices intersected with one another and were undergirded by forms of mutually reinforcing material and epistemic violence. Intersectional violence as an analytic allows us to attend to these connections, to the relationships between processes, histories and power, and to pursue expansive inquiries that contend with the pervasive violence of dispossession

Attending to intersectional violence also allows more robust analyses of how space is produced through the intersections of knowledge, discourse, materiality and power. It addresses how settler spatial imaginaries and desires mobilize multiple forms of violence, elimination and erasure to pursue material and conceptual terrains and produce colonial geographies. Intersectional violence has always been fundamental to settler productions of space, pursuit of territory and the elimination and dispossession of Indigenous nations. As we have seen, the production of colonial geographies always revolves around contending with the prior and ongoing presence of Indigenous nations. In this, colonialism's spatial project has been expansive. It sought to not only transform the landscape of Turtle Island but also its conceptual and discursive terrains; to take possession of space and reduce its polyvalent meanings to a singularity through the elimination of Indigenous geographies. Knowledge, materiality, and power are always symbiotically entangled in these productions of space. Physical transformations of the landscape materialized colonial understandings of space. In a circular logic, these materializations served to code contingent spatial understandings as natural, common sense. Colonial productions of space then always proceed from and simultaneously produce the knowledge systems, geographic imaginaries and structuring logics that underwrite them. Finally, the production of space through intersecting forms of settler violence has clear objectives: the elimination of prior claims to, and imaginings of, space. The production of space

through material, epistemic and ontological violence is designed to subsume Indigenous understandings of, and connection to, space and place, land and water in order to circumscribe political, emotional and spiritual assertions to territory, homelands and headwaters. It is always a political as well as a spatial project.

The development of dams within Treaty 3 takes place within this milieu of colonial discourses, expectations, spatialities and desires and through the deployment of multiple forms of violence. Development is part of larger projects to dispossess Indigenous communities and lay the conditions of possibility for settler territorialities and life. Turning to part two, for the next three chapters, I examine how these formations have been articulated in the production of space in Treaty 3 through the development of infrastructure, particularly dams in two broadly drawn periods, a period of exploration from the establishment of the Red River Settlement in 1811 to the signing of Treaty 3 in 1873, and a period of development from Treaty through to the construction of the International Falls Dam and the replacement of the Lac des Mille Lacs Dam in 1926. Analyzing what differentiates these two periods in terms of colonial objectives and productions of space allows a certain clarity in examining what ties them together: Indigenous dispossession and removal. These avenues allow me to ask how the master narratives and logics of colonial geographies have shaped the production of space in Treaty 3. How do shifting colonial productions of space continue to evidence and facilitate Indigenous dispossession through a series of interconnected colonial strategies? To answer this question, I begin by examining the cultural productions of a series of expeditions through the territory of Treaty 3.

Chapter 3

((((((((((((Representation))))))))))

3.1 'Contact Zones': Expeditions, Travel Writing and Geography

In 1857, the colonial government, anxious to connect the Prairies to the rest of Canada commissioned an expedition to explore the territory west of Lake Superior to the Red River Settlement (Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1858). This expedition was to lay the foundation for settler productions and understandings of space and the dispossession of Anishinaabe nations in Treaty 3. Expeditions were important cultural formations that attended and facilitated colonial and imperial expansions across the world (Thomas 2015). Mary Louise Pratt describes them as “Europe’s proudest and most conspicuous instruments of expansion” (1992:23). They staked claims to territory both materially and conceptually and served as important imperial and colonial modes of organizing the world. Expeditions arose in conjunction with emergent technologies for mapping, charting and representing the world which signaled a paradigmatic epistemological shift for colonial nations (Byrd 2011). These technologies initiated new ways of understanding and visualizing space and inaugurated a global geopolitics which shifted how colonial subjects understood the world and their place within it. By delineating and making legible the new lands of empire through a variety of narrative and cartographic technologies, they initiated a particular, and a particularly colonial, way of seeing the world through ‘imperial eyes’ that produced it as a colonial possession (Pratt 1992).

Expeditions have always been narrative technologies, intricately intertwined with forms of textual production that became increasingly popular with the ascent of the printing press. Expeditions’ meanings depended on their ability to narrate and communicate their particular representations of the world. They formed a literary genre of travel writing which produced cartographic productions of space and narrated cultural understandings of difference to settler and imperial publics. As a focus of public interest expeditions became “a source of some of the most powerful ideational and ideological apparatuses

through which European citizenries related themselves to other parts of the world” (Pratt 1992:23). These journeys and their representations not only shaped how the ‘distant’ lands and waters of colonial peripheries were understood but also imperial ‘centers’ and their relation to these peripheries. Expeditions as cultural productions served to encode and reify the very concepts of center and periphery; of hinterlands and homelands. Through their representations they produced the concepts of the frontier, of the borderland and simultaneously, the imperial center. They communicated to settler and imperial publics their hegemonic position at the center of the world. Occurring in the ‘contact zone’ of colonial encounter they also served to produce cultural notions of difference and alterity between Indigenous and colonial subjects in which a colonial Self was differentiated from its Indigenous Other (Pratt 1992:6; Mawani 2009). So, while they mapped the terrain of distant Indigenous lands they were also intrinsically bound up with the production of an imperial or colonial subject. In their encounter with ‘new worlds’, expeditions invariably involved forms of epistemic (and often physical) violence. In the erasures and hegemony they encoded, expeditions represented violent transformations and productions of space, as Thomas argues “the infrastructure of violence lies buried in the DNA of the expedition” (2015:21). As we shall see, in Treaty 3 *the infrastructure of infrastructure*, its ideological and discursive foundations, also lies bound up with the expeditions (Cowen 2018).

‘Opening Up the Country:’ Anticipatory Geographies and the Red River Expedition

The 1857 expedition was one of many that attempted to map, shape and manage the lands and waters between the Western edge of Lake Superior and the Red River Settlement over the next 15 years. In the same year, the British North American Exploring Expedition, better known as the Palliser Expedition also set out to explore the region and beyond to the Rockies (Palliser 1863). Likewise, expedition leaders Simon J. Dawson (1859) and Henry Youle Hind (1860), both led their own expeditions again the next year. A decade later, Dawson (1869) was commissioned to build the infrastructure necessary to open a line of communication between the two territories. In 1870, he joined the Red River Expeditionary force on its way to quell the Red River Uprising (Dawson 1871; Wolseley 1871). Taken

together, these expeditions produced a corpus of writings outlining colonial understandings and expectations of both space and Indigeneity. These representations proved influential in the policy decisions of Ottawa and popular with a public anxious for representations of the economically promising ‘unsettled’ West.

These publications produced certain levels of notoriety and fame for their authors and met relatively broad audiences. This meant that the narrative representations that they produced came to be encoded in the settler imaginary and an emergent national consciousness and subjectivity. The production of the Canadian citizen was reliant on the production of its Indigenous Other through representations and narratives like those encoded in the expeditionary reports. These narratives served to produce racist representations of Anishinaabeg as less-than-human and circumscribed views of territory for settler publics that bolstered White supremacy and shaped the ways in which development was pursued and dispossession enacted. The textual production of the expeditions encoded ideas about the inferiority of Anishinaabeg and their land use practices and a vision of the territory of Treaty 3 as a wasteland, idle and uninhabited; vacated of Anishinaabeg presence. In their entanglements with later processes of development, these cultural productions cannot be underestimated and deserve a level of analytical scrutiny.

Relaying the story of the expedition introduces us to a number of figures prominent in the spatial projects and reterritorialization of Treaty 3 from chief geologist and expedition leader Henry Youle Hind to Colonel Garnet Wolseley, leader of the Red River Military Expedition and Captain George Lightfoot Hayshe, an officer under Wolseley’s command. In particular, lead surveyor and chief engineer Simon J. Dawson serves as an appropriately ambiguous guide: a Charon through the muddy waters of the nascent period of mapping, construction and development in Treaty 3. Dawson went on to be a Treaty commissioner and Member of Parliament for the Northern Ontario district of Algoma. He was intricately embedded and instrumental in the politics and transformation of the landscape in the territories of the Anishinaabeg for the next 30 years. Dawson is a contradictory figure in the history of Treaty 3,

simultaneously championed as an advocate of Indigenous rights and accused of exploiting his position for material gain (Chute and Knight 2006; Telford 1996; Adler 2010). These figures, with their diverse (military, civil, scientific) backgrounds, assumptions and objectives metonymically stand in for the multiplicity of settler projects and the messy contradictions of colonialism. Parsing their reports allow us to see the territory of Treaty 3 through the ‘imperial eyes’ of agents enacting (and sometimes contradicting) the spatial prerogatives of colonial power and the settler state (Pratt 1992).

The authors of the expedition reports all brought their own expectations of Indigeneity to the territory. Military expedition leader, Colonel Wolseley’s narratives are characterized by virulently racist descriptions of Anishinaabeg that situate them logistically as potential enemy combatants (Wolseley 1871). Geologist Henry Youle Hind’s reports evidence a scientific racism based on social Darwinism which deplored the declension of Anishinaabeg nations while simultaneously framing this process as inevitable in the face of White supremacy and the march of progress (Hind 1860). Captain George Lightfoot Huyshe’s narrations struggled to occlude, invisibilize and de-agentivize Anishinaabeg so that the Expedition could be read as a formative exploit through which White men constructed and performed their masculinities against the hostile field of nature. Finally, Dawson’s position as a ‘liberal advocate’ for Indigenous rights did not preclude him from expounding on White supremacy and Indigenous inferiority, it simply led him to advocate for a benevolent, paternalistic and assimilatory colonialism (Dawson 1859; Dawson 1869). At a fundamental level, all of these perspectives adhered to the logics of White supremacy and produced dispossession for Anishinaabe nations. Whether the goals were liberal or more explicitly hawkish and eliminatory, the assumptions and objectives were the same; the inferiority of Indigeneity and the inevitable necessity of dispossession to facilitate colonial occupation and settlement.

In the actions and writings of these colonial actors we can see how the spatial imaginaries and expectations of colonialism find hosts, take hold and are expressed at the same time as they take unexpected localized directions and permutations. As agents and representatives of the Crown they attempted to affect transformations to the landscape through a specific set of spatial and geographic ideas,

and racial logics that continue to resonate and shape the spatial politics of Treaty 3 today. The expeditions and their reports allow us to see through the ‘anticipatory geographies’ of settler colonialism at the beginnings of a period of intensive development, occupation and settlement (Veracini 2010). Sifting through and engaging with their textual productions allows us to see dehumanization as a structural process which relates to, legitimizes and interpenetrates dispossession. In many ways, the history of infrastructure in Treaty 3 has its origins in these expeditions.

Gather Your Maps: Producing Geographic Knowledge in Treaty 3

The 1857 expedition was motivated by the complex politics, histories and territorial demands of Canada, the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC), the Red River Settlement and the imperial centers of Great Britain and the United States (Littlejohn 1967). The Hudson’s Bay Company had been granted an exclusive monopoly on trade to the area west of the Great Lakes administered as Rupert’s Land and the Northwest Territories through the Royal Charter of 1670 (Royle 2011). This granted the company control and nominal title over an enormous amount of territory. The Red River Settlement established in 1811 had originally been independent of the Company through a land concession but had been administered by a governor and council appointed by the Company since 1836 (Bumsted 2003). By the 1850’s, the Red River Settlement had increasingly developed from an economic outpost of the HBC to a self-sustaining, expanding and politically assertive settlement that bridled under the restriction of the Company’s charter guaranteeing exclusive rights to trade and the governance of the territory (Littlejohn 1967). Discontent with the settlement’s isolation from the Provinces of Canada and the restrictive policies of the HBC had rankled settlers and Métis and led to an increasing orientation both politically and economically towards Pembina and St. Paul across the border (Bumsted 2003). The settlement and its leaders flirted with closer political ties to the United States and the possibility of annexation during a period of American expansionism motivated by the sentiments and logics of manifest destiny (Littlejohn 1967:43).

At the same time, in the face of demands for territorial expansion and settlement, the Colonial Office in Britain was increasingly dissatisfied with the governance strategies of the HBC which were reliant on keeping the territories of the Northwest and Rupert's Land isolated in order to serve its economic interests. Settlement was a challenge to the Company's monopoly which could not survive in the face of demands for free trade and self-government. In light of American territorial overtures and with its own impulses towards expansion, the Provinces of Canada were anxious to assert itself and enfold the Red River Colony into the emergent space of the nation both territorially and imaginatively. The spatializations of the HBC had not been as concerned with the acquisition and occupation of territory, they sought to control trade not the land itself. The most pressing demand in the reformulation of space was to disrupt the settlement's orientation towards the United States by integrating it into the territorial and jurisdictional space of the nation by connecting it to the Provinces of Canada in the East. This was described as 'opening the means of communication' to previously disconnected colonial territories (Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1859). Mapping the territory, plotting a route of transportation and constructing the infrastructure to link the Red River Settlement with rest of Canada were critical national projects that furthered the territorial objectives of the colonial state. It was with these objectives in mind that the expedition was commissioned.

A Problematic Geography: Northwestern Ontario and the Colonial Imagination

The 1857 expedition consisted of a team of forty-four engineers, geologists, scientists, voyageurs and surveyors tasked with exploring, mapping and surveying the region "between Lake Superior and the Red River of the North, with a view to determine the best route for opening a communication between that lake and the settlements on Red River" in order to connect the agriculturally rich lands of the Red River Settlement to the rest of Canada (Hind 1860:2). The expedition would explore the territory of what would become Treaty 3 led by George Gladman and then Hind and Dawson through the summers of 1857 and 1858. At the time, the territory between Lake Superior and the Red River was relatively isolated, a frontier of the colonial government's geographical, territorial and jurisdictional imaginings (Chute and

Knight 2006:106). Waterways provided access from the Atlantic Coast to the Western shores of Lake Superior but the region to be explored presented navigational obstacles enroute to the agriculturally rich lands of the Red River settlement and the Prairies. Characterized by a complex network of lakes, swamps, muskeg and Canadian Shield, the territory appeared inhospitable and resistant to anticipatory imaginaries which were “based on the perceived possibility of ultimately transforming existing environmental conditions” into the familiar and productive geographies required by colonialism and global capitalism (Veracini 2010:182). In this period, the political impetus for charting and mapping the territory revolved around right-of-way rather than occupation and settlement. The colonial government had not yet fully begun to imagine the area into the nation; to stake its proprietorial and tenurial claims to the region but rather imagined beyond and through it to the productive potentials of the Red River Settlement and the Prairies.

In seeking a route through the territory, expeditions simultaneously amassed astronomical, meteorological and geological data, and described the country, its fauna and flora, its Indigenous inhabitants and its "capabilities" for settlement and transportation (Dawson 1859; Hind 1860). Expedition members sought to produce knowledge about the territory in specific ways and in minute detail; to know its species of trees, its minerals, the lengths and features of its waterways, and critically, the demographics, ‘habits’ and ‘proclivities’ of its Indigenous peoples (Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1858:5). Rendering the territory and its Indigenous inhabitants legible to the colonial gaze through a variety of technologies and knowledges was a means of claiming, organizing and managing space and those contained within it (A. Simpson 2014:67). The techniques and knowledges the expedition utilized produced spatial conceptions that facilitated these strategies of governance and technologies of rule. Through the mapping and delineation of the territory it was brought into the purview, imaginary and tenuous space of the emergent Canadian nation. Likewise, its circumscribed productions of Indigeneity erased Anishinaabeg political orders and negated Indigenous sovereignty. Through the lens of the expedition, its racist ideologies and the disciplinary and technical knowledges it employed, we can see

how the processes of charting, mapping and cataloguing were critical tools of colonial governance. Expeditions produced both geographic and anthropological accounts, that mapped and organized space and the relations within it. These accounts conjured a vision of the territory for colonial publics and represented the settler's place within it as conqueror and harbinger of civilization. Anishinaabeg recognized the prophetic presence of the expeditions and the implications of these mappings and categorizations. In 1857, a representative of the Rainy River Anishinaabeg cut to the heart of the expedition's (and colonialism's) mappings and objectives stating that "the white man looks at our flowers and trees and takes away the Indian's land" (Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1858:46). On Turtle Island expeditions, mapping and knowing were always tied to dispossession.

In searching for the most efficient route to the Red River, Dawson (1859) surveyed and plotted a number of lakes and rivers that he argued could be linked together to form a route through the territory. In order to make the route viable, Dawson called for a series of roads, locks and dams that would increase its navigable sections and allow for the large-scale transport of a burgeoning amount of settlers and goods. In particular, at the mouth of the Seine River on Lac des Mille Lacs at a site called Little Falls, he called for a dam of forty-two feet to raise the water levels and ameliorate the necessity of costly and inefficient portages stating that the water could be made navigable by "means of dams of the simplest construction thrown across the river" (Dawson 1858:28). However, the work was not started until a decade later in 1868 with Dawson as chief engineer. The 1869 Red River Rebellion compelled a sense of urgency to complete the project. After Louis Riel's execution of Thomas Scott, the government commissioned a military expedition of over a thousand men led by Colonel Garnet Wolseley to march to Red River to occupy the settlement and quell the uprising (Gibson 2015:281). The expedition itself was a logistical feat, often heralded by military historians as one of the greatest logistical achievements in the history of the Canadian military as Wolseley would have to march his men across over one thousand kilometres to the Settlement. Dawson was to have the project completed by May of 1870 but setbacks led to

Wolseley's force having to participate in the construction of infrastructure including roads, locks and dams before marching onto Fort Garry on August 24 1870 (Harman 1896).

Development continued after the expedition and in 1872, a stone dam was constructed across the mouth of the Seine River at Lac des Mille Lacs, flooding enormous tracts of land and beginning a process of slow violence for the community of Lac des Mille Lacs (Lovisek 1994; Adler 2010). Reports claim that the dam may have raised the water levels on Lac des Mille Lacs by as much as nine feet (Adler 2010:68; Lovisek 1996:130). However, the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the availability of an American route and the convoluted and inefficient nature of the route meant that it was quickly rendered obsolete (Adler 2010). As early as 1870, Indian Agent Wemyss Simpson claimed that "I think that the route as a means of communication with Red River will never be used" (Daugherty 1986:9). Yet, the effects of the Dawson Route and the expeditions continue to resonate within and beyond the community of Lac des Mille Lacs to this day as the environmental degradation due to flooding and watershed changes, when coupled with assimilative or eliminatory colonial policies served to displace communities from their lands and territorialize the region according to the imaginings and expectations of colonial power.

Changes in colonial policy and imaginings shifted rapidly after the construction of the dam. Treaty negotiations were opened in 1870 to protect the right-of-way along the Dawson Route (Mainville 2007). However, by the time Treaty 3 was signed in 1873 it had transformed into a comprehensive cede-and-surrender agreement, at least in the eyes of the colonial government.¹ So, how had the orientations of the settler state shifted from negotiations over transit and right-of-way to expansive proprietary claims to

¹Interpretations on the meanings of Treaty differ between colonial cede-and-surrender interpretations and Anishinaabeg understandings of peace-and-friendship (see Mainville 2007; Stark 2010; Stark 2012; Luby 2010).

exclusive sovereignty? Telford (1996:196) argues that the shift from viewing Treaty 3 as an obstacle to be traversed to a potential site of settlement was initiated in part by the discovery of minerals and resources, “this factor largely accounts for the change in policy. Right-of-way was no longer satisfactory; the dominion wanted to claim the mineral wealth of the area.” As the productive possibilities of land further west began to be more intensively exploited and these territories began to ‘fill up,’ settlers began to prepare the lands and waters of Treaty 3 for settlement through a reorientation in its politics and practices. This shift in political strategy also meant an expectant spatial reorientation, as the relatively fertile lands of the Rainy River Clay Plain became coveted and a geography of removal initiated. The anticipatory geographies that the expeditions had heralded were becoming real. As practices moved from franchise to settler colonialism, government and its actors would no longer wait for the expected yet, tragic disappearance of Indigenous nations. They would instead, press the issue.

With this brief narration of the historical context of Treaty 3 in hand, we can pose a number of questions about the expeditions and this nascent period of exploration. What can the expeditions tell us about the spatial imaginaries of settler colonialism? What did they signify? How did these productions enact and set the stage for further Indigenous dispossession? What the expeditions tell us in their cultural productions of territory and Indigeneity help us to understand how dispossession functioned during this period and beyond.

(Un)Productive Landscapes: ‘Barren Wastelands’ and ‘Gardens of Fertility’

In commissioning the expedition, the state had imagined beyond Northwestern Ontario towards the Red River Settlement. These two regions were understood through cultural and economic lenses that viewed and valued them very differently. Capitalism requires the accumulation and development of specific means of production. It requires productivity, and the means for achieving productivity. On Turtle Island, in the lands that would be developed into the ‘breadbasket’ of two settler nations, development was focused on the productive potential of agriculture. This emphasis was both economic

and cultural, having to do with both the circulations and market demands of global capitalism and the cultural value placed into specific land use practices and modes of organizing labour and economics. On Turtle Island, agriculture was the culturally and economically valued means of production. This meant that colonial actors placed high value in lands amenable to the demands of large-scale agriculture. Capitalism sought 'idle' or 'undeveloped' lands to transform and render productive. Lands that were deemed to be unsuitable to such transformations elicited not only economic but, cultural aversions. These wastelands, swamps, bogs and marshes were coded as atavistic, dangerous, even repulsive in their inability to be transformed from a state of unproductivity to productivity; from wilderness to civilization (Di Palma 2014:5). The nature/culture or wilderness/civilization divides are structuring dualisms and metanarratives within Western thought (Plumwood 1993). If capitalism revolved around notions of productivity, the well-worn yet, elusive concept of wilderness was fundamental to colonialism. Colonialism viewed Turtle Island as a wilderness, untouched lands and waters to be transformed through the generative power of settler labour into sites of occupation, settlement and property. Within colonial wilderness ideologies, the land itself calls out for such a Manifest Destiny. As Jessica Cattelino (2015:241) argues, wilderness ideologies find particular purchase in settler colonial societies because they facilitate the erasure of troubling Indigenous sovereignties. Constructing land as wilderness negates prior occupancies and holds out the potential for settlers to indigenize themselves and claim territory through Lockean notions of ownership and property through labour.

Discourses of the wilderness and 'wastelands' characterized and structured colonial understandings of Treaty 3 (Di Palma 2014). Dawson described it as "a wilderness, as yet in a state of nature" (1868:21). Yet, it was framed as an immutable wilderness, one whose characteristics, its unsuitability for transformation into the familiar and productive geographies demanded by global capitalism meant that it represented no value and was perceived as an obstacle to be surmounted. It was not only unproductive or idle but waste. Seen through a capitalist and Eurocentric perspective of appropriate and productive land use and tenure that valued agriculture, the landscape of Treaty 3,

dominated by rocky Canadian shield, swamps and bogs was positioned as a “a barren and desolate waste”; an unproductive, recessive and atavistic space characterized by “a poverty of soil” (Huyshe 1871:104; Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1858:53). It was produced as deficient, lacking, trapped implacably in the unproductive state of nature. Wolseley described the territory as “a dreary region— unfit, from its sterile barrenness, for man's habitation” (1871:278). His disgust at the deficiency of the territory and its inappropriateness for agriculture is made clear when he states “when it was necessary to pitch tents, we seldom found enough soil for the pegs to support them” (1871:278). This understanding of deficiency extended to its inhabitants. When expedition geologist Henry Youle Hind (1860:212) described the territory as “a rocky wilderness, almost destitute of civilized inhabitants, and throughout a considerable part of its area not, susceptible of cultivation” he was drawing connections and making culturally-informed value judgements about the land, and by extension, the Anishinaabeg who occupy it. Anishinaabeg land was understood as unproductive; dead, both through the deficiencies of Anishinaabeg in cultivating it, but also in its own intrinsic deficiencies. In colonial representations, land and Indigeneity were tied together through their deficiencies. We will see later how land use practices and associations with agriculture were also involved in the making and unmaking of Indigenous subjects and colonial citizens, in how culturally-produced understandings of the wilderness served to code Anishinaabeg as ‘wild’; outside of the category of the human.

In contrast to these representations of lack, deficiency and ‘waste’, the Red River Settlement and the Prairies beyond were looked upon with a kind of utopic fervor, for the verdant possibilities of their agriculturally rich lands; easily transformable into the geographies that colonialism and global capitalism demanded. Hind was hyperbolic in his descriptions stating that “of the valley of Red River I find it impossible to speak in any other terms than those which may express astonishment and admiration,” and going so far as to call it, “a paradise of fertility” (Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1858: 6-7). Expedition leader George Gladman also praised the country and “its immense capabilities” (Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1858:54). In his narrative of the Red River Military expedition, Dawson’s description mixes

hyperbole with the language of conquest stating that “as the Expeditionary force went on, the soldiers knew that they were taking part in a movement to become historical, that they were, in fact, carrying the sceptre of their Queen to a land of sunshine and fertility, and of proportions so vast that it might hold the half of Europe in its lap” (Dawson 1871:32). We can see here how colonial peripheries were tied together, as Dawson’s narration of the hinterlands and their possibilities form the economic and metaphoric foundations for empire. In the period of the expeditions, the differences in colonial understanding between the regions was stark and sharply delineated.

These cultural understandings of productive space meant that right-of-way rather than settlement and occupation was the primary concern of the expeditions. The settler state’s territorial imaginaries were oriented towards and settled on the landscapes of the Red River and the Prairies and their productive possibilities; an expectant and anticipatory orientation. Through imperial eyes, Treaty 3 was a landscape of obstruction and stories of its inhospitability circulated and proliferated. Dawson (1871:29) described “the barren and forbidding aspect” of the region and further described it as “a wilderness which afforded nothing in itself” (1871:13). Hind characterized it as hopelessly barren and argued that “the Country as a whole must be regarded as a sterile waste, offering no inducements for settlement” (Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1858:139). In the quest for colonial expansion, the territory of Northwestern Ontario presented an obstacle; a problematic geography, what Indian Agent and Treaty Commissioner Wemyss Simpson described as “a most serious bar to the settlement of the northwest” (Daugherty 1986:6). The topography of Treaty 3 obstructed the anticipatory geographies of colonialism, and as such, its agents imagined beyond and through it to the Red River Settlement. The expeditions were tasked with solving the logistical problems of transit and were characterized by a spatial orientation of elsewhere, fixated on the Red River. This orientation compelled an understanding of space as abstract and interchangeable. Colonel Wolseley of the Red River Military Expedition described the territory as ‘dreary’ and claimed that it had no “striking features, nothing to differentiate it from thousands of other places across Canada” (1871:276). Space in Treaty 3 was conceptualized as fungible, externalized and abstract. What mattered

was circulation and transit; the methods and techniques for traversing space. In a statement that foreshadows the spatial relations of dominance and mastery that dams would inaugurate, Bruce Littlejohn argues that the “general function of the Dawson Route was to “conquer the "canoe country" of the Precambrian Shield between Thunder Bay and Fort Garry” (1967:32). This conquering was to be effected through mapping and categorizing but also through the technologies and techniques of logistics and infrastructure.

Infrastructure, Settler Precarity and Anishinaabeg Sovereignty

The expeditions and their success were tied to a recognition of the importance of infrastructure in both imagining and physically constructing the nation. Infrastructure became the means to ‘conquer the canoe country’ of Treaty 3 and imagine the fertile Red River into the conceptual space of the nation. If earlier expeditions had been concerned with mapping a route through the territory, in the 1860’s Dawson was tasked with dealing with the logistics of circulation and transit. This necessitated the development and construction of infrastructure. Infrastructure was an important site in the construction of the settler nation and subjectivity. It was critical to colonialism’s territorial imaginings and a site through which it sought to extend its terrains and assert and perform its jurisdiction (Cowen 2018). The recognition of the importance of infrastructure to secure transit through the ‘barren’ and ‘unproductive’ lands of Treaty 3 in order to expand the territorialities of the nation, triggered a host of colonial anxieties as the spatial vulnerabilities of infrastructure became clear.

A number of colonial bureaucrats and agents worried over and explicated on infrastructure as dangerous points of weakness, sites which could be targeted to disrupt colonial expansionism and resource extraction. Expedition leader George Gladman notes of the Anishinaabeg, “that it is in their power to interrupt any chain of communication that may be formed, cannot be doubted” (Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1858:73). The expedition reports illustrate these anxieties around infrastructure as well as Anishinaabeg sovereignty and evidence the discursive strategies already being developed to deal with

the problematics of Anishinaabeg jurisdiction, sovereignty and presence. Dawson (1868:27) warns of the strength of the Anishinaabeg nations of the territory, particularly on the Rainy River Plain due to the carrying capacity and mobility afforded by abundant sturgeon, *manoomin* and an extensive network of rivers and lakes utilized as transportation corridors. In his report, Dawson notes that around Rainy River and Fort Frances, Anishinaabeg “collect in summer in larger numbers than Indians usually do, from the fact that they have abundance of food. This is afforded by the wild rice of the country which they collect, and by the fish which literally swarm in the lakes and rivers; some industry practised on their own part, too, in raising Indian corn, serves to supply them to a small extent” (Dawson 1868: 27). As Colonel Wolseley explained, “they might cause endless trouble and great loss to any military force seeking to push its way through the country without their permission” (1871: 232). This resource wealth and carrying capacity convinced Dawson to argue that Anishinaabeg would “be formidable if inclined to be troublesome” (Dawson 1859: 26). The troublesome Indian, the Indian problem, or the inconvenient Indian, are consistent tropes in settler discourse and illustrate colonial anxieties around the precarity of settler claims to sovereignty and legitimacy (King 2013).

Acknowledging the strength and numbers of the Anishinaabeg and motivated by colonial anxieties around threats to settler sovereignty, Dawson (1859:27) called for stationing a military force at Fort Frances in order to produce a dissuasive ‘moral effect’ and to “have a controlling power at hand” (1859:27). This ‘moral effect’ is the veiled yet, regulatory invocation of violence that Cole Harris (2004) has argued was likewise employed on the coast of British Columbia. As Harris explains “officials considered such power ‘a grand persuasive’” (2004:169). When colonial sovereignty was challenged or seen as unstable the use of force or the threat of violence could serve to produce the mirage of stability, legitimacy and jurisdiction. In the same report that Dawson outlines his promises of peace and friendship to the Anishinaabeg and intentions to sign treaty, he is simultaneously planning ways to regulate, control and dominate the relationship between Anishinaabeg and settlers (1859:27). Yet, the very need for a

grand persuasive illustrates that colonial sovereignty was seen as vulnerable, unstable and in need of buttressing.

3.2 The Invention of the 'Savage': The Construction of Colonialism's Others

If colonial expeditions represented the land of Treaty 3 as waste, in an interconnected process, they likewise produced Anishinaabeg as inferior and deficient, particularly through reference to their land tenure and use. In conjunction with their geographic mappings, the expeditions also produced narrative mappings and anthropological representations of Indigeneity through the Anishinaabeg communities they encountered. These representations were thoroughly informed by the logics of White supremacy and produced dehumanized images of Anishinaabeg. Hunt argues that “colonialism relies on the widespread dehumanization of all Indigenous people” to justify settler projects and naturalize colonial violence (2013b). This dehumanization is colonialism’s foundational violence, structural and integral to all of its expressions (Hunt, Holmes and Piedalue 2015:541).

In the expedition reports, dehumanization took many forms but was most often refracted through the cultural representation of the ‘savage’. The invention of the ‘savage’ is a form of Orientalist discourse with permutations particular to Turtle Island (Said 2003). It has been a persistent and enduring representational strategy of colonialism. While the trope of the savage is an impossibly overburdened colonial concept, we can note a number of its primary features. Constructions of the savage relied on scientific racism and colonial ideologies of superiority to produce civilization’s Other. Features of Indigenous life were misrepresented and exaggerated to produce Indigeneity as a radical alterity; to construct and patrol the boundary between colonial self and Indigenous other, savagery and civilization (Plumwood 1993). Indigenous tenurial systems, socialities, and sexualities were misrepresented and mobilized to produce this alterity against which civilization could be measured. These representations constructed Indigeneity as “normatively deficient and culturally, politically, and morally inferior” (Hunt 2014a:69). This image was an ideological concept mobilized towards political and territorial gains.

Excising Anishinaabeg from the category of the human, likewise excised them from the legal category of the citizen with territorial, proprietary or sovereign rights. These representations would figure prominently in the rulings of the St. Catherine's Milling's decision that legislated the negation of Indigenous title. As Hunt argues "in order to imagine the lands of Turtle Island, and other parts of the world, as available for settlement, they needed to first be cleared of any legal 'owners'. Religious and racial ideologies were utilized in creating ideas of European Christians as fundamentally different from Indigenous peoples, who were imagined as unable to formulate their own legal orders" (2014a:67). Dehumanization and the trope of the 'savage', produced *terra nullius*, justified dispossession and provided the legal foundations for the settler state (McAdams 2013; Newcomb 2008; Williams Jr. 1990). The utility of this cultural construction has been enduring and continues to structure Indigenous/settler relations to this day. Understanding productions of the savage as an epistemic violence allows us to see that these representations are not born of colonial ignorance but rather assist in facilitating colonialism's stated goals: the seizure and occupation of Indigenous land.

Ideas of the savage were pervasive and structured how colonial agents encountered both Anishinaabeg and the landscape of Treaty 3. As Cole Harris argues, in settler colonies "hardly a white person questioned the distinction between civilization and savagery or the association of the former with Europeans and the latter with native people" (2004:170). These representations were also reproduced and buttressed in the expedition narratives. Dawson, while putatively a champion of Indigenous Treaty rights, reproduced narrative representations of Anishinaabeg which essentialized them as biologically and culturally inferior and in need of the civilizing influence and disciplinary regimes of colonial power. In his 1868 report, he offers a flattening articulation of the logics of White supremacy and colonialism stating that "these Indians, notwithstanding their many good qualities, are still but savages", that is, morally and culturally deficient when juxtaposed with the colonial subject (1868:29). In this deterministic representation, Anishinaabeg are biologically or culturally encumbered with inferiority. It is intrinsic to the nature of Anishinaabeg subjectivity, regardless of whatever other qualities they may possess.

Dawson's invocation of the savage signals an inferiority and a demand for intervention, remediation and colonial governance. The inferiority of Anishinaabeg is further evidenced in Dawson's claim that "in dealing with them, therefore, it must be borne in mind that they are still the same barbarians that they ever were, and that, although they are perhaps among the most intelligent of the Indian tribes, and have many good traits of character, they are uncertain in disposition, and like all savages, ready to resort to violence on but slight provocation" (Gladman, Dawson and Hind 1858:119). Dawson repeatedly remarks on this 'natural ferocity' of Anishinaabeg, "they, in common with all the untutored tribes of their race, are keen to resent an injury, real or supposed... the sole arbiters of dispute with them are the scalping knife and the tomahawk" (Dawson 1859:29). These statements code Anishinaabeg as intrinsically violent and cast inferiority as biological, that is, natural, and in need of management and 'tutoring'. This evokes a whole host of colonial strategies to 'tutor' Indigenous nations with the Indian Residential School system, one of its most devastating tactics and would arise again in the rulings of the St Catherine's Milling case.

Dehumanization also entailed a negation of Anishinaabeg as agentive and geographic subjects (McKittrick 2008). The expedition reports are full of representations portraying Anishinaabeg as 'simple-minded,' 'childish' or 'improvident' (Wolseley 1871:258). These representations were predicated on White supremacy and evidenced a strong paternalism, which infantilized and de-agentivized Anishinaabeg. Wolseley's statement that Anishinaabeg "are very improvident, and cannot be induced to lay by provisions in case of want, so that a winter seldom passes that some do not die from starvation" finds echoes in Huyshe's claim that "the men are too lazy even to fish, until hunger compels them to do so" (Wolseley 1871:231; Huyshe 1871:147). These statements have clear repercussions in that their paternalism and negation of Anishinaabeg as agentive subjects legitimized colonial interventions, governance strategies and assimilatory processes as benevolent, indeed, necessary (Wolseley 231-232). Producing Anishinaabeg as helpless and deficient justified the 'improvement strategies' that were so intrinsic to colonialism and development (Baviskar 2003). These representations lay the groundwork for

larger narratives of a ‘benevolent colonialism’ which justified disciplinary management strategies to achieve assimilation through paternalistic references to Indigenous communities constructed inferiorities.

This negation of agency and personhood had material and political consequences in that it obviated the violence of development, displacement and dispossession. Dehumanization and desubjectification was a means of naturalizing the violence of colonial interventions into Anishinaabeg lives. Anishinaabeg could not have their lands taken from them as they held no sovereignty, they could not have their political identities stolen as they had been desubjectified, even their lives were ‘ungrievable’ as they had been discursively vacated from the category of the human (Butler 2009). Taken together these dehumanizing discourses produce an ‘unsubject’ against whom the very notion of violence is unimaginable. Such representations erase and foreclose the possibility of reading development and displacement as violence. From within colonial formulations Anishinaabeg cannot be dispossessed because they have nothing to possess in the first place, their lands, their waters, their nationhood, their sovereignty and even, their very lives and personhood are systematically devalued in ways intended to disallow settler societies from seeing the genocidal project of colonialism as anything more than a depoliticized development or natural progress. As we will see, while desubjectification and dehumanization had multiple and sometimes contradictory effects, they always remained oriented towards and furthered Indigenous dispossession

Imagining Anishinaabeg Out-of-Place: Discursive Removals and Terra Nullius

The anxieties that gesture towards the precarious nature of settler sovereignty and control in the face of Anishinaabeg presence are placed into stark relief with the simultaneous ways that colonial agents discursively erased Anishinaabeg or imagined them out-of-place through the dehumanizing logics of *terra nullius* (McAdams 2015). During his work constructing infrastructure in 1868, Dawson described the territory as both ‘uninhabited’ and ‘unfrequented’ while geologist and expedition leader Hind was convinced that “the number of Indians inhabiting Rupert’s Land has been considerably overrated”

(1860:149). These are confusing and incongruous statements when contrasted with their descriptions of the territory as threateningly populated by Anishinaabeg (Dawson 1858:27). The paradoxical construction of Indigeneity as simultaneously hypervisible and invisible is a common structuring trope in settler discourse. Such accounts mobilize the racial logics of White supremacy to represent Anishinaabeg through the well-worn tropes of ‘savagery’ rendering them hypervisible to the disciplining and regulatory gaze of the settler state through discourses which criminalize, surveil, and pathologize Indigenous communities (Stark 2016). These patrolling discourses frame Indigenous sovereignties and bodies as menaces, threatening to overrun and contaminate the settler nation, a discursive trope familiar today in the xenophobic and isolationist rhetorics of closed borders. It is this trope that is mobilized in Dawson’s anxious comments about the unusually populous congregation of Anishinaabeg on the Rainy River plain. Colonial anxieties around infrastructure were simultaneously anxieties around settler sovereignties and jurisdiction. As we have seen, the Canadian nation and its jurisdictions were constructed and materialized through infrastructure (Cowen 2018). Any attacks or potential attacks on infrastructure were seen as unsettling challenges to settler sovereignty and jurisdiction themselves. Potentially threatening infrastructure and thus, settler jurisdiction, Anishinaabeg are coded as hypervisible perils to settler nations and colonial projects.

The other side of the hypervisible/invisible dualism is the systematic and forcible erasure of Anishinaabeg presence through dehumanizing and desubjectifying discourses. Anishinaabeg are either painted as physically not present, disappearing before the encroachment of White civilization, or through the racist logics of White supremacy absent as subjects of any consequence, produced through epistemic violence as an ‘unsubject’ (McKittrick 2006). For colonial power, the unsettling problematics of Indigenous sovereignty are addressed through epistemic and discursive violence, systemic neglect, denial of Indigenous sovereignty, presence, history or even, humanity, that forcibly place Anishinaabeg under erasure. The expedition reports then were part of a colonial production of space in which Anishinaabeg are conjured as threatening Others to buttress and justify the necessity of ongoing (militarized) settlement

while simultaneously being discursively vacated from their own lands through dehumanizing representations and narrations that relied on the production of alterity through features such as appropriate land use. These are the tropes and malleable logics that allow Dawson and Wolseley to narrativize space in Treaty 3 as both populated by a ‘numerous’ or ‘formidable number’ of Anishinaabeg and simultaneously ‘uninhabited or ‘unfrequented’ (Dawson 1859; Dawson 1868:26; Wolseley 1871).

The logics that underwrite and explain such contradictory statements are made clear in Wolseley’s reports when he makes the extraordinary antipodal claim (yet, rational from within the logics of White supremacy) that the territory is “uninhabited except by wandering tribes of Indians” (Wolseley 1871: 231) that is to say, not inhabited in any sense that colonial power or its agents could recognize. Likewise, Dawson (1859) claims that “not a trace of civilization is anywhere visible, but the Indians are numerous”. Here, we see the dehumanization that Hunt, Holmes and Piedalue (2015:541) described as the “fundamental violence of colonialism”; the desubjectifying logics of colonialism laid bare, as Anishinaabeg are robbed of their very personhood through such narrations which rely on the racist logics of social evolutionism and stadial theories. As Brenna Bhandar argues, “the sovereignty of indigenous nations was vitiated by a colonial vision of that space as lacking in civilized inhabitants and thus, ripe for appropriation (2018: 3-4). Anishinaabeg were “lacking the requisite cultural practices, habits of thought and economic organization to be considered sovereign” (Bhandar 2018:3). To this conception we could add that this illegibility allowed not only the negation of Indigenous sovereignty but also, personhood. The racial logics that structure colonialism foreclosed the possibilities of viewing the territory as inhabited in any recognizable sense, they pushed Anishinaabeg outside the boundaries of civilization; outside the very boundaries of the human. These productions of course, had political utility. Dehumanizing discourses and the attendant tropes of *terra nullius* are a means of vacating space of Indigenous presence in order to lay settler claims to it. It is these logics that allow colonial agents to portray the territory as simultaneously populous, yet uninhabited.

‘An Incubus on the Territory’: Land Use, Stadial Theory and the Production of the Subject

Colonial representations often made their claims of Indigenous deficiency through reference to their land tenure and use. Colonialism was structured by the deeply racist logics of social Darwinism and stadial theories of human development which attached hierarchical values to disparate practices of land use, tenure and occupancy with Eurocentric ideas about the primacy of agriculture and its associated values of sedentarism and heteronormative socialities ascendant (Banivanua-Mar and Edmonds 2010). These logics regulated and defined ‘appropriate’ land use. The development of large-scale and intensive agriculture and regimes of private property were seen to signal civilization and to construct the liberal subject through forms of possessive individualism. Other forms of political organization such as decentralized governance, communal forms of ownership and deficient land use and economic practices, like Anishinaabeg strategies of hunting, fishing, harvesting and permaculture were devalued and seen to represent lower stages of social evolution.

Thus, Harris argues that in encountering new lands, settlers produced for themselves circumscribed geographies wherein “most of the land was waste, or, where native people were obviously using it, that their uses were inadequate (2004:172). Anishinaabeg land uses and economies were either devalued or invisibilized. For instance, the harvesting of *manoomin*, which involved practices of tending rather than intensive or monocultured forms of agriculture was devalued. Through the Eurocentric eyes of colonial agents, it wasn’t agriculture at all (Kinew 1995). On meeting Anishinaabeg while travelling through Fort Frances on the British North American Exploring Expedition, Captain John Palliser evidenced these racist assumptions noting that he pointed out to them “the advantages of agriculture and fixed habitations over their mode of life with the chase as their sole dependence and told them how provident foresight is the main reason for the more comfortable circumstance of the white man” (Palliser 1863: 33). Europeans’ association with agriculture and cultural emphasis on a possessive individualism is explicitly referenced here as the impetus for their racial superiority.

Property regimes and land use were intimately tied to citizenship and the construction of the liberal subject (Bhandar 2018). Through the perceived inability to pursue and develop ‘appropriate’ and

‘progressive’ tenurial systems Anishinaabeg were dehumanized and cast out of the category of the rational, liberal subject. By not mixing their labour with land in what Veracini describes as the ‘title-generating spell’ of private property in ways recognizable to colonial authorities, they were vacated from the category of the subject and had their sovereignty, rights and title discursively annulled (2015:58). Cultivating land mattered for colonial actors, it conveyed sovereignty, and sovereignty was tied up in the construction of the subject. These representations would lay the groundwork for the legal annulment of title that would follow years later in the St. Catherine’s Milling’s decision.

Expeditions then were involved in producing representations that vituperated Anishinaabeg land use practices in ways that vacated them from the category of the subject. The fact that Anishinaabeg would, as the provincial Minister of Lands argued, “never cultivate the land to any extent” served as the basis for justifying Indigenous dispossession once colonial authorities set their sights on occupying and settling the lands of Northwestern Ontario (Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm 1996:345). Colonial narratives produced Anishinaabeg as ‘backwards,’ not oriented towards civilization and modernity, facing the wrong way in the progressive linear stages of stadial theory. Anishinaabeg tenurial systems and their perceived unproductivity led authorities to position Anishinaabeg presence as a burden, an obstacle to development and settlement. Ontario’s Provincial Treasurer described Anishinaabeg nations as “an incubus on the territory”; that is, unproductive. These representations would be politically useful as the territorial gaze of the settler state shifted back towards Treaty 3 in the early 1900’s (Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm 1996: 339). These discourses obviously had racist underpinnings and political objectives, to justify the ‘legal’ seizure of land, but it is worth pointing out that this was based on the colonial assumption that Anishinaabeg did not farm when the historical record is full of references to Anishinaabeg practices of agriculture (Holzkamm and Waisberg 1993). Kathi Avery Kinew points out that contrary to colonial beliefs the harvesting of *manoomin* was a complex and highly organized practice (1995:53). Colonial agents then remained either willfully ignorant or unable to reconcile the complexity and sophistication of Anishinaabeg agriculture with their circumscribed constructions of Indigeneity.

Kathi Avery Kinew makes explicit the colonial connections between land use practices and cultural discourses of inferiority, “it is the wildness of wild rice that connotes the wildness of the Indian and the areas where it grows. It is as difficult for non-Indians to see wild rice as a cultivated, managed crop in the northern wilderness, as it is for them to believe the Anishinaabeg developed the science, technology and governance of *manomin*” (Kinew 1995:53). Anishinaabeg are collapsed into the natural landscape through their associations with improper land use and tenure. The perceived wildness of *manomin* serves to paint Anishinaabeg with the same brush. It was as difficult for colonial agents to see the land of Treaty 3 as productive, as it was for them to see Anishinaabeg as properly human. Rice is wild because Anishinaabeg cultivate it, but likewise Anishinaabeg are coded as wild through their association with ‘deficient’ resources and land uses. Emphasizing differences (or assumed differences) in land use and tenure was a means through which colonial subjects constructed alterity, patrolled its boundaries and differentiated themselves as possessed (and possessive) rational liberal subjects in contradistinction to Indigenous peoples constructed as their polar opposites (Plumwood 1993). The dehumanizing of Anishinaabeg and the devaluing of their tenurial systems as unproductive were critical to naturalizing violent dispossession and displacement as ‘progress’. As Amita Baviskar notes developmentalist discourses were predicated on constructions of cultural difference (and assumed inferiority) that justified the schemes and strategies of improvement. The expedition carried these expectations, values and imaginaries with them into the lands and waters west of Lake Superior.

Closing the Frontier

The period of exploration came to an end with the closing of the frontier signaled by the signing of Treaty 3 in 1873 and through the extension of military might and infrastructural domain achieved through the Red River Military Expedition. It is no surprise that the period closes with a military intervention. This final expedition signaled the territory’s incorporation into the jurisdictional and policeable spaces of the nation. The extension of military might through infrastructure is one of the ways that the Red River Settlement and Treaty 3 were brought into the imaginings of a settler nation. As

capitalism always seeks new markets, and colonialism new territories, the connecting of Red River to the rest of Canada meant that a reorientation towards Treaty 3 was inevitable. The closing of one frontier, is always the opening of another and Treaty 3 would be the territory across which development advanced in the coming years.

We can draw a few things out of this history of the era of exploration that will help us to understand the links between development, dehumanization and dispossession. First, during this period of exploration, the vital importance of infrastructure to settler life and its imaginative and territorial projects was established. Secondly, the lands and waters of Treaty 3 were discursively produced as waste, unproductive and unvalued. Finally, a process of dehumanization was initiated that abjected Anishinaabeg through racist references to their land use, socialities and even their very biology. Taken together, these constructions motivated and justified the displacements effected through development. As we shall see, the reterritorialization of Treaty 3 that occurred during the next period foundationally relied on the construction, representations and mappings of this period of expeditions and exploration.

Chapter 4

((((((((((((Erasure))))))))))

1873-1905, The St. Catherine's Milling's Decision: Producing Terra Nullius

A number of events occurred towards the end of the period of exploration that would have consequences for the development of infrastructure, the production of colonial space and the materialization of Indigenous dispossession. In 1867, Canada was confederated under the British North America Act, resulting (amongst other things) in the formation of the province of Ontario. Confederation led to an interior reorganizing of the nation's jurisdictional boundaries that continued to reverberate over the next two decades. Disputes over the internal borders of the new nation-state, arose between Manitoba and Ontario, leading to a case coming before the Privy Council to rule on the official provincial boundaries in 1883. In 1884 the Council handed down a decision supporting Ontario's claims extending its boundaries beyond the Western edge of Lake Superior.

During the same period, the Rupert's Land Act in 1868 extinguished the HBC's charter and its claims to the territories officially transferring Rupert's Land to the Dominion of Canada in 1870. However, this would also result in jurisdictional disputes between the federal government and the Province of Ontario (Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm 1996). In 1873, after three years of negotiations, Treaty 3 was signed, establishing a nation-to-nation relationship between the Crown and 28 signatory Anishinaabe First Nations (Mainville 2007). The Treaty was intended to guarantee peace-and-friendship and relationships of respect and reciprocity as well as the fishing, hunting and territorial rights of Anishinaabe nations (Stark 2010; Luby 2010). In conjunction with the Government of Canada, signatory nations were directed to survey and choose the lands to be designated for reserves (Adler 2010). While Treaty 3 was intended to be a compact that would last as long as the sun shines and the rivers flow, it was to become a point of contention and dispute between the federal and provincial governments as both parties attempted to mobilize it to pursue their own jurisdictional claims. Within the first decade of its

being signed, the spirit in which Anishinaabeg had entered into Treaty had been trammled with government neglecting its treaty obligations and “going back on its promises” (Luby 2010).

Finally, in 1876, the Indian Act was ratified legislating and regulating almost every aspect of Indigenous life, legally defining Indigenous peoples as ‘wards of the state’ and initiating the carceral geographies of the reserve system (Lawrence 2003; Milloy 2008). Like other colonial processes of the period the Indian Act inaugurated “territorial strategies to empty space of Indigenous tenure (Hunt 2014a:60). These processes also had hidden connections that would tie them together through the Canadian legal system and the histories of dispossession in Treaty 3.

In this chapter, I examine how these multiple histories converged and came together in 1885, when a landmark case came before the Ontario High Court of Justice. Intended to resolve a jurisdictional dispute between the province and the federal government, the St. Catherine’s Milling’s v. Regina decision had enormous impacts on Indigenous peoples throughout Canada but particularly, in Treaty 3 territory. The Ontario-Manitoba Boundary dispute had made clear the legal ambiguity and fungibility of many of the newly established provincial boundaries. Eager to further the territorial gains they had won in the Privy Council’s decision; the province took on the federal government directly through the case in an attempt to establish and assert its jurisdiction.

Situating Anishinaabeg Displacement in Context: A Policy of ‘Indian Removal’

Understanding the St. Catherine’s Milling case and its consequences for Treaty 3 communities is critical in establishing the mechanisms that facilitated dispossession and the context in which development took place. To make the point of colonialism’s comprehensive, intentional and willed effort toward dispossession, and to illustrate how flooding was only one of a set of accretive violences, displacement has to be seen in context with other colonial strategies for emptying the landscape of Anishinaabeg presence that enacted a de facto policy of ‘Indian removal’ (Dacey 1993; Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm 1996). To properly understand this process of removal, we need to employ a

systems-encompassing approach and contextualize it alongside a number of eliminatory strategies that were occurring simultaneously, from the ratification of the Indian Act in 1876, to the abrogation and annulment of Treaty 3 reserves and communities in 1915, and the forcible expulsions of Anishinaabeg communities after the establishment of Quetico Provincial Park in 1909 (Milloy 2008; Kulchyski 1994; McNabb 1999:90). Removal, displacement or dispossession are the imperatives of all of these processes. The Indian Act produced carceral geographies which confined Indigenous communities to small tracts of reserve land, opening up the rest of their territories for settlement (Hunt 2014a). Through policies like the pass system, Indigenous peoples were not allowed to leave the delineated space of the reserve without the express permission of an Indian Agent. Likewise, establishing conservation areas and parks like Quetico was used to dispossess and remove Indigenous communities and open their lands, if not to settlement, then to the increasingly economically important industries of recreation and tourism (McNabb 1999).

In this chapter, I focus on establishing how dehumanization links to the larger policy of removal by drawing connections between the St. Catherine's Milling's decision, the discourses and cultural productions of the expeditions, and the ways in which these two histories laid the foundations for development. The decision in certain ways, was about the legal standing and humanity of Indigenous peoples and their rights to title and thus, serves as a fertile ground to interrogate colonial understandings and productions of Indigeneity.

4.1 The St. Catherine Milling's Case: Territorial Strategies of Removal

Elaborating on the St. Catherine's Milling's decision, allows us to see removal as a comprehensive territorializing project and to situate development, flooding and displacement within it. The decision provides a striking example of how epistemic erasure and legal violence interact and illustrates clear policies of removal and dispossession. In constructing legal precedence that would shape colonial law, Indigenous communities and the settler state for the next 100 years, it relied on the discourses, cultural productions and representations of earlier periods. The encounter narratives of the

expeditions were part of this constellation of discursive formations and served to produce representations which justified and underwrote the ruling. The arguments forwarded in the case found consonance with the representations of Indigeneity contained within the expedition reports and exhibit a number of the same tropes. The processes of development, representation and displacement were interconnected and produced a colonial atmosphere wherein dispossession was normative and removal produced through differing, yet complementary settler policies.

The case revolved around competing jurisdictional claims between the provincial and federal governments. The limits of the boundary of Ontario had never been properly established and remained legally ambiguous after Confederation, the revocation of the Hudson's Bay Company's charter and the transfer of HBC lands that resulted in 1870. Both the province and the federal government laid claims to the jurisdiction of Northwestern Ontario. The federal government asserted its right to govern the lands through its legislative responsibility for "Indians, and lands reserved for Indians" under the British North America Act of 1867 (Hall 1991: 270). It held that its jurisdictional rights in the territory had been acquired through treaty with the Anishinaabeg, who they argued had held full title (albeit, alienable only to the sovereign authority of the Crown) prior to the signing of Treaty 3 (Kulchyski 1994:21). Ontario however, understood confederation as a "compact of sovereign provinces and argued provincial rights" (Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm 1996:340). They claimed that title inhered in the Crown *prior* to treaty and that Treaty 3 "served merely to extinguish any outstanding interest in the land" that Anishinaabeg possessed (Kulchyski 1994:21). In the province's view, prior to treaty, the land was *already* Crown land. The province held that the lands had been transferred to Ontario through the British North America Act of 1867 and thus, fell within their jurisdictional authority. The dispute dragged on for years with both sides looking for ways to assert their jurisdictional authority until a test case finally presented itself.

In 1883, the St. Catherine's Milling Company was granted a license to cut timber south of Wabigoon Lake in Treaty 3 territory by the federal government through its understandings of its

jurisdictional authority to the territory (Cottam 1991:247). Seeking to assert its own jurisdiction, the province brought a claim against the company contesting the authority of the federal government to grant such a license. The case came before the High Court of Justice for Ontario in 1885, with the Premier of Ontario, Oliver Mowat, acting as prosecutor (Ontario 1885). Ontario's argument rested on the disavowal of Indigenous title and Anishinaabe sovereignty (Harring 1998:236). It argued that Anishinaabeg held no title to cede to the federal government and therefore, title and jurisdiction must revert to Ontario as the administrator of Crown lands under the British North America Act. The province deployed racist rhetorics which made reference to Indigenous land use, moral inferiority, and questionable status as legal subjects to make its arguments and deny Indigenous title. Mowat argued "there is no Indian title at law or in equity. The claim of the Indians is simply moral and no more. They have no legal or equitable estate in the lands of Ontario" (Ontario 1885:199). This reasoning was based on the White supremacist and Eurocentric ideologies of stadial theory, social Darwinism, the doctrine of discovery and *terra nullius* that had found purchase and expression in the narratives of the expeditions. Indigenous peoples were represented as at a lower stage of social evolution, less-than-human and thus, not capable of sovereignty as colonial authorities would conceive it. The province's arguments in the case and subsequent appeals recurrently made reference to this constructed Indigenous inferiority, the deficiency of their legal and political orders and the inappropriateness of their tenurial and land use systems to justify their arguments.

By the time the case made it to the Supreme Court, the province had honed its arguments and provincial counsels, Walter Cassels and David Mills, who had engineered Mowat's arguments in the original case, followed similar tacks to dehumanize Anishinaabeg and legally produce *terra nullius* (Cottam 1991). Their arguments were based on how Anishinaabeg organized, governed themselves, and enacted sovereignty in ways that were either not visible or willfully ignored by colonial governments. Cassels and Mills argued that to defend Indigenous title the Crown "must assume that the Indians have a regular form of government, whereas nothing is more clear than that they have no government and no

organization, and cannot be regarded as a nation capable of holding lands.”² Cassels and Mills impinged upon Anishinaabeg political life but also their legal orders arguing “Indians had no rules or regulations which could be considered laws.”³ They forwarded the dubious statement that “the Crown had never recognized the aboriginal inhabitants of a country who were without any settled government as the proprietors of the soil” where the Royal Proclamation of 1763 had done just that.⁴ However, Mills and Cassels were attempting to spin the Proclamation admitting that it recognized occupancy but not proprietary ownership. These arguments found consonance in Dawson’s description of Anishinaabeg as having “a rude sort of government” (1868:27). The political and territorial motivations of Dawson’s narrative serve as a precursor and find their logical conclusion in Cassels and Mills’ arguments. The negation of title relied on earlier productions that vitiated claims to territory through references to Anishinaabeg moral and cultural deficiencies and inappropriate land uses (Bhandar 2018). The vacating of the legal subject is critical to the counsel’s argument negating Indigenous title. The utility of such an argument is plain, as it is the province itself which serves to benefit in the opening of lands and resources created by this negation of title. The narratives told through the expeditions contributed to discursive formations that inflicted epistemic violence and underwrote dispossession. Provincial counsel negated Anishinaabeg legal and political orders and with them the basis for Indigenous nationhood, sovereignty and any proprietary rights these might engender. By producing Anishinaabeg as less-than-human and in a state of abjection, Mowat, Cassels and Mills were able to argue that Indigenous title was usufructuary; an ill-defined right of occupation and this at the pleasure of the Crown, “Indians have only a right of occupancy, subject to a right to extinguish the same by conquest or purchase” (Ontario 1885:199) Treaty extinguished but could not transfer Anishinaabeg claims to the federal government as they were

²*St. Catherine’s Milling and Lumber Company v The Queen* [1887 CanLII 3](#), 13 SCR 577:596.

³ *Ibid*, 597.

⁴ *Ibid*, 596.

constituted as a lesser order (SCC: 1887:597).⁵ Treaty rights then were always a matter of policy; prudential and humane, but subject to the pleasures of the Crown (Privy Council 1888:44).

Legislating Abjection

In a ruling that would transform the shape of colonial law in regards to Indigenous title, the presiding judge, Chancellor Boyd, though not conversant in the legal doctrines of Indigenous title, not only agreed with Mowat's argument, but actually expanded on and developed the legal frameworks he had introduced (Harring 1991:134). In his ruling, Boyd concurred with the province that Indigenous nations had no right to title, only claims to occupancy, arguing that while signing treaties was prudential it did not signal a want of sufficient colonial title or infringe on the sovereignty of the Crown (Ontario 1885). Treaties were merely expedient. They did not indicate Indigenous title. Boyd made these arguments through the tacks familiarized in the narratives of the expeditions. He ruled that Indigenous "right of occupancy attached to the Indians in their tribal character" (Ontario 1885:209). This 'tribal character', as we have seen in the expedition reports, was established through misrepresentative references to the transience of Anishinaabeg nations, their moral and cultural deficiencies, inappropriate or 'backwards' land use practices and tenurial systems, proclivities towards violence and their political and economic organization. Invoking these representations allowed Boyd to justify the voiding of any sense of Indigenous title.

While averring that he had little knowledge of Anishinaabeg in Treaty 3, Boyd still to described them as "rude red men" in an "untaught and uncivilized condition" (Ontario 1885). In unsupported and sweeping generalizations, he frames Anishinaabeg as transient, 'nomadic' or 'wandering', to justify the negation of Indigenous title:

⁵*St Catherine's Milling and Lumber Company v The Queen* [1887 CanLII 3](#), 13 SCR 577:597.

Indian peoples were found scattered wide-cast over the Continent, having as a characteristic no fixed abodes, but moving as the exigencies of living demanded. As heathens and barbarians, it was not thought that they had any proprietary title to the soil. (Ontario 1885:206).

It was these characteristics which led Boyd to describe Anishinaabeg as a “more than usually degraded Indian type” (Ontario 1885:227). Knowingly or not, he invoked a form of social Darwinism and stadial theory that had also informed the expeditions’ interpretations. Anishinaabeg were framed as occupying a lower stage of civilization (“degraded”) and thus, humanity. Stadial theory and constructions of benevolent and paternalistic colonialism were also evident in Boyd’s claims that Indigenous nations were in a “transition from barbarism to civilization” that required the tutelage of settler nations so that they may be “trained up” to the level of civilization and White settler society (Ontario 1885:229). The stadial theories that had structured the ways in which expeditions viewed the world also found life in legal discourse in ways that would affect the material living conditions of Indigenous nations across Canada.

Boyd also followed the expeditions representations in coding Anishinaabeg land use as deficient, stating:

Indians could have acquired no proprietary interest in the vast tract of territory which they wandered over, and their right to the lands on which they hunted could not be considered as superior to that which is acquired to the sea by fishing in it; the use in the one case as in the other is not exclusive. According to every theory of property the Indians had no individual right to the land; nor had they any collectively, or in their national capacity, for the lands used by each tribe were not used by them in such manner as to prevent their being appropriated by settlers. (Privy Council 1888:44)

Again, we see the tying of rights, and legal subjecthood to appropriate land tenure and use in the phrase “not used by them in such a manner as to prevent their being appropriated”. Settlers’ claims, as proper and propertied rational and legal subjects, always supersede and take precedence over Indigenous sovereignties through their tenurial practices which transform land into property and subjects into (legal)

citizens. Property is the difference between a ‘ward of the state’ and a citizen. When Indigenous peoples were cast as incapable of holding property they were simultaneously cast out of the category of the human and vice versa. Without the Eurocentric features of sovereignty and property, colonial authorities could not fathom Indigenous title, partially because they could not fathom Indigenous humanity.

In his judgement before the Privy Council confirming Boyd’s ruling, J.A. Burton found the very notion of Indigenous title ridiculous, discursively diminishing their sovereignties through reference to population demographics, stadial theory and economic strategies. He argued that it would require a strong authority to induce a Court to come to the conclusion that the territory which was “supposed hitherto to belong to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, was owned by the small body of Indians, less than four thousand in number, who were roaming over it at large in their primitive state, and occupying it merely as hunting or fishing grounds”.⁶ Burton differentiates Indigenous and colonial sovereignty, “Indians' title was a mere occupancy for the purpose of hunting. It is not like our tenure, they have no idea of a title to the soil itself. It is over-run by them rather than inhabited”.⁷ This judgement makes clear the racist foundations and circumscribed narratives of Indigeneity on which the case’s decision was based and that colonial power told itself to justify settlement, occupation and its own sovereignties. Colonial production of Indigeneity served to vacate Anishinaabeg from the category of the legal or propertied subject thereby legally producing *terra nullius*. In the settler imaginary, colonial law and legal discourse produced the same outcomes as the travel writing of the expeditions: the vacating of Anishinaabeg from their territories. The decision codified this into the structures of colonial governance and buttressed it with the always-present threat of violence that underwrote colonial law.

4.2 Justifying Removal

⁶St. Catherine’s Milling and Lumber Company v The Queen (Ontario) [1888] UKPC 70:43.

⁷ Ibid.

These discourses then laid the legal foundations for settler sovereignty, justified colonial interventions into Indigenous life and codified Indigenous dispossession as normative. Arguing that Indigenous inferiority inhered in their inappropriate land use, forms of communal rather than private property and transience, Boyd outlined a paternalistic policy that justified removal as a benevolent form of colonialism. He argued that “the first step to the real improvement of the Indians is to gain them over from a wandering to a settled life, and for this purpose it is essential that they should have a sense of permanency in the locations assigned to them; that they should be attached to the soil by being taught to regard it as reserved for them and their children by the strongest securities” (Ontario 1885: 229). These interventions served as the justification for Indigenous removal and the carceral geographies of the reserve system.

In Boyd’s decision, the desire to displace or assimilate Anishinaabeg is made clear as the logic that underlies the negation of Indigenous title. In his judgment, Boyd relied on cases of American precedence which served to inscribe the discourses of manifest destiny into the foundations of Canadian law. Boyd cites decisions by Justice John Marshall of the United States which established the legal standing of Indigenous peoples as domestic dependent nations, and rulings in Canada which aligned with these legal doctrines. He quotes at length from a joint report prepared by the Department of Indian Affairs:

As the settlement of the country advanced, and the land was required for new occupants, or the predatory and revengeful habits of the Indians rendered their removal desirable, the British Government made successive agreements with them for the surrender of portions of their lands. If the Government had not made arrangements for the voluntary surrender of the lands, the white settlers would gradually have taken possession of them, without offering any compensation whatever; it would at that time have been as impossible to resist the natural laws of society and to guard the Indian territory against encroachment of the whites, as it would have been impolitic to have attempted to check the tide of emigration (Ontario 1885:212).

The report invokes many of settler colonialism's structuring tropes; its inexorability, its inevitability, its association with progress, with White might and White right. All of these concepts and discourses are invoked to justify a 'desirable removal'. Settler colonialism is inexorable and removal is in the best interest of settlers and Indigenous communities alike. As often as manifest destiny has been repudiated in the national narratives of Canada as a settler state, Boyd's ruling served to weave it into the social fabric of the Canadian settler nation. Such discourses also served to produce a vision of a benevolent colonialism in which dispossession is framed as humane. However, the violence of Boyd's ruling and the underlying logic and assimilative goals of colonization to erase, to upset and to undermine communities as distinct and coherent political entities are made clear when he claims that "the purposes of the reserve were satisfied by the diminution, or absorption or disappearance of the Indians" (Ontario 1885:234).

The essence of both Boyd's decision and the arguments of the provincial counsel would have made sense to the explorers of the earlier period, in part because they had laid the narrative foundations for it; constructed its discursive infrastructure. Boyd sums up his ruling in a statement flattening in its finality, "so far as respected the authority of the Crown no distinction was taken between vacant lands and lands occupied by the Indians" (Ontario 1885:209). Legally, Anishinaabeg do not exist. Such a statement of *terra nullius* is only possible if attended by a logic of dehumanization which serves to bifurcate Indigeneity from humanity, to vacate Anishinaabeg from the category of the human. The dehumanization of Anishinaabeg then was literally fundamental to colonial sovereignty, as it was the discourse through which authorities negated Indigenous title and established the foundations for its own exclusive claims to sovereignty. Dispossession then is encoded into the legal structures, jurisdictions and sovereignties of the settler state.

The Discursive Formations of Dehumanization

While the decision obviously drew on a wide (indeed, global) network of discursive formations surrounding race, subjectivity and Indigenous title, the expedition reports were a part of these formations and helped shape them, especially in the localized context of Treaty 3. The decision relied on the discourses and narratives of previous eras just as development would rely on the negation of Anishinaabeg as legal subjects. The discursive infrastructure of dehumanization had begun to expand, buttress and concretize its meanings. The reports as relatively popular narrations of colonial encounter served as some of the only resources available (other than prejudice) on which to base their decisions. Boyd summarizes his position in a way that makes clear the connections between the discursive and epistemic violence of colonial law and the material violence that would attend development, when he argues that as Indigenous nations held no title, if they refused the special status accorded to them as wards of the state, dependent domestic nations or *villein regardant* (a legal category referring to indenture), that is if colonial sovereignties and Indigenous subjugation are refused, “the government has perfect liberty to proceed with the settlement and development of the country, and so, sooner or later, to displace them” (Ontario 1885:230). This is the discursive foundation from which development and displacement proceed. In ruling against Indigenous sovereignty through dehumanizing discourse, the apparatus of colonial law exposed Anishinaabeg communities and territories to a number of ‘relentless forms of physical violence’ (Hunt 2014a).

Colonial Fallout: The Repercussions off The St. Catherine’s Milling’s Decision

The decision itself was not the only way in which the case enacted dispossession. The case went through a series of appeals after Chancellor’s Boyd’s ruling. It was recommended to the Ontario Supreme Court, then to the Supreme Court of Canada, and finally to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, then the highest appeal tribunal for the British Empire (McNeil 1999:68). All appeals upheld Boyd’s ruling and in 1888 a final decision was handed down which supported Ontario’s claims to jurisdiction (Kulchyski 1998). Anishinaabeg were deemed to have had rights to occupancy not ownership, and this at the whim of the province. The decision argued that Anishinaabeg had certain usufructuary rights, but no

claims to title. This ruling reflected a view of Anishinaabeg as less-than-human; incapable of sovereignty and nationhood. It circumvented a nation-to-nation relationship, and in the process negated Anishinaabeg sovereignty. It stood as the most important ruling on Indigenous title in Canada for almost one hundred years until the Calder Case again introduced Indigenous rights back onto the docket.

For Treaty 3 Anishinaabeg, the repercussions of the decision were enormous. It placed the reserves of Treaty 3 within provincial rather than federal jurisdiction and abrogated the ability of the federal government to allocate reserve lands within the province without consultation. So, while Treaty 3 had been signed as an agreement between the federal government and Anishinaabeg nations and reserves agreed upon between these two parties, the decision devolved the authority to confirm these reserves to the province on the understanding that Treaty should have been conducted in consultation with the provincial government who held jurisdiction over the lands.

In order to agree to confirm existing federally-allocated reserves, the provincial government demanded major concessions aimed at opening the territory to increased settlement, particularly on the Rainy River Clay Plain, an agriculturally fertile area. In ruling in favour of Ontario, Boyd had sought to protect it from federal interference as the province's "schemes for opening up the country might be prejudiced by the reserves being unsuitably placed" (Ontario 1885: 35). This was certainly the case on the Rainy River Plain where politicians and settlers eyed the relatively fertile lands avariciously and complained of the generous terms of treaty allowing land to pass into 'mortmain' (Waisberg, Holzkamm and Lovisek 1996). It was these exact reserves that would be cancelled in negotiations between the federal and provincial governments. The province demanded the abrogation of seven of the eight Rainy River reserves. This constituted over 43,000 acres of the most arable land in the region, a total of 89% of their reserve lands (Waisberg, Holzkamm and Lovisek 1996). Likewise, the province demanded that the Sturgeon Lake reserve within the recently mapped confines of Quetico Park be abruptly cancelled without consultation or compensation before confirming the remaining reserves throughout Treaty 3 (McNabb 1999). Negotiations dragged on until 1915 when the federal government acquiesced and the targeted

reserves were cancelled, this only forty years after the ratification of a treaty that was meant to last as long as the waters flow. Importantly, as the province did not confirm reserves until 1915, this allowed them to strip water and mineral rights, establish road easements and claim other resources in the ambiguous interim (Lovisek 1996:133). It was in this liminal period that development of the International Falls Dam was initiated. In other words, the province consented to development during a period when the legal standing of reserves was ambiguous, further circumscribing Anishinaabeg avenues for redress.

Through the example of the St. Catherine's Milling's decision we can see how colonial legal systems relied on the narrations of the expeditions and larger discursive formations to negate Indigenous title and personhood in ways that would structure how development unfolded. In the next chapter, I examine development explicitly and travel through the reports of the International Joint Commission on Boundary Waters to understand how these legal discourses around Indigeneity and the narrations of territory shaped these processes.

Chapter 5

((((((((((Development))))))))))

1873-1926: The International Falls Dam, Settler Occupation and Indigenous Removal

Following treaty and the St. Catherine's Milling's decision, the territorial imaginings of the settler state shifted from seeing the territory as an obstacle to be circumvented to a potentially productive area to be occupied, settled and exploited. This inaugurated a period of development within Treaty 3. Through the incipient possibilities of industries such as logging, pulp and paper mills, mining, and hydroelectric development, a colonial imaginary which framed the territory as an unproductive wasteland was overlaid by one which understood the lands and waters as productive and quite literally, generative (Kuhlberg 2005). Dams were no longer developed to facilitate movement through the territory but rather to power settler expansionism and resource extraction through hydroelectricity. The anticipatory geographies of settler colonialism had shifted to the settlement, development, and wholesale transformation of the territory. This shift initiated a reorientation and compelled different relationships to land and water, but traces of the previous period's spatial expectations remained to haunt the shifting productions of the settler state.⁸ White supremacy, dehumanization, erasure and dispossession remained fundamental to colonial spatializations and political projects.

In analyzing the production of colonial space in the period after the signing of Treaty 3, we move from the spectacular and wondrous narration of land and territory of the expeditions to the circumscribing

⁸There certainly remain traces of elsewhere orientations which blur the line between Veracini (2010b) and Wolfe's (2006) descriptions of franchise and settler colonialism. While Treaty 3 and Northwestern Ontario have become firmly incorporated into the national and jurisdictional imaginings of the settler state, its resources and industry remain extractive and tend to transit and flow towards urban metropolises and global markets in the same ways that Veracini and Wolfe had described franchise colonialism.

and delineative accounts of bureaucracy, management and colonial law (Greenblatt 1991). Following the threads of the story here takes us through the bureaucratic reports of two settler nations and into the discourses of a nascent environmentalist movement. Yet, the narratives of the era of exploration and rulings of the colonial legal system continued to figure in how space was produced and understood and the forms of dispossession that Indigenous communities encountered. Even with such a drastic spatial reorientation, Indigenous dispossession remained the structuring feature of colonial productions of space albeit, increasingly achieved through the material transformation of the landscape and the physical displacement of its inhabitants. Colonial spatializations in Treaty 3 have not been stable but rather have shifted to meet a number of contingencies, historical developments and settler demands. Discourse moved from utterly devaluing the territory as a wasteland to coveting it for its resource potential. Yet, the constant theme in these spatializations is how discourse undergirded material violence to facilitate Indigenous dispossession. Dispossession, whether discursive or material, is what ties these periods and the settler project together.

5.1 Powering Settler Expansionism: Hydroelectricity, Dispossession and Displacement

On January 9, 1905, the Province of Ontario granted a power lease to the Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company, for the purposes of hydroelectric generation (Dacey 1993:37). The company sought to build a dam across the Rainy River for the purposes of hydroelectric generation. The dam was an international project that while connected, would have generating stations on both the Canadian and American sides of the border in the communities of Fort Frances, Ontario and International Falls, Minnesota. Through the synergistic strategies of capitalism, the dam would provide power to pulp mills being developed by the company in Fort Frances and International Falls, while the surplus would be sold to the state of Minnesota and the province of Ontario.⁹ Absent in the official reports outlining the effects

⁹ Fort Frances v. Boise Cascade Canada Ltd. 1983 S.C.R. 171

of the dams, were the impacts on the Anishinaabeg communities at Couchiching and Manitou Rapids, above and below the dam, respectively. The dam was built and operative by 1909, with predictably disastrous consequences. It flooded both traditional territory and reserve lands, powered industries which produced environmental contaminants, and affected the habitats of muskrats, beavers, sturgeon and other game animals (International Joint Commission 1918:19). Like similar dams at Lake of the Woods, the development of the Fort Frances/International Falls dam led to the degradation of innumerable ricing lakes, destroyed *manoomin* and compromised Anishinaabeg ability to harvest this critical resource (Grand Council Treaty #3). Silting, stagnation and pollution from the mills that the dams powered led to the almost complete collapse of the sturgeon fishery and contaminated and compromised the water throughout the region and beyond (LaDuke 2002:38; Holzkamm, Lytwyn and Waisberg 1988:203; International Joint Commission 1918:19). The practices of hydropeaking and ponding, the matching of water levels to consumption demands, disrupted the rhythms of the watershed and further damaged *manoomin*, sturgeon and muskrats, non-human entities particularly susceptible to water fluctuations.¹⁰ As Seine River band member Steve McGillis argues “hydro figures its best to flood the land during the summer months for electricity, but it kills the wild rice” (Interview 2018). Water fluctuations also contributed to increased levels of mercury accumulation producing embodied fears of methylmercury contamination.¹¹ Finally, the dam’s footprint was greater than previous projects in that it required the construction of a series of affiliated dams throughout the watershed to act as reservoirs in order to impound, manage and control the flow of water through its gates. The distinction between the two periods’ dams is illustrative, the Lac des Mille Lacs dam had been constructed of stone. It was not

¹⁰International Joint commission 2018b. Fact Sheet #8 Peaking and Ponding http://ijc.org/files/tinymce/uploaded/RNLRCSB/Factsheet_Peaking_Ponding_8.pdf. Last Accessed August 11, 2018.

¹¹International Joint commission. 2018a. Fact Sheet #7 Mercury in Fish. <http://ijc.org/files/tinymce/uploaded/RNLRCSB/Factsheet%207.pdf>. Last Accessed, August 11, 2018.

operational. It could not regulate water levels or flows. It was only intended to impound water to raise its levels and facilitate transit *through* the territory. In contrast, the dam at Fort Frances was hydroelectric. It was intended to regulate and manage the flow of water, power industry and produce jobs. Thus, it signaled the potential for settlement and a spatial reorientation, a landed settler geography. Settlers were here to stay, a development which demanded the production of different kinds of spaces.

The Policy of Indigenous Removal: Manufacturing Terra Nullius

At the same time that the dam was being developed and constructed, Treaty 3 communities were enduring a network of colonial strategies that Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm (1996) describe as a de facto policy of 'Indian removal' intended to dislocate them from their lands. In 1909, the government of Ontario established the Quetico Forest Reserve, later to be designated Quetico Provincial Park. In 1915, this led to the cancellation of the Sturgeon Lake reserve located within the newly-defined boundaries of the park (McNabb 1991:167). Forest rangers forced the community off of their lands, expelling families at gunpoint and summarily destroying traplines and cabins (McNabb 1999). Negotiations between the federal and provincial government resulting from the St. Catherine's Milling's decision ended with a number of reserves arbitrarily abrogated, cancelled or redrawn, initiating migrations to other reserves and increasing the pressure on these communities without an attendant reallocation of resources (Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm 1996). An amendment to the Indian Act in 1881 allowed for federal control over the sale of Indigenous agricultural produce. This prohibited Anishinaabeg from commercial farming, inhibiting the range of economic strategies available to them (Grand council Treaty #3). Similarly, beginning in 1914, punitive sentencing for hunting and fishing off of an increasingly depleted reserve land base was increasingly enforced (Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkamm 1996:348). Taken together, the consequences of these policies were enormous, as communities were amalgamated and forced onto smaller and smaller parcels of land with fewer resources to support burgeoning populations.

Dams powered and expanded the operations of other extractive industries like logging and the mills on both sides of the border at International Falls and Fort Frances which contributed to environmental violence and dispossession for Indigenous communities. Pulp waste, combined with settler overfishing, were contributing factors in the collapse of the sturgeon fishery, one of the most critical resources for Anishinaabeg in the area (Holzkamm, Lytwyn and Waisberg 1988). Likewise, dams greatly expanded the capacities of logging in the area, powering the mills that provided an outlet for the pulpwood of the region (Kuhlberg 2005). This expansion of logging had dramatic consequences for communities. As former Lac des Mille Lacs band councilor Ron Momogeeshik Peters states, “the logging industry totally degraded the land” (Interview 2018). He notes the difference in water quality due to the operations of industry, before “we could take any water from any ditch and drink it, we didn’t even think about it” (Interview 2018). Industry led to embodied fears and worries about contamination that were borne out in the experience of communities like Grassy Narrows (Ilyniak 2014). Dams were not only located at a nexus of infrastructure projects, but were also a part of an interlinked network of extractive industries which relied on the power they provided to expand their operations.

In 1925, the timber baron, industrialist and controlling interest in the Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper company, Edward W. Backus sought to expand the hydroelectric capacities of the Fort Frances and International Falls dam complex citing the “uncertainty and inadequacy of available water power” and claiming his industries had “expanded far beyond their realized power output”(Searle 1977).He presented an expansive plan for the development of new dams, impounding locks and reservoirs to increase the storage capacities throughout the Boundary Waters. He sought to dramatically alter the landscape and raise the levels of Rainy Lake by three feet (International Joint Commission 1926:7).The plan was opposed, and eventually blocked by a nascent environmentalist movement headed by the author and conservationist, Ernest C. Oberholtzer (Searle 1977). While Backus’ expansive bid to reshape the region was frustrated, the Lac des Mille Lacs Dam and others were replaced during this period. To increase the capacity of the International Falls Dam and regulate its flow, the original stone dam at Lac

des Mille Lacs was replaced in 1926 by an operational timber storage dam controlled by stop logs, so that the lake could act as a reservoir controlling the flow of water towards the Rainy River and the International Falls dam (Adler 2010:75; Lovisek 1996:133; Seine River Watershed Management Plan). This exacerbated the slow violence initiated by the Dawson Dam and once again, flooded territory and affected the rhythms of the watershed and the water levels on Lac des Mille Lacs in ways that made it difficult for the community to subsist and remain on their lands (Interview 2018, Ron Peters).

During this period, dams served to drastically reterritorialize and stake claims to Treaty 3. They encoded particular meanings and communicated possession and settler jurisdiction. They were claims-making structures; they made possessive and territorial claims *to* space at the same time that they made ideological claims *about* space. Edwards and Banivanua Mar illustrate how in the construction of colonial space, “ownership had to be seen to be believed... and a range of cultural strategies cooperated to give observable effect to settler purchases or acquisitions of paper title to land” (2010:4). For Edwards and Banivanua Mar, “spatial and ecological changes to land gave effect over time to the transfer of title” (2010:5). Dams wrote power relations onto the landscape itself, and over time these relations and spatializations came to be naturalized and taken-for-granted. The ecological transformations they engendered served to give these ‘observable effects’ of settler title to territory in Treaty 3. They extended settler jurisdiction over the territory in ways that authorized development to remake the landscape of Treaty 3, to make real its spatial imaginings. Yet, it was infrastructure itself that materialized this jurisdiction and its legitimacy onto the landscape in ways that were coded to appear common sense, visually and thus, empirically affirmable (Cowen 2018). Settler jurisdiction was coded as legitimate by the fact that it was conceived as *fait accompli*, already evident on the landscape.

Returning to the lens of slow violence helps us to understand the impacts of these developments. While catastrophic for Anishinaabeg communities like Lac des Mille Lacs, the ecological, political and spatial effects of dams primarily manifested themselves over a *longue duree*, which renders difficult our abilities to conceptualize and contend with them. While certain outcomes from development, such as the

flooding of burial sites, gardens, reserve and traditional lands, were immediate, it is the slower violence of contaminants released into watersheds, the effects on fish, muskrats, beavers and *manoomin* and the attritional and assimilative legal violence of colonial policy, that led to the displacement of Anishinaabeg communities. Lac des Mille Lacs community member Ron Momogeeshiik Peters identified development and slow violence's effect on sustainable food sources as the impetus for displacement stating "that's why we left, otherwise, if the food and if the wildlife had been livable, I would have stayed there. That's what I intended to do, to become old living in the woods, fight off the world. Foolishly, because the food supply, in my lifetime, was totally gone" (Interview 2018). In discussing Lac des Mille Lacs, Adler (2010) frames displacement as 'forced abandonment' to draw attention to the ways in which it was not sudden but rather attritional. It involved the accretion of conditions which made life increasingly untenable, not the spectacular expressions of state violence which may attend other development projects. Abandonment suggests a form of agency but the adjective 'forced' suggests its negation. Anishinaabeg were not washed away by flooding but rather had their possibility of a future on the land displaced (Mollett 2014:30).

While the flooding of territory, the rapid collapse of sturgeon fisheries, and the decimation of *manoomin* and ricing lakes through dams and their associated industries occurred immediately, many of the effects of development took place invisibly and inexorably over generations, a period which makes it difficult to visualize the enormity of their impact on the territory as they became incrementally normalized (Adler 2010; Luby 2015). These processes began with the development of the Dawson dam and would continue with the International Falls dam and its attendant nexus of affiliated developments. Anishinaabeg were resilient, innovative and adaptive and were able to construct a number of strategies to withstand with the catastrophic effects of the dams. Holzkamm, Waisberg and Lovisek (1996: 108) suggest that Anishinaabe turned to cultural practices of 'resource switching', shifting from harvesting the most affected resources, such as sturgeon or *manoomin*, to wild game, in periods of ecological and economic stress. However, development radically and inexorably affected the ecology of Treaty 3,

placing stress on multiple sources and simultaneously undermining resource switching as a strategy. Likewise, Anishinaabeg also incorporated seasonal practices of wage labour or incorporated items like formula into their cultural practices to make up for the loss of wild foods due to environmental contaminants stemming from development (Luby 2015). However, these strategies, while resourceful and adaptive served to disrupt the cultural transmission of knowledge and to orient Anishinaabeg away from land-based practices and drew them further into the purview of the settler state. Despite these creative strategies, the slow violence of the dams has continued to proceed inexorably and resulted in the displacement of entire communities. For the community of Lac des Mille Lacs, displacement was not an explosive event but rather an ongoing attritional process that only slowly led to displacement. However, the genocidal impacts of development are not lessened for their having taken place incrementally and over duration. To understand the displacements that resulted from development we have to situate them in the larger context of Indigenous removal that were evident during this period of development.

Taken together, these developments severely undermined Anishinaabeg ability to live off of the land and rendered them vulnerable to impoverishment and led to increasing exposure to interventions and violence on the part of the settler state from punitive hunting and fishing sentences, to apprehension of their children under the Indian Residential School system (Martin and Violet Tuesday 1996:199; Luby 2015). In communities like Lac des Mille Lacs, the accumulative and slow violence of colonial development, legislation and expansion produced such conditions of abandonment and precarity, that the entire community was displaced and forced onto other reserves or the urban centers of Northwestern Ontario and Minnesota, with the last full-time resident forced off the reserve in the 1950s (Adler 2010). Today, many band members have never even set foot on the reserve.

Development, dispossession and displacement occur in this context of removal and cannot be disassociated from these processes. Large-scale and comprehensive policies of removal were initiated with enormous spatial consequences. Epistemic violence was used to deny Anishinaabeg sovereignty and personhood and the legal mechanisms of colonial law put this into practice. Removal was the de facto

policy of the province with Members of Provincial Parliament, such as James Conmee arguing that the "public interest" required that the reserves be "opened for settlement" (Waisberg, Lovisek and Holzkam 1996:345). Like the arbitrary annulment of reserves, forcing Anishinaabeg off of their territories through environmental violence, became a means of producing land open to settlement. Removal was a comprehensive, if incremental process and displacement through flooding was one of its strategic axes.

Situating displacement within this context allows us to see it as part of a conscious, structural and willed effort on the part of the settler state and industry to remake the landscape, produce and foster Indigenous dispossession and to lay the conditions of possibility for settler life. While displacement was not always the stated goal of development, it followed the structural objectives of settler colonialism and the de facto policy of removal evident in Treaty 3 at the time. Seen through the analytical lenses of abandonment and precarity, we can see how socially differentiated communities are exposed to differential levels of injury, violence, and death (Butler 2009). As we have seen, colonial authorities framed Anishinaabeg as 'an incubus on the territory', that is, a presence to be exorcised. Industry was able to offload the burdens of development onto communities whose presence was already problematic in the settler state.

By scaling out and drawing connections we can see the consistency in colonial policies that targeted Anishinaabeg communities for expulsion, elimination and removal. Displacement then is both part and parcel with earlier processes that discursively vacated Anishinaabeg from their territories, or imagined Anishinaabeg out-of-place, and emergent strategies that sought to assimilate or remove Indigenous communities through coercive, physical and developmental violence. These strategies sought the emptying of a storied, populous and networked landscape. They sought to recast the landscape as empty in order to clear space for settlement, 'indigenize' settlers, and naturalize their contingent spatialities predicated on property and possession. Flooding was only one of a network of spatial strategies of removal that attempted to eliminate or marginalize Anishinaabeg communities on their lands and territories and to produce exclusionary and singular conceptions of space, in which land and territory

are unequivocally deemed colonial possessions. Displacement further exacerbated and rendered Anishinaabeg vulnerable to other strategies of colonial governance and violence, assimilation and elimination. Displaced or fractured communities obstructed from turning to their relationships to land and water were more vulnerable to apprehension under the Indian Residential School system, sexual and gendered interpersonal violence, and ill-health deriving from impoverishment and environmental violence and degradation (Martin and Violet Tuesday 1998:103; Luby 2015). Through multiple colonial strategies, displacement mapped both the ideology and legal fiction of *terra nullius* onto Anishinaabeg territories and the logics of dispossession, precarity and abjection onto the bodies of Anishinaabeg.

Landscape transformations which had operated under a provisional character in the explorations of the Dawson Route became more comprehensive. The slow violence that had been initiated with the development of the route and its attendant flooding, displacement and environmental and ecological violence, intensified with the development of this nexus of dams with the International Falls Dam at its center. As we have seen, dehumanizing discourse and narratives of *terra nullius* had been employed to discursively clear the lands and waters of Treaty 3 and lay the conditions for settler spatialities. As the settler state became concerned with creating the conditions of possibility for settler life, it increasingly pursued policies of removal that physically vacated or contained Anishinaabeg. While colonialism's geographic imaginings of Treaty 3 had been drastically altered, its structural and territorial imperatives had not. Indigenous dispossession continued to be its defining structural feature with displacement and physical removal coming to be the strategies through which it achieved its goals.

In analyzing this period, I ask a number of questions. What forms did dispossession take on during the period of development? How was the structure of dispossession enacted both materially and discursively through colonial productions of space? Finally, in what ways are these processes and periods linked?

Genealogical Excavation: Unearthing the Logics of Development

Seeking the logics that underwrote dispossession has been particularly difficult in the period of development. While the effects of the construction of hydroelectric dams throughout the territory has been catastrophic and clear, the discourse and logics that underwrote development in the period have been harder to get at. By the early 1900s, colonial narrations of space and productions of Indigeneity had become hegemonic through the narrative technologies of the expeditions and the apparatus of colonial law. This served to inscribe erasures and silences into the colonial archive. The social value of concepts like development and the structural nature of Indigenous dispossession in a settler state, were so common sense as to appear unremarkable, not worthy of comment. In the archive, the connections remain unstated, the discourses which underwrote and abetted displacement and dispossession, unspoken. This makes searching for the discourses and logics of dispossession in the archive difficult.

In the expeditions and the records of proceedings of the colonial legal systems, we found complementary sites and histories that interacted with one another and through we could construct the narrative of dispossession in Treaty 3. Through their confluences we could begin to see the logics of dispossession, how it shifted, but also which of its features remained the same. This led me to seek another complementary site through which to draw connections and excavate the underlying logics of infrastructure, development and dispossession. In the conclusion of this work, I examine a set of hearings held by the International Joint Commission on Boundary Waters to ascertain the expediency of raising the water levels on Rainy Lake through the construction and redevelopment of dams. The proposal was headed by Edward W. Backus who had developed the Fort Frances and International Falls dams. While the project was eventually rejected, by analyzing these hearings we can get a sense of the logics that underwrote earlier hydroelectric developments. The hearings provide a final site of analysis through which we can direct prismatic inquires to understand how dispossession has functioned in Treaty 3. The hope is that through these avenues we may catch glimpses of the logics of earlier periods of development refracted through the International Joint Commission and its hearings.

5.2 The International Joint Commission Hearings: Excavating the Logics of Development

By the 1920s, environmentalist and conservationist movements had emerged in conjunction with the closing of colonial frontiers and with them the spaces in which nationalist and masculine identities could be constructed. Organizations like the Izaak Walton League and figures like Aldo Leopold, John Muir, and in Minnesota, Ernest C. Oberholtzer had begun to articulate the ideologies of these nascent movements. In the early 1920s, Backus sought to expand his operations in Treaty 3, calling for the construction or redevelopment of a number of dams throughout the Boundary Waters (Searle 1977). However, in public hearings convened to ascertain the impacts, feasibility and expedience of further development, public resistance from these nascent environmental movements was loud and forceful. While these hearings would ultimately result in Backus' plans being rejected, they offer us a generative site to understand the logics of development and how they intersect with the discursive formations of earlier periods. By extrapolating these insights, we can understand the processes and justifications that led to the development of the dams at Fort Frances and Lac des Mille Lacs.

The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 established the International Joint Commission to legislate how the shared waters of the United States and Canada would be governed. The Commission was tasked with settling disputes between the two settler nations and to provide recommendations to both Canada and the United States about their shared water resources. In 1925, hearings were convened to ascertain the effect of a proposed raise in the levels of Rainy and Namakan Lakes through the construction of a series of dams (International Joint Commission 1926). The commission received dozens of letters protesting the development and held in-person hearings on September 25, 1925 in International Falls. Numerous agencies and departments from both nations were consulted and appeared before the commission and it sought and received the opinion of concerned citizens and conservationist groups. Yet, no Anishinaabeg were present and no representative was sent to protect Anishinaabeg interests. Even the Department of Indian Affairs, while acknowledging that up to fourteen reserves would be affected, declined to send a representative (International Joint Commission 1926:25). As the IJC secretary was quick to point out verbatim to scores of concerned citizens, no application for a hydropower lease was 'officially' being

considered, rather the commission was leading an investigation into the effects of raising the water levels on Rainy and Namakan Lake, “the commission has before it, by joint reference from the Governments of the United States and Canada, certain questions for investigation and report, with conclusion and recommendations, regarding the level of certain of the boundary waters”(International Joint Commission 1926:44). However, Backus himself had initiated this investigation through his contacts and pull with Republican officials in Minnesota (Searle 1977). To avoid conflicts of interest his companies were not officially able to apply for a permit or lease to develop hydropower. Yet, he was one of the only proponents for raising the storage capacities of the lakes. It was even suggested that Backus had maneuvered to have the hearings held in International Falls, a town almost entirely beholden for its livelihood to the mill that Backus built and operated there (International Joint Commission 1926:44). After fierce opposition, the proposal was rejected in the final report of the IJC (1934). However, interest had already wavered, as Backus had suffered financial losses in the stock market crash and subsequent Depression and was to pass away the same year (Searle 1977). The proposal was defeated on the interest of recreation and even other forms of industry, and was perceived as a massive victory for conservationist movements. It was certainly not won through reference to its adverse effects on Indigenous communities or the invocation of Indigenous title or duty to consult.

Wastelands Returned: Discourses of Productivity at the Hearings

While the expansive developments of the Boundary Waters that Backus sought never materialized (although some did, the redevelopment of the Lac des Mille Lacs Dam occurred during this period), the hearings afford us a lengthy opportunity to hear Backus himself justify and defend development. The arguments forwarded through the hearing, particularly Backus', allow us to see the ways in which development relied upon the legal erasures and discursive removals of earlier periods, as well as constructions of Treaty 3 lands as unproductive waste. It illustrates how industrial interests understood the lands and waters of Treaty 3 and where Anishinaabeg were situated in these imaginaries.

If the decisions of St. Catherine's Milling had illustrated that the dehumanizing logics of the expeditions had been coded as normative, the hearings demonstrate how productions of Treaty 3 lands as unproductive waste had likewise endured through the periods of exploration and development. In his testimony, Backus describes the lands to be affected as 'stoney' or 'swamp land' (International Joint Commission 1926:107). Emphasizing productivity and capitalist valuations of land, he states simply, that the land to be flooded "does not pay" (International Joint Commission 1926:107). Its value is 'nominal' or "not of value enough to consider (International Joint Commission 1926:107). Like the expeditions these valuations were placed on the land's suitability for agriculture or increasingly, logging. By these metrics, Backus is able to claim that the territory constitutes "nothing of what you would call our valuable agricultural land" that is, "land capable of being tilled (International Joint Commission 1926:107). The trope of the wasteland that had been constructed through the expeditions' narrations provided a useful justification for the destruction of lands through extractive industries. We can see that while in the shift from exploration to development, colonial authorities had begun to imagine the territory differently, traces of the representation of it as waste remained to facilitate practices of destructive development.

When asked if flooding would submerge or damage the islands of the territory Backus responds that "any island that it covered, that it might cover, would not be any loss" (International Joint Commission 1926:120). Through the representations of the expeditions, the lands had already been produced as waste and thus, not worthy of consideration. Backus argues that the lands were put to very little use and thus open to development (International Joint Commission 1926:120). They were unproductive and for all intents and purposes, idle. Backus then relied on (and helped form) productions of land which positioned it as waste, through the expansive developments that he sought to enact. We can hear echoes of Chancellor Boyd's argument that Anishinaabeg did not use the land in any way that would prevent it from being expropriated. Islands in particular were important sites for Anishinaabeg, but through the discursive and legal erasures of the previous eras they were absented in any meaningful way from these discussions (McNabb 2004).

Dispossession as the Foundation for Development

What is not acknowledged in Backus' testimony and appeals for development, just like in the narratives of the settler nation, is the ways in which they are predicated on ongoing Indigenous dispossession. Backus never mentions the impact of development or dams on Anishinaabeg. Even the Department of Indian Affairs was not overly concerned with development's impacts. Anishinaabeg are marked in Backus' testimony only by their conspicuous absences. To find them in his narrations we have to chart the gaps and omissions in his arguments. The cultural production of idle or waste lands facilitated development or attempts to develop. Likewise, the erasure and negation Anishinaabeg sovereignty through St. Catherine Milling's allowed Backus to frame development as no great loss, as not affecting anyone of consequence. In asking about the practice of maintaining water at its maximum allowable level Commissioner McCumber inquired if this was injurious to any other 'interests'. Backus replied that it had not overflowed lands that would not otherwise have been subject to flooding (although he also provided the questionable condition that his own statement was 'practically' true) (International Joint Commission 1926:107). This despite the fact that he was involved in a decades long dispute with the Department of Indian Affairs to provide compensation for damages done to Anishinaabeg lands at Fort Frances (Adler 2010). In these correspondences, Backus was made aware of exactly how much land had been destroyed. Likewise, the commissioners also reminded him that a number of claims for damage resulting from flooding *had* been brought against him, to which he cryptically replied that individuals have "been trying awfully hard to establish damages" but that "I think you will find that we have all the lawsuits that they have dared to bring" (International Joint Commission 1926:130). Yet, he communicated none of this to the Commission.

In justifying development, Backus hyperbolically describes the "wonderful improvements in the situation that such a plan will bring about, with detriment to no one and benefit to everybody" (International Joint Commission 1926:103). However, Anishinaabeg could not expect these benefits to accrue to them as they had been discursively characterized as less-than-human. The exclusionary logics of

Backus' claims are made clear when in attempting to illustrate his transparency he claims that 'any private landowner' could visit his offices to ascertain his intentions and the levels to which he wished to raise the lake. Of course, Anishinaabeg had been represented through the expedition reports, and then legally defined through the St. Catherine's Milling's decision as the very antithesis of a private landowner, thereby rendering such recourse unavailable to them. In his description of a 'public' characterized as a polity of property-owning subjects, Backus elides the ways in which colonial law had ensured that Anishinaabeg would never be subjects constitutive of this form of 'public' as they had been legally defined through the Indian Act and the St. Catherine's Milling's decision as 'wards of the state' incapable of rights to the soil and thus, excluded from the very notion of a colonial public or polity.

In previous periods, Anishinaabeg had elicited colonial anxieties, especially in regards to their problematic claims to title and the ways that they threatened precarious infrastructures. While they had not always been central in colonial narrations of its projects, they were always inescapably present. Yet, the hearings evidence almost no mention of their presence. The erasures of legal discourse and colonial narration had been expansive, serving to vacate Anishinaabeg from the colonial imaginary. The hearings are some of the first textual productions of colonialism in Treaty 3 where Anishinaabeg are almost entirely absented and expunged. While Backus still had to make central to his argument advocating for development that the land was unproductive, illustrating that while this concept was enduring it was not hegemonic, the idea that Treaty 3 was uninhabited, excised of Indigenous presence had become normative, common-sense and not worth remarking upon. Likewise, the idea that alternative claims to sovereignty existed within Treaty 3 had been coded as unimaginable within the stories that settler nations told themselves. Some colonial narratives still needed buttressing while others, like the erasure and dispossession of Anishinaabeg, had come to be seen as settled. The negation of title and personhood through St. Catherine's had overlaid, yet another layer onto the colonial story of Indigenous dehumanization. Development relied on the negation of title and vacating of the territory, as the legal rulings had relied in turn on the expeditions' narrations of encounter and difference.

Reinscribing Erasure: Conservationist Appeals to 'Public Interest'

We can conclude by examining how at the moment of the hearings, dispossession was morphing yet again. In the testimonies of development's opponents, land and title were framed as the heritage of settlers, they had begun to indigenize themselves in ways that further absented Indigenous presence (Deloria 1998). Backus' proposal met overwhelming resistance and a counternarrative to his vision of development was produced by an emergent conservationist movement. However, this narrative would inscribe its own erasures and similarly proceeded from the foundations of Indigenous dispossession in ways that illustrated how expansive dispossession had become. The commission had been barraged with letters and testimonies denouncing Backus' scheme and calling for its rejection. While conservation movements certainly viewed land differently, placing value in its scenic beauty rather than productive potential (although economic productivity in the form of tourism was always a primary consideration), they replicated the colonial erasures of developmentalist discourse. Conservationist movements also began with a conception of Indigenous dispossession as normative. The enraged letters from concerned settler citizens repudiated Backus claims to territory by invoking their position as the "real owners" of the country and calling the territory "the heritage of the people of Minnesota" (International Joint Commission 1926:49). In his testimony, Oberholtzer described the territory as "a region in which the people have already acquired a public interest by the fact of all these homes, by the fact that people come in here year after year and are coming in more and more every year" (International Joint Commission 1926:231). Opponents to development were those who believed that the public had acquired an interest in the region, an interest that superseded, subsumed and erased Anishinaabeg claims.

As we have seen, the invocation of a public interest was troubling for Anishinaabeg sovereignties as the St. Catherine's Milling's decision had excised them from the legal category of citizen and thus, from the very notion of a 'public'. From a conservationist perspective, the territory was "wild and natural" or "unmarred by the hand of man" (International Joint Commission 1926:232; International Joint

Commission 1934:49). However, these constructions elided Anishinaabeg presence and relied on removal and constructions of the territory as vacant and uninhabited. The territory was ‘unmarred’ because colonial representations and legal decisions had served to write Anishinaabeg out and earlier processes of development had served to physically remove them. As we have seen, conservationism would also produce its own forms of displacement, forcibly removing Anishinaabeg families from within the boundaries of Quetico Provincial park to have the land conform to their productions of it, in what has been described as the production of a ‘national park nature’ pristine, yet uninhabited and expunged of Indigenous presence (Cronin 2011). In preserving the territory from development, the conservationist movement also laid claim to it and imposed its own conceptions of appropriate land use in ways that erased Indigenous title and produced land for the benefit of a clearly White and colonial ‘public interest’. When the IJC’s final report was released recommending that Backus’ proposal not be pursued, the various conservation movements that had opposed it celebrated their victory. However, the final report indicated that damage would “accrue to Indian lands on Lac la Croix even under the modified proposals” which remained under consideration (International Joint Commission 1934:40). For Anishinaabeg communities the decision hardly represented a victory as the future of communities like Lac La Croix remained precarious in ways that conservation movements with their neocolonial objectives was ignorant to.

Tying It All Back Together: Development in Context:

What do we learn from this final sketch? In the hearings, we can see how dispossession came to be coded as normative and was relied upon by industry, but also the conservationists who opposed development. Epistemic and legal violence served to obscure how hard at work structural dispossession continued to be. They allowed it to disappear into the very foundations of the settler nation. However, dispossession remained to permeate and haunt the infrastructures of settler colonialism. Development enacted its own particular forms of removal. The conditions of precarity it imposed led to displacement, ill-health and impoverishment and wide-ranging forms of lateral violence. It served to dramatically fracture communities like Lac des Mille Lacs in ways that they still struggle to contend with. Yet, it

cannot be separated from its legal and discursive underpinnings even if these underpinnings lay buried in the colonial archive and the hegemonies of the settler state. It relied on the abjection, erasure and dispossession of Indigenous nations affected through the processes of earlier periods and it occurred within a context of removal, functioning as a critical axis of dispossession. Decisions like St. Catherine's Milling's, coded dehumanization of Anishinaabeg as natural, expected and not worth remarking upon. Law gave a veneer of truth to the contingent and oftentimes sketchy or apocryphal (mis)representations of the expeditions. It coded Indigenous dehumanization and desubjectification as normative. Negating title and limiting Anishinaabeg interests to their reserves (themselves also always precariously situated and able to be expropriated or annulled), preempted the state or industry's need to attend to Anishinaabeg communities. Likewise, amendments to the Indian Act which made it illegal for Indigenous peoples to retain legal counsel also foreclosed their options for recourse or redress. In many ways, the question of Indigenous humanity was settled for colonial authorities in the St. Catherine's Milling's decision. In legal terms, a precedent of dehumanization had been set that justified development's elision of Anishinaabeg as subjects. It abdicated the necessity of colonial authorities to attend to Indigenous life, in whatever perfunctory or violent ways it had previously.

Remaining tight on the hearings or development in our analyses disallows us from seeing the bigger picture in which development took place. It is here that a mobile and system-encompassing approach bears fruit. Scaling out and contextualizing development with the expedition reports and the legal rulings allows us to see its displacements as part of a colonial pattern to vacate, displace and dispossess. In placing these processes into conversation and analytical interplay, we are able to emphasize and gesture towards what is actively absented. These stagings draw attention to and chart the invisibilized contours of what is missing, placed under erasure. Without understanding the context of dehumanization and legal violence around Backus and Oberholtzer's statements and rhetorical claims to territory and 'public interest' it would be very difficult to envision the ways in which these discourses relied on Indigenous dispossession. However, after situating development within a context of Indigenous removal,

the link to dispossession becomes clear. This is the strength of a systems-encompassing analytical framework capable of drawing connections and bringing seemingly disparate processes into conversation. In this work, I have attempted to understand the contours of dispossession and development by staging them next to these consonant and complementary processes. Through these mobile and systems-encompassing methods and by charting the gaps in settler discourse we are able to give shape to the invisibilized contours of dispossession. We can see dispossession even when it is unstated and only spectrally present in settler discourse. We see it in both Backus' and Oberholtzer's appeals to a 'public' erased of Anishinaabeg presence. We see it in the ways in which some discourses continue to need to be propped up, like the idea of the wasteland, while others have come to be hegemonic, like dispossession. We also see it in the consonances between complementary sites of colonial violence and removal. In fact, once we become attuned to looking for dispossession in the settler state, it is all we can see. I hope to have illustrated both how discourse, law and development combined to produce dispossession and how mobile and expansive inquiries can be productive ways to get at dispossession and its interconnections.

Conclusion

((((((((((((((Resurgence))))))))))))))

In the Wake and the Afterlives of Development: Grounded Normativity and Radical Resurgence

A number of developments, processes and histories combined to produce Indigenous dispossession in Treaty 3. In this work, I have sought to understand the ways in which these various axes interacted and interpenetrated and to draw connections between seemingly disparate developments; how for instance, colonial travel writing underwrote development, how discourse was intimately entangled with physical violence, how infrastructure and colonial law relied on and produced one another. The epistemic violence of colonialism coded dehumanization and colonial productions of space as natural. As we saw, dehumanization was central in initiating a policy of Indigenous removal in Treaty 3.

Development and infrastructure were only a singular axis of these larger processes of dispossession. I have argued that in analyzing dispossession, development and infrastructure we need to take an expansive view and incorporate the discourses and cultural productions of earlier periods to understand the origins, motivations, and objectives of dispossession and colonial productions of space. This took us on a tangled journey through the reports of the expeditions, the legal decisions of the Privy Council and the Supreme Court of Canada, the built landscape and back to the islands, lakes, and bogs of Treaty 3. A convoluted journey to be sure, but in undertaking it, I hope to have illustrated the expansive violence of dispossession in a settler colonial state. It is never confined solely to the landscape, but rather travels through a number of sites of transit from infrastructure to discourse and colonial law.

Dispossession is interconnected, expansive and multiscalar. It involved devaluing Anishinaabeg land use practices, vituperating their lands, and negating their very personhood. It attempted to remake the physical landscape according to colonial prerogatives and in its own image. It is a violence that tears at the very fabric of communities, and from which they are still trying to heal while resisting its ongoing encroachments. Colonial violence is both pervasive and hegemonic. Yet, its spatializations are not

inevitable. In fact, eliminating the possibility of alternatives is one of colonialism's greatest strengths; to convince us that this ordering of the world is natural. How do we move outside of these settler atmospheres and find places to breathe that are not utterly inundated with naturalized colonial violence? What are the strategies through which we can denaturalize colonial spatial arrangements (Holmes, Hunt and Piedalue 2015)?

One of this project's goals was to provide a methodological map for what analyses of dispossession and erasure could look like. How do we overcome some of the challenges that these forms of research present? In seeking the logics that underwrite dispossession, I have consistently been troubled by the ways in which they appear as a horizon line, disappearing as we approach. In this work, I engaged with and developed a number of concepts from intersectional settler colonial violence to expansive dispossession for understanding colonial violence and its spatializations. I also forwarded a number of methodologies and methods designed to attend and contend with these concepts, including mobile and constellatory inquiry, and systems-encompassing research. These concepts and methods were directed toward an understanding of the intersections between colonial law, representation, infrastructure and development. I sought to understand the multiple vectors and dimensions of dispossession. As should be obvious by now, I was not always successful. At times the gaps were too large to overcome.

Colonialism effaces and naturalizes its own violence. It codes itself as common sense through its expansive projects of violence and dispossession. The systemic and structural nature of dispossession within settler societies renders it hegemonic, a form of settler common sense that makes it difficult to look beyond (Rifkin 2014). In settler societies, dispossession constitutes what Christina Sharpe (2016) describes in the context of antiblackness as the weather; a violence so pervasive, yet simultaneously prosaic, that it comes to be naturalized, to construct and fill our fields of vision. Kristen Simmons (2017) describes this as 'the surround of settler atmospherics.' These atmospherics are "the normative and necessary violences found in settlement" (Simmons 2017). This violence is so prevalent that it suffuses every corner, crack and crease until it comes to constitute the atmosphere; a structural and inescapable

condition of colonial life. There is no looking beyond the violence of settlement on Turtle Island because it serves as the foundation on which settler societies and states are built. The violence of dispossession is the very fabric of settler societies. We move through it, inhabit, occupy it and hold it within our very bodies. Yet, its very hegemony, its foundational importance in settler colonies serves to normalize and obscure it. The silences that this naturalization and hegemony manufactures troubles our abilities to analyze and deconstruct colonialism and dispossession. It creates foreclosures and occlusions and makes interrogating the logics that underwrite dispossession difficult. How to look beyond what is beyond imagining?

I hope that in preliminarily developing concepts like intersectional settler colonial violence, constellatory and systems-encompassing inquiry, we have the seeds of frameworks that will allow us to contend with settler colonialism's expansive violence. I want to see where these concepts will carry us, what they can encompass and how they can help us analyze and upset settler colonialism. In the end, they too may obscure more than they illuminate, but I believe they remain a trajectory worth following. So, while I am not confident that I have provided answers to these questions, I hope to have provided some possibilities, gestured towards potentially productive methodologies and sites of inquiry. In our quest to upset and disrupt colonialism, a possibility is all we can ask for and hopefully it's all we need.

Grounded Normativity and Radical Resurgence

I want to close by recognizing and holding up the strength and resilience of Anishinaabeg who experience the violence of colonial productions of space. Colonial spatializations and its genocidal projects were not totalizing. They never succeeded. For Anishinaabeg, especially from Lac des Mille Lacs, to simply survive is to upset the plans and projects of settler colonialism. But they do so much more than that. Anishinaabeg continue to creatively resist, to embody grounded normativity, to nurture worlds of hope and love, to live their responsibilities and obligations. When they rice, when they sew and bead, when they walk for water, when they teach and care, when they survive period, they refuse dispossession

and remap their territories. Anishinaabeg communities continue to map their own understandings of space, place, land and water and their relationship to these entities. There are other ways to understand and produce space. In the spatial practices of Anishinaabeg from Treaty 3 and beyond, we see embodied forms of resistance that frame the spatializations of development and colonialism as contingent, as not necessarily inevitable and thus, capable of being dismantled.

I have argued for more nuanced visions of violence, for seeing the structural violence that inheres in development and for understanding epistemic violence and its intersections with material violence. Reformulating how we conceptualize colonial violence necessitates that we rethink resistance to this violence. It necessitates a reorientation in how we understand what resistance looks like. Reorienting our analysis to intersecting forms of colonial violence and the sites through which they occur shifts our inquiries, our lines of flight and their trajectories and allows us to see forms of Indigenous resistance previously invisibilized, circumscribed and foreclosed, while also charting the spectral presence of colonial architecture and infrastructure. Colonial foreclosures often disallow us from reading certain actions *as* resistance: roasting *manoomin*, re-establishing relationships to sturgeon or muskrats, honouring *nibi*. Anishinaabeg animate and activate these sites through practices of spatial resistance (Recollet 2016). Resistance functions as a ‘diagnostic of power’ (Abu-Lughod 1990). A diagnosis is a naming and a naming is an invocation; a call to appear, and a call to account. To refute power, we must first name it; bring it into the open (Tuck and Yang 2014b:223). Resistance refutes settler violence and denudes colonialism of its protective prevarications. Anishinaabeg have consistently mapped “violent infrastructure systems with their direct actions and analyses” (Cowen 2018). When Ron Momogeeshiik Peters returned to the site of his reserve to try to make a home there, he mapped dispossession and the systems that had led to his displacement. He refused colonialism, its violence and its orderings. When my partner returns to her traditional territory despite the violence that ripped her away from it, she maps both the structure and contours of colonialism, while simultaneously mapping a way out.

I want to finish by returning to the Lac des Mille Lacs dam. The dam is an assemblage, a geographic metaphor, a plottable place, ideology made concrete. It is all of these things and more. It holds water, it holds stories, and it holds colonial violence. It is a container filled to excess with the histories, desires and violence of settler colonial power. In conversations with Ron Momogeeshiik Peters, he has often told me about his conflicted feelings about the dams, wanting them to be destroyed but understanding that they are multivalent, representing more than their physical assemblage of materials, their meanings, their impacts on his community are multiple and permeate the landscape, the bodies of Anishinaabeg and the histories of Lac des Mille Lacs as a community. They extend beyond their material structures. How to address and dispel these immaterial features, this violence, the lingering oncology of dispossession?

In their practices of resurgence and resilience both my partner and Ron map the multiplicities of the dams as a feature of dispossession. They unmap themselves as objects of jurisdiction, untethering from the history of violence that the dams represent. A map is also an orientation, a charting of future possibilities, a guide to another world. Anishinaabeg communities certainly do live ‘in the wake’ as Sharpe (2016) describes it and development has an ongoing afterlife. But, Anishinaabeg like Ron and Quill are actively involved in sculpting the contours of what shape this afterlife takes. In refusing dispossession, they provide lessons in how to destroy a dam.

Bibliography

- Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1990. The Romance of Resistance: Tracing Transformations of Power Through Bedouin Women. *American Ethnologist* 17 (1): 41-55.
- Adler, Howard. 2010. "A War Without Bombs": The Government's Role in Damming and Flooding of Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation. (MA Thesis) Carleton:MR71599.
- Ahmed, Sara. 2013 Making Feminist Points. *Feminist Killjoys*. <https://feministkilljoys.com/2013/09/11/making-feminist-points/>. Last Accessed August 9, 2016.
- Arvin, Maile, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill. 2013. Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections Between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations* 25 (1): 8-34.
- Banivanua-Mar, Tracey, and Penelope Edmonds. 2010. Introduction: Making Space in Settler Colonies *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 1-24.
- Barad, Karen 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Baviskar, Amita. 2003. For a Cultural Politics of Natural Resources. *Economic and Political Weekly* 38 (48): 5051-5.
- Bhandar, Brenna. 2018. *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Blaser, Mario 2014. Ontology and Indigeneity: On the Political Ontology of Heterogeneous Assemblages. *Cultural Geographies* 21 (1): 49-58.
- Blomley, Nicholas 1996. "Shut the Province Down": First Nations Blockades in British Columbia, 1984-1995. *BC Studies*(111): 5-35.
- Blomley, Nicholas. 2003. Law, Property, and the Geography of Violence: The Frontier, the Survey, and the Grid. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 93(1):121-141
- Blomley, Nicholas. 2011. Cuts, Flows, and the Geographies of Property. *Law, Culture and the Humanities* 7 (2): 203-16.
- Bumsted, J. M. 2003. *Trials & Tribulations: The Red River Settlement and the Emergence of Manitoba 1811-1870*. Winnipeg: Great Plains Publications.
- Buchanan, Rachel. 2007. Decolonizing the Archives: The Work of New Zealand's Waitangi Tribunal. *Public History Review* 14: 44-63.
- Butler, Judith. 2005. *Giving an Account of Oneself*. 1st ed. New York: Fordham University Press
- Butler, Judith. 2009. *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* New York; London [England];: Verso.
- Butler, Judith, and Athena Athanasiou. 2013. *Dispossession: The Performative in the Political*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Byrd, Jodi A., 2011. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. N - New ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Calderon, Dolores. 2016. Moving from Damage-centered Research Through Unsettling Reflexivity *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 47 (1): 5-24.

- Cameron, Emilie, Sarah de Leeuw, and Caroline Desbiens 2014. Indigeneity and Ontology. *Cultural Geographies* 21 (1): 19-26.
- Carlson, Elizabeth. 2017. Anti-colonial Methodologies and Practices for Settler Colonial Studies. *Settler Colonial Studies* 7 (4): 496-517.
- Cattelino, Jessica R. 2015. The Cultural Politics of Water in the Everglades and Beyond: Transcript of the Lewis Henry Morgan Lecture. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5 (3): 235-50.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh 2009. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Christie-Peters, Quill 2017. Anishinaabe Art-Making as Falling in Love: Reflections on Artistic Programming for Urban Indigenous Youth. (MA Thesis), *University of Victoria*.
- Chute, Janet E. and Allan Knight 2006. Taking Up the Torch: Simon J. Dawson and the Native Resource Campaign of the 1860s and 1870s in *With Good Intentions: Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal Relations in Colonial Canada*. Celia Haig-Brown and David Nock eds. 106-131. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Clifford, James. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill 2002. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. 2nd, rev. 10th anniversary ed. London; New York; Routledge.
- Collins, Patricia Hill and Sirma Bilge 2016. *Intersectionality*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA; Polity Press.
- Cottam S. Barry 1991. Indian Title as a "Celestial Institution": David Mills and the St Catherine's Milling's Case in *Aboriginal Resource Use in Canada: Historical and Legal Aspects*. Kerry M. Abel, Jean Friesen eds. Winnipeg, Man: University of Manitoba Press.
- Cottam, S. Barry. 1995. *Federal/Provincial Disputes, Natural Resources and the Treaty No. 3 Ojibway, 1867-1924*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cowen, Deborah 2018. The Jurisdiction of Infrastructure: Circulation and Canadian Settler Colonialism. *The Funambulist* 17.
- Crawley, Ashon. 2015. Otherwise, instituting. *Performance Research* 20 (4): 85-9.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle 1989. 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics'. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140: 139-167.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241-99.
- Cronin, J. Keri. 2011. *Manufacturing National Park Nature: Photography, Ecology, and the Wilderness Industry of Jasper*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Dacey, Alison F. 1993. *Treaty 3: The Failure of the Canadian Government to Protect Native Treaty Rights, 1905--1920*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

- Daugherty, Wayne 1986. *Treaty Research Report, Treaty No. 3*. Ottawa: Treaties and Historical Research Centre, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.
- Dawson, Simon J 1859. *Report on the Exploration of the Country Between Lake Superior and the Red River Settlement, and Between the Latter Place and the Assiniboine and Saskatchewan*. Toronto: Lovell.
- Dawson, Simon J. 1869. *Report on the Line of Route Between Lake Superior and the Red River Settlement* Ottawa: I.B. Taylor.
- Dawson, Simon J. 1871. *Report on the Red River Expedition of 1870* Ottawa: Times Printing and Pub. Co.
- Day, Richard J. F., and Tonio Sadik 2002. BC Land Question, Liberal Multiculturalism, and the Spectre of Aboriginal Nationhood. *BC Studies*(134): 5-34.
- Deloria, Philip 1998. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Di Palma, Vittoria 2014. *Wasteland: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dotson, Kristen 2011. Tracking Epistemic Violence, Tracking Practices of Silencing. *Hypatia* 26 (2): 236-57.
- Escobar, Arturo 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2006. Difference and Conflict in the Struggle over Natural Resources: A Political Ecology Framework. *Development* 49 (3): 6-13.
- Falzetti, Ashley. 2015. Archival Absence: The Burden of History. *Settler Colonial Studies* 5 (2): 128-44.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, Michel 2003. *Society Must be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*. 1st ed. New York: Picador.
- Foucault, Michel 2013. *Lectures on the Will to Know: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1970-1971; and Oedipal Knowledge*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fricker, Miranda. 2007. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Genovese, Taylor R. 2016. Decolonizing Archival Methodology: Combating Hegemony and Moving Towards a Collaborative Archival Environment. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 12 (1): 32-42.
- Gibson, Dale 2015. *Law, Life, and Government at Red River, volume 1: Settlement and Governance, 1812-1872*. Vol. 13. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. 2008. Diverse Economies: Performative Practices for 'Other' Worlds. *Progress in Human Geography* 32 (5): 613-32.
- Gladman, George, Simon J. Dawson and Henry Youle Hind. 1858. *Report on the Exploration of the Country Between Lake Superior and the Red River Settlement*. Toronto: Lovell, printer.

- Goeman, Mishuana. 2008. From Place to Territories and Back Again: Centering Storied Land in the Discussion of Indigenous Nation-Building. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies* 1 (1):23-34.
- Goeman, Mishuana. 2009. Notes toward a Native Feminism's Spatial Practice. *Wicazo Sa Review* 24 (2): 169-187.
- Goeman, Mishuana. 2013. *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping our Nations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Grand Council Treaty 3 2018. "We have kept our part of the treaty" the Anishinaabe Understanding of Treaty #3. <http://www.ocsta.on.ca/ocsta/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/We-Have-Kept-Our-Part-Of-The-Treaty-Booklet.pdf>. Last Accessed August 11, 2018.
- Greenblatt, Stephen Jay. 1991. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Oxford [England]; New York: Clarendon Press.
- Griffith, Jane. 2017. Hoover Damn: Land, Labor, and Settler Colonial Cultural Production. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 17 (1): 30-40.
- Halberstam, Judith 2011. *The Queer Art of Failure*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hall, Anthony J. 1991. The St. Catherine's Milling vs. the Queen: Indian Land Rights as a Factor in Federal-Provincial Relations in Nineteenth Century Canada in *Aboriginal Resource Use in Canada: Historical and Legal Aspects*. Kerry M. Abel, Jean Friesen eds. Winnipeg, Man: University of Manitoba Press.
- H2O Power. Fort Frances Generating Station. <http://www.h2opower.com/locations/fort-frances/>. Last Accessed August 8, 2018.
- Haraway, Donna. 1988. Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575-99.
- Harman, S. Bruce 1896. *Twas 26 Years Ago: Narrative of the Red River Expedition, 1870* Toronto: Toronto Mail and Empire.
- Harring, Sidney L., 1998. *White Man's Law: Native People in Nineteenth-century Canadian Jurisprudence*. Toronto: Published for the Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History by University of Toronto Press.
- Harris Cole. 2004. How Did Colonialism Dispossess? Comments from an Edge of Empire. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94(1):165–182
- Herman, RDK. 2008. Reflections on the Importance of Indigenous Geography. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 32 (3): 73-88.
- Hind, Henry Youle, S. J. Dawson, George Gladman 1858. *Report on the Exploration of the Country Between Lake Superior and the Red River Settlement*. Toronto [Ont.]: J. Lovell, printer. Printed by order of the Legislative Assembly.
- Hind, Henry Youle 1860. *Narrative of the Canadian Red River Exploring Expedition of 1857: And of the Assiniboine and Saskatchewan Exploring Expedition of 1858*. London: Longman, Green, Longmen and Roberts.
- Holmes, Cindy, Sarah Hunt, and Amy Piedalue. 2015. Violence, Colonialism and Space: Towards a Decolonizing Dialogue. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 2014, 14(2), 539-570.

Holzmann, Tim E., Victor P. Lytwyn, and Leo G. Waisberg. 1988. Rainy River Sturgeon: An Ojibway Resource in the Fur Trade Economy. *The Canadian Geographer* 32 (3): 194-205.

Holzmann, Tim and Leo G. Waisberg. 1993. Agriculture and one 19th-century Ojibwa Band: "They Hardly Ever Lose Sight of Their Field". *Papers of the Algonquian Conference* 24: 407-24.

Holzmann, Tim, Leo Waisberg and Joan Lovisek. 1998. Rainy River: Heartland of the Grand Council Ojibway in *Sacred Lands: Aboriginal World Views, Claims, and Conflicts*. Jill Oakes ed. Edmonton: Canadian Circumpolar Institute Press.

Hunt, Sarah 2014a. *Witnessing the Colonialscape: Lighting the Intimate Fires of Indigenous Legal Pluralism*. Diss. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Hunt, Sarah. 2014b. Ontologies of Indigeneity: The Politics of Embodying a Concept. *Cultural Geographies* 21 (1): 27-32.

Hunt, Sarah, and Cindy Holmes 2015. Everyday Decolonization: Living a Decolonizing Queer Politics. *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 19 (2): 154-72.

Huyshe, George Lightfoot. 1871. *The Red River Expedition*. Toronto London and New York: Macmillan.

Ilyniak, Natalia. 2014. Mercury Poisoning in Grassy Narrows: Environmental Injustice, Colonialism, and Capitalist Expansion in Canada. *McGill Sociological Review* 4: 43-66.

International Joint Commission 1918. *Final Report of the International Joint Commission on the Pollution of Boundary Waters Reference*. Washington-Ottawa: Washington: Govt. print. off.

International Joint Commission 1917 *Final Report of the International Joint Commission in the Lake of the Woods Reference*. Washington-Ottawa: Washington: Govt. print. off.

International Joint Commission 1926. *Hearings of the international joint commission on the reference by the United States and Canada in re levels of Rainy Lake and other upper waters of the Lake of the Woods watershed and their future regulation and control being public hearings at international falls, Minn., September 28, 29, 30, 1926*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

International Joint Commission 1934 *Final Report of International Joint Commission on the Rainy Lake Reference Washington-Ottawa 1934*. Ottawa: J.O Patenaude.

International Joint Commission. 2018a. Fact Sheet #7 Mercury in Fish. <http://ijc.org/files/tinymce/uploaded/RNLRCSB/Factsheet%207.pdf>. Last Accessed, August 11, 2018.

International Joint Commission 2018b. Fact Sheet #8 Peaking and Ponding. http://ijc.org/files/tinymce/uploaded/RNLRCSB/Factsheet_Peaking_Ponding_8.pdf. Last Accessed August 11, 2018.

Kaika, Maria. 2006. Dams as Symbols of Modernization: The Urbanization of Nature between Geographical Imagination and Materiality. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 96 (2): 276-301.

J. Kēhaulani Kauanui 2016. "A Structure, Not an Event": Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity," *Lateral* 5.1.

- Kinew, Kathi Avery. 1995. *Manito Gitgaan Governing in the Great Spirit's Garden: Wild Rice in Treaty Number 3: An Example of Indigenous Government Public Policy Making and Intergovernmental Relations between the Boundary Waters Anishinaabeg and the Crown, 1869--1994*. (PhD Dissertation) University of Manitoba: NQ23618.
- King, Thomas 2013. *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kovach, Margaret 2009. *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations and Contexts*. Toronto [Ont.]: University of Toronto Press.
- Kuhlberg, Mark. 2005. "Eyes Wide Open": E. W. Backus and the Pitfalls of Investing in Ontario's Pulp and Paper Industry, 1902-1932. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 16 (1): 201-33.
- Kulchyski, Peter. 1994. *Unjust Relations: Aboriginal Rights in Canadian Courts*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2008. *Reshaping the University: Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes, and the Logic of the Gift*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- LaDuke, Winona. 2002. *The Winona LaDuke Reader: A Collection of Essential Writings*. Penticton, B.C: Theytus Books.
- Latulippe, Nicole. 2015. Bridging Parallel Rows: Epistemic Difference and Relational Accountability in Cross-cultural Research. *International Indigenous Policy Journal* 6 (2): 1-17.
- Lawrence, Bonita 2003. Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States: An Overview. *18* (2): 3-31.
- Lefebvre, Henri 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford; Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Lipsitz, George. 2006. *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Littlejohn, Bruce M. 1967. *The Dawson Route: A Phase of Westward Expansion*. University of British Columbia. (MA Thesis): University of British Columbia.
- Lovisek, Joan A. 1994. Lac des Mille Lacs "Dammed and Diverted": An Ethnohistorical Study. *Papers of the Algonquian Conference* 25: 285-314.
- Lovisek, Joan. 1998. The Lac des Mille Lacs Tragedy: Anatomy of a Century of Flooding in *Sacred Lands: Aboriginal World Views, Claims, and Conflicts*. Jill Oakes ed. Edmonton: Canadian Circumpolar Institute Press.
- Luby, Brittany. 2010. "The Department is going back on These Promises": An examination of Anishinaabe and Crown Understandings of Treaty. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 30 (2): 203-228.
- Luby, Brittany. 2015. From Milk-Medicine to Public (Re)Education Programs: An examination of Anishinabek Mothers' Responses to Hydroelectric Flooding in the Treaty #3 District, 1900-1975. *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 32 (2): 363-89.
- Macoun, Alissa, and Elizabeth Strakosch. 2013. The Ethical Demands of Settler Colonial Theory. *Settler Colonial Studies* 3 (3-04): 426-443.

- Mackey, Eva. 2016. *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty, Land and Settler Decolonization*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Mainville, Sara J. 2007. *Manidoo Mazina'igan: An Anishinaabe Perspective of Treaty 3*. (MA Thesis) University of Toronto: MR27478.
- Massey, Doreen B. 2005. *For Space*. London: Sage.
- Mawani, Renisa, 2009. *Colonial Proximities: Crossracial Encounters and Juridical Truths in British Columbia, 1871-1921*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Mbembe, Achille. 2003. *Necropolitics*. *Public Culture* 15(1):11–40.
- McAdam, Sylvia. 2015. *Nationhood Interrupted: Revitalizing Nēhiyaw Legal Systems*. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Limited.
- McKittrick, Katherine. 2006. *Demonic Grounds: Black Women and the Cartographies of Struggle*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McNabb, David 1991. 'Principally Rocks and Burnt Lands' Crown Reserves and the Tragedy of the Sturgeon Lake First Nation.' *Aboriginal Resource Use in Canada*. Ed. Kerry Abel and Jean Friesen. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1991. 157-172.
- McNabb, David 1999. *Circles of Time: Aboriginal Land Rights and Resistance in Ontario*. Waterloo, Ont., Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- McNabb, David 2004. Borders of Water and Fire: Islands as Sacred Places and as Meeting Grounds. *Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes*. Ed. Jill Oakes and Rick Riewe. Winnipeg: Aboriginal Issues Press, 2004. 35-46.
- McNeil, Kent 1999 "Social Darwinism and Judicial Conceptions of Indian Title in Canada in the 1880s." *Journal of the West* 38 (1): 68-76.
- Medak-Saltzman, Danika. 2010. Transnational Indigenous Exchange: Rethinking Global Interactions of Indigenous Peoples at the 1904 St. Louis Exposition. *American Quarterly* 62 (3): 591-615.
- Menzies, Charles R. 2001. Reflections on Research with, for, and among Indigenous Peoples. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 25 (1): 19-36.
- Menzies, Charles R. 2004. Putting Words into Action: Negotiating Collaborative Research in Gitxaala. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 28 (1/2): 15-32.
- Mignolo, Walter. 2003. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Milloy, John 2008. "Indian Act Colonialism: A Century of Dishonour, 1869-1969." Research Paper for the National Centre for First Nations Governance. http://fngovernance.org/ncfng_research/milloy.pdf
- Mohanty, Chandra Tolpade. 1991. 'Under Western Eyes. Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses' in C. Mohanty, A. Russo and L. Torres (eds) *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Mollett, Sharlene. 2014. A Modern Paradise: Garifuna Land, Labor, and Displacement-in-place. *Latin American Perspectives* 41 (6): 27-45.

- Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. 2011. The White Man's Burden: Patriarchal White Epistemic Violence and Aboriginal Women's Knowledges within the Academy. *Australian Feminist Studies* 26 (70): 413.
- Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. 2015. *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Morgensen, Scott Lauria. 2011. The Biopolitics of Settler Colonialism: Right Here, Right Now. *Settler Colonial Studies* 1 (1): 52-76.
- Nadasdy, Paul. 2003. *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge, and Aboriginal-State Relations in the Southwest Yukon*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Nash, Jennifer C. 2008. Re-Thinking Intersectionality. *Feminist Review* 89: 1-15.
- Neckoway, Ramona. 2007. Amiskuk Boo-Koo Ta Ki Oosey-Ta-Chik Ki-Piikuna: "Only Beavers Should Build Dams". (MA Thesis) University of Manitoba: MR26164.
- Newcomb, Steven T. 2008. *Pagans in the Promised Land Decoding the Doctrine of Christian Discovery*. New York: Fulcrum Publishing.
- Nixon, Rob. 2011. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Ontario. 1885. High Court of Justice. *The Ontario Reports: Containing Reports of Cases Decided in the Queen's Bench and Chancery Divisions of the High Court of Justice for Ontario*. Toronto: Rowsell & Hutchison, 1882-1901.
- Palliser, John. 1859. *Papers Relative to the Exploration by Captain Palliser of that Portion of British North America which Lies between the Northern Branch of the River Saskatchewan and the Frontier of the United States; and between the Red River and Rocky Mountains*. London: G.E. Eyre and W. Spottiswoode.
- Palliser, John. 1863. *Exploration-British North America: The Journals, Detailed Reports, and Observations Relative to the Exploration, by Captain Palliser, of that portion of British North America, which, in Latitude, Lies between the British Boundary Line and the Height of Land or Watershed of the Northern or Frozen Ocean Respectively, and in Longitude, between the Western Shore of Lake Superior and the Pacific Ocean during the Years 1857, 1858, 1859, and 1860.*: G.E. Eyre and W. Spottiswoode.
- Pasternak, Shiri. 2017. *Grounded Authority: The Algonquins of Barriere Lake Against the State*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Peluso, Nancy and Christian Lund. 2011. New Frontiers in Land Control. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(4):667-681.
- Plumwood, Val. 1993. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. New York: Routledge.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge.
- Razack, Sherene. 2002. Introduction: When Race Becomes Place in *Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Recollet, Karyn. 2016. Gesturing Indigenous Futurities Through the Remix. *Dance Research Journal* 48 (1): 91-105.
- Regan, Paulette. 2010. *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

- Rifkin, Mark 2014. *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rowe, Aimee Carrillo, and Eve Tuck. 2017. Settler Colonialism and Cultural Studies: Ongoing Settlement, Cultural Production, and Resistance. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 17 (1): 3-13.
- Royle, Stephen A. 2011. *Company, Crown and Colony: The Hudson's Bay Company and Territorial Endeavour in Western Canada*. New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Said, Edward W. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. 1st ed. New York: Knopf.
- Said, Edward W. 2003. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Searle, R. Newell 1977. *Saving Quetico-Superior: A Land Set Apart*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press.
- Seine River Watershed Management Plan. *Lac des Mille Lacs Dam*. <http://seineriverwmp.com/lacdesmillelacs.html>. Last Accessed August 10, 2018.
- Sharpe, Christina 2016. *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Short, Damien 2016. *Redefining Genocide: Settler Colonialism, Social Death and Ecocide*. Chicago: Zed Books
- Simmons, Kristen 2017. Settler Atmospheric. *Cultural Anthropology*. <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/1221-settler-atmospherics>. Last Accessed September 4.
- Simpson, Audra 2007. On Ethnographic Refusal: Indigeneity, 'Voice' and Colonial Citizenship. *Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue* (9): 67-80.
- Simpson, Audra 2014. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Simpson, Audra 2017. The Ruse of Consent and the Anatomy of 'Refusal': Cases from Indigenous North America and Australia. *Postcolonial Studies* 20 (1): 18-33.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2017. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sium, Aman, Chandra Desai and Eric Ritskes 2012. Towards the 'Tangible Unknown': Decolonization and the Indigenous Future. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*. 1 (1):i-xiii.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 2nd ed. London: Zed Books.
- Smith, Neil 2008. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. 3rd ed. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Snelgrove, Corey, Rita Kaur Dhamoon and Jeff Corntassel 2014. Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*. 3 (2):1-32

- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2010. *Can the Subaltern Speak?: Reflections on the History of an Idea*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Stark, Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiiik. 2010. Respect, Responsibility, and Renewal: The Foundations of Anishinaabe Treaty Making with the United States and Canada. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 34 (2): 145-164.
- Stark, Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiiik. 2012. Marked by Fire: Anishinaabe Articulations of Nationhood in Treaty Making with the United States and Canada. *American Indian Quarterly* 36 (2): 119-149.
- Stark, Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiiik. 2016. Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land. *Theory & Event* 19 (4). <https://muse-jhu-edu.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/article/633282>. Last Accessed September 8, 2018.
- Steinhauer, Evelyn. 2002. Thoughts on an Indigenous Research Methodology. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 26 (2): 69-81.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 2009. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Suchet-Pearson, S., K. Lloyd, L. Burarrwanga, R. Ganambarr, M. Ganambarr-Stubbs, B. Ganambarr, and D. Maymuru. 2016. The Politics of Ontology and Ontological Politics. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 6 (1): 23-27.
- Telford, Rhonda Mae. 1996. "The Sound of the Rustling of the Gold is Under My Feet Where I Stand; We Have a Rich Country": A History of Aboriginal Mineral Resources in Ontario. (PhD Dissertation). University of Toronto: NQ41579.
- Thomas, Martin. 2015. What Is an Expedition? An Introduction. *Expedition into Empire: Exploratory Journeys and the Making of the Modern World*. Martin Thomas ed. New York: Routledge. 1-24
- Todd, Zoe. 2016. An Indigenous Feminist's Take on the Ontological Turn: 'Ontology' is Just Another Word for Colonialism. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 29 (1): 4-22.
- Todd, Zoe 2017. Teaching in Place: Fostering Relationality and Reciprocity in the Classroom in 2017. *Savage Minds*. <https://savageminds.org/2017/08/19/teaching-in-place-fostering-relationality-and-reciprocity-in-the-classroom-in-2017/>. Last Accessed August 9, 2018.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph 2015. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Tuck, Eve. 2009a. Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities. *Harvard Educational Review* 79 (3): 409-428.
- Tuck, Eve 2009b. Re-visioning Action: Participatory Action Research and Indigenous Theories of Change. *The Urban Review* 41 (1): 47-65.
- Tuck, Eve 2010. Breaking up with Deleuze: Desire and Valuing the Irreconcilable. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 23 (5): 635-50.
- Tuck, Eve, and Marcia McKenzie 2015. Relational Validity and the "Where" of inquiry: Place and Land in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 21 (7): 633-8.

- Tuck, Eve, and Marcia McKenzie 2014. *Place in Research: Theory, Methodology, and Methods*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang 2012. Decolonization is Not a Metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (1): 1-40.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2014. Unbecoming Claims: Pedagogies of Refusal in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 20 (6): 811-818.
- Tuesday, Martin, and Violet Tuesday. 1998. The Effects of Loss of Traditional Lands in Lac Seul and Lake St. Joseph Areas in *Sacred Lands: Aboriginal World Views, Claims, and Conflicts*. Jill Oakes ed. Edmonton: Canadian Circumpolar Institute Press.
- Veracini, Lorenzo 2010. The Imagined Geographies of Settler Colonialism in *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 179-197.
- Veracini, Lorenzo 2015. Settler Colonial Expeditions in *Expedition into Empire: Exploratory Journeys and the Making of the Modern World*. Martin Thomas ed. New York: Routledge. 51-64
- Vizenor, Gerald Robert 1994. *Manifest Manners: Postindian Warriors of Survivance*. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Vizenor, Gerald Robert. 1998. *Fugitive Poses: Native American Indian Scenes of Absence and Presence*. Lincoln, Neb: University of Nebraska Press.
- Waisberg, Leo, Joan Lovisek and Tim Holzkamm. 1996. Ojibwa Reservations as "An Incubus upon the Territory": The Indian Removal Policy of Ontario 1874-1982 in *Papers of the Twenty-Seventh Algonquian conference*. David H. Pentland. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba. 337-352
- Wagamese, Richard. 2011. *Runaway Dreams: Poems*. Vancouver: Ronsdale Press.
- Waisberg, Leo and Tim Holzkamm. 1998. From Ojibway Homeland to Reservoir: Flooding the Lake of the Woods Anishinaabeg in *Sacred Lands: Aboriginal World Views, Claims, and Conflicts*. Jill Oakes ed. Edmonton: Canadian Circumpolar Institute Press. 177-128.
- Watts, Vanessa. 2013. Indigenous Place-Thought and Agency Amongst Humans and Non Humans (First Woman and Sky Woman go on a European World Tour!). *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 2 (1): 20-34.
- Weizman, Eyal 2007. *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation*. London; New York: Verso.
- Robert A. Williams, Jr. 1990. *The American Indian in Western Legal Thought: The Discourses of Conquest* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whetung, Madeline 2016. *Nishnaabeg encounters: Living Indigenous Landscapes*. (MA Thesis). University of Toronto: 10189364.
- Williams, Jr., Robert 1990; *The American Indian in Western Legal Thought: The Discourses of Conquest*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Shawn 2008. *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Halifax: Fernwood Pub.

Wing, Adrien 1991. Brief Reflections toward a Multiplicative Theory and Praxis of Being. *Berkeley Women's Law Journal* 6: 181-201.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native. *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387-409.

Wolseley, Garnet J. 1871. *Narrative of the Red River Expedition* New York: White and Allen.

Yerxa, Jana-Rae 2014. Gii-kaapizigemin Manoomin Neyaashing: A Resurgence of Anishinaabeg Nationhood *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3 (3): 159-166.

Interviews

Adams, Marilou. April 15, 2018 Personal Interview with Caolan Barr.

Christie-Peters, Quill. August 1, 2018 Personal Interview with Caolan Barr.

McGillis, Steve. June 13, 2018 Personal Interview with Caolan Barr.

Marshall, Leanna. May 4, 2018 Personal Interview with Caolan Barr.

Peters, Ron Momogeeshiik. June 13, 2018 Personal Interview with Caolan Barr.

Legal Rulings

St. Catherine's Milling and Lumber Company v The Queen (Ontario) [1888] UKPC 70 (12 December 1888).

Fort Frances v. Boise Cascade Canada Ltd. 1983 S.C.R. 171.

St Catherine's Milling and Lumber Company v The Queen [1887 CanLII 3](#), 13 SCR 577 (20 June 1887).