Worlds on the Edge:
The Politics of Settler Resentment on the Saugeen/Bruce Peninsula

by

Phil Henderson
B.A., The University of Western Ontario, 2014

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Political Science

Worlds on the Edge:
The Politics of Settler Resentment on the Saugeen/Bruce Peninsula

By

Phil Henderson
B.A., The University of Western Ontario, 2014

Supervisory Committee:

Dr. Simon Glezos, (Department of Political Science)
Supervisor

Dr. Heidi Stark, (Department of Political Science)
Departmental Member

Supervisory Committee:

Dr. Simon Glezos, (Department of Political Science)
Supervisor

Dr. Heidi Stark, (Department of Political Science)
Departmental Member

Abstract:

Why is it that, at a time when countless state officials are apologizing for historic wrongs and insisting that Canada has entered a period of reconciliation, many settlers continue to act towards indigenous peoples with unabated aggression and resentment? This thesis attempts to explain the continual reproduction of settler colonialism through an investigation of the processes involved in the formation of settlers as political subjects. Developing a Butlerean account of the subject, the author suggests that settlers are produced through colonial regimes as political subjects with deep and often unacknowledged investments in the reproduction of systems of oppression that provide for their material and psychic position of privilege. While the instability inherent in such systems ultimately threatens settlers themselves – as seen in the collapsing North American middle class – the fragility and precarity experienced by settlers who are targeted by neoliberal reforms often leads them to reinvest in, and aggressively defend, those very systems of power as a matter of subjective continuity.

The author's inquiry into these issues emerges from his own experience as a settler, and as an attempt to understand what motivates the aggression and resentment that many elements within his own community direct towards indigenous peoples. Because of these motivations, much of this thesis is grounded in discussions about the ways in which the author's home community, in the southern Ontario riding of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound, is predicated in ongoing acts of colonization. From burial ground reclamations, to mob violence, to the problems inherent in combatting white supremacy without at once critiquing settler colonialism, each of the examples brought forward in this thesis attempts to analyze why this community of settlers seemingly throbs with a collective anger and indignation that is continually directed at the Saugeen Anishinaabek.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements:

This project cannot begin without first recognizing and acknowledging the indigenous peoples upon whose territories I have been trespassing. The research, writing, and thinking (such as it is) that is contained in these pages would not have been possible were it not for the fact that generations of indigenous peoples have struggled, against seemingly insurmountable odds, to preserve the air, earth, and waters of Turtle Island - elements that I, and my fellow settlers, draw upon daily for sustenance. At various times throughout this project I have trespassed on the territories of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, the Huron-Wendat peoples, and the Métis. I have also imposed myself upon the Anishinaabek, in particular the Saugeen Anishinaabek, and on the Salish peoples, in particular the Lekwungen and W̲SÁNEĆ. The resistance, resurgence, and decolonial projects being undertaken by each of these peoples, and countless other people(s) across this continent and globally, are a constant source of inspiration, galvanization, and hope. All that I can say is thank you, for the gifts that I continually receive from these lands, that I hope the work I am putting forward has been done in a good way, and that I can contribute in some small way to the decolonial work being undertaken across Turtle Island and beyond.

Graduate work is often a very lonely and isolating experience. I am, however, gifted to have been supported and encouraged by a wide array of people and groups. Whatever successes lay in the pages that follow belong as much to those recognized below as they do to me.

Various portions of this project have been endured by a number of different audiences as it developed. An early theoretical model of the first chapter has been published by *Settler Colonial Studies*. And various portions of the project have been read at graduate conferences at UVic and York. To the peer reviewers, to the audiences at these events, and to the friends that I have made in my travels, thank you for your comments, voicing your concerns, and for making this project worthy of at least a second glance.

My supervisor, Simon Glezos, deserves endless credit for guiding me through this entire process. Throughout my time at UVic, and even before arriving, Simon has shown exceptional kindness, concern, and patience as I have meandered my way towards a thesis. His gentle nudges and his deep insights have been nothing short of exceptional. Thank you, Simon.

Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark has my endless gratitude for her incredible graciousness and generosity. Despite being on sabbatical for much of the time that this project was underway, Heidi offered consistent and thoughtful responses to my work. She's also bravely undertaken to supervise my doctoral research. Thank you, Heidi and *miigwech*.

Thank you to David McLaren and Katherine Mann-Jensen for your words of support and your help understanding the complexities of home. The support of the faculty at UVic has also been instrumental in both my academic and personal development and this project would not have been possible without the support of this uniquely committed group of scholars. All our work would not be possible, however, without our dedicated office staff. In particular, our graduate secretary, Joanne Denton, deserves endless credit for her patience and kindness. I would

be remise if I did not recognize the generous support that I have received from various institutions. Of particular note are the Department of Political Science, the Cultural, Social and Political Thought program, and the Faculty of Graduate Studies at the University of Victoria. In addition, I am also exceptionally grateful for the support that I have received from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council.

Throughout my time at UVic I have consistently been surrounded by a community of highly committed and inspiring colleagues. To be able to engage with such caring and insightful individuals has been a true privilege. While I could not hope to name everyone who has impacted me, a special thanks goes out to Janice, Susan, Sasha, Will, Jordan, Jess, Matt, and Elissa. Deepest love to each of you for your intelligence and your friendships.

To Richard and Steph, who have both served as my long-suffering editors, thank you. You both provided the labour that made my labour possible. It's an extreme privilege to know and grow with you and with the rest of 'collective'. Despite not seeing the two of you, Rishita, Danika, Anna, Kelsey, Sam, Nur, Noor, Emma, or Clara with any regularity, your love, friendship, and understanding are unsurpassable.

My family, each of you deserves acknowledgements that cannot be squeezed into this tiny space. To the Vithiananthans and the Rajaratnams, thank you for inviting me to join your families and for giving me kindness and support beyond measure. To all the aunts, uncles, cousins, and other relations who have held me up, while making sure to keep me humble throughout my education, thank you. To my grandfathers, who are both passed on, thank you for the sense of loving obligation and responsibility towards family and community that you instilled in both my parents and which has been passed down to me. To my grandmother who has passed on, thank you for the love of learning and the curiosity about the world that you gave to each and every one of us. To the grandmother who remains to me and to Erwin, thank you for the seemingly bottomless love and affection you show to me always. To Mary Louise, you have an heroic capacity to listen to me prattling on and to show nothing but warmth while doing it, thank you. Aileen and Brett, you two have offered couches, words, and encouragement throughout this project, the Salish Sea always feels more friendly knowing that you're on the other side. Anna, energy and excitement are infectious things and you share these gifts with me and with the world in such an incredible way. Mom and Dad, I don't even think I could begin to do the two of you justice. Despite not necessarily understanding the world that I'm now in, despite my own failings and shortcomings, despite the unkindnesses I've done to you both, you have always been there for me in whatever way I needed it. I know you always will. No one could ask for parents who are more caring or embody goodness as you both do - such parents don't exist. I love you all.

Aruna, whatever I write here is bound to come short of what's in my heart and to do an injustice to my feelings. You have been my rock for more than five years now, and everyday you show me a kind of love - occasionally tinted by exasperation - that my words cannot hope to explain. Together we have both done and seen so much, but there's more still to do, there's a world to see and to fight for. And we'll do it the only way we know how - together and with love.

for Aruna,
for ever

Introduction:

"*history is an armature/ concealed as if by design/ to which our lives are affixed/ only when attractive/ are the timbers shown off*" - Richard-Yves Sitoski[1]

In the fall of 2015 I spent much of my spare time canvassing households across the riding of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound in the run-up to the October federal election, working for the New Democratic Party's candidate David McLaren. A particular, though not atypical, exchange remains quite vivid. After several minutes of amicable conversation, and in a genuinely friendly way, the householder asked: 'so where's David from anyway?' My response of 'Cape Croker' brought an immediate cloud over her previously friendly face; 'So… is he an *Indian*?' she implored - all but spitting out the final word. I replied that no, David is in fact not Anishinaabe, however, his wife is and they live on the reserve. This was the thin-edge of the wedge for her, as she immediately launched into nothing short of tirade about the ways in which 'Indians' act with entitlement and impunity, while 'Us hardworking folk gotta struggle just to get by'.

Unable to listen to this, I cut her invective short and tried to expose her colonial assumptions or, at the very least, to correct many of the outright falsities that she posited as fact. However, my rebuffs only served to exacerbate the tension, as she became increasingly irate and agitated. Ultimately, a stoney silence descended, signalling the end of - perhaps limit to - our interlocution. I left that doorway assured of having lost a vote, and likely several others when she inevitably told her friends and family. But, even more troublingly, I left that doorway knowing that I had just come face to face with example of the aggressively reactionary sensibilities that help to sustain and normalize colonial violences across Canada.

Worse still, was the realization that this woman had been quite kind, receptive, and evenly friendly towards me prior to the revelation of even this tangential connection between myself and the Anishinaabek. That I found this second realization to be worse is not because I mourned or felt melancholic over my brief but now severed connection with this woman. Rather, it was because of the ease with which the connection was established between us at all. This entire exchange revealed how reflexively I am interpellated by, and presumed to be sympathetic towards, social intercourses that reproduce and normalize such blatant bigotry. Moreover, it exposed - not for the first time - how the community in which I was raised and with which I struggle to continue identifying - for what other than an implicit sense of community could mobilize me to knock on the doors of otherwise total strangers - is constituted and sustained by the insidious logics of colonialism.

❖ ❖ ❖

This project, though already underway before this doorstep exchange took place, is my investigation of, and response to, such interactions. The research that follows below is part of my process of working through how it is that the community in which I was raised and other

communities much like it are consumed by an increasingly ubiquitous sense of fragility. Particularly, I hope to determine why this fragility so readily leads to hostility and aggression, rather than conciliation and solidarity. At no point have I doubted that this sense of precarity is genuine or real. I can easily imagine that the woman I canvassed has experienced economic precarity, as I have watched friends and family members struggle to get by in increasingly difficult situations with decreasing support from all sides. The fact remains, however, that such precarity is not evenly distributed. Various factors such as class, race, gender, sexuality, ability, and colonial status intersect one another, attenuating the production of precariousness. By almost any system of measurement, the woman who so aggressively asserted her sense of precarity is better off than the average indigenous person living under Canadian colonialism - despite this woman's presumption that indigenous people(s) are the lazy beneficiaries of some sort of entitlement program. Yet at the mere mention of indigenous peoples (or things, people, or places associated with them), an immediate sense of pain and vulnerability was activated, which is then expressed through anger and aggression. This, despite the fact that indigenous peoples across Turtle Island continue to undergo the occupational violences of settler colonialism - processes from which settlers, like this woman, continually benefit.

It is this inverted logic that I want to begin understanding: the proclivity that many of us settlers in precarious but still relatively privileged situations have towards locating, often reflexively, the source of our precarity in the figure of an 'other'. I especially wanted to understand why it is that this spectral figure of the other is likely to emerge from a distorted (re)imagining of those who are even further removed from dominant systems of power. This project is thus an effort to explore and to situate the sensibilities, emotions, and commitments

that underpin the visceral reactions settlers often display when encountering indigenous peoples. Moreover, I consider how these dispositions are mediated at once individually and collectively in an era of increasing economic precarity. As such, the analysis that I provide throughout this project is situated within a wider critique of systems of power, that at once act to enable and constrain action, contouring speech and imaginative capacities. In particular, I explore how this growing sense of precarity within settler communities is engendered by the processes of neoliberalization. I suggest that these processes have altered the accumulative and distributive patterns of the economy, dispossessing many communities of the comfortable lifestyles to which they had become accustomed. Importantly, however, in pursuing this line of thought, I refuse to reproduce the mournable fantasies of a now disappeared and lamented middle class.[2] I suggest that the emergence and sustainability of the (now increasingly precarious) Canadian middle class has been, and remains, predicated upon the ongoing settler colonization of Turtle Island. That is to say, that the establishment of a Canadian middle class, the loss of which might be mourned, is possible only through processes which continuously reproduce irredeemable suffering as they displace, disappear, assimilate, or murder countless indigenous people(s) in order to establish and maintain the settler colony.

The project that follows below considers how these two regimes of power - settler colonialism and neoliberalization - act in assemblage with one another to produce, form, and sustain political subjectivities. It is my contention that the political subject produced through the confluence of these regimes, who I call the neoliberal settler, exists within a space of liminality. Increasingly precarious as a result of neoliberalization - as signalled in the withdrawal of the welfare state and its redistributive policies - the neoliberal settler nevertheless remains a

substantial beneficiary of, and deeply invested in, the reproduction of regimes of settler colonization which continually strive to dispossess and displace indigenous peoples. I suggest that as more settlers experience marginalization as a result of neoliberalization - that is the weakening of labour laws, increased internationalization leading to the offshoring of jobs, and withdrawal of state spending on social programs and regional development schemes - a sense of fragility or precarity mobilizes settlers in a politics of recrimination and revanchism, and that this rancorous politics has as an implicit target the indigenous peoples of Turtle Island who continually resist and challenge the structures of colonization. Thus, the underlying contention of my thesis is that neoliberalization is an active re-entrenchment of settler colonialism. This is true on the obvious level that, in Canada, neoliberalization presumes, reproduces, and even extends the basic precepts of the settler economy, attempting the further destruction of indigenous peoples' economies and of their relationship with their territories. However, neoliberalization also causes settlers to actively recommit themselves to the most aggressive and destructive processes of settler colonialism as they rancorously defend the regimes of oppressive power which produce them as intelligible subjects. Given that the resurgence of indigenous peoples has forced the settler state into ostensibly committing itself to a rather dubious politics of reconciliation and recognition, the anti-indigenous aggression that is invoked in settlers as a result of neoliberalization tends to exceed even the coloniality of the settler state itself.[3]

Positioning the Researcher:

As someone who has come to self-identify as a settler, I believe it is of critical importance to situate myself within the context of my own work. This is meant to at once identify the position from which I approach the questions and concerns embedded in this project,

as well as to reveal the commitments and intentions that I bring. Although I have striven throughout this project to maintain a position of some academic and authorial removal from the subject at hand, the fact remains that I maintain inextricable bonds to the people(s), places, and issues that are considered in the text that follows. As such, the exercise of self-situating is of as much benefit for myself - reminding me of the reasons why I came to this project and what I hope to achieve - as it is for the reader - who I hope will be better able to imagine the person behind the text.

I am a settler, recognized as a citizen of the settler colony known as Canada, and for much of my life I have occupied the territories of the Saugeen Anishinaabek - although it is only within the past several years that I have come to learn and to grapple with this fact - located just below the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula in southwestern Ontario. My father's side, a mix of Scottish, Irish, and English descendants, originally settled around present-day Fergus, before migrating further north towards the end of the 19th Century. The Henderson's and the Smyth's settled around the small hamlet known as Keady - named after a village in Ireland. While many relatives have scattered throughout the area and around the world, my own immediate family has remained in Keady to the present day. Less is recorded about my mother's family, though I know it to be predominately a mix of Irish and Scottish. Similar to my father's side, the Clarke's and the Lemon's have occupied Saugeen Anishinaabek territories for at least five or six generations. Most of this side of the family has remained settled around the hamlet of Bognor - likely named after Bognor-Regis in England - located about twenty kilometres east of Keady. All this is to note that my story, like those of my ancestors, is deeply entangled within the history of settler colonization in Saugeen Anishinaabek territories. Presently, I live and work in Victoria, British

Columbia which is situated on Salish territories, in particular on the lands of the Lekwungen and W̱SÁNEĆ peoples.

Given this, it is an immutable fact that I am as much a product of the very processes which this project seeks to critique - and ultimately to disrupt - as are any of the subjects who appear within the pages below. I am no less a beneficiary of settler colonialism simply because I have chosen to critique it. But, it is precisely because I am such a beneficiary - because my comfort is predicated upon the historic and ongoing immiseration of others - that I am responsible for striving to critique power and for working with others towards decoloniality. This is what I take Paulette Regan to mean when she suggests that "it is necessary to link the individual's sense of personal responsibility to the collective socio-political, moral, and ethical responsibility that we carry."[4] It's not nearly enough to critique power, without at once recognizing and challenging the ways in which I am personally, and we as settlers collectively, are complicit in said power. Thus, as the project proceeds, I hope it is apparent that I am not removing or excusing myself from the critiques that I level against settlers more generally. Rather, the reader should imagine that I sit as much within these pages as a subject of my own critiques as does any other settler.

Why this Project?

As is likely clear already, this project is meant as a deliberate analysis of, and response to, a set of sensibilities that I perceive to be permeating my community. Crucially, I am not alone in this perception. Following a particularly disturbing confrontation wherein a mob of settlers in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound physically threatened a young Anishinaabe woman and her child, Marilyn Struthers wrote that the aggression of her fellow settlers in that mob had been what she

called an act of “diminishment”. What Struthers calls diminishment, was simply a revelation, plain for all to see, that the “image of peacefulness, contentment, and community” that so often defines settlers’ comfortable sense of themselves, and of Owen Sound in generally, is principally untrue.[5] We settlers of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound are diminished, individually and collectively, by the seemingly continuous revelation that - despite our high rhetoric of civility, neighbourliness, and quietude - as a community we remain ready and willing to exact enormous violences in the name of preserving our claims to space and place against any and all acts of sovereignty by the Saugeen Anishinaabek or other indigenous peoples.

In part, my work is motivated by a desire to attend to this diminishment. Critically, this is not born out of a naïve attempt to *reclaim* a self-image of an idyllic community which has only recently fallen from grace; the litany of violences constitutive of the present clearly conveys this was never the case. Rather, I intend to work towards a future wherein this diminishment is unable to reproduce itself. For, in as much as I and my community are unquestionably settler colonists in territories that are not ours, I hope that this is not all that we are capable of being. Instead, I am motivated by a sincere wish that I, and my community, can act differently than we have since arriving in Saugeen Anishinaabek territory. Despite the machinations of, and our continued (re)investment in, the oppressive and dispossessive processes of settler colonization up to the present moment, there remains the potential for the formation of a decolonial ethic that will demand and necessitate that we stand ready *as a community* to act like the treaty-partners we were always meant to be. Working with the Saugeen Anishinaabek in a good way, and with respect for all of our relations. When this comes to pass, I hope that I will no longer have to struggle to identify with my own community.

While this project partakes in many dense and seemingly esoteric debates, it does so always with an eye towards grounding such matters in the concrete realities of neoliberalized settler colonialism in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound. As such, I have endeavoured to unpack my concerns by engaging them within the cultural, social, and political milieu of my own community. This decision could certainly be limiting, as it sharply curtails the contexts from which I can draw examples or towards which my assertions might be directed. As a result of their locally-driven specificity the observations that I put forward below may not be valid more generally, or even outside of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound at all. I take this as an acceptable risk for two reasons: first, as I elaborate throughout the text, settler colonialism is constituted by uneven processes that develop in heterogenous ways. Specificity is thus quite often necessary to ensure fidelity to local truths. Second, I take it as a welcome ethical imposition to speak from and to my own positionality. Too often academic inquiry becomes a view from nowhere: expounding knowledge of and judgements against communities with which the researcher has only tangential or fleeting connections. I intend to ensure that this is not the case in my own work.

My decision to remain largely fixed in locality does, however, offer important benefits. Primary amongst these being that a text which is focused on a particular context has the potential to generate more engagement within that context. Confronted by names, places, and events with which they are already at least partially familiar, I suspect that many would-be readers are more likely to consider and reflect upon, or at least see themselves as having a direct stake in, the arguments being posited. By concretizing my work within a fixed locality the theoretical and metaphorical abstractions of academic work become less overpowering as concrete and relatable concerns are foregrounded. My greatest wish for this project is that it might be read by at least a

few people who are working towards bettering the situation in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound, and that because I was unflinching in my critique of myself and my own neighbours, they recognize the necessity of being unflinching in their resolve to do things differently.

This project is also meant to contribute to the small - but quite exceptional - body of literature that already concerns itself with a variety of issues in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound - including both settler colonialism and neoliberalization, though seldom stated in those terms and even more rarely considered together. The texts within this academic corpus fall into three broad camps. The first historicizes settler colonization (*qua* settlement, development, encroachment, etc.) in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound, the best and most critical works are usually conducted by Anishinaabek authors and their allies.[6] The second camp explores contemporary conflicts between settlers and the Saugeen Anishinaabek, primarily focusing on the dramatic events of the mid-1990s.[7] Finally, a small but growing body of literature - the most important parts of which have been produced by local organizations - investigates the impact of neoliberalization in the area.[8] As I see it, my work attempts to situate itself between these three camps: at once taking the challenges posed by neoliberalization seriously, while also refusing to reproduce the silences of various academics and activists that continue to occlude settlers' ongoing investments in and aggressive reproduction of neoliberal settler coloniality.

Why these Words?

The words we chose to use are of vital importance, as they give shape to, and establish the limits of, the ways in which we think of things. As such, a brief comment is required to explain several of the most deliberate lexical decisions that I have made. The first is my usage of "Saugeen Anishinaabek" to denote the indigenous peoples on whose territories Bruce-Grey-

Owen Sound is situated. To many, this may seem odd, especially as settlers on and around the Peninsula are accustomed to talking about their treaty-partners as the “Saugeen First Nation” and the “Chippewas of Nawash” or - for those more versed in the issues - collectively as the “Saugeen Ojibway Nations”. Indeed, these are the words often used by the indigenous people(s) of the Peninsula to describe themselves.[9] By eschewing such terms I do not wish impose typologies on another people, rather I mobilize already operable words that produce an inclusivity which rejects - to the greatest degree possible - determinants established by and in reference to the legal strictures imposed by the settler state. Saugeen and Nawash both refer to the reserves onto which the indigenous peoples of the Peninsula were forced by the Crown.[10] Such names are thus entwined with the imposition of colonial law on the Peninsula and are used in this project only to deliberately reference the reserves and the communities living there as such. While I do not, and could not, disparage the usage of Saugeen or Nawash by others, I have opted instead for words that I hope will centre the national and sovereign power of the indigenous peoples of the Peninsula. “Anishinaabek” is the name used since before colonization, and “Saugeen” is the Anishinaabemowin word for “river mouth”, though it also denotes a large river that cuts through Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound.[11] By referring to the Saugeen Anishinaabek as such, my intent is to name and invoke the continuous presence of the sovereign peoples with whom the Crown entered into treaties relations.

My decision to use the words “indigenous peoples” has been informed by a similar line of thinking. While academics and activists often use “aboriginal peoples”, “native peoples”, or “First Nations” interchangeably with “indigenous peoples”, I have deliberately chosen to avoid this tactic. With the exception of instances where I make reference the works of others, I use the

term “indigenous peoples” to describe the multitude of political, social, and cultural communities who have existed in sovereign and reciprocal relations with Turtle Island since time immemorial - and who continue to do so, despite the violences levelled against them by settler colonization. Usage of the term “aboriginal peoples” has been increasingly disparaged, as contrary to popular belief the word’s etymological origins imply that the peoples referenced are *not* the original inhabitants (they are *ab*-original). By contrast, while “native peoples” certainly implies an original inhabitation, I have found that in daily conversations or in coverage of the issues I discuss below, this phrase is very often used by settlers - particularly the worst amongst us in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound - in a pejorative or demeaning way. These negative, even bigoted, associations have led me to set these words aside almost entirely. Finally, I have neglected to use “First Nations” - except in very explicit contexts - because these words carry particular meanings within the legal system of the Canadian settler colony. Within settler law “First Nations” refers to the various communities and councils recognized under the *Indian Act* and, thus, not to sovereign political communities that both exceed and precede recognition by the Crown.[12]

While none of these terms are *essentially* ensnared in colonial legacies and all are used effectively by other scholars, I have determined to set them aside in order to engage what I believe is the more politically impactful term “indigenous peoples”. Nevertheless, I use even these words advisedly and with caution towards their colonial undertones; for the term “indigenous peoples” would be seemingly meaningless in the absence of settler colonization. To speak of being “indigenous” implicitly requires that it is contrasted with being non-indigenous - that is, a settler, invader, migrant, etc. Thus, prior to the imposition of colonization across Turtle Island, it is unlikely that the concept of indigeneity would have been used as a term of self-

identification. Rather, people(s) would have identified as part of the Anishinaabek, Lekwungen, or Haudenosaunee nations; or perhaps individuals would have articulated identities without reference to nations, such as being members of the Turtle or Bear Clans. I thus use "indigenous peoples" as an intentionally political appellation to challenge and disrupt universalist concepts like citizenship. It is out of a desire to maintain this political contingency, and to avert reification, that I have chosen not to capitalize "indigenous", as many scholars now do. Moreover, wherever possible throughout the thesis, I refer to people as members of particular nations, rather than as simply "indigenous", out of the hope that this continues to foreground the multiple localities engaged in the political struggles for decoloniality.

Perhaps to some the most jarring choice of words will be one that I use most frequently: settler. During the development of this project many have asked me why I use the word settler with such frequency and univocality throughout the text. Why not use other words like "Canadian", "white", or "non-indigenous"? As before, the answer to this question is a political one. I use settler as a way to disrupt the sense of comfortability or naturalness that typifies the sense of place engendered in subjects of the settler colony. To speak of the "Canadian" subject throughout this project was tempting, and indeed likely would have been very productive. I decided against this, however, out of a sense that while the processes of neoliberal settler colonization presently rely upon the settler state, their dispossessive impetus could persist even in its absence. For instance, I have often been quite discouraged by the apparent blindness of many Marxist and anarchist groups to their positions within settler colonialism. A critique of Canada and the Canadian subject would have imposed an unproductive limitation on my work. Similarly, to have talked about the "white" subject would have occluded the ways in which

settler colonialism enlists multiculturalism, people of colour, as well as highly racialized and stigmatized communities in the displacement of indigenous peoples.[13] While white supremacism attenuates and underwrites many of the processes of settler colonialism, whiteness cannot itself fully account for the ways in which power circulates through the settler colony. Finally, I have eschewed "non-indigenous" entirely. I believe it would be a stinted effort to understand the production of political subjects by focusing primarily on what they are *not*, rather than on what they are and what they do. Insisting on the word "settler" is thus to simultaneously insist on the fact that our presence here is neither a given nor politically neutral fact, that we have always already been embedded within, and reproductive of, systems of oppressive power and of dispossession. It is my hope that in using this word, I disrupt the sense of complacency that we as settlers so often rely upon to obscure the obligations we carry collectively and individually as a result of our various treaty-relationships.

As one final note on the words that I have chosen for this project, each chapter begins with an excerpt of poetry or prose. These excerpts are taken from works by authors who live on or around the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula, and are meant to offer a representation of the various artistic voices that breathe life into the communities that I study. While this project often attends to quite dark and seemingly pessimistic issues, each of these authors uses a poetic language that engages the challenges that I can only intellectualize. Their work gives me genuine hope, as it offers a way of thinking and of being that is altogether more free and malleable than the often stifling language of the academy. I also hope that juxtaposing such powerful art with my own laboured prose enables more creative reading. Seldom do I unpack the excerpts directly in my text, I leave the task of drawing connections, networks, and new lines of thought to the reader.

Synopsis:

This project is divided into three chapters, the first two of which may seem disconnected from one another. Ultimately, however, they provide the background discussion and theoretical framework by which to approach the final chapter. While it is likely possible to read each chapter independently of the others, my intent is to build a progressive argument throughout the project; thus, the fullest reading is as a cumulative work.

Chapter one, "Imagoed Communities," offers an account of how settler colonialism operates productively through the formation of settler subjectivities. In this chapter I suggest that settler colonialism is a unique form of colonial domination, as its successful operation makes it increasingly difficult to be identified from within as a colonizing project. Settler colonialism, by my account, follows a spatializing logic that reiteratively attempts to transform the territory of indigenous peoples into settler spaces. Taking my lead from authors like Wendy Brown, Mishauna Goeman, and Edward Soja, the transformation of space through settler colonization is understood to produce what I am calling a settler *imago*. The production of this *imago* functions to invest settlers with a sense of comfort, place, and home by occluding from their imagination the historic and ongoing presences of indigenous peoples throughout the spaces of colonization. In this chapter I ground my theoretical discussion by considering how settler colonial logics materialize in contemporary political relations. First, I explore a series of bigoted comments made by the Member of Parliament for Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound; following this I offer an extended consideration of the tensions that emerged in the 1990's when the Chippewas of Nawash sought to reclaim a burial site within the territories claimed by the City of Owen Sound.

Chapter two, "Discerning Dispossession," investigates the ways in which the processes of neoliberalization attenuate the production of settler subjectivities and how they modify the dispossessive and accumulative regimes established through settler colonization. Contrary to much of the critical and Marxist literature on neoliberalism, I suggest that neoliberalism does not represent a radically new mode of accumulation; rather, that it entrenches and expands the processes of dispossession that have always undergirded the settler economy. What I note, is that as the processes of dispossession expand they begin to work against segments of the settler colony itself, actively threatening the dissolution of lifestyles and communities which have been predicated on the dispossession of others up to the present moment. Importantly, I assert that these processes are (re)animated by the presence and reproduction of a dispossessive drive that mobilizes the settler to continually reinvest in settler colonization, even as its neoliberalization now begins to threaten many settlers themselves. Engaging authors like Karl Marx, David Harvey, and Glen Coulthard, I eschew accounts that suggest settler colonial dispossession is a *fait accompli*, developing instead a decolonial account of neoliberalization that emphasizes the reiterative nature of dispossession. I conclude this chapter by considering the ways in neoliberalization has impacted Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound.

Chapter three, "Unsettling *Ressentiment*," considers the neoliberal settler as political subject invested with an extreme sense of having been injured or made fragile. As a result of this supposed injury the neoliberal settler engages in a politics of aggression and rancour that inevitably targets indigenous peoples. Developing Friedrich Nietzsche's concept *ressentiment*, I suggest that the processes of subject formation within neoliberalized settler colonialism produce a subject who is unwilling and perhaps unable to articulate a politics that contests oppressive

power and instead capitulates to it. Despite this capitulation, the neoliberal settler nevertheless refuses to explicitly avow their position within, continued reliance on, and privileges received from, said power. Neoliberal settlers presume a rightful possession of the spaces of occupation and act to aggressively defend and extend an assemblage of oppressive powers that maintains this sense of possession, as well as maintaining their sense of being under constant threat of dispossession. Simultaneously foreclosing and denying all alternative collective actions or political imaginations - particularly those of resurgent indigenous peoples. In this chapter I discuss two examples of settler aggression towards Anishinaabe resurgence in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound; the first over the reclamation of fishing rights in the 1990s and the second an ongoing conflict over roughly two miles of beach.

The research that I have developed in this project has largely been concerned with understanding the ways in which settler colonialism and neoliberalism function in assemblage with one another, and how this coupling impacts the political and individual commitments of people living within such regimes. While I am firm in the convictions that ground my critique, I also remain hopeful that the sense of fragility and precarity that so many of my fellow settlers imbibe need not result in the sort of aggression and anger that I observe throughout Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound. Rather, settlers' increasing sense of fragility could potentiate the acknowledgement of ubiquitous - though certainly uneven - precarity, and serve as a propellant towards a politics that recognizes and respects complex relationality.

Introduction Notes:

[1] An untitled excerpt from the introductory pages of Richard-Yves Sitoski's *brownfields*. Sitoski is a settler, originally from Ottawa, who has relocated to the Owen Sound area. Much of his work deals with the experience of living in an era that is seen as shot-through with ubiquitous decline and disenchantment. Interestingly, through his striking prose, and creative positioning of his work (holding readings in the midst of crumbling infrastructure), Sitoski is engaged in an active re-enchantment of the world around him. His poetry, and the political import of his prose, is evaluated more fully in chapter two. Richard-Yves Sitoski, *brownfields*, (Owen Sound, ON: The Ginger Press, 2014), vii.

[2] For examples of texts that seem to rely on middle class as their primary analytic, please see: Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism,* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2007). Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, *Understanding Freefall: The Challenge of the Rural Poor,* 39th Parliament, 1st Session. December 2006. Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, *Beyond Freefall: Halting Rural Poverty,* 39th Parliament, 2nd Session. June 2008. Thom Workman, *If You're in My Way, I'm Walking: The Assault on Working People Since 1970,* (Black Point, NS: Fernwood Press, 2009).

[3] For a thorough discussion on the reproduction of settler coloniality through the politics of reconciliation and recognition, please see. Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Mask: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition,* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

[4] Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), 32.

[5] I discuss this encounter more thoroughly in chapter three, under the section "Resurgence and the Marketing of Hate". Marilyn Struthers, "Reflections on the Politics of Neighbourliness in Aboriginal/White Alliance-Building from the Fishing Wars of 1995," in *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, Lynne Davis, eds., (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 373.

[6] Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege: How the People of the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation Asserted Their Rights and Claims and Dealt with the Backlash,* (Chippewas of Nawash, 2005). Polly Keeshig-Tobias, *The Illustrated History of the Chippewas of Nawash,* (Chippewas of Nawash, 1996). Stephanie McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession: Nawash Ojibwa and Potawatomi in the Saugeen Territory, 1836-1865," MA thesis, The University of Calgary, 1997. Peter S. Schmalz, *The History of the Saugeen Indians,* (Ottawa: Ontario Historical Society, 1977).

[7] Those events are discussed in detail throughout the thesis. Chippewas of Nawash, *Encountering the Other: Racism Against Aboriginal People,* (Chippewas of Nawash, 2007). Edwin C. Koenig, *Cultures and Ecologies: A Native Fishing Conflict on the Saugeen-Bruce Peninsula,* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2005). Bruce Morito, "The Rule of Law and Aboriginal Rights: The Case of the Chippewas of Nawash," *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*. 29, no. 2 (1999), 263-288. Rick Wallace, *Merging Fires: Grassroots Peacebuilding Between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Peoples.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2013. As well as select chapters in *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, Lynne Davis, eds., (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010).

[8] Peace and Justice Grey Bruce, *Final Report of the Precarious Work Group,* (Owen Sound, ON: Peace and Justice Grey Bruce, January 2015). Laureen Snider, "Captured by Neo-Liberalism: Regulation and Risk in Walkerton, Ontario," *Risk Management* 5, no. 2 (2003). 27-36.

[9] Chippewas of Nawash, *Encountering the Other*.

[10] Wallace, *Merging Fires*, 78.

[11] Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 3. Schmalz, *Saugeen Indians,* 1.

[12] Don Marks, "What's in a name: Indian, native, aboriginal or indigenous?" CBC News, (October 2, 2014), www.cbc.ca/news (accessed May 19, 2016). John Ahni Schertow, "Anishinabek outlaw term 'Aboriginal'," Intercontinental Cry, (June 30, 2008), www.intercontinentalcry.org/ (accessed May 19, 2016).

[13] I discuss the tensions between anti-racism and decoloniality in chapter one, under the section "Settler Coloniality, a Non-Partisan Policy".

Chapter One: Imagoed Communities

"*Like the Nawash and the city of Owen Sound -/ a fine Canadian city/ founded on dead Indians/ built of dead Indians."* - Lenore Keeshig[1]

Settler colonialism presents a serious conceptual challenge as the degree to which settlers dominate is also the degree to which the settler, as the peremptory political subject, disappears. Moreover, the common histories of states like Canada or the United States occlude their origins in, and continuing organization of, a politics of settlement that attempts to continually erase indigenous peoples. In this first chapter I identify the double movement that occurs within the processes that produce the settler as a political subject: investing the settler with a sense of their own disappearance *qua* settler - naturalizing colonization - and simultaneously erasing indigenous peoples *qua* peoples who retain sovereignty throughout Turtle Island. Following the work of other scholars of settler colonialism, I assert that both moves are operationalized through a spatializing logic. Unlike other observers, however, my work takes as a central consideration the psychic operations of power that form the subject who at once performs and is constituted by settler colonialism's spatialized logic. I assert that the settler at once produces the spatiality of settler colonialism and is (re)produced as a subject by and within those spaces. Moreover, I suggest that despite settlers' desire to disappear themselves *qua* settlers, their psychic investments in settler coloniality introduce the potential for continual failure of these processes. That is to say, that without actually undoing themselves and settler colonial power structures - without contesting the violences normalized through the occupation of indigenous peoples' territories - the settler cannot achieve the full disappearance they desire.

To prove these assertions I divide this chapter into six sections. In the first section I summarize the theoretical framework of settler colonial studies in order to understand how settler colonialism operates in general and in the particular case of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound. In the second section I contextualize these theoretical arguments with a contemporary example from Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound which illuminates the subtlety with which settler colonialism reproduces itself - even when it might appear absent. In the third section I discuss the propensity of settler colonialism, as a power relationship, to (re)produce colonized spaces that erase the evidence of the historic and ongoing sovereignty of indigenous peoples. In the fourth section, I build from the notion of settler colonialism as a spatial order to provide a psychoanalytical account of settler coloniality as productive of a new political subject. In the fifth section I discuss the history of settler colonialism in Owen Sound, with particular attention to a land dispute in the 1990s. In the final section I discuss how by the precarity involved in reproducing the settler potentiates repeated failure.

Settler Colonialism:

As the conceptual backdrop of this project, I think it is important to situate my understanding of the literature on settler colonialism in four broad strokes. First, I examine the distinction between colonialism as such and settler colonialism. I then discuss the process through which settler colonies come into existence, concretizing these assertions with recourse to the history of treaty-making in Saugeen Anishinaabek territory. After this, I implicate settler states in the (re)production of a series of dichotomous relationships between settlers and indigenous peoples, wherein the former seeks the destruction of the latter. Finally, I touch on the particular manner by which ostensibly liberal states perpetuate settler colonial relationships.

While colonialism is present as an historic fact in the public consciousness, settler colonialism remains largely the property of academic and activist circles. Fundamentally, this is a result of settler colonialism's discursive framing, which disappears and erases both the settler and indigenous peoples as politically articulable subjects, thus rendering settlers' desires for domination indiscernible within the discourses of their regime of power.[2] Patrick Wolfe makes the astute observation that, within the settler colonial context, the invasion of indigenous peoples' territories by Europeans becomes a "structure rather than an event".[3] This invasion-as-structure carries with it the impetus for the formation of a wholly new polity and - as I show - a new political subject. In the colonization of India, for example, Europeans operated under logics of extraction, brutally repressing indigenous populations in order to extract labour or to open commodity markets. Contrarily, settler colonization operates under a "logic of elimination".[4] Eliminatory logics serve as the impetus for and justification of the intergenerational project to destroy indigenous peoples. Total disavowal of indigenous presences - indeed of the possibility of meaningful indigenous lives at all - facilitates the imagining of a "settler body politic 'to come'".[5] This desire to eliminate is pursued, because the persistence of indigenous peoples as meaningful lives in the spaces of the settler colony disrupt settlers' narratives of their own righteousness or liberality by insisting on the knowledge of foundational and persisting acts of violent colonization. Thus, a settler body politic is instantiated by murder, removal, or assimilation, and is sustained through efforts to thoroughly erase or sanitize the spectres of said violences.

For a settler colony to be reproducible it must be seen by settlers as the *only* viable order in which they can participate and it must secure "the violent erasures of alternative modes" of

being, both physically and psychically.[6] A common tactic to secure these erasures involves a concerted effort to deny that indigenous peoples hold fidelity to place. Tom Flanagan advances this mythology, contending that the indigenous peoples of Turtle Island "moved a great deal" prior to European contact and had no real sense of home, belonging, or permanence.[7] Flanagan's work provides settlers intellectual material to imagine indigenous peoples as nomads, facilitating the myth of the wandering native.[8] When reality contradicts these myths - that is, when nations are clearly in continuous and deep relationships with the land - indigenous peoples are often *forced* into nomadism as settlers raze their communities.[9] These supposed nomads become, in the eyes of settlers, relics of a past that must inevitably fade away. Once this settler myth transforms nations into nomads, the violences of colonization become "naturalized as an unfortunate byproduct of *progress*".[10] Much of the intellectual work of this process comes prepackaged in the so-called "stadial theory of history", which purports to track the development of humanity from 'barbarian' to 'civilized' - conveniently positioning western European society at the apex.[11] Enraptured by the idea of their inevitable ascendance, settlers voraciously pursue the creation of a new polity, transforming the land and establishing themselves therein. This establishment of settlement is both spatial, by (re)constructing the landscape, and temporal, beginning a narrative of settlers' historic and ongoing relationship to the places of their occupation. As they create cities, establish a state, build (rail)roads, and homes, settlers perpetuate and naturalize the violence inherent in their continued existence within colonized spaces.

These processes are at work throughout settler colonies, but a particular example many concretize how they are operationalized. Prior to the encroachment of settlers in the early decades of the 19th Century, the Saugeen Anishinaabek - in an indisputably sovereign capacity -

inhabited territories in present-day Ontario stretching from Goderich, east to Arthur, north to Point Vail, encompassing the entirety of the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula.[12] As the number of settlers in Upper Canada increased, the colonial government desired more open country to cultivate and settle. It was with this objective in mind that the Crown sent representatives to the Saugeen Anishinaabek, asserting that settlers' voracity for land could no longer be contained and, because Saugeen Anishinaabek territory remained uncultivated, that the Crown was having "great difficulty in securing" the Saugeen Anishinaabek's territories against settlers.[13] So it was, under the double threat of dispossession at the hands of settler mobs and of simultaneous abandonment by their supposed ally the Crown, that the Saugeen Anishinaabek signed Treaty 45 1/2 (1836). This treaty's validity - even by settler law - is suspect at best, as three of chiefs of the Saugeen Anishinaabek never signed the document, nor were its terms ever presented to a general council of the nation - as is required by settler law, following the Royal Proclamation (1763).[14]

Following this Treaty, sustained settlement began to occur on a million and a half acres of the Saugeen Anishinaabek's southern territory. This occurred with the Crown's solemn assurance that the Saugeen Anishinaabek's northern territory, encompassing the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula, was to remain closed to settlers. Here we can see, already, how the presence of settlers on Turtle Island trends towards an invasion-as-structure. The settlements of Upper Canada, which had been established through treaties with the sovereign indigenous peoples of those lands, under conditions of friendship and the presumption of a nation-to-nation relationship, came to be viewed by settlers as both ahistorical and unconditional locales under the sole sovereign control of the Crown.[15] Abrogating nation-to-nation relationships, the assertion of unipolar Crown sovereignty insures that settlements function as an invasion which structures settler life.

As the earliest treaties were violated, a path is cleared to an almost endless succession of violations. Assertion of the Crown's primary sovereignty - that is, its invasion of indigenous peoples' territories - builds momentum as the violation of each treaty recedes into settler memory, into forgetting. Treaty 45 1/2 had assured the Saugeen Anishinaabek of the Crown's intentions to endeavour "*for ever* [*sic*] to protect" the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula "from the encroachments of the whites".[16] Yet, little more than a decade later, because of continued encroachment by settlers and because so many displaced indigenous people(s) sought refuge on the Peninsula, the Saugeen Anishinaabek were compelled to seek the assurances of their treaty-partner in the Crown once again. The Imperial Declaration of Queen Victoria (1847) was issued, in response to these concerns, (re)affirming that the Saugeen Anishinaabek "and their Posterity for ever [*sic*] shall possess and enjoy and at all times hereafter continue to posses and Enjoy" the lands and waters of the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula.[17] With the honour of the Crown and the validity of treaties at stake, the Saugeen Anishinaabek ought to have been assured that they would never again be coerced into another questionable treaty and that their sovereignty would be respected by the Crown and its representatives.

As the processes of settler colonization have borne out, however, the Crown has had precious little honour in its relationship with the Saugeen Anishinaabek. Just seven years after the Imperial Declaration, agents of the Crown began to talk of another major treaty; to cover nearly all the lands of the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula. The Saugeen Anishinaabek were again coerced into this treaty as the Crown threatened that it had "the power to act as it pleases" and that noncompliance could lead to a situation where the Saugeen Anishinaabek's posterity would be "left without resources".[18] This marks a dramatic shift in the Crown's interactions with the

Saugeen: the Crown now presumes a right to govern the Anishinaabek. Never mind that the Peninsula was not a reserve but, rather, Saugeen Anishinaabek territory, the Crown's new disposition, in conjunction with conniving negotiations orchestrated by Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, Laurence Oliphant, coercively extracted Treaty 72 (1854). This began sustained settlement on the entire Peninsula, excepting five small unceded sites.[19] Much like Treaty 42 1/2, however, Treaty 72 was also never signed by several of the Saugeen Anishinaabek's chiefs and its validity is spurious[20]

The Crown's abuses of its 'allies', the Saugeen Anishinaabek, were not yet finished; as the terms of Treaty 72 did not survive to their triennial. Even as he concluded the Treaty of 1854, Oliphant communicated to his superiors that the presence of thriving settlements in the "immediate vicinity" of the Saugeen's remaining territories, "will render further surrender necessary".[21] In 1857, Owen Sound's population surpassed two thousand and it incorporated as a town. From the settlers' perspective, the presence of the Anishinaabek in Nawash Village on the northwest edge of town represented an impassible impediment to the transit of modernity. Even the joy of the white man's burden no longer satiated Owen Sounders' loathing:

> The initial enthusiasm for 'civilization' policies had declined. Settlers now wanted their neighbours' land which, from their vantage-point was hardly being used. Progress and success seemed tangible in the Canadas in the 1850s, *demonstrated in the changes in the physical landscape*… Some called for the removal of this 'obstruction to improvement.'[22]

So it was that the Indian Department pressured several leaders at Nawash Village into signing Treaty 82 (1857). Again, leveraging internal divisions and violating the terms of the Royal Proclamation (1763), which necessitated that treaties be approved at an assembly of the signatory nation(s). Under Treaty 82, Nawash Village and all the unceded lands immediately

northwest of Owen Sound were expropriated by the Crown - with the exception "that one acre be reserved and set apart for a burying ground".[23] A portion of this acre was located at what became, after the Treaty, "lots 97 and 99 Amelia Street in the Townplot of Brooke."[24]

The removal of the Anishinaabek from Nawash Village suggests that a commitment to the perpetuation of settler colonial projects necessitates continual erasure of the indigenous presences, both external and internal to the space of settlement. Try as they might, however, settlers cannot fully expunge the evidence of such presences because indigenous peoples continuously and rightly resist their own colonization. In contemporary cases, as in the treaty processes above, the repetitive efforts to erase indigenous peoples *qua* peoples from the minds of settlers is facilitated by the settler state. Adam Barker has noted that the processes of colonization are often initially carried out by collectives of settlers, typically rabbles of lawless squatters; however, over time states are created to ensure the perpetuation of the settler colony.[25] In the European tradition, both Hobbes and Locke deploy metaphors of the state as the vehicle by which a collective explicitly seeks to immortalize the amalgam of individually finite lives in order to constitute an immortal body politic.[26] Once a state is established it seeks to secure its own stability and reproducibility. In the context of settler colonization, and from the assumption that sovereignty is necessarily singular, the reproduction of the settler state simultaneously reproduces the processes attempting to erase indigenous peoples.

Amongst the settler states' most effective methods of reproducing itself, and of erasing indigenous peoples, is nationalism, which Mishuana Goeman describes as a powerful tool for producing within settlers a strong attachment to the colonized territory.[27] Nationalism deploys metonymic chains of historical, cultural, political, and even religious symbols that together

provide meaning on both an individual and a communal level. Strong affective resonances are used: scenes of ‘honour’ and ‘glory’ on a battlefield, memories of tragedy, or awe inspiring achievements are all common nationalistic tropes. By producing a sense of place and community, nationalism seeks to secure a holistic ‘we’ which imbricates a multiplicity of individuated subjects. Against this ‘we’ is set the overdetermined and phantasmatic figure of an alien ‘them’, that necessarily is seen as a threat to ‘us’.[28] Barker asserts that this dichotomy, which in settler colonies often conjures an image of the frontier, is not a phenomenon of the periphery; rather, it occurs ubiquitously within settler colonies. The ubiquity of the frontier results from the consistency with which settlers and indigenous peoples interact - indeed, intermingle. Moreover, Barker notes that this is not a process driven solely by elites for strategic position: it happens “everywhere that there are settler collectives, and it occurs constantly”.[29]

As settlers claim their territories more reflexively - that is, without pause or self-doubt - a new paradigm emerges. Wolfe puts this succinctly: “[w]ith the demise of the frontier, elimination turned inwards”.[30] Jodi Byrd clarifies Wolfe’s argument along lines similar to Barker when she writes that the frontier is best thought of as “thresholds of contact at the edges of governmentality, violence, and racialization”.[31] Thus, in the absence of a space into which indigenous peoples can be (re)moved - when Canada claims to reach from sea to sea to sea and is abutted by another settler colony - the settler state must confront directly that which it necessarily denies: the ongoing presence of sovereign indigenous peoples representing the frontier *within* the settler colony. In their efforts to confront what amounts to a return of the repressed, settler states rely on a range of tactics: from pure violence to more subtle and systematic processes of erasure. Settler colonialism perverts even ostensibly liberal state policies

into insidious tools to erase indigenous peoples. For example, Goeman notes that while multiculturalist policies may disrupt the racial hegemony of whiteness in settler states, these policies validate the abstractions and universalisms that settler colonialism relies upon to extinguish indigenous title.[32] Policies of multiculturalism seek to naturalize the magnanimity of the settler state and thereby continue erasing indigenous claims and title (I discuss this more fully in the next section). This naturalization pursues the ultimate goal of settler colonization, as it disappears the settler as well, now inexpressible as a settler with the presumed disappearance of indigenous peoples - how might one see settlers if the sovereign indigenous peoples are imagined away? Put differently, when the settler is produced as a subject incapable of or unwilling to see indigenous peoples as persistently sovereign nations, that subject is *simultaneously* incapable of recognizing their own presence within indigenous peoples' territories as predicated on ongoing acts of invasion. The effect of these liberal policies is to take what ought to be viewed as the crimes of one nation against another and re-present them as internal policies of a legitimate and open polity.[33]

Settler Coloniality, a Non-Partisan Policy:

In order to elucidate these theoretical apparatuses, in this section I consider an example in which the structures and discourses of settler colonialism operate to contour political discourses. The focal point of this discussion is a series of public remarks made by Larry Miller, the Member of Parliament for Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound. I begin by providing an account of Miller's remarks, offering the fullest and fairest context possible. Then, I discuss the public reaction to Miller, drawing from editorials written in response to his remarks. Finally, I discuss how these exchanges fit within and reify the logics of settler coloniality.

One of Owen Sound's local radio stations, CFOS 560AM, produces a weekly call-in show hosted by former Member of Provincial Parliament, Bill Murdoch. As a mainstay in the community and something of living folk legend, Murdoch has turned his show into conduit through which both private citizens and public figures articulate the local take on all manner of issues.[34] So it was that on March 16, 2015, as the sitting MP, Larry Miller was invited to guest-host and take calls from his constituents. Somewhere near the middle of the program a listener who identified himself as "Joseph" (appearing to be on friendly terms with both Miller and Murdoch) called in to discuss his concerns regarding the so-called Islamic State. In a twist - which, we shall see, while byzantine was also revealing - the conversation between Joseph, Miller, and Murdoch shifted to discussing a case that was then before the Canadian courts. The case in question had been brought forward by Zunera Ishaq, a woman in the process of immigrating to Canada. At issue was Ishaq's right to wear the niqab while taking her citizenship oath, a right which the federal government suspended in 2011. After affirming Joseph's position that the idea of Ishaq wearing a niqab was "wrong", Miller immediately went on to express his bafflement that the courts upheld her claim. Continuing, Miller stated emphatically that if a person does not want to show their face when "joining the best country in the world" that person should "stay the hell where [they] came from." Cajoled by his caller, Miller declared how "sick" he is of people - read as racialized immigrants - wanting to "change things before they even officially become a Canadian."[35]

Predictably, Miller was not without his supporters. The extreme right-wing *Rebel Media* praised the MP for his clear articulation of Canadian values in the face of what they describe as a clash between two cultures.[36] Similarly, comment boards on online stories about Miller were

often flooded with supportive messages.[37] Despite having backers, condemnation of these comments was also remarkably swift, especially given that Miller has never had a public profile beyond his own riding. From the Liberal Party, calls came for Prime Minister Harper to "condemn these comments" and to punish caucus members who make such objectionable remarks.[38] During the election of 2015 the leader of the New Democratic Party asserted that it was "reprehensible" for Miller to even be allowed to run for office again - Miller, in fact, not only ran but won reelection.[39]

Unifying the vast majority of Miller's critics was a tacit appeal to multiculturalism. In a particularly biting satire of Miller, Heather Mallick published a letter in *The Toronto Star* entitled "Why doesn't MP Larry Miller stay where he came from?" Initially, Mallick ostensibly agrees with Miller, going so far as to offer a list of "countries that should stop sending us fresh Canadians".[40] Her ruse is revealed almost immediately, however, as the suggested list of banned sources of immigration include: Scotland, India (the homelands of Mallick's mother and father, respectively), and the United Kingdom (her husband's birthplace). By indicating the need to cease immigration from countries that various members of her own family left for Canada, Mallick cleverly positions herself - already indisputably a Canadian - as the subject of a discourse that is generally thought to be about an 'other'. The implication of her move is twofold: that Miller's objections to the niqab could just as easily be replicated as critiques against any ethnic or cultural group that one dislikes and, further, Mallick mobilizes a discourse that implies that 'Canada is a nation of immigrants'. Most interestingly, Mallick concludes her letter with the assertion that Miller's comments are an expression of the "rural idiocy" that she says she moved to Toronto in order to escape.[41] Ultimately, Mallick's letter typifies the mainstream

liberal objection to Miller: asserting the supremacy of multiculturalism and positioning racism as an aberration born out of individualized parochialism.

Of course, more structural critiques of Miller's niqab comments could be proffered through recourse to critical race and anti-racist scholarship. As distinct from Mallick, who decries racism as aberrational, Stephen Knadler notes that anti-racists more commonly locate racism in "institutionalized systems of power" that form the basis of "everyday experience".[42] A telling example of how racism instantiates itself through institutional power is the structuring position that race carries within discourses of state security. This is shown in the discussion between Joseph, Miller, and Murdoch, as they transit from discussing the so-called Islamic State to Zunera Ishaq. Murdoch makes the transition seem almost effortless:

> Now, when we're talking about [the Islamic State] covering their face. What do you think about this latest blowup about people, some of them, thinking they should be able to cover their face when they go for their citizenship?[43]

While ostensibly connected through the issue of face coverings, the unquestioned slippage between these two issues embeds them both within in the same securitizing discourse and creates a false equivalency between the supposed threat posed to Canada by both the so-called Islamic State and by Ishaq's niqab. What this reveals is the "paranoia" embedded within security discourses, belying an "anxiety about being dispossessed by racial others".[44] Whether it is fighters external to the polity or cultural diffusion within internal populations, the threat is deemed equally prominent because of the hegemonic and naturalized position of whiteness as the norm within institutions of power and everyday experience.

What I suggest, however, is that all these critiques of Miller's exchange do not do proper justice to the full sentiment that he expresses. This is because Miller's appeal to an implicit and

normative whiteness, the thing he alludes to as threatened by change originating in immigrant communities, is in fact a double assertion. At once refusing any dilution of the white ideal by populations external to Canada, Miller simultaneously disavows the already present cultural and ethnic multiplicity that exists within his community. Certainly this multiplicity towards which I gesture is, in part, facilitated by Canadian immigration policy and, by histories of forced migration. Importantly, however, it also preexists and exceeds Canada, in the historic and continuing presence of indigenous peoples. Thus, while Miller's remarks certainly bear all the trappings of racism, when spoken within the context of Canada's ongoing project to disappear indigenous peoples, they also reenact the logics of settler colonial power. As others have noted, in settler colonies the settlers' sense of "always having arrived" is paired "with the wilful forgetting of the nature of that arrival", an event which began the dispossession of indigenous peoples.[45]

By speaking under the false presumption that indigenous peoples have disappeared and by naturalizing the settlers' presence in their place, structures of settler colonial power provide Miller with the discursive frame necessary to presuppose Canada as a nation constituted *ex nihilo* and always already normatively white. That immigrants should "stay the hell where [they] came from" erases the longer view that incorporates Miller's own having come from elsewhere; moreover, his fear that immigrants want to "change things" implies that Miller's own position of whiteness is the presumed and unmarked norm within the space of arrival, of the coming to. By presuming the normalcy of his position, Miller re-entrenches the status of the Saugeen Anishinaabek in particular, and indigenous peoples generally under settler colonization, as forced into homelessness - having no place to call their own given the always already present status of

ubiquitous whiteness within the settled borders of so-called Canada. Thus, in addition to being racist, Miller's comments simultaneously (re)iterate settler colonization.

Likewise, the liberal objection to Miller also proves to be an inadequate response when offered within prevailing conditions of settler colonization. The discourse that rejects Miller's statements under the auspices that 'we are all immigrants' is fallacious, because the fundamental truth is that the 'we' who are all meant to be immigrants is a necessarily exclusionary category that effaces enumerable lives that are lived within the spaces this 'we' claims. Indigenous peoples have and continue to exist in the place now called Canada from time immemorial, they are not immigrants and, thus, not 'we'. But also not recognized as a valid lives exceeding and preceding this 'we'. By relying upon unchangeable discourses of universal migration, the liberal position mirrors Miller's in its displacement of indigenous peoples. Moreover, by asserting that racism and intolerance are aberrations within an otherwise tolerant and egalitarian society, the liberal position acts "to mask the persistently privileged position of whiteness and its possession of the nation [ie. settler state] that simultaneously disavows Indigenous sovereignty".[46] By reifying settlers' sense of "belonging, home, and place", the liberal position occludes the fact that Canadian multiculturalism is built on the foundation of indigenous dispossession and white supremacism.[47] In this way, it is apparent that the liberal critique is ultimately "complicit with the [settler] state requirements for *manageable forms of difference*".[48] While decrying Miller's insensitivity towards benign cultural practices, the liberal position simultaneously proves incapable of even acknowledging the alterity of indigenous peoples, as their ongoing sovereign presence within the settler colony is the exact antithesis of a 'manageable' variety of difference.

Ultimately, this example points towards the necessity of a more thorough and strident critique of racism (also: sexism, classism, ableism, etc.), that simultaneously refuses to reproduce the structures and discourses of settler colonialism. In the case of Miller's very clearly racist remarks, it requires not only denouncing his implicit and overt propagations of white supremacism, but also recognizing that in a settler colony such as Canada, white supremacism is attenuated by the historic and ongoing theft of indigenous peoples' lands. Appealing to liberal sentiments is clearly insufficient, as they also reproduce the normative status and presumed benignity of the settler colony. Herein lies the settler colonial trap: both sides of the conservative versus liberal dialectic, representing the settler colony's internal politics, remain embedded within, and reproductive of, the displacement and dispossession of indigenous peoples. Only a critique that addresses the dispossession of indigenous peoples as conditioning, and likewise conditioned by, other forms of oppression within the settler colony, is capable of breaking the reproductive cycle of settler colonialism.

Settler Coloniality as Spatiality:

Given the evident challenge of articulating a politics in such conditions, the notion of spatialization as an operation of power relations offers a fruitful way in which to think about settler coloniality. In this section I interrogate the logic of spatiality that propels settler colonization. To achieve this I take three approaches. First, I situate Edward Soja's account of spatiality as both socially produced and socially productive. After this I move towards Mishuana Goeman's (re)appropriation of Soja, wherein she reads his work through the problem of settler colonialism. Finally, I extract some observations on the ways in which indigenous peoples interact with and in settler colonial spaces.

Soja's *Postmodern Geographies* is widely regarded as a foundational work in spatial theory. The central observation of the text, and the consensus which Soja strives to overcome, is the long-standing tendency amongst theorists and social scientists alike to treat space as "fixed, dead, [and] undialectical".[49] That is to say that space is generally conceptualized as an inert zone in which subjects interact with one another, but the space itself is inconsequential beyond its passive hospitality. Against this, Soja suggests that space must be understood as "a substantiated and recognizable social product" which becomes part of a subject's "second nature" as they incorporate both physical and psychological imprints from their place of occupancy.[50] The spaces that we inhabit "both reflect and configure" our "*being* in the world".[51]

While Soja leaves this statement somewhat under theorized, the phenomenon he describes is common to our experience of spaces constructed for social purposes that require modifications of our usual behaviour: reverence in a sanctuary that houses the sacred, joviality in a bar where revellers gather, or sombreness in a cemetery where the dead sleep. Yet, it is usually the case that no institutional authority enforces our compliance to these norms; judicial punishment is rarely meted out for muttering profanities in a church, misanthropic pub-dwelling, or graveside snickering. Instead we police ourselves, or are policed by others, to show these spaces their 'proper' respect. Thus, far from being inert, space actively shapes daily life: on the relatively banal level of enabling and conducting movement, but also in the extraordinary sense of informing sociable behaviour. So it might be noted that while spatiality is unquestionably *constructed*, it is also *constructing*. That is, building within communities and subjects a naturalized sense of how things 'are' and ought to be.

Soja's analysis has further relevance to the discussion here as he provides several markers by which we can begin to think through the spatialization of mass society. In a lengthy excerpt from an interview with Michel Foucault, Soja extracts an observation that is striking in its simplicity: communal life, regardless of its particularities, is impossible without adequate and appropriate space.[52] As such, not only does power exist when a multiplicity of subjects commune together, but as we have seen power must also arise from the *space* of communing itself - as it moulds the subjects' sense of the possible. Thus, Foucault sounds the charge that a "whole history remains to be written of *spaces* - which would at the same time be the history of *powers*".[53] In the contemporary world one need not look far to find evidence of this fact. As Soja observes, states are territorial institutions explicitly "engaged in the reproduction of a particular social spatialization", often merely as an externality of the exercise of state power.[54] Moreover, states are themselves given shape and character by the spatial order over which they claim jurisdiction. As with all forms of power, however, spatiality is neither pure nor innocent; this is especially true, as we have already begun to see, in the case of settler states and spaces. While Soja offers a serious reflection on spatiality, reviving it from the untimely conceptual grave to which it had been consigned by many settler scholars, his work fails to deeply story the spaces that he studies. For this reason, I turn to Goeman's work which engages in a rich spatial discourse, while keeping the histories of settler colonization at the centre of her analysis.

In *Mark My Words*, Goeman adopts Soja's theorization of spatiality, but reads it into the context of settler colonialism which was previously unaddressed. As we have seen, Soja observes that for many thinkers space is assumed to be an inert zone and, pursuant to this, that the discipline of geography has been treated as a purely descriptive study.[55] While Soja makes a

somewhat convincing case, Goeman rejects a crucial elision that's near to the core of his position. In his rush to decry the marginality of geography, Soja's analysis leaves unacknowledged the domineering dichotomy inherent to settler colonization. His silence facilitates the unproblematic (re)production of knowledges that do not require the settler geographer to recognize their own position as being embedded within the structures of settler coloniality. Encounters between indigenous peoples and settler geographers produce an understanding within the former that descriptive geography is complicit in, and integral to, the project of settlement and dispossession. Indeed, as Goeman notes, indigenous peoples have long known that settler colonies depend on mapmakers as a technology to "enable the assertion of political force".[56] As has been noted, settler colonialism necessitates the erasure of alternative ways of being, and this drive is abetted in part by the purportedly objective knowledges produced within disciplines like geography.[57] Soja's perpetuation of the myth that geographers have *ever* acted as merely descriptive agents further naturalizes settler geographic discourses, which are at once discourses deeply implicated in histories of dispossession.

As Goeman states so clearly: in their tendency to be taken as true representations of what 'is', "[m]aps are preeminently a language of power".[58] The power that inheres in a map is readily apparent when we consider how educational maps continue to perform a nearly total erasure of indigenous peoples from history. Many of the standard maps used in Canadian history texts - and hosted on Library and Archives Canada's website - demarcate the borders of the British colonies that went on to become Canada, without any acknowledgement of the presence of sovereign indigenous peoples.[59] While thumbnails of ambiguously labelled 'First Nations' or unnamed territory peak onto the western- or northern-most edges, these maps almost uniformly occlude

the ubiquitous presence of indigenous peoples, much less their sovereign authority, throughout Turtle Island.[60]

A more honest representation of the early relationship between settlers and indigenous peoples would carry the nuance of what Michael Asch calls the “linking principle”. This linking principle explains the spirit of the earliest treaties between newcomers and indigenous peoples: that settlers were welcome to coexist in the territories of the still sovereign indigenous peoples, with both parties living “together as partners”.[61] Almost no maps actually make such careful representations. Instead, educational maps elide the fact of treaties between indigenous nations and settlers, as they imply the territorial supremacy of European powers. The formalization of this type of representation into a disciplined knowledge produces a settler narrative which becomes axiomatic, and which has been seen in various degrees above: that the territory is their’s by right. Claims made to the contrary by indigenous peoples, as seen in more detail below, seem irrational and fleeting to settlers. Aileen Moreton-Robinson has identified these processes at work in the context of Australian settler colonialism, wherein she notes that the settler colony “cannot exist as such without land and clearly defined borders”.[62] The production of knowledges that stabilize the borders of the settler colony operate in assemblage with concepts of the unitary Westphalian state to produce a “mode of rationalization”, which encourages no reflection on the part of the individual settler.[63] This mode of rationalization invests the collective settler imaginary with the foregone conclusion of their own possession of territories that can no longer be acknowledged as belonging to indigenous peoples.

Goeman reveals that Soja’s genealogy of spatial thinking glosses a critical truth: that within settler colonial contexts, the academic and social deadening of space - that is, the view of

space as fixed, dead, and undialectical - *is* the project of socially producing spatiality. Settler colonialism requires, at least initially, that spatiality be addressed in purely descriptive terms: producing "closed, categorized, and defined spaces" in order to naturalize the settler and erase the sovereignty of indigenous peoples.[64] The claim by settler geographers to study space with objective detachment is meant to place their work within the realm of rationality and simultaneously to code indigenous knowledge of the same spaces as mystifying or mythologizing. Thus, we see again the conceited assumption of settlers: that we will inevitably persist as indigenous peoples fade. It is expected, within this episteme, that what is 'rational' will declare victory in a final calculus. While he calls for a social understanding of spatiality, Soja's work recapitulates the myth that settler geography has ever been, or could ever be, purely descriptive work. From the perspective of indigenous peoples resisting settler colonization the more purely descriptive the study of space purports to be, the more subtly it props up settler knowledges about the land as the only possible way of understanding. Rather than reiterate Soja's call for a *new* social spatial theory, Goeman demands "*decolonized* spatial knowledges" instead.[65] Spatial theory that purports to re-enliven understandings of space recuperates the settler colonial project if it neglects the role that the myth of "fixed, dead, [and] undialectical" spaces has in producing the knowledges of social spaces that facilitate settler colonial occupation and hegemony.

Soja asserts that "an integral part of the instrumentality of political power" is to inculcate experiences of spatiality as coherent and homogenous.[66] However, this depiction of spatiality as ontologically smooth is rooted inexorably in the experiences of subjects that are embedded within, and produced through, dominant power structures. In truth, the more removed a subject is

from centres of power and the more readily they turn away from said power, the more likely they are to experience the dissonances of a given spatial order. This seems especially true in the case of indigenous peoples, as they are always implicit targets of the violences that produce settler spaces. Settler colonialism produces a "spatial schema" wherein the bodies, speech acts, and cultural milieu of indigenous people are marked as not belonging.[67] As Goeman writes, within the logic of settler colonialism indigenous peoples might exist in *space*, but never in *place*.[68] That is to say, that although indigenous peoples occasionally rise into visibility for settlers, this occurs with the assurance that they remain unrooted and spectral - a quaint reminder of what is no more.[69] Thus, indigenous peoples' experiences of settler spaces are not of coherence; rather, they are often a cacophony of oppressive powers that serve to mark indigenous peoples as always already out of place and of productive powers meant to infuse the actions of settlers with intelligible meaning. These two operations of power naturalize the violence of settler colonization, (re)producing its spaces and its subjects.

The Psychic Life of Settler Spatiality:

While Goeman's discussion of settler colonialism and its spatial logics is quite fruitful, it lacks a sustained consideration of the subject position that establishes and perpetuates settler colonialism. To close this gap of understanding, I turn in this section towards the insights offered by psychoanalysis and in particular to the concept of the *imago*. From the texts examined thus far I situate fragmentary accounts of the psychic subject as it is deployed in the contemporary literature on settler colonialism. I also introduce Mark Rifkin's phenomenological account of settler subject formation. I then explore the concept of the *imago* as a critical element within subject formation, tying this back to the settler colonial context.

The authors whom I have discussed thus far do not offer an extended treatment of the psychic investments inherent in the production of spatial orders, whether settler colonial or otherwise. However, fragmentary mentions of settler colonialism's psychic power do exist within this literature and they ought to be situated. Not only do these fragments bridge the bodies of literature in which I am operating, they also indicate how psychoanalysis might best be used in this context. Soja, for instance, remarks off-handedly that the concreteness of a subject's experience of space is "wrapped in the complex and diverse re-presentations of human perception and cognition".[70] Contained within Soja's almost singular remark is at once the banal observation that spatial experiences are embedded within the psyche, but also an indication that experience is always already a '*re*-presentation' of the thing itself - an approximation creating the space of imagining. Such approximations inevitably include and exclude elements of the real, providing distortions and occlusions that shape our narratives - our imaginaries - in ways that are largely opaque to us.

To be made intelligible to the subject, experience filters through wider discursive meanings. What is seemingly external to and pressing upon the psyche must be made internal and aligned with the subject's system of meaning; but this internality also projects the psyche outside of itself as its actions (re)make the world after its imaginary. Soja hints at this, when he writes that socially produced spatialities "reflect and configure" how we are in the world.[71] Soja's final analysis does not, however, address spatiality as produced by subjects or as subject producing. This is because he halts his analysis on the assertion that spatialities become part of our "second nature" as a "substantiated and recognizable *social* product".[72] Put differently, Soja's analysis fixates on the social and occludes the psyche as a site of power. In actuality there exists -

in addition to the social element - an intrinsic psychic component binding the subject to the social. While Soja largely ignores it, this relationship between the psyche and the social should be excavated if the consequences of these phantasms are to be understood. In other words, to understand how domination and dispossession provide the unacknowledged contours of a social order that settlers have a vested interested in imagining as fundamentally benign, the inextricable nexus of the subject and the social should be the crux of analysis.

In a manner similar to Soja, Goeman's work also contains several fragmentary indications of the psychic investments that settler colonialism necessitates. *Mark My Words* opens with the provocative assertion that Goeman's project began before she "was even *cognizant* of the power of place and its relationship to colonialism, race, and gender."[73] While the young Goeman may not have been able to intellectualize the pervasive power of spatiality, she indicates that as a Haudenosaunee child she had to "learn the constraints and limitations of… socially constructed spaces" early in life.[74] Occupying a subject position distant from centres of settler colonial power, even as a child, Goeman's experiences of settler spaces were discordant. Goeman's remark reveals that the psychic imperative of spatial power is always already forming and pressing through the subject. Indeed, Goeman alludes to this in relation to the settler when she draws on a quotation from historian Colin Galloway. Galloway writes that "perhaps the first pioneers did not *come* to the West; perhaps they were *made* in the West": that is, in the act of colonizing and (re)spatializing.[75] In an almost perfect parallel, Wolfe extracts a remark from an intellectual founder of Israeli settler colonialism, Julius Posner, who wrote that the creation of Israel is a project for Zionists to "build and *be rebuilt*" in the Holy Land.[76] While both these astonishing remarks are left under-developed, they reveal the circuitous motion that is the

psychosocial ontology of spatiality. Both Galloway's and Posner's observations point towards the fundamental Nietzschean observation that has informed psychoanalysis: that "there is no 'being' behind doing… 'the doer' is merely a fiction added to the deed - the deed is everything."[77]

Perhaps more than any scholar of settler colonialism who I have discussed thus far, Mark Rifkin provides a close study of the formation of settler subjects. *Settler Common Sense* opens with a phenomenological examination of Rifkin's move into his newly purchased home and how he came to experience the possession of this property as "an expansion of self". To understand this experience Rifkin considers the ways in which "institutionalized relations of settlement" contour the everyday lives of their subjects, producing affects.[78] These quotidian and banal ways in which settler colonialism enacts and reenforces itself in settlers' lives are what characterize its operations as a form of "common sense". Rifkin asserts that because of the power structures - legal, political, or otherwise - that settlers erect, the invasion of indigenous territories by settlers is "lived as given, as simply the unmarked, generic conditions of possibility" for everyday life.[79] The violence of their invasive presence becomes invisible to settlers themselves. Clearly this shares a certain degree of affinity with Wolfe's thesis of invasion-as-structure; however, Rifkin's observations provide greater explanatory power when faced with the question of how settler colonialism remains obscured to the settler. Rifkin's model explains that this invisibility is because the settler colony's institutions establish and enforce their position by "directing attention to some things and not others" and thereby delimit how their subjects experience "the space of inhabitance".[80] Settler colonial institutions, while oppressive in a multitude of ways, also produce and support settler ways of perceiving the world. All of these modes of perception

operate to ensure that indigenous peoples' "appearance in the present can be experienced as mere oddity" from the settlers' perspective.[81] While Rifkin's account of settler common sense relies on a phenomenological framework, it is not entirely dissimilar to the insights offered by the psychoanalytical concept of the *imago*.

Originally introduced by Carl Jung, the *imago* was later developed as a political concept by feminists building on the work of Jacques Lacan. The *imago* is understood as the psychic formation of the body that is constructed through a subject's socialization and psychic development. Described by Catherine Waldby, an

> 'imago' does not connote a real biological body over which a cultural image is laid. Rather it places the morphology of the body, the configuration of its flesh, its boundaries and the relationship between parts, in an indissociable relationship with its psychic investment by the subject who lives that body.[82]

The indissociable bond between psychic perceptions and the materiality of the flesh, establishes the limitations of bodily experience - at once delineating zones of erogeneity, neutrality, and taboo. The production of an *imago* is achieved in a nebulous haze of repetitious actions and prohibitions. As an enormously complex but perceptually mundane process, the *imago* produces itself as inscrutable. An *imago* is always experienced *qua* body - *qua* real. Bodily experiences are enabled by the *imago,* naturalized, treated as universal facts and, when the norms of the *imago* are contravened, a striking panic - even rage - grips the subject.[83]

For most of its conceptual history the *imago* has been wedded to the body. However, recent theoretical work on waning state power has expanded the idea of the *imago*, making it explicitly relevant to the discussion of settler spatialities and subject formation. Moreover, as the bodily *imago* is necessarily spatial already, this move is not exceedingly difficult.[84] In *Walled*

States, Waning Sovereignty, Wendy Brown discusses the phantasmatic effects that the construction of border-walls have in perpetuating an *imago* of Westphalian state sovereignty.[85] Working through Edward Said's concept of "imaginative geography", Brown observes that the "mental organization of space produc[es] identities through boundaries".[86] That is to say that the boundaries of a nation or alliance act as liminal markers of an insider|outsider distinction: those on the inside form a community, while those beyond the boundaries are imagined as 'other'. Brown notes that the coherence of the Westphalian state, under conditions of globalization, is strained to a point that the boundaries of the community itself are at constant risk of dissolution. Movements of goods, immigrants, refugees, terrorists, etc. all underscore the difficulty of maintaining the coherence of the state. In such a situation, newly erected border-walls "function theatrically, projecting power and efficacy that they do not and cannot actually exercise".[87]

By Brown's account the importance of border-walls' obdurate materiality is not located in the success with which they defend the community they enclose, but rather in the phantasmatic effect the border-walls have as "organizers of human psychic landscapes".[88] Despite standing as a firm marker of a polity's edge, a wall may not be able to actually prevent the flows of materials, people, threats, etc. that ultimately disrupt the state's basic coherence. A wall, however, provides assurances that said space continues to exist - that it remains intact and relevant. Border-walls act for the body politic as the skin does for the *imago* of the culturally dominant body: a physical barrier that fulfills its psychic purpose regardless of its actual porosity.

The logic that inheres in this theatrical process harkens back to an observation made by Soja, that the "appearance of spatial coherence and homogeneity" is necessary for the operation

of political power.[89] The communal *imago* that a polity at once produces and embraces through the presence of walls gives a sense of coherence to the space in which the subjects abide. The impact of this is enormous, for as Brown notes, in many cases newly constructed walls can actually "invent the societies they limn".[90] As they cut between communities and nations which once intermingled, walls are meant to approximate the extremities of a particular group. As this is only ever an approximation - the wall being monolithic and communities being fractal - walling inevitably excludes residual populations of the now divided community. Simultaneously a wall includes populations that had not been previously associated with the walled polity. Over time those populations that were excluded or included by the wall, may begin to function not as residual fragments of an originary community but as members of communities that are divided and even defined by the wall. As such, by its very existence, a wall aids in the psychic (re)production of a communal *imago* that facilitates a nationalistic 'us' and 'them' distinction - that itself leads to further walling.[91] The truly radical element of Brown's work is the inexorable and circuitous tie between the wall, the society it limns, and the subjects constructing it. In her account, the wall produces the society, which produces subjects who need the psychic security of the wall - or perhaps it runs in reverse.

While Brown's analysis does an excellent job transitioning from a bodily to a spatial *imago*, she does this by focusing almost exclusively on the edges of polities. Although edges, and the walls that demarcate them, are certainly important sites in the production of spatial phantasms, attention must also be paid to the occlusions that a spatial *imago* facilitates *within* its boundaries. Throughout her analysis Brown pays careful attention to the anxiety that propels wall building when subjects of nation states are faced with a sense of "growing lawlessness

lapping the edges of nation states and streaming across them."[92] However, almost no attention is given in this analysis to the similar disruption from *within* that the ongoing presence of indigenous peoples' sovereignty poses to the holism of the settler state's *imago*.[93] Brown's occlusion occurs in the face of Barker's observation that in settler colonies the frontier is experienced ubiquitously, and Rifkin's similar assertion that settler colonies are necessarily "founded on top of polities" of indigenous peoples.[94] Rather than being threatened solely by forces lapping at its edges, Brown forgets that in settler colonies the *imago* is always already troubled by the persistence of indigenous peoples' sovereignty bubbling up through the *imago*.

In this way, and perhaps unintentionally, Brown's work acts as an encore performance to the project of erasing indigenous peoples. In the context of settler colonialism, it is not only walls that establish the spatial *imago*, but also office buildings, (rail)roads, houses, city squares, resource extraction operations, etc.[95] Like the walls Brown considers so intently, all of these obdurately physical structures stabilize settler psyches by producing phantasms of communal permanence and perpetuity that simultaneously screen out indigenous peoples' presences and sovereignty.[96] The homestead, for instance, provides a myth of settler permanence: at once storying the presence of current settlers back several generations and offering evidence for the presumed legitimacy of their claim to ownership through the motif of shaping and being shaped by the land. All this acts to screen out the continuous violence of colonization that is the condition for the possibility of settler states as such.

The *imago* produced by settler 'development' is necessary for imagining the erasure of indigeneity - just as imagining the erasure of indigeneity is necessary for the production of a stable settler *imago*. The clustering within the *imago* of the psyche and the social, is a critical

element in the production of a subject that reflexively occludes their own involvement in the ongoing dispossession of indigenous peoples. In their report to the Ipperwash Inquiry, the Chippewas of Nawash note that as indigenous sovereignty is nullified in the minds of settlers:

> a kind of psychological *terra nullius* is created - the land is now emptied of people who matter and so it does not matter that trap lines are drowned by hydro projects, or hunting grounds clear-cut, or that fishing nets are stolen out of the water.[97]

At a distance, the duplicity here is quite strange. Lines are drowned, forests are cut, nets are stolen, because settlers reflexively presume that they have a right - duty even - to shape the vacant land according to their collective and individual needs. Yet the very things which they seek to remove should prove the falsity of *terra nullius,* as they evidence indigenous peoples' presence. The settler glosses the colonial violence of their actions so easily, however, because they are ultimately the product of, and dependent upon, a series of power relations that actively disappear indigenous peoples as sovereign bodies. Within the psychosocial order of settler colonialism, supported by the settler *imago,* these acts are understood as progressive or represent an adherence to the law, and become unreadable to the settler for what they are: the latest in a series of dispossessive acts.

2245 and 2255, 6th Ave. West, Owen Sound (Welcome to Anishinaabek Territory):

In this section I examine the politics that emerge through, and in opposition to, the production of a settler *imago*. Having provided the tools to better understand settler psyches, I now consider the case of a longstanding land dispute, which climaxed in the early 1990s, between the Saugeen Anishinaabek and the City of Owen Sound. I briefly reiterate the treaties in question, before examining how the theoretical framework of the settler *imago* applies to this

situation. I then point towards the disruptive effects that the presence of assertive and sovereign indigenous peoples have on the reproduction of the settler *imago*.

As we have seen, the history of settlement in the Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound region involves a succession of treaties abrogated to the almost sole benefit of settlers. Following Treaty 45 1/2 (1836), settlers began occupying more than a million acres of land below the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula. Despite the Imperial Declaration (1847) Anishinaabek territory on the Peninsula was not protected 'forever', as Oliphant's manipulation of Treaty 72 (1854) forced the Saugeen Anishinaabek on to five small reserves. Even this affront was compounded almost immediately when, in 1857, Treaty 82 forced an exodus from Nawash Village, just north of Owen Sound. In the terms of this last Treaty, however, the signatories from Nawash Village ensured that an acre of land be reserved as burial sites. In what is perhaps its most enduring adherence to the terms of any Treaty with the Saugeen Anishinaabek, the Crown actually upheld the reserved status of the lots 97 and 99 burial site for a number of years. While the Department of Indian Affairs showed little concern for conditions at the site, allowing it to sustain "injury by horses and cattle", on at least one occasion a private patent on the lots was clearly withheld while those for the adjoining lots were released.[98] Such goodwill did not last, however, because in 1903 the lots were sold to Sarawak Township without inclusion of the Saugeen Anishinaabek in the negotiations - again violating the Royal Proclamation's requirement for approval of treaties by general assemblies.[99]

Early in the 20th Century the burial grounds, which were eventually incorporated into the Owen Sound city plan as 2245 and 2255, 6th Avenue West, became the site a marl quarry, instrumental in the local manufacturing of brick.[100] Occupation of the burial site, illegal even by

the standards of settler law, continued unquestioned until a researcher with the Chippewas of Nawash uncovered several documents relating to the site in 1991. As a result of this research it was requested that the Minister of Indian Affairs intervene and cooperate with the Chiefs of the Saugeen Anishinaabek to restore the burial site to its proper dignity and to recognize its status as reserved land.[101] Indian Affairs proved either unable or unwilling to work at a pace that would halt the continuing desecration of the site, now occupied by suburban residences. In response, Chief Ralph Akiwenzie of *Neyaashiinigamiing* (Cape Croker) led his community in a reclamation of the burial grounds. An eight day stand-off ensued, in which Anishinaabek peoples came together at their ancestors' burial grounds in healing ceremonies and celebrations. Ultimately the City of Owen Sound was forced to recognize the illegality that was being done, affirming the site as reserved land, a status which it retains to this day.[102]

Perhaps the most striking motif within the history of treaty-making in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound is the degree to which the acquisition of territory figures as an obsession for settlers. Parallel to Wolfe, Stephanie McMullen notes that as settler populations grew the necessity of maintaining military and economic alliances with indigenous peoples declined, acquiring "land became the most significant thing of value" in settler calculations.[103] A strictly materialist reading of history suggests that this demand was meant to ensure the physical security of the settlers, with the goal to increase agriculture, providing the necessities of life in abundance. Acquisition of the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula was likely to be of little help in this regard, however, as it's defining geographic characteristics were noted even then as being "rocky soil and [an] unsuitability for agriculture".[104] Despite this, settlers were undeterred, going to the extreme lengths of accosting Superintendent-General Oliphant in public to demand that more

territory be opened to them.[105] The actions and mentality of settlers at this time may best be characterized as that of an incited rabble.

But what was it that caused this settler rabble, in the throws of their rancour, to turn against their sovereign treaty-partners? Why was it that these masses of rancorous settlers did not condemn their own political masters in revolutionary fashion, as had been exemplified in recent European revolutions? I suggest that the reason is embedded within the structures of settler colonialism. Intoxicated by their success in having moulded the landscape to their own ends, settlers began to see only themselves and their society reflected back upon them. Though their cities were built on grounds opened to them through alliance-building treaties, those conditions imposed upon the event of arrival became obscured by the assumed permanence of their settlements. Moreton-Robinson speaks as if from the settler unconscious:

> These cities signify with every building and every street that this land is now possessed by others: signs of white possession are embedded everywhere in the landscape. The omnipresence of Indigenous sovereignties exists here too, but it is disavowed through the materiality of these significations…[106]

If the hauntological features of indigenous peoples' sovereignty - in a landscape which appears unequivocally settled - can tear at the settler *imago* from within, how much more immeasurable would the impact of a sovereign indigenous polity on the edge of settler territory be? Especially if that polity was a site of refuge for many of those indigenous people(s) displaced by the act of settlement.

Representing the "last tract of relatively accessible unceded" territory in southern Ontario, in the early 19th Century the Saugeen Anishinaabek's territory must have been the cause of some psychic dislocation within the settler community. Indeed, as we've seen, at this time

manic consternation was expressed through recourse to the language of 'progress' - to be achieved by a remaking of the land. A consistent reminder of the indigeneity that they actively sought to repress within already occupied lands, the unceded Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula was no doubt a gash across the otherwise whole surface of the settler *imago.* In a state of anxiety borne out of the logics of settler colonialism, the settler came to view sovereign indigenous peoples as a "threat to industry, development, and the interests of the nation."[107] This threat is potentially material, as indigenous peoples may represent some type of impediment to accessing natural resources; but indigeneity is always already an existential threat to the settler, as ongoing indigenous sovereignty undermines the singular and phantasmatic wholeness of the sort of unipolar sovereignty upon which the settler *imago* depends.

Thus, while the work of solidifying the settler *imago* continued apace in the construction of cities, (rail)roads, etc., the task of erasing from the settler imaginary the very idea of sovereign indigenous peoples, was also underway. In the brief period from 1835 to 1857 the relationship between the Saugeen Anishinaabek and the Crown morphed from one of nation-to-nation exchange, to a relationship wherein the latter party insisted on, and actively sought to ensure, the dependent status of the former. These alchemical processes by which the Crown strives to subjugate of the Saugeen Anishinaabek can, in part, be read through the changes that occur in the language of the treaties. Treaty 45 (1836), which framed Treaty 45 1/2 (1836), begins by recognizing that "Seventy snows have now passed away since… the King, and the Indians of North America tied their hands together by the wampum of friendship."[108] By deliberately referencing the Treaty of Niagara (1764), which the Two Row Wampum represents, and by linguistically framing the Treaty as an address to the Anishinaabek, Treaty 45 was clearly

approached with at least the minimal understanding that the Crown "represents the interests of Settlers alone", and that it must treat with indigenous peoples as partners.[109] While Treaty 45 goes on to insinuate that the Anishinaabek ought to become "civilized", and also to coerce the surrender of Manitoulin Island, it does uphold the basic language of a nation-to-nation relationship - albeit a particularly abusive and tenuous one.

Contrast this with Treaty 72 (1854), which contains no such reference to Niagara. Instead, it begins by "confiding in the wisdom and protecting care of our Great Mother" Queen Victoria and ends, tellingly, with a "request [for] the sanction of our Great Father the Governor General to [approve] this surrender".[110] A language of partnership has been replaced with one of supplication. Moreover, the terms of address in Treaty 72 are inverted: the Anishinaabek now address themselves to the Crown. This inversion is particularly telling when we consider that the text of this Treaty was drafted almost solely by Laurence Oliphant, then Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.[111] Ventriloquizing the Saugeen Anishinaabek, the Crown has assumed a position of open paternalism abrogating the terms of friendship represented in the Treaty of Niagara. The contrast between the languages used in Treaties 45 and 72 shows the rapid dissolution of settlers' ability to understand the Anishinaabek as a sovereign people. Settler discourses now reflexively position indigenous peoples as wards of the Crown. The difference in the position of the Anishinaabek under these two treaties originates within the settler imaginary, as the difference between nations and nomads.

It is as a result of these enormous, historic, and ongoing efforts, that when we - as settlers - arrive almost one hundred and forty years later on the doorsteps of 2245 and 2255, 6th Avenue West, Owen Sound we experience no disruption or dislocation. Our experience of these

homesteads is remarkably and chillingly settled. Rifkin notes that the "legal and political structures" of the settler colony ensure that the presence of settlers remains as "unmarked, generic conditions of possibility for occupancy, association, history, and personhood."[112] Our institutions enter into an assemblage with the settler *imago*, the product of which is a subject dependent on, and invested in, the invisibility of indigeneity. Settlers' investment in the continuous erasure of indigenous peoples is to such an acute degree that, when concrete was poured at 2245 and 2255, the desecrated remains of the Anishinaabek were left as reinforcement for the foundations.[113] Likewise, as the marl was quarried away from the site, the bodies - which had not been coffined and remained open to the soil - were ground down into brick and underwent another form of colonization, as they were forced into service bearing the weight of Owen Sound's oldest and most prestigious buildings.[114]

Despite the fact that Anishinaabek remains were violently and unceremoniously removed from their resting place and then, in the most macabre way, forcibly integrated into the settler *imago* as part of our buildings, residents of Owen Sound still manage to find outrage and indignation when indigenous peoples assert their sovereign presence. The efforts to defend their ancestors and to reassert the reserved status of the 6th Avenue lots is a prime example. When members of the Chippewas of Nawash arrived at 2245 and 2255, their vigil was led by council member Mel Elliot. Immediately, Elliot sent young people from Nawash around to all the neighbours, providing them with background information on why the Anishinaabek were there and also offering a "standing invitation… to come and chat about the situation."[115] Despite their conciliatory efforts, the Anishinaabek were still vilified. As part of the healing ceremonies, sacred drums were used to "honour [the] dead and return them to peace"; however, this was

portrayed by settlers as a "provocation".[116] Indeed, in a letter to the local paper one resident wrote: "My frustration has turned to anger and to being prejudiced which I never thought I was." She continues: "Residents agreed that the *occupation* was breeding prejudice among their children who are frightened and feel threatened."[117] How casually she inverts the idea of occupation: naturalizing her position and, somehow, ensuring that the Anishinaabek - who have been in these lands since time immemorial - are described as the disruptive and thieving newcomers. Imagine: it is those whose basements, sidewalks, and walls were built on and off the bones of the Saugeen Anishinaabek that declare themselves afraid.

It was not, however, the Anishinaabek and their drums that created the prejudice. Fear, hatred, and resentment are the preconditions of our colonization of indigenous peoples' lands, and thus form the unacknowledged conditions of daily life in settler colonies. Perhaps they were afraid. Perhaps as settlers our psyches, our stabile sense of ourselves, is so contingent upon (re)production through power structures that assure us of the impossibility of indigenous presences, that when indigenous peoples inevitably assert themselves our smooth *imago*, our comfortable sense of ourselves, is threatened with absolute dissolution.

Destabilizing a Dispossessive Subject:

Not only does the concept of the spatial *imago* facilitate interrogations of the formation of the settler as a subject, it also provides a powerful analytical tool to begin explaining the vitriolic reactions that indigenous peoples constantly face from settlers. Many point to racism as the source of such reactions, and this is not without cause, as settlers have long imbibed a sense of racial and cultural superiority - particularly towards indigenous peoples. Despite these prejudices, however, Wolfe notes that the "primary motive" of settler colonialism's domination

"is not race" but "access to territory."[118] Thus, in as much as the settler colonial *imago* validates access to territory by occluding indigenous peoples' sovereignty, the ongoing presences on and claims to the land by indigenous peoples trouble the settler *imago* and induce panic in settler subjects.

Facing assertive indigenous presences within colonial spaces, settlers must answer the legitimate charge that their daily lives - in all their banality - are predicated upon the privileges produced by ongoing efforts at genocide. The jarring nature of such charges offers an irreconcilable challenge to settlers *qua* settlers.[119] These charges threaten to implode the *imago* of settler colonialism, which was meant to operate within the settler psyche in a relatively smooth and benign manner. This implosion is potentiated at the moment when even a portion of the violence that is required to make settler life possible is revealed. If, for example, settlers are forced to see 'their' neighbourhood as a site of desecration and ongoing colonization, it becomes more difficult to sustain it within the imaginary as a space of frivolity.[120] As Brown writes, in the "loss of horizons, order, and identity" the subject experiences a sense of enormous vulnerability.[121] Threatened with this "loss of containment" the settler subject embarks down the road to psychic disintegration.[122] Thus, to parlay Brown's thesis to the settler colonial context, the uncontrollable rage that indigenous peoples' presences induce within the settler are not evidence of the strength of settlers, but rather of a subject lashing out on the brink of its own dissolution.

This panic - this latent anger - is always already a necessary condition of the settler as a subject. As Lorenzo Veracini observes, the settler necessarily remains in a disposition of aggression "even after indigenous alterities have ceased to be threatening."[123] This disposition

results from the unaffirmable precarity inherent in the maintenance of settler colonialism's *imago*, wherein any and all indigenous presences threaten subjective dissolution of the settler as such. Trapped in a paradox, the very thing that provides a balm to the settler subject - further development and entrenchment of the settler colonial *imago* - is also what panics the subject when it is inevitably contravened.[124] We can think of this development as a process of hardening, that leaves the *imago* brittle and more susceptible to breakage. Their desire to produce a firm *imago* means that settlers are also always already in a psychically defensive position. That is to say that the settlers' offensive position on occupied land is sustained through a defensive posture - here I think of the neighbour's letter, that characterizes the Anishinaabek as 'occupiers'. For, while settlers desire the total erasure of indigenous populations, the attendant desire to disappear their own identity *as* settlers necessitates the suppression of both desires, if the subject's reliance on, and production through, settler colonial power structures is to be psychically naturalized.

Faced with threats of dissolution, subjects act in various ways to prop up their psychic investments and maintain themselves as subjects as best they can. Settlers' reactions to assertive indigenous peoples fit, broadly within the two ego defence responses that Sigmund Freud observed. The first defence attempts a complete conversion of the suppressed desire into a new idea. In settler colonial contexts this requires averting attention from the violence of dispossession; as such, settlers often suggest that they aim to create a 'city on the hill'.[125] Freud noted that the conversion defence mechanism does suppress the anxiety-inducing desire, but it also leads to "periodic hysterical outbursts." Such is the case when settlers' utopic visions are forced to confront reality: that the genteel neighbourhood they imagine is founded in and perpetuates irredeemable suffering. A second type of defence is to channel the original desire's

energy into an obsession or a phobia. The effects of this defence are seen in the preoccupation that settler colonialism has with purity of blood or of culture.[126] As we have already seen, this obsession at once solidifies the power of the settler state, thereby naturalizing the settler and simultaneously perpetuating the processes of erasing indigenous peoples. Psychic defences are intended to secure the subject from pain, and whether that pain originates inside or outside the psyche is inconsequential. Because of the threat that sovereign indigenous peoples present to the phantasmatic wholeness of settler colonialism, settlers must always remain suspended in a state of arrested development between these defensive positions. Despite any pretensions to the contrary, the settler is *necessarily* a parochial subject who continuously coils, reacts, disavows, and lashes out, when confronted with their dependency on indigenous peoples and their territories. This absolute psychic precarity exists as the condition of the settler subject because of the unending fear of their own dissolution, as indigenous peoples' sovereignty is continuously (re)asserted.[127]

Goeman writes that decolonization must include an analysis of the dominant "self-disciplining colonial subject".[128] While she intended this as an explicit challenge to other indigenous people(s), it holds true for settler-allies as well. However, as this discussion of subjective precarity demonstrates, the degree to which these disciplinary or phenomenological processes are complete should not be overstated. Evidence of this incompletion is apparent in the settler's arrested state of development. Settler-allies must examine and cultivate the ways in which settlers fail to be totally disciplined subjects. Discovering the instability of the settler, indeed of all subjects, is the central conceit of psychoanalysis. This expectation of at least a partial failure of settler subject formation is also what sets my account apart from Rifkin's. His

phenomenology falls into the trap that Jacqueline Rose observes within many sociological accounts of the subject: that of assuming a successful formation of normative subjects.

From the psychoanalytical perspective the "unconscious constantly reveals the 'failure'" of subject formation.[129] As we have seen, within settler subjects this failure can be expressed as an anxiety that expresses itself whenever a settler is confronted with the facts regarding their colonizing status. Under conditions of total subjectification such charges ought to be unintelligible to the settler and would bring about no reaction. But we see that this is manifestly not the case. The process of subject formation is always in slippage and never totalized; because of this precarity the settler is prone to violence and lashing out.[130] But the subject in slippage also provides an avenue by which the processes of settler colonialism can be subverted - creating cracks in a phantasmatic wholeness which can be opened wider. Breakages of this sort offer an opportunity to pursue what Paulette Regan calls a "restorying" of settler colonial history and culture, to decentre settler mythologies built upon and within the dispossession of indigenous peoples.[131] The cultivation of these cracks is a necessary part of decolonial work, as it continues to panic and thus to destabilize settler subjectivities.

Resistance to settler colonialism does not occur only in highly visible moments like the famous conflict at Kanesatake and Kahnawake.[132] It also occurs in reiterative and disruptive practises and speech acts. Goeman correctly observes that the "repetitive practices of everyday life" are what give settler spaces their meaning, as they provide a degree of naturalness to the settler *imago* and its psychic investments.[133] As such, to disrupt the ease of these repetitions is at once to striate radically the otherwise smooth spaces of settler colonialism and also to disrupt the easy (re)production of the settler subject. Goeman calls these subversive acts the "micro-politics

of resistance," which historically took the form of "moving fences, not cooperating with census enumerators, sometimes disrupting survey parties" amongst other processes.[134] These acts panic the subject that is a product of settler colonial power, by forcing encounters with the sovereign indigenous peoples who settlers imagined were gone. This reveals to the settler, if only fleetingly, the violence that founds and sustains settler colonialism. While such practises may not overthrow the settler colony, they may contribute to undoing it, by subverting its logics and insistently drawing attention to the ongoing presence of indigenous peoples who refuse erasure.

Today we can draw similar inspiration from the variety of tactics used in the 6th Avenue dispute or in movements like Idle No More. From flash mobs in major malls, to round dances that block city streets, and even projects to rename Toronto locations, Idle No More is engaged in a series of micro-political projects across Turtle Island.[135] The micro-politics of the movement strengthen indigenous subjects and their spatialities, while leaving an indelible imprint in the settler psyche. Predictably, rage and resentment were provoked in some settlers.[136] However, Idle No More also drew thousands of settlers into the streets and renewed conversations about the necessity of nation-to-nation relationships. With settler colonial spaces disrupted and a relationship of domination and paternalism made impossible to ignore, in the tradition of centuries of indigenous resistance and self-affirmation, Idle No More also put the settler subject into serious flux once more.

Conclusion:

Settler colonialism, we have seen, is distinguished from colonialism by what Wolfe calls its 'logic of elimination,' which requires the erasure of indigenous peoples from the colonized territory. This is accomplished through a variety of mechanisms that range from outright

violence to policies of gradual assimilation. Ultimately, settler colonialism is perpetuated through a double move: to erase indigenous peoples and then to disappear settlers by naturalizing the violence inherent in their existence in colonized territory. This is accomplished through the production of spatialities imagined to be bereft of indigeneity. Out of this spatial logic, an *imago* of settler society is produced that binds settlers both psychically and socially to each other and to the colonized spaces. The continual (re)production of a settler *imago* is necessary to secure the psychic horizons of the settler subject, it is also inextricably bound up with an insatiable need to constantly renew the erasure of indigenous peoples. Thus, in order to secure its continued survival as a subject, the settler must always strive to maintain the conditions of settler colonialism.

Total erasure of indigeneity is the grotesque desire of the settler, and it must be constantly subverted. As indigenous peoples persist as a self-affirmative and sovereign presence within the settler *imago,* they are always already threatening this subversion of the settler subject at its very core. For while the affirmation of indigeneity can induce panic, and subsequently rage, in the settler, it also opens a crack within the *imago* - that is, within the settler subject itself - through which an ethic of decolonization can emerge. While it seems that settler colonialism is propelled by a tightly circuitous movement of subject formation, projection, and (re)formation, the presence of indigenous peoples in ongoing and sovereign relationships with the land serves as a powerful blockage of the smoothness of this process. Those who consider themselves settler-allies must aid their treaty partners by engaging in the radical act of truth telling and point their fellow settlers towards the evidence of ongoing and sovereign indigenous presences.

Chapter One Notes:

[1] An excerpt from Anishinaabe author, poet, and storyteller Lenore Keeshig's poem "Good Bye, Wild Indian". Lenore is a member of the Chippewas of Nawash, and lives at *Neyaashiinigamiing.* Lenore Keeshig, "Good Bye, Wild Indian," in *Running on the March Wind,* (Toronto: Quattro Books, 2015), 105.
[2] While they may seem synonymous, I use the words "erase," "disappear," and "dissolve" in very particular ways throughout this chapter. In order to attain greater conceptual clarity, "erase" ought to be understood as indicating efforts by one set of actors to remove all evidence of another group. "Disappear" implies an effort to conceal the ongoing existence of something the presence of which is an inconvenience in one way or another. "Dissolve" indicates the coming apart of a thing as a result of logics internal to itself.
[3] Patrick Wolfe, "Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (December 2006), http://www.jstor.org (accessed March 27, 2015), 402. This observation has been cited widely throughout the literature on settler colonialism.
[4] *ibid*., 388.
[5] Lorenzo Veracini, "On Settlerness," *borderlands* 10, no. 1 (2011), www.jstor.org (accessed March 27, 2015), 4.
[6] Mishuana Goeman, *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 2.
[7] Tom Flanagan, *First Nations? Second Thoughts* 2nd ed., (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008), 19.
[8] It ought to be noted that these original settlers were themselves drawn largely from the masses of landless people in Europe. In their desire to achieve the highest European ideal - proprietorship - these masses became what Wolfe calls a "rabble". That is, an insatiable body of people who attempt to forcibly insert themselves into the universal position. Please see Wolfe, "Settler colonialism," 392. And for a theory of the "rabble" see: G.W.F. Hegel, *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, H.B. Nisbet, trans., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 234-266.
[9] Wolfe, "Settler colonialism," 396.
[10] Mishuana Goeman, "Disrupting a Settler-Colonial Grammar of Place: The Visual Memoir of Hulleah Tsinhnahjinnie," in *Theorizing Native Studies*, Audra Simpson and Andrea Smith, eds., (London: Duke University Press, 2014), 250. Emphasis original.
[11] Michael Ash, *On Being Here to Stay: Treaties and Aboriginal Rights in Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 50.
[12] I am ultimately grateful to Aaron Mills, who gifted me the wonderful graphic history of the Chippewas of Nawash; please see Polly Keeshig-Tobias, *The Illustrated History of the Chippewas of Nawash*, (Chippewas of Nawash, 1996), 2 and 71. The Saugeen Anishinaabek's territory encompassed roughly two million acres in all, Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege: How the People of the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation Asserted Their Rights and Claims and Dealt with the Backlash*, (Neyaashiinigamiing: Ningwakwe Learning Press, 2005), 3 and 114. I am indebted to David McLaren for providing me with this document..
[13] Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash,* 5-6. Even at this very early stage, the Crown seems to be totally unable or unwilling to uphold the terms of its treaties with indigenous peoples. The terms of the Royal Proclamation (1763) had indicated the Crown's intention of entering a nation-to-nation relationship with indigenous peoples, that would preclude this type of coercion, see Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 5.
[14] Peter S. Schmalz, *The History of the Saugeen Indians*, (Ottawa: Ontario Historical Society, 1977), 66-68.
[15] Victoria Freeman, "'Toronto Has No History!' Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, and Historical Memory in Canada's Largest City," *Urban History Review* 30, no. 2 (Spring 2010).
[16] Emphasis mine, Treaty 42 1/2 is reproduced in full: Stephanie McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession: Nawash Ojibwa and Potawatomi in the Saugeen Territory, 1836-1865," (MA thesis, The University of Calgary, 1997), 110. See also, Keeshi-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash,* 81.
[17] *ibid.,* 82-83.
[18] Statement of Indian Affairs Superintendent Thomas G. Anderson, as quoted in McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession," 62.

[19] Oliphant leveraged the internal division of the Saugeen Anishinaabek to his own advantage. Negotiating the bulk of Treaty 72 in the absence of several Chiefs who arrived late to the negotiations, having only been invited by Oliphant once the discussions began. The terms of this Treaty left the Saugeen Anishinaabek with five small sites of unceded territory: to the northwest of Owen Sound, the southeast of Colpoy's Bay, Chief's Point (north of present-day Sauble Beach), Saugeen (south of present-day Sauble Beach), and Cape Croker (*Neyaashiinigamiing*). Only twenty years early, in 1835, the Saugeen Anishinaabek had held a territory of roughly two million acres; by 1854, because of the machinations of their 'friend' the Crown, the Saugeen were recognized to control only around 2% of that original territory. Oliphant's manipulation of internal disunity enabled the usurpation of the Saugeen Anishinaabek's territory and fostered a great deal of anomie within the Anishinaabek, so that they became alienated from each: from this point onwards the distinctions between the communities at Saugeen and Nawash become much easier to delineate. See, McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession," 61-68. Also see, Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 13-20. Finally see, Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 6-7. I am indebted to David McLaren for providing me with this document.

[20] Schmalz, *Saugeen Indians*, 87.

[21] Oliphant quoted in McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession," 74.

[22] Emphasis mine. As you read on, note how close McMullen's language comes to hitting on the concept of the *imago* as I develop it in this paper. While a parallelism, rather than even coincidence, it does seem to suggest a very tight connection between the space of occupation and the development of a settler's psyche. See, *ibid*., 76.

[23] See, *ibid.,* 76-78. Treaty 82 is reproduced in full in: Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 87-87

[24] "Summary of events concerning Nawash burial ground reserves," *Anishinabek News*, (January 1993), 8.

[25] Adam Barker, "Locating Settler Colonialism," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 13, no. 3 (Winter 2012), www.jstor.org (accessed August 10, 2015).

[26] Wendy Brown, *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*, (New York: Zone Books, 2010), 78-79.

[27] Goeman, *My Words*, 27.

[28] Brown, *Walled States,* 116-117. Indeed, Carl Schmitt identifies the ability to declare the distinction between friend and enemy as the constitutive element of sovereignty, see *ibid*., 55.

[29] Barker, "Locating Settler Colonialism."

[30] Wolfe, "Settler colonialism," 399.

[31] Jodi A. Byrd, "Follow the typical signs: settler sovereignty and its discontents," *Settler Colonial Studies* 4, no. 2 (2014), http://www.jstor.org (accessed August 8, 2015), 151.

[32] This is not meant to be read as an opposition to multiculturalism *per se,* rather to its adoption and perversion by settler states that seek only to validate their own existence. Goeman, *My Words*, 35-36. For an excellent theoretical and political critique of the liberal state's reliance on recognition politics please see Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

[33] Goeman, *My Words,* 21.

[34] Robert Benzie, "Conservative MPP Bill Murdoch to ride off into the sunset," *The Toronto Star*, July 5, 2010.

[35] The entire exchange between Joseph, Miller, and Murdoch is hosted on *The National Post*'s website, accompanied by an article that provides excellent background information on Miller and Zunera Ishaq's case. See, Jake Edminston, "Tory MP Larry Miller on women wearing niqabs at citizenship ceremonies: 'Stay the hell where you came from,'" *The National Post*, March 17, 2015.

[36] *Conservative MP Larry Miller's niqab comments: harsh but true*, Rebel Media, YouTube, March 17, 2015 (accessed November 1, 2015).

[37] Almost any comment board of any article dealing with Miller's remarks will provide sufficient evidence of the support that was offered to him following his comments. See for example, Kady O'Malley, "Larry Miller, Conservative MP, recants inflammatory niqab-ban comment," *CBC News*, March 17, 2015.

[38] Edminston, "Tory MP".

[39] Ryan Maloney, "Mulcair Hammers Harper for Letting Tory MP Larry Miller Run Again," *The Huffington Post Canada*, August 7, 2015.

[40] Heather Mallick, "Why doesn't MP Larry Miller stay where he came from?" *The Toronto Star*, March 17, 2015.

[41] *ibid.*

[42] Stephen P. Knadler, *The Fugitive Race: Minority Writers Resisting Whiteness*, (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2002), 204.

[43] Edminston, "Tory MP".

[44] Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty*, (London: University of Minnesota Press, 2015), xxiii.

[45] Susanne Schech and Jane Haggis, "Migrancy, Multiculturalism, and Whiteness: Re-charting Core Identities in Australia," *Communal Plural: Journal of Transnational and Crosscultural Studies* 9, no. 2 (October 2001), 148.

[46] Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive*, 24.
[47] *ibid.,* 3.
[48] *ibid.,* xvii.
[49] Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, (London: Verso, 1989), 11.
[50] *ibid*., 129.
[51] *ibid.,* 25. Emphasis added. It does not appear here as though Soja is making a Heideggerean comment, rather he is simply discussing the manner in which a person can and does act in the world as a space.
[52] *ibid.,* 19.
[53] Cited in *ibid*., 21. Emphasis original.
[54] *ibid*., 35.
[55] *ibid.,* 35-38.
[56] Goeman, *My Words*, 17-18.
[57] *ibid.,* 2.
[58] *ibid.,* 23.
[59] "Maps: 1667-1999," *Canadian Confederation*, in Library and Archives Canada, http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/politics-government/canadian-confederation/Pages/maps-1667-1999.aspx (accessed June 7, 2015).
[60] The Anishinaabe name for what settlers call North America, its etymology is deeply rooted in the story of the Trickster Nanaboozhoo and the flood. See Chippewas of Nawash, *Encountering the Other: Racism Against Aboriginal People*, (Chippewas of Nawash, 2007), 9-10.
[61] Asch, *Here to Stay*, 118-119.
[62] Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive*, 30.
[63] *ibid., xii*.
[64] Goeman, "Settler-Colonial Grammar," 251.
[65] Goeman, *My Words*, 11. Emphasis added.
[66] Soja*, Geographies*, 126.
[67] Goeman, *My Words*, 9.
[68] Goeman, "Settler-Colonial Grammar," 239.
[69] The example *par excellence* is the way in which settlers along the Canadian Pacific coast have integrated totems into the geography of settlement. Domesticated in the settler psyche, totems are taken as historical markers at best, or tourist attractions at worst; settlers never see totems as evidence of ongoing and assertive indigenous presences.
[70] Soja, *Geographies*, 121.
[71] *ibid.,* 25. Like an M.C. Escher sketch, the original move becomes lost in the circuitous motion of phantasms.
[72] *ibid.,* 129. Emphasis added.
[73] Goeman, *My Words*, 1. Emphasis added.
[74] *ibid.*
[75] Quoted in *ibid.,* 19.
[76] Quoted in Wolfe, "Settler colonialism," 390. Emphasis added.
[77] Friedrich Nietzche, *On the Genealogy of Morals* and *Ecce Homo*, Walter Kaufmann, trans., (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), 45.
[78] Mark Rifkin, *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance*, (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 2014), xv.
[79] *ibid.,* xvi.
[80] *ibid.,* 13.
[81] *ibd.,* 31.
[82] Catherine Waldby, "Destruction: Boundary erotics and refigurations of the heterosexual male body," in *Sexy Bodies: The strange carnalities of feminism*, Elizabeth Grosz and Elspeth Probyn, eds., (London: Routledge, 1995), 268.
[83] Waldy discusses this panic through the lens of so called "queer panic", which is the irrepressible anxiety and even rage experienced by straightly-identified persons encounting sexual queerness. For example, the male *imago* usually figures a body that must be impenetrable; thus, the incidence of male anal eroticism "threatens to explode this ideological [impenetrable male] body." The panic is a result of the fact that penetration reveals the phantasmatic nature of the supposedly impenetrable male body: it denaturalizes the subject, revealing its contingencies. This concept of the panicked subject will be critical later in this discussion. Please see: *ibid.,* 272.
[84] Goeman approaches this fact in her treatment of the body as intrinsically bound up with spatiality. However, she fails to foreground the psychic dimension of this relationship. Please see: Goeman, *My Words*, 10-12.

[85] In its European theorization, which developed following the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), sovereignty is defined by: supremacy, perpetuity, decisionism, absoluteness, non-transferability, and territoriality. Brown, *Walled States*, 22.
[86] *ibid.,* 74-75
[87] *ibid.,* 25.
[88] *ibid.*, 74.
[89] Soja, *Geographies*, 126.
[90] Brown, *Walled States,* 90.
[91] *ibid.,* 116-117.
[92] *ibid.*, 83. Emphasis added.
[93] Indeed, in the smattering of references that Brown does make to "Native Americans" (note the conjoining of the indigenous element to the colonial signification of Turtle Island), she paints them almost universally as pacified victims of state power, who are acted on in one way or another, without the ability to act back. Please see variously: *ibid.,* 30, 36, and 113 for the totality of Brown's references to indigenous peoples.
[94] Rifkin, *Common Sense*, 3.
[95] Indeed, artistic expression is also often implicated in the production of settler colonial spaces. Take as an example the normative manner in which white colonialism functions throughout country music. As a quintessentially American musical genre, country music takes almost exceptional pride in the motifs of place, family, and memory. What country music obscures is the constitutive role that settler colonial power structures have played and continue to play in enabling such motifs. For an example of this, please see Robert Lacy, "When Country Was Country," *Sewanee Review* 120, no. 1 (Winter 2012), http://www.jstor.org (accessed August 10, 2015). For an interesting inversion of this please enjoy Adam James' album *Messages and Memories*; in particular the track "One Mile". As a Goenpul artist, James' music deploys the motifs of country music spoken from an indigenous perspective rather than that of an Australian settler.
[96] What I absolutely do not intend to imply here is that blocking out the natural world blocks out the settlers' contact with indigenous peoples. The trope of indigenous peoples existing symbiotically and indistinguishably from the natural world is old and rooted in colonial taxonomies and I do not wish to reproduce it. For a discussion of European taxonomies of indigenous peoples please see: Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodology: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd ed., (New York: Zed Books, 2012), 27.
[97] Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 73.
[98] "Burial ground reserves," *Anishinabek News*, 8.
[99] *ibid.*
[100] *ibid.,* 8-9. Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 18-19. Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 26.
[101] "Burial ground reserves," *Anishinabek News,* 9.
[102] Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 26-36. Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 18-27.
[103] McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession," 6.
[104] *ibid.,* 61.
[105] *ibid.,* 63, 65. Keeshig, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 13-15.
[106] Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive*, xiii.
[107] *ibid.,* 70
[108] From the text of Treaty 45, reproduced in full: Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 80.
[109] Asch, *Here to Stay*, 9.
[110] From the text of Treaty 72, reproduced in full: Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 85.
[111] McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession," 64-65. Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 17-20.
[112] Rifkin, *Common Sense*, xvi.
[113] After the dispute over the 6th Ave. sites had been settled, efforts were made to remove the foundations of the two homes. However, upon discovery that the gravel subfloor and the concrete foundation had been laid directly over Anishinaabek bodies, the decision was made to avoid further desecration by covering the remains with earth. Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 35. See also, Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 24.
[114] Many of Owen Sound's oldest buildings contain bricks that were manufactured with material from this site. All metaphorical language aside, this revelation means that the structural integrity of these buildings is, in part, predicated upon the desecration, destruction, and assimilation of Anishinaabek bodies. See, Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 18.
[115] *ibid.,* 25.
[116] Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 30.
[117] Emphasis mine. Quoted in Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 25.
[118] Wolfe goes on to indicate that "religion, ethnicity, grade of civilization, etc." are also not suitable explanations of settler colonialism's compulsion. Please see: Wolfe, "Settler colonialism," 388.

[119] Remembering, of course, that the settler is the subject that aims to erase indigenous peoples and to then disappear its own existence by naturalizing the process of settlement.
[120] Moreton-Robinson provides a scathing review of the manner in which the white Australian imaginary has conjured the beach as a site of possession. Please see, Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive,* 33-46.
[121] Brown, *Walled States*, 107.
[122] *ibid.,* 118.
[123] Veracini, "On Settlerness," 3. I understand Veracini to mean threatening in both a material and existential manner.
[124] For Brown's discussion of how walls at once act as a balm for the subject and as an activation of panic or anger in the subject, please see: Brown, *Walled States*, 92-93.
[125] In the Canadian cultural imagination Paulette Regan has identified the pervasiveness of the "settler peacemaker myth", that describes a country settled peacefully by Europeans who later became the Canadians committed to peacekeeping globally. See Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), 143-170. Similarly, Aileen Moreton-Robinson finds that Australians tend to project an image of themselves as members of a "tolerant society" wherein everyone gets a "fair go" at life. See Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive*, 19-33. Note that in both instances the violence that enables dispossession is disappeared by the national mythology.
[126] Pamela Palmater, *Beyond Blood: Rethinking Indigenous Identity*, (Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Inc., 2011).
[127] This treatment of Freud is an appropriation through Brown, *Walled States,* 123-126.
[128] Goeman, *My Words*, 12.
[129] Jacqueline Rose, *Sexuality in the Field of Vision,* (London: Verso, 1987), 90.
[130] Brown notes as much in her study of walling when she remarks on the multiplicity of dispositions - from enraptured to revolted to ambivalent - that exist towards walls both between and within communities on either side. Brown, *Walled States*, 76.
[131] Regan, *Unsettling*, 6.
[132] Canadian settlers generally know these conflicts collectively as the "Oka Crisis". For a rich collaborative text on this topic please see Leanne Simpson and Kiera Ladner, eds. *This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years Since the Blockades*, (Winnipeg: Arbieter Ring Press, 2010).
[133] Goeman, "Settler-Colonial Grammar," 237.
[134] Goeman, *My Words*, 21.
[135] For a phenomenal account of Idle No More that was written collaboratively by artists, activists, academics, and allies within the movement, please see: The Kino-nda-niimi Collective, *The Winter We Danced*, (Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Press, 2014).
[136] For a series of examples of settler backlash, ranging from reprehensible to darkly humorous, please peruse the results of a Google search for "Ezra Levant Idle No More".

Chapter Two: Discerning Dispossession

"*No longer black coal would be burning/ But now she too has been put down/ By the wheels of progress turning round/ The sounds of my home town*." - Larry Jensen[1]

In this second chapter I address the animating force that continues to energize settler coloniality, what I call its dispossessive drive. As I developed in the previous chapter, settler colonialism is constitutive of a variety of material and psychic violences attempting to disappear indigenous peoples *qua* sovereign peoples. These violences are normalized through, and productive of, the settler as a political subject determined to (re)produce settler colonialism. The establishment and maintenance of a settler colony, by definition, is a continual - though constantly disrupted - attempt to dispossess indigenous peoples - of their territory, their peoplehood, their very way of being if it were possible. However, as indigenous peoples resolutely resist colonization, and affirm their own ways of being, these processes of dispossession are continually failing. Because they repeatedly meet with failure, the processes of dispossession require a wellspring of energy to ensure their reproducibility. The source of this energy, I suggest, is embedded within the subjectivity of the settler *qua* settler. The reproduction and stabilization of settler colonialism, and of the settler as a political subject, amount to a non-volitional, even unacknowledged, but still constitutive drive towards the mastery and dispossession of others. This drive sustains and energizes regimes of dispossession engendering greater concentrations of power. While ultimately unsustainable, these processes of dipossession have had dramatic impacts on the ways in which settlers and indigenous peoples are able relate to each other and the land - also producing multiples resistance movements.

Unsurprisingly perhaps, the effects of this dispossessive drive have begun to over-exceed themselves. The past half-century has witnessed the rise of a regime of dispossession often called neoliberalism. Not only does this regime sustain settler colonialism, it also begins to turn the colonizers' processes of dispossession inwards against segments of settler society. Whether it is the unabated concentration of wealth, the withdrawal the life-sustaining institutions of the welfare state, or health complications resulting from the anxiety of participating in a labour market wherein nearly all power is tilted towards the employer, the impacts of neoliberalism - even on many settlers - are very real and often quite severe. It is also true, however, that many critiques of neoliberalism neglect the foundational and ongoing role that attempts to dispossess indigenous peoples play in all settler economies constituted against the backdrop of settler colonization. These critiques efface settlers' ongoing attempts to dispossess indigenous peoples, (re)producing within settlers an assumption that they possess colonized territory by right. Given this, I assert that, even as they are increasingly impoverished and marginalized as a result of neoliberalism, poor, rural, and working class settlers nevertheless remain invested in the processes dispossessing indigenous peoples, in as much as those regimes continue to sustain colonization. In this sense, within settler colonies there is no neoliberalism proper, it is rather the neoliberalization of settler coloniality. While the locations undergoing the vicissitudes of dispossession expand to include parts of settler society, neoliberalization is nevertheless energized by the same appetitive drive towards dispossession that sustains settler colonization. I thus assert that, under conditions of settler coloniality, only a decolonial critique of neoliberalization - which I distinguish from ideological neoliberalism as a reiterative process, rather than a *fait accompli* - addresses its constitutive dispossessive drive.

To prove these assertions I divide this chapter into three sections. The first explores the development of the regimes of dispossession through a drive that animates the processes and subjects of settler colonization in North America. The second section moves into a discussion of how the processes of neoliberalization sustain and expand settlers' dispossessive drive. Here I develop a conceptualization of the dispossessive drive as a movement defined by spirality. In the final section I discuss the effects of neoliberalism, focusing on Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound.

Regimes of Dispossession:

Recent critical scholarship has expended much energy exploring the general social impoverishment that neoliberal economic restructuring is causing.[2] This scholarship tends to present the processes of neoliberalism as a regime of accumulation the primary target of which is the labouring subject - that is, the poor and working classes. In this section I suggest that, particularly in the context of Canadian settler colonization, neoliberalism is not only an assault on working people by capital; rather, neoliberalization at once participates in such an assault and, simultaneously, extends the historic and ongoing processes of settler colonization. I explore the history of settler colonial dispossession, in order to later position neoliberalization as only the most recent development within the longer history of settler coloniality's dispossessive drive. Moreover, I contend that poor and working class settlers are not merely passive victims of dispossessive processes. Rather, the ongoing dispossession of indigenous peoples constitutes the settler as a subject with a sense of proprietorship - of possession - engendering material and psychic attachments to the regimes of dispossession that provide this privilege. I also discuss how, in resisting neoliberalism, poor, rural, and working settlers often reinvest themselves both psychically and materially in the dispossession of indigenous peoples.

As Emma Lowman and Adam Barker assert, attempting to disentangle and isolate capitalist, racial, gender, or colonial oppressions from one another is misguided.[3] Each of these processes operate simultaneously, overlapping and reinforcing one another in a variety of non-schematic ways. Still, settler states such as Canada remain committed to ongoing colonization, and this is the background condition establishing and enabling - or, rather, disabling - what settlers perceive as the immutable ground or bedrock upon which all possible political projects must be built. Glen Coulthard observes that settler colonies mobilize "discursive and nondiscursive facets of economic, gendered, racial, and state power" to secure the continuance of hierarchical social orders predicated from their genesis on dispossessing indigenous peoples.[4]

As such, a decolonial account of dispossession begins by rejecting settlers' claims to territorial sovereignty as a matter of course. Moreover, this rejection must continue to contour how political and economic issues are understood within the context of settler colonialism. Narrating the dispossessive drive's development begins with this rejection, and with a subsequent coming to terms, as Michael Asch says, with the fact that wherever indigenous peoples and persons are in Turtle Island today,

> whether on rural reserves or in urban centres, they live on land that remains under their sovereignty and jurisdiction; and that we [settlers] ourselves live on 'unceded land'… rather than arguing over the point, we need to begin by determining the implications for us and accepting the reality of our status on Indigenous lands.[5]

Analyses of dispossession that attend to this fact by recognizing the ongoing decolonial struggle to disrupt the settler colony's presumption of sovereignty and its highly destructive economy begin to accommodate the radical alterity of multiple subject positions. A decolonial critique underscores that the neoliberal regime, which many scholars portray as something radically new,

is only an extension of the dispossessive drives which were initiated by and continue to sustain the processes of settler colonization, and now also begin to operate against newly disposable populations of settlers. Neoliberalization does not emerge *ex nihilo*; rather, it maintains colonization, expanding and entrenching processes of dispossession while striving to open North America to deeper exploitation by the settler economy. For the purposes of this project it is sufficient to trace the initiation of this animating dispossessive drive only as far back as its origins in North America. Though a longer history exists, and is a project worthy of serious consideration, it is nevertheless both too broad and too deep to be contained in this work.[6]

With notable and important exceptions, the earliest settlers primarily aimed to establish trade and military alliances between Europe and the various indigenous peoples of northeastern Turtle Island.[7] As Europe's economy transformed, however, the importance of these partnerships declined precipitously in the reckoning of settlers. The rise of a regime of accumulation predicated on industrial capitalism saw European populations and markets undergo a massive expansion. To the instrumentalized mentality of early industrial capitalists, the territories of indigenous peoples represented at once a nearly unlimited resource to be commodified and a site to which the "Malthusian excesses" of Europe could be conveniently relocated and used as labour in the extractive economy.[8] The presence of sovereign indigenous peoples, who may have traded with Europeans but would object to the total exploitation and destruction of their territories by industry, became an impediment to the unbridled expansion of capitalist markets. Exemplified in the repeatedly violated treaties between the Saugeen Anishinaabek and the Crown, as discussed in chapter one, the settler state continually ignored both the letter and spirit

of these treaties, using subterfuge and coercion to advance an economy that necessitates the dispossession of their treaty-partners.

It is tempting to assert that this is merely an example of cynical self-interest trumping treaties - and, to some degree, it no doubt is. I do not, however, think this explanation can fully account for the voraciousness and reflexivity with which settlers continue dispossessing indigenous peoples. Settler colonialism relies, as all political regimes do, on the development of a political subject through discourses and social practices that naturalize the distribution of power. Developed just prior to the initiation of settler colonization, John Locke's "powerfully and influentially elaborated" labour theory of property provided settlers with a cogent narrative to support their sense of proprietorship.[9] Asserting that all the world was a commons awaiting a claim to private ownership via its transformation through human labour, Locke's theory presented North America as radically open to the imposition of European possession.[10]

In actual fact, and this should be so clear as to hardly require comment, the indigenous peoples of Turtle Island had been extensively labouring in their territories since time immemorial. The economies of indigenous peoples were, however, radically different from those of Europeans. Many of these economies were "based on the land and the free, unrestricted access of everyone to its resources."[11] Because many indigenous peoples did not engage in the same sort of hierarchically structured and highly destructive economies as Europeans, settlers discounted indigenous labour as too 'rudimentary' to warrant acknowledgement. This enabled settlers to assert that North America was unassisted by human improvement and, therefore, that indigenous peoples' territorial sovereignty need not be recognized. These abstractive discourses encouraged settlers to transplant into North America the material "preconditions underwriting

the capital relation" in Europe.[12] Through the regimes of private property, which were codified into laws and enforced by both the violence of the settler state and by vigilante mobs of settlers, indigenous peoples' access to their territories was gradually eroded by settler enclosures.

Enclosure of North America into a patchwork of private properties initiates what Karl Marx refers to as primitive [*ursprünglich*: original, initial] accumulation.[13] Repeated wherever capitalist relations instantiate themselves, this process represents the severance of a people from their direct access to the land, and the mediating of that access through hierarchical proprietary regimes. As such, in North America, the development of capitalist relations and the foundations of private property - of settlers' sense possessing land - enacts the dispossession of indigenous peoples of their territories and the degradation of their original economies through processes of settler colonization. This is to say that while the development of capitalism may not necessitate colonialism - the case of England problematizes such a linear causality - in North America the emergence and maintenance of capitalism relies on ongoing processes of settler colonization.

That said, the initiation of the dispossessive drive in North America through the processes of settler colonization cannot be reduced solely, or even primarily, to a materialist account. As Lowman and Barker note, beginning the story of dispossession from a materialist standpoint presents the risk that our narrative will act as a conduit for smuggling settler "biases into Indigenous ways of being."[14] Instead - as treaty-partners - we must struggle to do the difficult work of learning from indigenous peoples' ontologies, especially as indigenous peoples have long been required to learn our systems of knowledge in an effort to merely survive settler coloniality's capriciousness.

Indigenous scholars and activists explain that colonialism's dispossessive drive is at once experienced materially, in the continued severance of indigenous peoples' physical access to their territories by an imposed and disruptive system of proprietorship; as well as subjectively, in settlers' repeated attempts to destroy indigenous peoples' ways of being founded on place-based knowledges. Coulthard argues that what distinguishes the ontologies and social practices of various indigenous peoples from those of settlers, is the principle of "grounded normativity". Rather than abstractive, the principles that guide indigenous peoples' "ethical engagement with the world", whether that be with human or nonhuman others, flow from "land-connected practices and longstanding experiential knowledge".[15] Anishinaabe elder and scholar, Basil Johnston, affirms the centrality of place-based knowledge, noting the density of meaning embedded in the Anishinaabemowin word '*aki'*. While a rough translation renders *aki* as 'land' or 'earth', Johnston suggests a fuller interpretation "embraces plants, insects, fish, birds - '*all our relations*'."[16] Lee Maracle appears to make a similar point when, in a discussion of the ontological relationship of the Salish peoples to their territories, she writes that "[s]tones are our oldest grandfather. We refer to the stones that keep our songs and stories as our grandfathers."[17] As Maracle goes on to explain, settler colonialism introduced a deliberate "fragmentation" of the Salish world, which effectively "aborted the knowledge transmission" of these relational principles from elders to children.[18]

The geographic and cultural distances between Anishinaabe and Salish peoples are vast, and the two nations are not reducible to one another or to any other indigenous nation - let alone to settler ontologies. Nevertheless, these examples reveal the fundamental truth towards which Coulthard points with his concept of grounded normativity. In spite of vast differences, for many

of the indigenous peoples across Turtle Island their ontologies place the initial moment of sociality in a culture of relationality to the land, which offers up knowledge to guide the proper conduct of relationships with human and nonhuman others. This is radically different from the anthropocentric deadening of being that is foisted on all nonhuman subjects within the ontological orientations of settlers - who generally hold that the human is the subject of primary consequence.[19] Put differently, the settler is produced as a subject within a regime of power that locates the human - and, even then, only some humans historically - as *the* site of ethical concern or relationality. Settler regimes of proprietorship - of possessiveness - imposed by colonization, attempt the dispossession of more than mere materiality. It is also always already working to dispossess indigenous peoples of their ways of being in relation to the world, their grounded understandings of responsibility to all relations. Aileen Moreton-Robinson asserts that the processes of settler coloniality function to "disavow and dispossess the Indigenous subject of an ontology that exists outside the logic of capital".[20]

As a matter of course settler colonization attempts to eliminate indigenous peoples' ontological alterity and subsequently to reground the colonized subject in the colonizers' ontology. Duncan Campbell Scott confessed to this very aim when he suggested that the Indian Act (1876) would "solve the Indian problem" by ensuring that "there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed into the body politic."[21] All difference was to be flattened into the homogeneity of the settler subject. Used throughout the anglophone settler colonies, Residential Schools are a particularly vicious example of the technologies employed in the effort to dispossess indigenous children of all ontological alterity. Designed to "obliterate young children's connections to indigenous culture", Residential Schools simultaneously imposed

settler ontologies onto indigenous children.[22] The goal, as Stephanie McMullen notes, was to reproduce indigenous children as "assimilated subjects", imbued with the values of "self-supporting Christian farmers".[23] The dispossessive drive that animates settler colonization in its commodification and exploitation of the land operates at two levels simultaneously: attempting to strip indigenous peoples of both their material and ontological relationship to their territories.

In a decolonial critique these processes of dispossession must not, as happens so often, be rendered as merely historic events which recede with the passage of time. Moreton-Robinson notes that overwhelmingly settler accounts of colonialism reduce dispossession to "a mere blemish on the historical record," an event which no longer brings weight to bear on the present except as an historic grievance.[24] Even Marx is ambivalent about the contemporary relevance of the originary dispossessive movement. In the first volume of *Capital* he writes that primitive accumulation "is nothing else than the *historical* process of divorcing the producer from the means of production… it forms the *pre-historic* stage of capital".[25] Marx thus relegates the material and ontological dispossessions that initiate enclosures to a discrete and historically finalized fact.

Subsequent Marxist scholars have worked to temper this historicizing tendency somewhat. David Harvey notably asserts that the concept of 'primitive' accumulation is misleading as it suggests that the processes of enclosure occurred in the past. He proposes subsuming what Marx identifies as primitive accumulation within the phrase "accumulation by dispossession", a process that he says is occurring "at a certain level" to this day.[26] Despite recognizing primitive accumulation as operating in the present, Harvey nevertheless subtly recapitulates Marx's historicism, suggesting that dispossession through primitive accumulation

occurs through a series of discrete and foreclosed acts. He writes that primitive accumulation is a "*necessary* though ugly *stage*" in the developmental movement of economies.[27] While Harvey recovers primitive accumulation from the archaic past, his insistence on stadial development imparts a certain historicism to the process: suggesting that dispossession occurs as a series of singular events, the conclusion and political neutralization of which are determinable. Such an account ignores the always ongoing struggle involved in sustaining dispossession. As Moreton-Robinson notes, it "takes a great deal of work" to maintain the processes dispossessing indigenous peoples in the face of their ongoing resistance.[28] Settler possession of the colony is thus never achieved with finality; rather it is a continuous reiteration of dispossessive acts.

Within regimes of settler colonial power even the politically radical are very often so invested in maintaining their sense of possession - through processes dispossessing indigenous peoples - that they reflexively neutralize the contemporaneity of dispossession through historicizing discourses. Settlers occupy a subject position from which they are nearly incapable of recognizing indigenous peoples' ongoing resistance to the processes of dispossession as an affirmation of a grounded normativity that is fundamentally at odds with capitalist colonial ontologies. Decoloniality necessitates that dispossession be considered as neither discrete nor singular, but rather as constitutive of the present moment and as an ongoing struggle to which settlers are continually recommitted - or from which they might dissent. Against Marx and Harvey, Coulthard suggests that primitive accumulation cannot be consigned to a now foreclosed period in the tidy metanarrative of stadial development. So long as settler colonies persist the dispossession of indigenous peoples continues in a "*persistent role*… [to ensure] the reproduction of colonial and capitalist social relations".[29] The dispossession of indigenous

peoples is thus not a series of discrete and determinable events carried out at different times in different locations. Rather, dispossession engages in a continual process that, once begun, is always already attempting enlist more subjects to secure its own reiteration.

Reiterating settlers' sense of possession - through the reproduction of dispossessive drives - is partially achieved through state policies. In the past several decades, the Canadian settler state has attempted to reframe its relationship with indigenous peoples in a language that ostensibly commits the state to reconciliation. Nevertheless, a consideration of the objectives delivered to various government departments reveals the continual operation of the drive towards dispossession. On its website, Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada explains that, by creating "certainty over rights to land and resources", the title claims processes and self-government agreements which the settler state now pursues serve the primary goal of maintaining "a positive investment climate and creating greater potential for economic development".[30] The reconciliation and treaties being proposed by the settler state do not follow principles of restitution or nation-to-nation relationships predicated on indigenous peoples' uninterrupted sovereignty, but attempt to reconcile indigenous peoples to the sovereignty of the settler colony and its economy. Which is to say, the presumption of settler possession, predicated on the dispossession of indigenous peoples. As the Chippewas of Nawash assert in their report to the Ipperwash Inquiry, the reclamation of indigenous economies is made increasingly difficult as the settler economy has continually "carved up [their territories] to satisfy the competing interests of third parties and industry"; thereby reducing their capacity "to re-build economies shattered by the suffocation of their rights and self-governance."[31] While the state and many

settlers adopt discourses of reconciliation and inclusivity, indigenous peoples are rightly wary of a disguised dispossession by other means.

Importantly, while this account of the dispossessive drive's development in North America has focused primarily on the propulsive efforts of the settler state, it is just as much a process driven from below by settlers themselves. As I indicated above, the sense of possession, and its attendant dispossessive drive, is constitutive of settler subjectivities - animating the subject in a number of different ways. In the previous chapter I discussed the fact that during early colonization of the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula, state officials were at times accosted by rancorous mobs of settlers, angry at what they saw as the relatively slow pace of settlement expansion.[32] In addition to the psychic necessity of effacing the presence of indigenous peoples in order to stabilize the settler colony's *imago*, settlers demand this expansion because their position as a subject of the colonizing market inculcates within them a drive to facilitate the energetic expansion of the consumptive economy. Regimes of private property produce a form of manufactured scarcity, as personal ownership now mediates general access to resources. This assumption of scarcity embeds the subjects of that regime within the logics of the expansionary economy as a matter of their very survival. As a subject of the regime of settler coloniality one must labour within its consumptive economy, but to excel one must also seek to exceed previous benchmarks of production and consumption. In this way, the settler economy truly depends upon the production of subjects for whom the drive towards expansionary possession is taken a natural or given - which is always also a drive towards the continued and expanding dispossession of indigenous peoples.

As Lowman and Barker note, it is all too common for communities that are otherwise marginalized (by hierarchies of class, race, gender, etc.) "to buy into the structures of invasion… and to participate in systemic dispossession of Indigenous peoples" in order to maintain a modicum of personal comfort.[33] As subjects produced within and energized by settler colonization, "the interests of capital and settlers converged" in the drive to dispossess indigenous peoples.[34] Anything that threatens to undo the regimes of dispossessive proprietorship sustaining the colonization of North America simultaneously threatens the subjective dissolution of the settler themselves. Thus, the lived experience of precarity under these dispossessive regimes is neutralized and then sublated into the settler psyche at least temporarily, as the processes of settler colonization fix the location of active dispossessive accumulation in an extractive, staples based economy. Which is to say, an economy predicated primarily on establishing settler possession through the destruction of territories which are not theirs. In the next section I discuss the recent morphologies of the regimes of dispossession wherein settlers now experience a long-deferred sense of precarity.

Neoliberalism in Critical or Decolonial Perspective:

Of growing concern for academics and activists today is the increase of economic inequality. Inequality is often exacerbated as an effect of policy decisions informed by the ideology of neoliberalism, which Michael Mascarenhas describes as the "most powerful political and discursive project" (re)shaping the world today.[35] Despite being the topic of frequent discussion, the processes of neoliberalization are often decontextualized from their emergence within, and extension of, regimes of settler colonial dispossession. In response, the second section of this chapter schematizes the neoliberal project in four broad ways. First I briefly

explore the origins of neoliberalism as rooted in an extension of the regimes of dispossession discussed above. After this, I consider the general policy program of neoliberalization as extending settlers' dispossessive drive. I then consider the discursive framing used to legitimate and facilitate neoliberal reforms. Finally, I clarify the role of the settler state in neoliberal reforms, refuting the often cited claim that neoliberalism represents the demise of the state as a locus of power.

Neoliberal thought began to coalesce in the late 1940s, at a time when public policy was characterized by the hegemony - at least in western Europe and North America - of the so-called Fordist compromise.[36] This compromise was a variant of Keynesian economics predicated on maintaining a convergence between the interests of labour, the state, and capital. This entailed careful planning of the economy in order to safeguard workers' wages while also ensuring capital's growth through the mass consumption of goods.[37] Keynesian redistribution allowed many working class people to share in the post-war prosperity, experiencing an unprecedented increase in both economic and political clout. Importantly, the Keynesian compact was mediated by the settler state in an effort to ensure that "capitalist social relations would prevail".[38] In Canada, Keynesianism also remained predicated on, and acted to sustain, settlers' presumptive possession of North America. The compact, then, is more accurately described as facilitating the continued convergence of capital's interests with those of labour *qua* working settlers.[39] If anything, the Keynesian model deepened this convergence, as redistributive policies ensured that the spoils from the ongoing dispossession of indigenous peoples were distributed amongst settlers in a more egalitarian fashion, expanding individual possessiveness.

Redistributive schemes brought a comparative increase in the power of working settlers vis-à-vis industry, a trend which became particularly troubling for the capitalist classes in the 1970s, when the so-called crisis of profitability led to declining returns on capital's investments - even as the wages of working settlers maintained relative stability. Neoliberals responded to this crisis, blaming Keynesian redistributive planning for the general stagnation, as part of what Harvey calls a deliberate decision by capital "to achieve the restoration of class power" over labour.[40] Marxist scholars like Thom Workman have long held that a sustained and stable compact with capital is contrary to the "very character of capitalism's *modus operandi*" which demands ever expanding profitability - achieved through the "fundamental struggle… between capital and labour".[41] However, the problem seems to be even more foundational than that, for it is not the case that capital and labour are always and everywhere in direct and perfect opposition to one another. As discussed above, in the settler colonization of North America, both sides of Workman's capital|labour dialectic reproduce themselves through, and participate enthusiastically in, the processes attempting to dispossess indigenous peoples - processes which are maintained under mercantilism and Keynesianism, as well as neoliberalism. Nevertheless, while neoliberalization sustains the insatiable dispossessive drive that animates the political subjects of the settler colony, it does represent the termination of a long standing convergence of interests. Neoliberalism is thus constituted not as a turning over a dialectic, but as yet the most recent extension of settler coloniality's dispossessive drive - perhaps over-extension, as the process of dispossession now turn inwards against segments of the dispossessors' community.

In Canada, the ascendence of neoliberal doctrine, at least federally, occurred in response to the famous 'stagflation' crisis of the mid-1970s. Pierre Trudeau's government enacted a series

of anti-inflationary policies that preserved the integrity of the financial system at the cost of workers' security. This crusade against inflation correlated to a decline of more than four percent in the average working settler's wages set against the cost of living over a four-year period.[42] This was the first instance of a sustained decline in working settlers' wages since the Keynesian compromise was established, but it was only an opening salvo to the volatility that has accompanied neoliberalization. However, as Workman explains, Trudeau made no resounding commitment to neoliberal ideology, tending instead to oscillate between traditional Keynesian policies and neoliberal alternatives.[43] It was the adoption by the major political parties and the state bureaucracy of the MacDonald Royal Commission's (1984) recommendations that solidified neoliberalism in Canadian federal policy.[44] Moreover, although Brian Mulroney's government accepted the Commission's recommendations and began reforming the public sector, the truly decisive restructuring began in the 1990s with Jean Chrétien's consecutive austerity budgets, which severely curbed government expenditures.[45] In Canada, neoliberalization has suffused the political establishment, gradually achieving hegemony.

Despite uneven temporal and geographical advances, and the fact that this unevenness has produced multiple localized permutations, neoliberalization is nevertheless identifiable globally with a package of broad policy objectives.[46] Primary amongst these is the acceleration of national economies through the removal of centralized planning, imposing a decentralized model wherein the market - and in particular labour - is made more "flexible".[47] Workman identifies three major reorientations in public policy by which flexibilization is achieved. In the most generalizable sense these reorientations centre around ideological commitments to: "free marketism" through the adoption of free trade agreements; a near total aversion to "state

indebtedness" leading to the diminution or total revocation of social welfare programs; and ensuring "corporate efficiency" by reducing state regulations and amending labour legislation in favour of capital.[48] Simultaneously exposing local markets to greater global competition, dismantling the safety net that secured at least partial protection for disadvantaged workers, and marginalizing organized labour, neoliberalization of the state systematically dissolves the compact between working settlers and capital.

As such, neoliberal policies represent an "intensification" of the "geographic expansion of capital… aimed at the restoration of profitability through the aggressive restructuring of social relations".[49] In Marxist vernacular, neoliberalism is a new "regime of accumulation" - the latest morphology in capital relations.[50] In this regime, neoliberalization disrupts the social relations established in the compact between working settlers and capital, with a view to optimizing the accumulation of wealth and power by capital alone. This optimization is facilitated, in Mascarenhas' words, by displacing the crisis of profitability from capital onto "workers, the middle class, the poor, and [yet again] indigenous peoples."[51] The assault on social welfare programs and labour laws, for instance, means that workers experience an increasing sense of precarity, compelling them to take whatever job they can find, rather than risk the indignities and struggles of unemployment. In the absence of strong collective counter-movements, like trade unionism, industry treats labour as "a commodity" to be squeezed for profit like any other.[52]

The neoliberalization of settler colonialism expands the processes of dispossession, leaving "larger and larger segments of the population exposed to impoverishment."[53] As global economic growth rates have mostly flat-lined, accumulation under the conditions of neoliberalization is largely predicated on a continued and deliberate concentration of wealth

away from indigenous peoples, as well as from working and poor settlers.[54] The drive that energizes settler colonization continues to sustain the dispossession of indigenous peoples while simultaneously turning inwards against working settlers, disrupting settlers' comfortable sense of possession as the greatest degree of value is wrung out of both the colonized territories and from each subject therein. Neoliberalism turns the dispossessive drive inwards, sustaining the exploitation of indigenous peoples while expanding the technologies of dispossession into the lives of working settlers.[55]

Todd Gordon notes, however, that neoliberalization does not just target workers it also reproduces colonial processes of dispossession - leading to a "renewed intensification" of the assault on indigenous peoples.[56] This is perhaps nowhere better exemplified than in the Harper Government's introduction of Bill C-45 (2012), a move which spurred the Idle No More movement. This legislation amends a number of environmental protection acts, withdrawing protected status under the Navigable Waters Act from nearly thirty two thousand lakes, as well as from more than two million rivers. The primary objective of Bill C-45 is to ensure that the territories and waters over which the Canadian settler state claims sovereignty - although clearly not responsibility - are as open to industrial exploitation and appropriation as possible.[57] In its aversion to state regulation, neoliberalization furthers the processes dispossessing and subsequently degrading indigenous peoples' territories in the name of ensuring the maximization of corporate efficiency and profitability.

It is critical to the development of a decolonial critique to understand the principle of accumulation that characterizes this dispossessive drive, a principle which I think is best addressed by the image of a continual turning inwards, concentrating, or tightening - that is, of

spirality. Wade Davis gestures towards the necessary shape of this movement when he notes the paradox of capitalism's requirement of infinite growth in a finite world, that the economic models of settlers are "projections and arrows when they should be circles."[58] Perhaps initially infinite growth seemed plausible, as the processes of dispossession spread globally during early colonial expansion. Inevitably, however, this abstracted arrow of growth crashes into the circle of a terminable planet, at which time the only available direction of movement for the dispossessive drive is a spiraling inwards. This image of the spiral helps to conceptualize the movement of the dispossessive drive for a number of reasons, the first being the tendency of this movement to produce ever greater concentrations of wealth and power. As we have seen, the processes attempting to dispossess indigenous peoples of their relationships to their territories concentrates land in the hands of significantly fewer possessive settlers. This tendency is extended as the neoliberalization of settler colonialism dispossesses working settlers - as seen in the collapse of the North American middle class - thereby concentrating wealth even further. The spiral also thematizes how the concentrations engendered by the inward or concentrative movement of the dispossessive drive produces an ever-growing number of communities on the margins. Harvey notes that the concentrative principles of regimes of dispossession make both people(s) and resources superfluous or disposable "until surplus capital seizes upon them".[59]

Further, the image of the spiral is also useful in describing how this experience of being pushed towards the margins. In as much as the dispossessive drive's movement is determined by a spiraling inwards, a sense of marginality is felt as soon as one's own possessive presumptions are disrupted - that is, as soon as one no longer represents the final point of power and privilege into which the benefits of dispossession funnel. For many, neoliberalization disrupts this

presumption, as the compact between labour and capital is dissolved - throwing segments of the settler population towards the margins. Many settlers react to this challenge to their possessive presumptions - their growing sense of marginality - by bemoaning the processes dispossessing them of their relative privilege and affluence. Yet, they regularly occlude that their possessor status has been and remains predicated on all those historic and ongoing processes working to dispossess indigenous peoples. This lacuna indicates that the processes of dispossession that benefit settlers at the expense of indigenous peoples are sublated - that is taken into the settler's subjectivity and rendered as neutral or given. So, as Taiaiake Alfred notes, many settlers who decry neoliberalization are regularly "staunch defenders of the first wave of globalization against the second."[60] To put this differently, as the spiraling of the dispossessive drive turns inwards, concentrating power still further, settlers demand that a stasis or new compact be arranged to preserve their relative and accustomed power and privilege. Settlers want to freeze the process of dispossession, not undo it, as that would undo their own subjectivity.

As Elizabeth Povinelli notes, neoliberals are successfully neutralizing the potential political ramifications of this expansion of dispossession by "colonizing the field of value".[61] The stability of neoliberalism's concentrative objectives requires that its discursive frame become hegemonic, that is, seen as common sense or axiomatic. Thus neoliberalism sustains itself through a discursive framing that reproduces a modified subject - the neoliberal settler. Configured by neoliberal discourses, the settler's politics come to rest on a demand for greater individual freedom and an insistence on a form of difference-blind equality.[62] Operating within these discourses, collective political struggles against various historic and structural oppressions are re-presented in the language of deregulation and personal responsibility or accountability.

Neoliberal discourses defuse struggles over the distribution of power, supplanting collective action with appeals to individualized grievance, the remedy to which is almost always a greater degree of personal freedom. This insistence on "governing through freedom" has, Mascarenhas notes, been remarkably successful at transferring the focus of political discourses from variously constituted collectives "toward markets and individuals."[63] The reverse side of the language of governing through freedom, however, is the subsequent "privatizing [of] risk".[64] Because they are assumed to have nearly absolute freedom of choice, the subjects of neoliberalization are held personally responsible for their condition as they could - and perhaps should - have acted differently than they in fact did. The discourses of neoliberalization, then, produce a political subject who is atomized and responsibilized.

By positing the centrality of the individual, and then by abstracting them out of their lived conditions of inequitably distributed social and material power, neoliberalizing discourses insist that individuals bear sole responsibility for their relative success or failure. Within these discourses, the individual subject is responsible for personal fulfillment - even as they are discursively vacated of the potential to mobilize collectively for a better world by challenging structurally embedded inequities and violences. As neoliberal discourses reach hegemony, the imaginative capacity of those who are subjected to neoliberalism aligned "with dominant economic and cultural ideals," thereby sustaining a psychic investment in the dispossessive drive.[65] It is often not enough, however, to simply rely on restructuring the field of values through the slow diffusion of neoliberal discourses; sometimes this must be secured more aggressively. Neoliberal rationale most fully imbibes the dispossessive drive's colonizing aspects in its pursuit of those nations, cultures, or communities that fail to conform to the specifically

neoliberal logic of marketized productivity. Where such groups are seen as an existential threat to "the security of the market" they are systematically "ferreted out and strangled."[66] Naomi Klein's *Shock Doctrine* and Harvey's *The New Imperialism* offer a litany of examples of neoliberalization being imposed primarily through violence.

The willingness to secure the continued supremacy of these regimes of dispossession through overt violence, brings me nicely to the final point of interest in this section. Much argument has been had over the effects of neoliberal restructuring on the power and coherence of the state. The terms of this debate are often staked around whether neoliberalization represents a diminution of state power, as it is eroded by market forces, or whether something else is at work. By way of example, in an article about the 2000 water crisis in Walkerton, Ontario, Laureen Snider asserts that the state's power to "oversee and control the private sector has diminished" as a result of neoliberalization.[67] Snider is not alone in this general attitude; in fact, it is representative of many opinions appearing in popular media - particularly media associated with the political left.[68]

While the neoliberalism-as-state-decline thesis has suffused itself into some of the dominant discourses of the left, I suggest contrarily that, even under the advanced processes of neoliberalization, the state remains a vital locus of power. Verónica Schild notes that neoliberal restructuring "is not about a weakening or minimizing of state power… but about shifting the terms and forms of state power."[69] Harvey explores this more fully, arguing that the state is also critically important for *sustaining* neoliberal hegemony, deploying its various coercive and non-coercive apparatuses for the purposes of "persuasion, co-optation, bribery, and threat".[70] Despite the assertions of Snider, the state is a necessary ally of neoliberalization, ensuring that

populations remain pliable subjects of the market. As I've suggested, the pliability of these subjects is not ensured solely by means of overt coercion. The apparatuses of the state provide innumerable and subtle venues by which to contour the "conduct of conduct", shaping perceptions of the possible and the permissible in ways that reinvest their subjects in the neoliberal agenda.[71] In interviews with Ontario schoolchildren, Kate Cairns notes that the state-set curriculum cultivates a neoliberal common sense, fostering "individuated narratives [that] obscure structural processes and enlist individuals into their own self-governance" from the earliest stages of education.[72] Ideological state apparatuses fulfill a critical role in the production of subjects who are highly atomized and who view themselves as individually responsible for their own relative success or failure - as determined by capitalist metrics.

While neoliberalism often brings the withdrawal of the state from various spheres, it is followed by a subsequent commitment from the state to ensuring the supremacy of the market within those newly vacated spheres. As such, under neoliberalization, capital:

> still needs state taxation and national banks capable of securing interest and investment promises. The educational, consumption, civil, resource, and punishment infrastructure of capitalism is provided or guaranteed *by the state*.[73]

Likewise, when seeking approval for industrial development programs, capital continually depends on the settler state as the legitimating authority, rather than deferring to the sovereign indigenous peoples of Turtle Island. William Connolly argues that the persistence of the state is actually a necessity within neoliberal discourses, as it provides an appropriate location onto which responsibility for market failures and excesses can be displaced.[74] The state thus functions as a site of psychic relief for the neoliberal settler, acting as the necessary scapegoat for the

internal contradictions and negative effects of neoliberalization; thereby creating the requisite foil against which demands for greater freedom are made, through appeals for a further withdrawal of the state. Thus, the state remains a vital, if ultimately maligned, component of neoliberalization. Settler states, in particular, strive to continue effacing the ongoing dispossession of indigenous peoples through discursive and sublationary processes that produce the settler as always already presuming themselves to be in rightful possession of North America.

Subjects of Rurality:

Thus far I have provided a broad conceptualization of the neoliberalization of settler coloniality, focusing on the dispossessive drive that animates the settler state and its subjects. In this section I discuss with greater specificity how the neoliberalization of this drive at once sustains previous processes of dispossession and simultaneously extends them inwards against the subjects of the settler colony. While providing this account, I follow Povinelli's assertion that the impacts of neoliberalization are felt most often, and perhaps most perniciously, in the proliferation of "quasi-events". That is, in the exacerbation of the "ordinary, chronic, and cruddy" struggles for daily survival.[75] Rural settlers' typically experience neoliberalization through the state withdrawing supports for local development and abandoning wealth redistribution, rather than explicit efforts to cause direct harm. I begin this section by offering a comment on the shift in the modalities of settler colonialism that the neoliberalization of the settler state represents in rural areas. I then discuss the conditions of rural decline in Canada generally. Finally, I close by shifting my focus to the situation in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound, examining both the material and cultural impacts of economic decline and abandonment.

Despite the pretensions of many rural people, the state was and is a critical component in the processes of settler colonization that establish and sustain rural communities. A report by the Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, entitled *Beyond Freefall: Halting Rural Poverty*, acknowledges as much when it notes "that much of Canada's rural population is there because previous governments built the infrastructure that encouraged people to settle [*sic*: colonize] Canada's hinterland."[76] Indeed, in his testimony to the Standing Committee, Greg Halseth asserts that in the earliest morphologies of settler colonization it was understood that industry must be led into remote areas by state policy and investment.[77] Such was the case for the Sydenham settlement, later renamed Owen Sound. An Executive Council order, dated to June 16, 1840, established the settlement with the explicit aim of providing "jobs for immigrants and to open up more farm land."[78] By facilitating this expansion of settlers into areas remote from the colonial metropoles, the state at once expropriated enormous profit from the land into the metropolitan areas and also "made an implicit promise that rural residents were full Canadian citizens": to be assured of equitable treatment through the continued state investments in, and maintenance of, critical infrastructures and services.[79] Thus, it was the continuous projecting outwards of the colonizing state that made it possible for rural settlers to sustain themselves.

Despite these facts, the processes of settlement and the origins of rural communities are often shrouded in a mythos of the hearty pioneering individual.[80] This mythology must give way to a recognition that settler colonization was successfully extended across North America largely because the settler state actively encouraged and assisted it, projecting itself outwards alongside settlers. Indeed, it was the heavy investment of the state that "helped settle much of what is now considered rural Canada" by connecting distant and disparate areas through the settler

metropole.[81] This exemplifies the convergence of interests between rural settlers, the state, and capital wherein each assisted the others in projecting themselves outward from the metropole in the effort to colonize more territories. And, while the preponderance of the profit extracted from these territories was concentrated in the settler colonies' metropoles, this was offset by active state investment in rural areas. Thus, during early settler colonization the outward movement of the state sustained and sheltered rural settlers from the full rapaciousness of the dispossessive drives animating colonial capitalist accumulation. Neoliberalization represents a schism; the state begins withdrawing the apparatuses and investments that sustained rural settlers' expansionary possession, often leaving behind only coercive state apparatuses to ensure the stability of industry and to buttress claims of sovereignty. While neoliberalism does not undo the settler state, it does shift its priorities by abandoning the tacit commitments between the state and rural settlers, opening the latter to a series of vulnerabilities against which they had previously been sheltered.

Perhaps the first impact of neoliberalization on rural settlers is their abandonment by state welfare and development programs. In testimony compiled for *Beyond Freefall*, witnesses repeatedly cited an ongoing withdrawal of the state from rural areas. The report's authors affirm these assertions, stating that for over thirty years "the federal government's presence in many parts of rural Canada has declined *almost to the vanishing point*".[82] This withdrawal means that, for rural settlers, basic state services are increasingly inaccessible. As the Senate report asserts, this withdrawal - and the regional decline that follows - engenders a situation in which "rural Canadians cease to be full-fledged citizens" when contrasted with their urban counter-parts.[83] This withdrawal is experienced in quotidian ways such as the increasing difficulty of getting to a

government office in order to access even basic government services. Unlike their urban counterparts, rural folk have no public transit system upon which they can rely and live at increasing distances from the nearest government office.[84]

More than just the difficulties associated with the withdrawal of the state's social agencies, neoliberalization is also leading to a radical decline in the physical infrastructure of rural areas. The budgetary constrictions demanded by neoliberalism's ideological aversion to state indebtedness has incited a steady move towards downloading as many costs and responsibilities as possible from senior levels of government to their junior partners. In practice, what this means is that federal and provincial governments have foisted ever greater responsibilities onto municipalities. For instance, between 1961 and 2002 the average share contributed by municipalities to infrastructure costs increased by more than twenty percent.[85] This increasing financial burden occurs absent a corresponding increase in municipalities' fiscal capacities.[86] As a result there is a growing deficit in the physical infrastructure across the country, but "especially" in rural areas where smaller populations mean less municipal tax revenue and where large distances bring higher development costs associated with the difficulty of rationalizing delivery.[87] Neoliberalization is thus felt quite sharply by rural communities, as these reforms amount to a policy wherein the settler state withdraws support and abandons rural settlers "to their own devices", regardless of their capacity to meet even basic needs.[88]

Commitment to the neoliberal ideology of a purely free market also tends to negatively impact rural economies. Neoliberal ideology insists that a free market unencumbered by regimes of redistribution produces greater wealth, which is in turn diffused throughout the population as businesses raise wages and engage in further development. This touted "trickle-down" principle

has a surface-level appeal, however, *Beyond Freefall* states unequivocally that in reality "it is wrong."[89] In actual fact, the settler state's decision to abandon active regional development programs enables the market's dispossessive drives to perform their own redistributions or, rather, concentrations. As the Senate Committee notes, this has meant that "very little of the vast wealth *produced* in rural Canada" remains there, instead it is pulled towards the metropolitan centres.[90] Moreover, the ever-widening reach of free trade agreements systematically undermines the economic sectors that employ many rural settlers: agriculture and forestry. Free trade agreements put farmers into increased competition against global producers, many of whom lack strict labour and health regulations. This creates a "long term trend towards fewer but larger farms" that are increasingly mechanized as family farms struggle to survive.[91] Likewise, the forestry sector lost nearly fifty-thousand jobs between 2003 and 2008, primarily as a result of increased competition through free trade agreements and a difficult exporting market due to the meteoric rise of the Canadian dollar.[92] Anti-protectionist clauses in free trade agreements couple with the neoliberal antipathy towards state interventions against the market, amounting to tacit state support for a sector-wide shift that is hemorrhaging jobs.[93]

These dire economic realities have led to the social desolation of many communities, particularly in rural areas. *Beyond Freefall* notes that 1991 was the year in which the number of persons living in rural areas began declining as an absolute figure; further, in 2006, the proportion of Canadians living in rural areas dropped below twenty percent for the first time.[94] The strongest tendency is for the young to leave, seeking educational or employment opportunities in urban areas, leaving behind a rural population that has a disproportionate concentration of the elderly.[95] Compounding this still further is the fact that, because of their

aging demographics and their more physically demanding and hazardous lifestyles, "rural Canadians are, on average, less healthy than their urban counterparts."[96] What this means is that rural communities are increasingly characterized by a population more dependent upon the very social and physical infrastructure that their municipalities already struggle to provide due to cutbacks. Still, the clearest evidence that neoliberalization is causing the economic and social diminution of rural settlers is likely one of the most surprising. While rural areas are often imagined as idyllic bread-baskets, they are increasingly struggling to feed themselves. From 2000 to 2008, ninety percent of new food banks opened in Canada service rural communities.[97] As Jacques Proulx explains, the degree and severity of rural decline is a crisis produced by neoliberalization.[98] Which is to say, that the recent decline of certain settler communities disrupts their presumption of stable - let alone expansionary - possession; but this decline is itself the result of neoliberalization expanding the very regimes of dispossession which settlers themselves enthusiastically participate in up to the present day. Indeed, the discourses of settlers constantly prove that they have an at least latent - if not explicit - drive to continue participating in these regimes of dispossession, as long as they are not themselves the targets of dispossession.

While this situation is certainly alarming, it does not exist in isolation of wider processes of dispossession. Even as the neoliberal settler state substantially curtails its spending in general, indigenous peoples are disproportionately disadvantaged - to dramatic consequences. A report from the Assembly of First Nations highlights the stark gap between indigenous people(s) and settlers. As the report explains, of the nearly eight billion dollars allocated to Indian and Northern Affairs Canada in the budgetary year 2003-2004, only slightly more than five billion dollars actually directly benefited indigenous people(s). This equates to total spending of just over seven

thousand dollars per indigenous person that year. By contrast, the same report estimates that through the inputs of federal, provincial, and municipal governments, a settler living in the city of Ottawa received a total state service costing of nearly fifteen thousand dollars in the same budgetary year - more than twice that of an indigenous person.[99] In its 2016 ruling on complaints about the inadequate delivery of child-welfare services to on-reserve populations, the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal likewise found that the funding and services provided by Indian and Northern Affairs Canada is "inequitable and thus discriminatory" against indigenous peoples. Moreover, the Tribunal found that the department "was aware of the adverse impacts" of their (in)actions and that reform repeatedly failed because departmental solutions focused almost solely on funding levels.[100] Not only did the settler state knowingly underfund services for indigenous children, but when confronted with this fact, its response was continually determined by a calculus of fiscal responsibility, rather than a commitment to upholding the terms and spirit of the treaties or ensuring the dignity of life.

All this occurs as the processes of primitive accumulation constantly strive to reiterate the dissolution of indigenous peoples' original economies, often forcing them into the settler economy as a matter of survival. Indigenous peoples have been forced to enter into this economy at a significant disadvantage and this is only exacerbated by the pressures neoliberalization exerts on the labour market. The decline of agriculture and forestry looks meagre when compared to the average unemployment rate for on-reserve populations, estimated at twenty three percent - or four times the national average - in 2006.[101] In fact, Rick Wallace reports that the Chief and Band Councils with whom he spoke at *Asubpeeshoseewagong* (Grassy Narrows) and *Neyaashiinigamiing* (Cape Croker) placed the unemployment rates in their communities

between seventy five and ninety percent.[102] Material disparity is not the only evidence of the effects of ongoing dispossession. In an exact inversion of rural settlers, indigenous peoples often do not even have the luxury of becoming an aging population. As of 2006 indigenous men live on average seven and a half years less than male settlers, and indigenous women live just over five years less than female settlers.[103] No doubt this is partly a result of the state's refusal to ensure adequate housing - as required by many treaties. It is estimated that fully six percent of indigenous people's homes lack basic sewage and sanitation services.[104] Moreover, while indigenous peoples account for five percent of the total population in Canada, they comprise twenty six percent of the homeless population across the country and twenty five percent of youth in the criminal justice system. The direness of these realities is underscored by the fact that an indigenous person is more than five times as likely as a settler to take their own life.[105]

Now, while these facts are certainly indicative of a morally outrageous situation, a strictly comparative analysis is nevertheless a rather weak manner by which to account for the impacts of neoliberalization in a settler colonial context. I consider this account to be 'weak' because - while it reveals a disturbing gap when indigenous people(s) are compared to settlers - it continues to sustain the settler as *the* normative subject of analysis. Put differently, the challenges, struggles, and successes of indigenous peoples are - in strictly comparative analyses - always evaluated as deviations from a norm or value established by, and with reference to, settlers. By a straightforward comparison the ongoing dispossessions engendered by colonization are disappeared within the supposedly more pressing and ubiquitous concern of working and middle class impoverishment as a result of the neoliberal state's withdrawal. The colonizing move, which seeks to erase indigenous peoples *qua* sovereign communities, is thus

recapitulated within comparative critiques of neoliberalization that sustain a normative investment in colonial dispossession. It also tends to obscure the very long history of indigenous peoples working within their own traditions and ontologies to repair the harms of ongoing colonization.

The move to sustain the neoliberal settler as the normative subject is often so taken for granted that it is even applauded. Cathy McLeod, the Conservative Party's Critic for Indigenous Affairs, exemplifies this when responding to the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal's ruling. She states that her party believes "First Nations children should have the *same* rights, access to services and opportunities as *every other Canadian child*."[106] Here, McLeod shows a partial recognition of at least a minimal difference in the degree and type of disadvantage experienced within different communities. On a crucial level, however, she continues the work of colonization: refusing to recognize a fundamental difference in kind between how dispossession affects indigenous peoples vis-à-vis settlers. By sustaining the normative position of the settler ("every other Canadian"), McLeod's strict comparison presumes settler possession, effacing historic and ongoing colonial dispossessions - sublating them into the apparent naturalness or desirability of that normative subject. As Coulthard argues, unlike poor, rural, and working settlers, it is not class conflict - that is, not material impoverishment as labouring subjects - but rather "the history and experience of dispossession" as sovereign subjects that defines the "dominant background structure" continuing to oppress indigenous peoples within the neoliberalized settler colony.[107] All those figures that I cited typify neoliberalism, but this is always built on and extending the principles of settler colonialism. It is thus necessary to conceptualize the impacts of neoliberalization through a decolonial framework which retains the

alterity of the positions occupied by settlers and indigenous peoples. While both are embedded within and experience the vicissitudes of neoliberalization, settlers retain material and psychic investments in the dispossessive drive in as much as it continues to sustain even the most marginal benefits of colonization.

Almost all of these general trends of rural decline, and the ongoing sublation of indigenous dispossession, can be found in the microcosm of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound. The area is particularly striking for the advanced age of the settler population. As of the 2011 Census the median age in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound was just over forty seven years old, fully seven years more advanced than the median for Canada at large.[108] Furthermore, the median total income in 2010 was nearly six percent lower in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound when compared to the rest of Ontario and more than ten percent of that total reported income is classified by Statistics Canada as “retirement pensions, superannuation and annuities".[109] On an statistical level the demographic and economic situation of the area looks as if it is in long-term decline; when we consider the situation more closely, however, it reveals that many people are already living in bleak situations. This is manifested quite clearly by the issue of housing, which *Beyond Freefall* acknowledges as a “hidden problem” throughout rural Canada.[110] In Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound the clearest sign of a housing problem is that, like the residents, area homes are rapidly aging. The 2011 census reveals that nearly forty percent of area homes are more than fifty years old, and almost nine percent of all area homes are in need of “major repairs”.[111] Even as the quality of housing declines its associated costs are becoming an ever increasing burden. In the same census year, nearly one in four residents of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound were spending in excess of thirty percent of their income just to keep a roof over head.[112]

Perhaps the clearest metric by which to judge the processes of abandonment, engendered by the unabated dispossessive drive of neoliberalization, is the rate at which industry has fled the region. Since the early 1990s Owen Sound has undergone a sustained withdrawal of the major industries that created and sustained its working classes. In 1993, the Russel Brothers ship building company closed its doors, neglecting to even pay its workers outstanding wages and severance; Black Clawson-Kennedy, which at one point constructed propellers for "ninety-five percent of marine traffic on the Great Lakes", folded in 1996; Pittsburgh Plate Glass (PPG) announced the closure of its Owen Sound plant in 2008, citing an inability to maintain its current equipment; and in 2012 Veyance Technologies Canada, formerly a Goodyear Tire plant, announced its intention to withdraw after years of downsizing.[113] This flight of almost all major industry from the area has been driven by the increased impact of the hyper-competitive global economy, and is left unabated as the neoliberal settler state gradually withdraws its support for developing or sustaining local economies. It has also meant that the regional economy is shifting, rather rapidly, from relying on a mix of agriculture and industry towards a service economy. As suggested in the *Final Report of the Precarious Work Group*, delivered by Peace and Justice Grey Bruce, this shift towards the service sector creates an environment in which "precarious work replaces good paying jobs".[114] As such, across Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound particularly, but also in Canada more generally, "more people are either falling out of the middle class and into working poverty" or else are relying on debt and working multiple jobs.[115]

Surprising as it may be, given the direness of the local economy as I have described it, the artistic and cultural climate of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound is nevertheless thriving in a way that it rarely has before. The art community's success is of particular interest to this discussion, not

because of its impact on the wider regional economy - which, unfortunately, remains quite minimal. Rather, it is the degree to which the cultural milieu of settlers in the area has been so indelibly marked by the disruption of their possessive presumptions. Larry Jensen's lament for the loss of industry, with which I opened this chapter, exemplifies the attempts by many settlers in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound to come to terms with the realities of their abandonment and decline. While Jensen gives perhaps the clearest and most widely appreciated voice to this condition, he is far from the only artist to contend with the local travails created by neoliberalization. Merely by glancing over a few of the recent titles published by local authors a strong theme develops: *Vanishing: Lost Places in Grey and Bruce*; *Hard Times*; and *brownfields* - to pick just a few close at hand.[116] Written by settlers in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound, each of these titles, and the works they enclose, evoke in the mind's eye historic and contemporary images of stagnation, struggle, failure, decline, and abandonment. They are thus likely expressive of a melancholic condition experienced more generally by settlers whose sense of proprietorship, or possession, is undergoing the disruptive effects of neoliberalism.

Richard-Yves Sitoski's *brownfields* - a titular reference to the toxic spaces that dot post-industrial regions - is perhaps the most direct effort by a local artist to tackle the ubiquity of decline in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound and to develop a language capable of expressing this experience. In the preface he asserts that the poetry of *brownfields* is an attempt to understand the "process whereby one of a town's most vital and celebrated industries could *wither and die*, leaving a vast, unsightly scar on the landscape".[117] In Sitoski's poetry, the experience of dispossession through the neoliberalization of industry is a literal wound to the collective body:

> along the Bay/ there were factories/ and warehouses/ sheds/ fencing/ tracks/ and a million other things/ responsible/ for the A to B of life/ until surgical time/ sawed each digit/ extremity and limb/ from our writhing torso…[118]

The withdrawal of industry lacerates a community, that is then forced to grapple with their apparent dependence on these magnates and with the recognition that this dependency has left them chronically poisoned - stranded in brownfields. Sitoski deftly expresses the lived experience of this particular rural community undergoing neoliberalization. The vicissitudes of that dispossessive drive which now undoes Owen Sound, ensures that "each dismantled factory/ is a line of ellipsis dots" signifying the newly omissible or superfluous status of the community itself. Viscerally, Sitoski names that which neoliberal discourses obscure: the subjective and collective disarticulations resulting from neoliberalization. As neoliberal discourses pivot on the individual they occlude the ways in which power is unevenly distributed, foreclosing languages of collective resistance. This amputated torso, which Sitoski conjures into being only as '*our*' body - as belonging to no-body in particular and, thus, potentially, to every-body - may presage the development of a powerful and poetic language of solidarity with which to describe the communal conditions of alienation and dispossession that result from neoliberalization.

Yet, Sitoski's poem also appears to maintain that fundamental ambivalence, that liminality between dispossessed and dispossessor, that characterizes the neoliberal settler as a political subject. If it is true that *brownfields* is "[e]qual parts lament and encomium", then surely it is fair to ask what exactly is to be mourned and what is being trumpeted.[119] In the poem quoted above, the object of mourning seems to be what settlers read as markers of their unchallenged possession - the withdrawal of which now makes the always ongoing processes of dispossession suddenly apparent to settlers themselves. If this is indeed the cause of Sitoski's melancholia, if

the loss of industry is the primary incision made on "*our* writhing torso", is this *our* not always already constituted as the collectively possessive pronoun that reifies the settler as *the* political subject.

If *our* experience of disarticulation only begins with the decline of industry, with the disruption of a presumption of possession, have *we* not then repeated the exclusion and suppression of voices that speak of longer histories of dispossession. For the Saugeen Anishinaabek perhaps this now departing industry was not - as Sitoski suggests - "responsible/ for the A to B of life", but was rather a serious impediment to the living of lives in good relation to the land and to all other relations. Does this lamenting *our* not then attempt to silence voices who continue to tell of how the settler colony, its industries, and its labourers have all collaborated in efforts to displace peoples from the territories in which they have lived since time immemorial. Or, of how industry and its labourers have continuously choked out both the waters and very name of *Chi-wikwedong* (resignified as Owen Sound Bay) - which no treaty covers.[120] As he laments the disruption of a comfortable sense of settler possession, the dispossession of the Saugeen Anishinaabek is reiteratively effaced within Sitoski's figure of *our* (that is, settlers) torso's dismemberment by the processes of neoliberalization. Injuries that are accrued by settlers as the dispossessive drive turns inwards through the processes of neoliberalization thus occlude from their view the sustained lacerations that are the ongoing processes of settler colonial dispossession that continue to constitute the settler and their world.

Perhaps, however, I am unduly harsh. For the encomium that Sitoski pens is altogether more ambiguous than his lament, as it seemingly agitates for a more open - perhaps decolonial - politics. Indeed, as the poetic narrative advances beyond the images of amputated settlers,

Sitoski insists that he and his interlocutors are "here to celebrate/ nothing more than our success/ in living/ in the hour when cities are failing".[121] We might continue to dog Sitoski with questions: which hour do you presume this to be? or, by which violent acts of possession and dispossession were these failing cities first constructed? The answers, however, are likely to be unsurprising and accrue little satisfaction. Yet, it may be in a return to this reiterated *our* that the most fruitful possibilities develop. If it is possible to jettison the melancholic lament for an bygone sense of possessiveness, predicated on the dispossession of the Saugeen Anishinaabek, Sitoski's second *our* may yet offer a site through which to develop a decolonial ethic. For, as I have insisted throughout this chapter, the *we* who are constituted by the bare fact of continuing to survive the capriciousness of neoliberalization - as it sustains and expands settler colonization - is filled with a multiplicity of subjects, necessarily encompassing the still sovereign indigenous peoples of Turtle Island. The question then becomes, on whose terms will a new politics of resistance to dispossession be constituted? As their own dispossessive drive now over-exceeds and turns inward against settlers, will a politics of rancour and revanchism emerge, or is there a potential for a disidentification with the regimes of dispossession that sustain colonization?

Conclusion:

Settler colonization is continuously animated by the need to stabilize settlers' sense of possession. This stability is facilitated by what I call a dispossessive drive, that at once strives to invest the settler materially and psychically with a sense of having always already been in rightful and incontestable possession of the colony. Simultaneously this drive deploys multiple colonizing technologies in an ever-faltering attempt to dispossess the indigenous peoples of Turtle Island of their material and ontological relationships to their territories. For much of the

history of settler colonization, these drives have sustained a convergence between the interests of working settlers, the state, and capital - all of whom strive in overlapping (though fraught) ways to continuously reproduce the processes working to dispossess indigenous peoples. With the neoliberalization of settler coloniality, however, this compact dissolves as the dispossessive drive exceeds itself, turning the processes of dispossession inwards against particular communities of settlers who the state has abandoned to the vicissitudes of capital. Nevertheless, as subjects produced within and dependent upon regimes of settler colonial power, settlers sustain both material and psychic investments in the continuity of those processes which maintain the settler colony through reiterated acts of dispossession. Thus, settlers' critiques of neoliberalization regularly occlude or gloss their continued dependence on the maintenance and extension of settler colonization, neutralizing these dispossessive processes within the normative figure of the increasingly impoverished and marginalized labouring subject.

This is not, however, the only account of neoliberalization that can be offered. The decolonial critique that I offer insists that neoliberalization be interpreted as a furtherance of the processes of dispossession initiated in North America by settler colonization. A decolonial critique repositions neoliberalism as a new morphology of settler coloniality, one in which the dispossessive drives begin to turn inwards against portions of the dispossessing population. This is certainly the case in many communities of rural settlers, who experience severe impoverishment as a result of neoliberalization, even as they maintain investments in the processes dispossessing and disappearing indigenous peoples. However, as the dispossessive drive instantiates itself through subject formation and through various processes and institutions, it is necessarily reiterative and thus potentiates disidentifications.

Chapter Two Notes:

[1] A verse from Larry Jensen's "The Sounds of My Home". A singer, songwriter, and unassuming poet, Larry is a cornerstone of the arts community in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound as the co-Poet Laureate for Owen Sound. His work reflects on the realities of life in the area - particularly the working class settlers. *The Sounds of My Home Town*, Larry Jensen, YouTube, August 11, 2015 (accessed February 1, 2016).
[2] Even the titles of many texts on the subject belie a nervous condition in relation to the coming to hegemony of neoliberalism. Henry Giroux, *Against the Terror of Neoliberalism: Politics Beyond the Age of Greed*, (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2008). Chris Hedges, Brad Schreiber, and Mark Farkas, *Death of the Liberal Class*, (New York: Nation Books, 2010). Vincente Berdayes and John W. Murphy, *Neoliberalism, Economic Radicalism, and the Normalization of Violence*, (New York: Springer, 2016). Sanford Schram, *The Return of Ordinary Capitalism: Neoliberalism, Precarity, and Occupy*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).
[3] Emma Battell Lowman and Adam J. Barker, *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2015), 37.
[4] Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Mask: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 2014) iBook, 28.
[5] Michael Asch, *Here to Stay: Treaties and Aboriginal Rights in Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 112.
[6] Lorenzo Veracini, for instance, seems to suggest that the dispossessive drive may be embedded in European thought as far back as Plato. Veracini notes that the ancient philosopher posited a primary alienation of the soul from the body, and subsequent move by the former to colonize [*katoikizein*] the latter. Lorenzo Veracini, "On Settlerness," *Borderlands* 10: no. 1 (2011), http://www.jstor.org/ (accessed December 20, 2015), 4. In addition to critiquing Plato in much the same way, the Chippewas of Nawash also note that the story of Genesis similarly begins in the process alienation and necessary move towards salvation. Thus, both ancient philosophy and the Christian liturgy, two of the primary sources of European culture, begin with a schismatic conception of the human subject in its relationship to itself, its peers, and the wider world around it. These are lines of thought that deserve far deeper consideration than I can offer here. Chippewas of Nawash, *Encountering the Other: Racism Against Aboriginal People*, (Chippewas of Nawash, 2007), 5-7.
[7] Stephanie McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession: Nawash Ojibwa and Potawatomi in the Saugeen Territory, 1836-1865," (MA thesis, The University of Calgary, 1997), 5-6. Lee Maracle notes that the Beothuk people were never welcomed into this alliance model. Instead, they were viciously hunted by the early European settlers. This 'sport' is perhaps one of the earliest, and fullest, examples of the European predilection for genocide. Lee Maracle, *Memory Serves: Oratories*, Smaro Kamboureli ed., (Edmonton: NeWest Press, 2015), 175.
[8] David Lloyd and Patrick Wolfe, "Settler colonial logics and the neoliberal regime," *Settler Colonial Studies* (May 7, 2015), http://www.jstor.org/ (accessed December 25, 2015), 4.
[9] Cole Harris, "How Did Colonialism Dispossess? Comments from an Edge of Empire," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94, vol: 1 (2004), http://www.jstor.org/ (accessed January 15, 2016), 171.
[10] *ibid.*
[11] David Bedford and Danielle Irving, *The Tragedy of Progress: Marxism, Modernity, and the Aboriginal Question*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2000), 13.
[12] Coulthard, *Red Skin*, 29-30. Maracle notes that enclosure had a particularly gendered dynamic to it, as it disproportionately disempowered women. This is because "the original economy was managed by women" who were responsible for ensuring a sustainable relationship with the land and managing familial wealth. The destruction of these economies, Maracle suggests, created the "inequity between [indigenous] men and women" that persists today. Maracle, *Memory*, 133.
[13] Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy Volume I*, Frederick Engels ed., (Chicago: Charles Kerr & Company, 1906 [1867]), 785-786.
[14] Lowman and Barker, *Settler*, 20.
[15] Coulthard, *Red Skin*, 40.
[16] Emphasis mine. It is further suggested that the land is central to social relationships because the ancestors of the living have come to rest therein. The land and the Anishinaabek are literally and inextricably mixed with one another. Chippewas of Nawash, *Encountering the Other*, 18.
[17] Maracle, *Memory*, 3.
[18] *ibid.,* 200.
[19] Coulthard, *Red Skin*, 40.
[20] Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty*, (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 2015), 191.

[21] Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), 238 *fn*2.
[22] Todd Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2010), 74.
[23] McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession," 22.
[24] Morteon-Robinson, *White Possessive*, 26.
[25] Emphasis mine. Marx, *Capital*, 786.
[26] David Harvey, *The New Imperialism*, (London: Oxford University Press, 2003), 144 and 152.
[27] *ibid.*. 163
[28] Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*, xi. Indigenous peoples who resist the ongoing processes of colonization - that is primitive accumulation - are the exact group that Harvey seems to have in mind when he accuses many liberatory movements of lapsing into "nostalgia for that which has been lost". He presumes, and reproduces, the ascension of European values over indigenous ontologies, thereby re-naturalizing the colonizing move within his own critique of capital. Harvey, *New Imperialism*, 177.
[29] Emphasis mine. Coulthard, *Red Skin*, 32. A fair and very close reading of *Capital* suggests that Marx may actually have understood this to some degree himself. He writes of the separation that primitive accumulation creates between political subjects and their relationship to the land: "As soon as capitalist production is once on its own legs, it not only maintains this separation, but *reproduces* it on a *continually* extending scale" (emphasis mine). It may be, given the depth of thinking demonstrated here, that Marx's recourse to stadial developmentalist theories is less consistent with his own criticism of capitalism than it is with the cultural attitudes of the era in which he was writing. Regardless, many of Marx's acolytes have reproduced his historicizing treatment of primitive accumulation and Coulthard's critique is, thus, quite a fair one. Marx, *Capital*, 786.
[30] Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, "Acts, Agreements, Treaties and Land Claims," Modified April 4, 2015, https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/ (accessed February 15, 2016).
[31] Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege: How the People of the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation Asserted Their Rights and Claims and Dealt with the Backlash*, (Chippewas of Nawash, 2005), 76.
[32] McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession," 63, 65. Polly Keeshig-Tobias, *The Illustrated History of the Chippewas of Nawash*, (Chippewas of Nawash, 1996), 13-15.
[33] Lowman and Barker, *Settler*, 72.
[34] Cole Harris, "How Did Colonialism Dispossess?" 173.
[35] Michael Mascarenhas, *Where the Waters Divide: Neoliberalism, White Privilege, and Environmental Racism in Canada*, (New York: Lexington Books, 2012), 5.
[36] Telling the story of neoliberalism's ascent as an economic theory begins, somewhat crudely, with the founding of the Mont Pelerin Society in 1947. It is a crude beginning because neoliberals often trace their intellectual origins to the principles of classical economic theorists like Adam Smith or David Ricardo. Nevertheless, by establishing an active community, the Mont Pelerin Society fostered the intellectual and political clout of a group of academics determined to fundamentally reorient economic thinking. In fact, the membership of the Mont Pelerin Society included several figures who, though already established in their own fields at the time, have since become almost household names. These early figures in neoliberal thought include Friedrich von Hayek, Ludvig von Mises, Milton Friedman, and Karl Popper. Beginning with the Mont Pelerin Society also lends a certain amount of poetic justice to the discussion, as the society was named for the Swiss resort at which its founding meeting was held. A fitting tribute to the bourgeois values and aristocratic sensibilities that have animated the neoliberal intellectual movement from the beginning. David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, (London, Oxford University Press, 2005), 20.
[37] Thom Workman, *If You're in My Way, I'm Walking: The Assault on Working People Since 1970*, (Black Point, NS: Fernwood Press, 2009), 10-12.
[38] *ibid.,* 12.
[39] This is not meant to imply that indigenous people(s) do not labour, for they certainly do. Indigenous people(s) continue to participate in both the labour of their original economies and, often as a matter of necessity, labour within settler economies. What I mean to highlight is that the figure of 'the labourer' is always already conceptualized with reference to the normative position of working class (white, male, cisgendered, heterosexual, able-bodied, etc.) settlers.
[40] Harvey, *Neoliberalism*, 15-16.
[41] Workman, *I'm Walking*, 6 and 26.
[42] *ibid.*, 71.
[43] *ibid.,* 72.

[44] Indicative of neoliberalism's cross-partisan support, while the MacDonald Royal Commission was appointed by the Liberal Party's Trudeau, its report and recommendation were received by the Progressive Conservative Party's Brian Mulroney. As indicated above, both parties were largely amenable to the general thrust of the report and subsequently incorporated it into their platforms. David Clark, "Neoliberalism and Public Service Reform: Canada in Comparative Perspective," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 4 (December 2002), http://www.jstor.org (accessed January 20, 2016), 775.
[45] *ibid.,* 782.
[46] David Harvey's *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* offers a fascinating comparison between the development of neoliberalism in Britain and in America. See Harvey, *Neoliberalism*, 39-63.
[47] Workman, *I'm Walking*, 18.
[48] *ibid.,* 21-23. A comparative analysis indicates that these moves seem to be constitutive of neoliberal governing in general. Observing the Canadian experience of neoliberalism, Workman notes the three policy reorientations cited above; similarly, Harvey asserts that Thatcher's neoliberalization of Britain "entailed confronting trade union power, attacking all forms of social solidarity… dismantling or rolling back the commitments of the welfare state, the privatization of public enterprises…. and creating a favourable business climate to induce a strong inflow of foreign investment". Harvey, *Neoliberalism*, 23.
[49] This intensification occurs on at least two levels. The first seeks out and aggressively targets new zones and regions, previously unopened to market forces, from which wealth can be expropriated. The second seeks to transform zones and regions already opened to the market, attempting to reorganize previously non-marketized aspects of life in these regions to conform to the logics of the market. Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, 32-36.
[50] Workman, *I'm Walking*, 7.
[51] Mascarenhas, *Waters Divide*, 63.
[52] Harvey, *Neoliberalism*, 171.
[53] *ibid.,* 76. Workman has gone so far as to indicate that the "central goal" of neoliberal restructuring is the "deterioration" of living standards for poor and working people. But again, this account fails because it continues to reduce the impact of neoliberalism to simple working class impoverishment. Workman, *I'm Walking*, 32.
[54] Harvey, *Neoliberalism,* 154.
[55] Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, 30.
[56] *ibid.*, 78.
[57] Fyre Jean Graveline, "Idle No More, Enough is Enough!" *Canadian Social Work Review* 29: no. 2 (2012) http://jstor.org (accessed January 18, 2016).
[58] Wade Davis, *The Wayfarers: Why Ancient Wisdom Matters in the Modern World,* (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2009), 217.
[59] Harvey, *New Imperialism*, 151.
[60] Here, Alfred clearly means to indicate those particular varieties of globalization that tend to dispossess individuals and nations in a variety of more or less violent ways. Taiaiake Alfred, *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*, (Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2005), 235.
[61] Elizabeth A. Povinelli, *Economies of Abandonment: Social Belonging and Endurance in Late Liberalism*, (London: Duke University Press, 2011), 134.
[62] Wendy Brown, *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*, (Brooklyn: Zone Books, 2015), 108. Bedford and Irving, *The Tragedy of Progress*, 11.
[63] Mascarenhas, *Waters Divide*, 61.
[64] Povinelli, *Abandonment*, 157.
[65] Kate Cairns, "The subject of neoliberal affects: Rural youth envision their futures," *The Canadian Geographer* 57, no. 3 (2013), http://www.jstor.org (accessed January 15, 2016), 343.
[66] In this passage Povinelli is channeling Michel Foucault's work from *The Birth of Biopolitics*. She makes note that this strangulation of ways of life not conforming to the market does not occur in the same spectacular display of sovereign power that begins *Discipline and Punish*, but rather occurs through clandestine pacts that ensure the unliveability of such lives. Povinelli, *Abandonment*, 22.

[67] Walkerton is a small town on the south end of Bruce County. In 2000, because of deregulations to water safety and treatment standards, introduced by the provincial government of Mike Harris, an E coli outbreak occurred that left seven dead, sixty five hospitalized, and over two thousand three hundred sick. As part of Harris' 'Common Sense Revolution', these neoliberal deregulations to the water testing processes withdrew provincial oversight, shifting responsibility to the municipalities, who - lacking requisite skills and resources - were forced to turn to private industry for testing and treatment. Laureen Snider, "Captured by Neo-Liberalism: Regulation and Risk in Walkerton, Ontario," *Risk Management* 5, no. 2 (2003), 27-28. Snider's assertion of the state's decline is seemingly echoed from some unlikely corners within the academy. For instance, Wendy Brown has argued that neoliberalism represents the transference of sovereign power "from the nation-state to the unrelieved domination of capital and God-sanctioned political violence." While she later softens this somewhat by asserting that "[l]aissez-faire capitalism is as much the expression of such a [state] decision as is the New Deal", her interpretation of the state's durability under neoliberalism is decidedly ambiguous. See, Wendy Brown, *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*, (New York: Zone Books, 2010), 23 and 57.

[68] Gary Younge, "Who's in Control - Nation States or Global Corporations?" *The Guardian* (June 2, 2014), http://www.theguardian.com (accessed January 25, 2016). Jim Stanford, "Canada's transformation under neoliberalism," *Canadian Dimension* (March 29, 2014), http://canadiandimension.com (accessed January 25, 2016).

[69] Verónica Schild, "Empowering 'Consumer-Citizens' or Governing Poor Female Subjects? The institutionalization of 'self-development' in the Chilean social policy field," *Journal of Consumer Culture* 7, no. 2 (2007), http://jstor.org (accessed January 26, 2016), 184.

[70] Harvey, *Neoliberalism*, 40.

[71] Brown, *Demos*, 21.

[72] It should be noted that neither Cairns nor I see anything conspiratorial in this. The state is not setting the curriculum with some malicious goal in mind, rather the curriculum develops as a result of the uncontested logics of neoliberalism that have embedded themselves into state policy. It is through these repetitious and uncritical reproductions of neoliberal discourses that subjects are remoulded. Cairns, "Neoliberal affects," 342.

[73] Emphasis mine. William E. Connolly, *Capitalism and Christianity, American Style*, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 26.

[74] *ibid.*

[75] Povinelli, *Abandonment*, 3 and 144.

[76] Emphasis mine. Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, *Beyond Freefall: Halting Rural Poverty*. 39th Parliament, 2nd Session, June 2008, 137. The tacit confession of the state's active role in fuelling settlement is certainly an interesting one, especially given the duty of the Crown to respect the various treaties into which it had entered and its oft repeated claim that settler encroachment on indigenous peoples was beyond the state's ability to control. Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash,* 35.

[77] In the case of Prince George, British Columbia, Halseth asserts that the state "had to set in place all of those [major] infrastructure pieces before the forest industry would even think of investing a dollar". Quoted in, *ibid*., 105.

[78] Discerning readers will remember from the first chapter that this follows the signature of Treaty 45 1/2, which permitted settlement below the Peninsula. The establishment of Owen Sound was thus, intentionally placing settlers on the very extremities of the territory covered in the Treaty, thereby increasing the likelihood of further encroachment on untreatied land. McMullen, "Disunity and Dispossession," 35. See also, Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash,* 35.

[79] Senate Committee, *Beyond Freefall*, 137.

[80] This mythology of the steadfast and individualistic settler appears in many unexpected places. In Owen Sound during May 2015, at an event celebrating the life of Angus Macphail, I listened to a speaker break suddenly from the topic at hand - Macphail's personal journey as the first elected woman in federal politics - to wax poetic about the "perseverance and courage" that defined early settler attitudes.

[81] Senate Committee, *Beyond Freefall,* 105.

[82] Emphasis mine. Importantly, when discussing the state's withdrawal, most witnesses made reference to the downsizing or closure of government service agencies; few, if any, indicated that there was any substantial withdrawal of the state's coercive apparatuses. Senate Committee, *Beyond Freefall*, 29.

[83] *ibid.,* 106.

[84] This means that in order to access government services in a rural area one must either have a vehicle of their own (an expensive endeavour, especially for those on assistance) or else have an amenable and dependable neighbour, friend, or family member, with their own means of transport. *ibid.,* 29.

[85] *ibid.,* 107.

[86] This combination of an increased financial burden without corresponding increases in fiscal capacity has forced municipalities to find as many cost-cutting measures as possible, including contracting out services, increased fines and user-fees, and the sell-off of assets. These measures are further compounded by the fact that Canadian municipalities are legally restricted from carrying debt in the same way that federal and provincial governments can. *ibid*., 289-311.
[87] *ibid.,* 105.
[88] Mascarenhas, *Waters Divide*, 68.
[89] Senate Committee, *Beyond Freefall*, 25.
[90] Emphasis mine. *ibid.,* x.
[91] Importantly, those agricultural sectors that have remained staunchly protected by state-regulated supply management programs - dairy, poultry, and eggs - have not suffered the same degree of decline experienced in the agricultural sector more generally. *ibid.,* xii and 42. The recent sell-off of the Canadian Wheat Board is a case in point, the breakup of the Board's monopoly has led to a reported loss of six and a half billion dollars over two years. "Sask. Farmers call for return of Canadian Wheat Board," CBC News (February 15, 2016), www.cbc.ca/news (accessed February 15, 2016).
[92] Senate Committee, *Beyond Freefall*, 77-80.
[93] *ibid.,* 43-44. Staggeringly, Statistics Canada has estimated that Canada lost nearly ten percent of all its farms over just a five year period ending in 2011. Paul Waldie, "Family farms are fewer and larger, StatsCan says," *The Globe and Mail* (May 10, 2012), http://www.theglobeandmail.com (accessed January 20, 2016).
[94] *ibid.,* 19.
[95] Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, *Understanding Freefall: The Challenge of the Rural Poor*, 39th Parliament, 1st Session, December 2006, 26.
[96] Senate Committee, *Beyond Freefall*, xviii.
[97] This amounts to around sixty new food banks opening in rural areas in an eight year period. *ibid.,* 165.
[98] *ibid.,* 13.
[99] Assembly of First Nations, *Federal Government Funding to First Nations: The Facts, the Myths, and the Way Forward*, 2004, http://www.afn.ca/ (accessed January 13, 2016).
[100] First Nations Child & Family Caring Society of Canada, *Victory for First Nations Children: Canadian Human Rights Tribunal Finds Discrimination Against First Nations Children Living On-Reserve*, January 26, 2016, https://fncaringsociety.com (accessed February 20, 2016).
[101] Rick Wallace, *Merging Fires: Grassroots Peacebuilding Between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Peoples*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2013), 54.
[102] *ibid.,* 75 *fn*8.
[103] *ibid.,* 53.
[104] *ibid.* In 2016, the Band Council at *Neyaashiinigmiing* requested a Small Communities Fund grant in order to upgrade water treatment. At the time of the request, twenty three homes (nearly one in ten) did not receive any potable water from their treatment system, and were under a boil water advisory for more than a year. Nelson Phillips, "Chippewas of Nawash get unanimous support from SBP for water treatment application," *Wiarton Echo*, February 17, 2016.
[105] Wallace, *Fires*, 52-53.
[106] Emphasis mine. Kyle Duggan, "Blackstock on tribunal ruling: 'This is our Mississippi,'" *iPolitics* January 26, 2016, ipolitics.ca (accessed February 17, 2016).
[107] Coulthard, *Red Skin*, 39.
[108] "Grey County," *Census Profile*, Statistics Canada, http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/ (accessed February 11, 2016). "Bruce County," *Census Profile*, Statistics Canada, http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/ (accessed February 11, 2016).
[109] "Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound," *National Household Survey Profile*, Statistics Canada, https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/ (accessed February 11, 2016). Moreover, the gap between the median income for men and women in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound is staggering. According to the 2010 census data, the median income for the women of this riding was sixty nine percent that of men. This is very likely because women are filling a disproportionate number of service sector jobs, where they are poorly compensated for their labour. "Individuals by total income, by province and territory (Ontario)," Statistics Canada, www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/ (accessed February 11, 2016).
[110] Senate Committee, *Beyond Freefall*, 197.
[111] "Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound," *National Household Survey Profile*, Statistics Canada, https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/ (accessed February 11, 2016). Statistics Canada takes the necessity of "major repairs" as an indicator of "problems that compromised the dwelling structure or the major systems of the dwelling" making them "inadequate" for living in. "Housing Reference Guide," *National Household Survey*, Statistics Canada, https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/ (accessed February 11, 2016).

[112] This number applies to the total number of households with incomes greater than zero, not living on a farm, or on reserves. The total number of households spending more than thirty percent of income on housing is placed by Statistics Canada at about one in five. *ibid.*
[113] "The Kennedy Empire," Exhibits, Grey Roots Museum & Archive, http://www.greyroots.com (accessed February 11, 2016). Scott Dunn, "Russel Brothers bankrupt: Workers lose jobs, 3-weeks of pay and severances," *The Sun Times* (July 17, 1993), 1. Interestingly, in the case of PPG, the corporation had once relied upon government programs to help fund machinery upgrades, However, it seems that the government withdrew those available funds sometime between 1981 and 2008. Scott Dunn, "PPG to close city plant," *The Sun Times* (September 4, 2008), http://www.owensoundsuntimes.com (accessed February 11, 2016). Tracey Richardson, "Former Goodyear plant to close," *The Sun Times* (February 1, 2012), http://www.owensoundsuntimes.com (accessed February 11, 2016. Even the most optimistic and progressive people in the area seem to have given up the hope that manufacturing will be returning to the riding any time soon. Peace and Justice Grey Bruce, *Final Report of the Precarious Work Group*, (Owen Sound, ON: Peace and Justice Grey Bruce, January 2015), 13.
[114] *ibid.,* 6.
[115] *ibid.,* 2.
[116] Andrew Armitage, *Vanishing: Lost Places in Grey and Bruce*, (Owen Sound, ON: The Ginger Press, 2015). Rob Rolfe, *Hard Times*, (Thornhill, ON: Aeolus House, 2015). Richard-Yves Sitoski, *brownfields,* (Owen Sound, ON: The Ginger Press, 2014).
[117] Emphasis mine. Sitoski, *brownfields*, ix.
[118] *ibid.,* 96.
[119] *ibid.,* book jacket.
[120] This is discussed more fully in chapter three, in the section "Resurgence and the Marketing of Hate". Keeshig-Tobias, *Chippewas of Nawash*, 59-68.
[121] Sitoski, *brownfields*, 97-98.

Chapter Three: Unsettling Ressentiment

"*[O]n the shore/ the fish nets/ are there under/ the waves/ you forget/ ancient anger/ festers here*" - Rob Rolfe[1]

August 5th, 1995: a crowd, numbering between seventy five and one hundred people, many of them members of local sportsmen associations, marched through the downtown core of Owen Sound. Led by prominent public figures, this crowd had as its intended terminus a stall at the weekly Owen Sound Farmers' Market where Yolanda Jones, an Anishinaabe woman from *Neyaashiinigamiing* (Cape Croker), was selling fish with her young daughter. The crowd marched towards Jones out of protest: expressing their collective anger over the expansion of Anishinaabe fisheries, which following a recent court ruling had been recognized by the settler state - for the first time in several generations - as extending throughout the waters surrounding the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula. Evidently, those within the crowd saw the removal of the state's strict quota system, which had devastated Anishinaabe fishing practices, as a threat to their own livelihoods, or to their preferred recreational activity. They were intent on asserting their displeasure.

Tipped off about the likelihood that the protestors were intent on a confrontation, a group of supporters - many of them settlers - gathered to stand in solidarity with Jones. A "scuffle" broke-out and Jones' supporters linked arms, placing their own bodies between the mob and the stall to prevent "the sportsmen from attacking" the stall. Even as the tension remained, the crowd - which now more closely resembled a mob - eventually dissipated. Not, however, before a protestor within the crowd threw a bag stuffed with rotting fish at Jones' stall, it splattered across her fresh catch. Those present were so shaken by the visceral aggression and hatred expressed by the mob that Marilyn Struthers, one of the people who stood beside Jones, writing about the event years later, describes the mob's actions as a form of "back garden terrorism".[2]

❖ ❖ ❖

While I consider this event more fully towards the close of this chapter, it captures the ways in which rancour and resentment are all too familiar within the legacies and ongoing struggles against empire. Such emotions are often presented as inherently corrosive, if not outright destructive. (Settler) Colonizers often discursively and imaginatively portray those subjects who resist the processes of colonization - particularly indigenous peoples - as ensconced in such aggressive dispositions and, thus, unable to come to grips with the 'reality' of the world created by colonization, thereby marking such subjects as 'other'. Glen Coulthard insists,

however, that within regimes of dispossessive and oppressive power, such sentiments can act as powerful prolepses to the assertion of sovereignty, decolonial practices, and new lines of solidarity. While rancour and resentment are often marked by settlers as signs of indigenous peoples' intransigence - of their failure to 'just get over it' - these emotions are, in fact, an "entirely appropriate manifestation" of both self-affirmation and resistance in the face of the ongoing dispossession and destruction that maintains the settler colony.[3] Far from stymieing indigenous peoples' political projects, these emotions express the righteous indignation that accompanies a refusal to accept either the inevitability or desirability of settler colonization. They also provide at least part of the fuel necessary to sustain decolonial projects. Cultivating a productive and radical politics from the resonances of these decolonial sentiments is a project of enormous importance, already being carried out by persons and communities of almost singular compassion, and vision.[4]

As the confrontation at the Market suggests, however, it is totally disingenuous to allow settlers to pretend as if rancour and resentment are solely the jurisdiction of indigenous peoples - that is, to allow settlers to continue erasing our own ubiquitous and amplifying aggression. As I have alluded to throughout this project, it is very often settlers who provide the most virulent and pernicious expressions of these rancorous sentiments. Whether it is the mobs of early settlers threatening Laurence Oliphant to secure them more land, the woman from the 6th Avenue neighbourhood in Owen Sound who feels prejudice boiling up as the Anishinaabek reclaim their burial grounds, or scores of men threatening the bodily safety of a young Anishinaabe woman and her child, there is no shortage to the evidence of the aggressive sentiments that embed themselves within settler colonialism - indeed, within the very production of settler

subjectivities. However, the rancour and resentment of settlers is often differentiated from that of indigenous peoples by the consistency with which such sentiments sustain settlers' investments in, and operationalization of, the highly oppressive and destructive processes of settler colonization. That is, to affirm domineering power rather than contest it. These (re)investments seem especially likely when settler anxieties are triggered, often as a reaction to the presumed threat of indigenous peoples' sovereignty or to the experience of dispossession as a result of neoliberalization.

In this final chapter I contend that the neoliberalization of settler colonialism produces settlers as subjects who are unwilling - and perhaps unable - to articulate a politics that contests oppressive power rather than capitulates to it. Yet, the neoliberal settler also refuses to explicitly avow their position within, and continued reliance on, said power. Settlers tend to mobilize around the assertion of grievances that reproduce a highly individuated or atomistic subject and to demand solutions that are managerial or policy-oriented rather than political.[5] I suggest that this fixation upon grievance, in the absence of an emancipatory imagination, ossifies a sense of injury within settler subjects. Thus, today settlers are what Friedrich Nietzsche calls subjects of *ressentiment*. Seemingly power-averse creatures, settlers nevertheless aggressively defend and extend an assemblage of oppressive institutions, sensibilities, and practices that at once maintain their sense of injury and self-righteousness, while sustaining their sense of ownership and rightful possession of the spaces of occupation. All while simultaneously foreclosing and denying all alternative collective actions or political imaginations - particularly those of indigenous peoples.

To substantiate my position, I divide this chapter into five sections. In the first, I explore Nietzsche's concept of *ressentiment*, in particular how it attenuates the processes of subject formation. Following this, in the second section, I discuss how the vicissitudes of neoliberalized settler colonialism chafe at settler *ressentiment*. In the third section I contend that as settlers remain embedded within, and reliant upon, settler colonial regimes, indigenous peoples' sovereignties inflame their *ressentiment*, which is than expressed in a politics that at once naturalizes and rancorously re-entrenches neoliberal settler colonialism. In the fourth and fifth sections I concretize this discussion by exploring two examples of settler aggression towards acts of Anishinaabe sovereignty in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound; the first over the reclamation of fishing rights in the 1990s and the second an ongoing conflict over roughly two miles of beach.

Subjects of Ressentiment:

Amongst Nietzsche's most insightful philosophical developments is *ressentiment*. For Nietzsche, this concept is more than a new emotion or affect that exists amidst a number of others. Rather, he suggests that *ressentiment* conditions the ways in which one at once perceives and relates to the world as a whole. Today, the language of subjectification or subject formation approximates his intent, as it appropriates Nietzsche's implication that *ressentiment* precedes and exceeds the formation of consciousness in a way that emotions do not. Nietzsche asserts that subjects of *ressentiment* are characterized by a latent "hatred of the human, and even more of the animal, and more still of the material," and that at its base *ressentiment* is "a rebellion against the most fundamental presuppositions of life".[6] Yet, far from being an inwardly directed act of self-destruction or self-denial, Nietzsche insists that *ressentiment* is dangerous to all. This is because *ressentiment* remains actively willful, recoding a profound hatred of life and desire for revenge

against the intolerability of existence "under the name of *justice*".[7] In this first section, I discuss the social diffusion of *ressentiment*, exploring the processes through which subjects are formed by, and invested with, an unavowable yet insatiable and existential hatred.[8] First, I discuss how a sense of having been injured by an identifiably guilty party potentiates the development of *ressentiment*; and that an inability to respond to this sense of injury in timely or proportionate ways creates a schism between resentment, as it is commonly understood, and *ressentiment*. Following this, I consider how the unfulfillability of *ressentiment*'s vengeful desires causes it to sink deep within the psyche, sedimenting *ressentiment* as a (re)iterative conditioning of subjectification.

As with much of his thought, Nietzsche explores *ressentiment* most poignantly through his aphorisms. In *On the Genealogy of Morals*, Nietzsche writes of a flock of lambs that is routinely hunted by birds of prey. Eventually, the lambs conclude that, more than being hunted, they are actually being deliberately harmed and persecuted by the birds. Given this, the lambs come to believe that "these birds of prey are *evil*; and whoever is least like a bird of prey, but rather its opposite, a lamb - would he not be *good*?"[9] These lambs exemplify the subject of *ressentiment* in rebellion against the presuppositions of life itself: in denial of the fact that their being in relationship with the world necessarily exceeds their capacity for control. It is possible, and was once fashionable, to take this as evidence of Nietzsche's approval of cruelty and readiness to condone violence.[10] A generous reading, however, is more nuanced.

Nietzsche's parable is importantly situated within the realm of instinct rather than intention. Lambs decrying the evilness of birds of prey is no more sensible or ethically imperiling an idea than if the grasses of the pasture were to bemoan the lambs' grazings. Each

are always already caught in relationships to the others - relationships which cannot preclude the possibility of pain, but demand reciprocity nonetheless. For Nietzsche, being in a relationship with the world is not necessarily, or even likely, a privileged or comfortable experience; yet, the subject of *ressentiment* insists on the anaesthetization of all pain. The condition of *ressentiment* thus emerges in opposition to a "world that allows pain and suffering to occur" at all.[11] Later in his *Genealogy*, Nietzsche makes this quite explicit when he characterizes the subject of *ressentiment* as being like a sick patient who seeks to hold someone as guilty of causing their condition: "Someone or other must be to blame for my feeling ill".[12]

The development of *ressentiment* is thus potentiated by a sense of, and anxiety over, having been injured. As Robert Solomon notes, and as may be apparent given Nietzsche's general disposition towards categorical truth claims, this sense of injury is not predicated on absolute or objective criteria. Rather, injury is experienced with reference to a "perception of oneself" and is thus affixed to "frustrated ambitions and desires, [emerging in those] whose self-esteem depends on their social status".[13] Put differently, the injury that generates, or potentiates, *ressentiment* need not be a literal physical blow, it need not even be an actualized harm to one's interests - although it *could* be both these things. All that is absolutely necessary, it seems, is that one imagines themselves having fallen short of their imagined self. Faced with this failure, Wendy Brown asserts, the frustrated subject either absorbs these shortcomings into themselves - which redoubles the sense of failure: 'I failed *and* I am to blame for failing' - or else they seek "a site of external blame upon which to avenge [their] hurt and redistribute the pain."[14] These psychic displacements necessitate the production of an agent(s) - Nietzsche's birds of prey, for instance - who is then held responsible for the injury and subsequent pain - displacing the lambs'

loathing of life itself. Nietzsche insists that the agent who is to be produced must be a "*guilty* agent who is susceptible to suffering", as this agent of harm is to be figured as having caused the injury by volitional intent and must then be made to hurt themselves, either "actually or in effigy".[15] Thus, to displace the psychic trauma brought on by the inevitable travails of life, an agent is produced and marked with the guilt of having caused this supposed sense of injury. This agent then becomes a site of fixation, onto which the injured subject displaces the cause of their suffering and situates an intention to avenge this injury.

As the birds of prey parable suggests, part of what ensures the continual circulation and reproducibility of this ossifying sense of *ressentiment* is the tendency of this subject to portray themselves as meek and thereby incapable of contesting their injurious foe. As Solomon notes, because *ressentiment* is driven by a sense of injury, it maintains itself from a "marked perspective of *inferiority*."[16] Whereas open struggle, resistance, or self-affirmation could result in defeat, the subject of *ressentiment* operates through "prudential, strategic, even ruthlessly clever" machinations that ensure their "self-preservation".[17] That is to say that subjects of *ressentiment* position themselves as always already subjugated and, thus, they suggest, outside of power. Averse to agonistic struggle - what might be called politics - Nietzsche's *ressentiment*-filled lambs recode their tenderness with a sense of moral superiority, while the birds of prey are figured as embodying evil. Brown notes that this moralism is only sustained through a suspension of the political, as the subject of *ressentiment* "drape[s] itself in powerlessness".[18] The development of *ressentiment* thus makes two moves contributing to the subject's insurmountable and radiating hatred of their supposed injurer: the first invests the subject in the maintenance of a never-abating sense of injury, while the second causes said subject to project a

moralizing image of themselves as powerless and, therefore, sanctifiable. Richard Sugarman suggests that the subject of *ressentiment* is "[u]nable or unwilling to find satisfaction in revenge" without undoing their sense of themselves, and so "has recourse only to spite" - but a spite without end or ends.[19] As the development of *ressentiment* occurs within an obsessive and reiterative matrix of injury and sanctimonious self-aggrandizement it is, in Max Scheler's words, a "self-poisoning of the mind".[20]

Ultimately the schism distinguishing resentment from *ressentiment* rests on this unending yearning for revenge against the supposedly guilty agent. Whereas resentment is an action-oriented emotion seeking its own termination, in the same manner as anger and hatred; *ressentiment* inculcates an enduring hostility that circumscribes action rather than impelling it. As Sugarman suggests, while potentially destructive, resentment can be "justified in the face of gratuitous harm" if it spurs the injured subject forward to act in ways that reduce or prevent the continuation of said harm.[21] By contrast, *ressentiment*, at its etymological root, implies continuous inaction in the face of this presumed injury. According to Sugarman, the original French suggests the presence of a "time-lag", in which *ressentiment* continuously cycles without relief though actions or expressions that might abate it - this reiterativity is not necessarily, or even typically, implied by the English word resentment.[22] Absent the release of action, the desire for revenge is psychically repressed so as not to erupt. However, as with all repression, it "invariably recommences, magnified and intensified" as it ossifies into *ressentiment*.[23] Importantly, for subjects of *ressentiment*, the passage of time does not imply the dissipation of either the sense of injury or the desire for revenge. This is because the injury itself is invested with meaning, providing the subject with purpose - a desire for revenge and a sanctimonious

self-image. Thus, as time passes, the subject of *ressentiment* does not forget their hurt as others might; rather, they "continually reinfect the narcissistic wound", ensuring that it continues to throb.[24] Constantly returning to and reopening this wound, the subject of *ressentiment* remains trapped and invested in their sense of injury. This ritualized and fetishized relationship to hurt, as Simon Glezos asserts, means that "*ressentiment* is resentment crystallized".[25]

This crystallization does not, however, imply that the *ressentiment*-filled subject becomes increasingly focused on their injurer - in fact, it is quite the opposite. Because the desire for revenge must be psychically repressed, the supposed injurer becomes secondary, the hurt itself - that sense of being injured - becomes all that ultimately matters. The effect of such repression is that the desire for revenge is "detached" from the discrete figure of the injurer - that is, from "any particular individual" - and instead it "radiates" outwards indiscriminately.[26] Coupling a sustained and exacerbated sense of injury with an inability to retaliate against the injurer leads to a diffusion of the desire for revenge. The further this desire is allowed to sink within the psyche - that is, the more sustained and total the repression - the greater the likelihood that it "shifts toward indeterminate groups" that happen to share some defining characteristic with the now phantasmatic figure of the injurer.[27] As William Connolly suggests, by diffusing the source of injury, expressions of *ressentiment* "congeal into a disposition" that holds the whole "actually existing world" responsible for having allowed this hurt.[28] Even if the subject of *ressentiment* exacts revenge on the one who supposedly or actually caused them injury, or on another person acting as an effigy of the injurer, it would not dissipate the aggression now radiating outwards against the world entire.

What is more, despite Nietzsche's repeated usage of the phrase "[wo]man [or (wo)men] of *ressentiment*", subsequent considerations suggest that *ressentiment* is demonstrably not limited only to, or even primarily, an individualized condition.[29] As Scheler explains, the conditions necessary for the production of *ressentiment* are "accumulated by the very *structure of society*."[30] This is especially the case in societies where liberal democratic discourses and institutions predominate. Liberal democracies presume *prima facie*, the existence of a fundamental and formal equality between their subjects; as such, enormous disparities in political, social, and economic power, are very often deemed inconsequential or become unrecognizable as such within the discourses and institutions of liberal regimes. Scheler writes that the problem emerges from the fact that, while the liberal political subject has an unquestionable right to assert the principle of their equality with everyone in their political community, their ability to live a life reflective of that presumed equality is sharply curtailed.[31] Regimes of power that at once discursively laud equality, while simultaneously reproducing social, political, and economic disparities, produce subjects who are always already fluctuating between frustration with their condition and anxiety over any degree of worsening in that condition. Nevertheless, these discourses of difference-blind equality are enormously powerful, acting as a balm for the liberal political subject. The assurance of a primordial equality, that remains operable, soothes the injurious psychic dislocation between the liberal subject's expectation of the equality of all and their lived experience of marginality and disposability.

David Bedford and Danielle Irving observe that discourses of difference-blind equality are often most appealing to "those who experience oppression of various kinds", as discourses provide a morally grounded position from which to make a claim of having been disadvantaged

or unfairly treated. For subjects of liberal democratic regimes, disadvantage and disparities are often framed as the "result of the special treatment accorded others". While such fixations on difference-blind equality *may* critique those who establish, benefit from, and perpetuate systems of exploitation within liberal regimes, it is just as likely to "translate into opposition to anything that resembles difference."[32] Thus, returning to Scheler's assertion that the liberal subject is always already produced as a subject of *ressentiment*, the reason for this is quite clear: while the liberal subject is psychically invested in imagining themselves as the equal of all their peers, their lived reality is an endless series of transgressions against this presumption. Repeatedly falling short of their imagined equality produces within the liberal subject a dislocation, expressed through assertions of having been injured. Produced within, and therefore dependent upon, liberal democratic regimes of power, the liberal subject cannot disavow such injurious regimes without simultaneously disavowing their own recognizability and articulability as subjects. The liberal subject thus repeatedly sustains investments in the sense of injury that accrues from the gap between discursive equality and lived disparities. This insurmountable sense of injury reiteratively conditions the subject of liberal democracies, and *ressentiment* sediments within said subjects. In the next two sections I discuss how the assemblage of neoliberalized settler colonialism exacerbates and inflames this psychically conditioning *ressentiment*.

Neoliberalization's Abrading of Ressentiment:

If it is true, as Nietzsche suggests, that *ressentiment* is constitutive of the liberal subject, then the sense of precarity that accrues under conditions of neoliberalization is likely to only further exacerbate the most rancorous expressions of that *ressentiment*. As developed in the

previous chapter, the neoliberalization of settler colonialism represents the turning inwards of the dispossessive drives that animate both settler colonialism and the settler themselves. With this turning inwards, processes of dispossession begin extending into communities that, heretofore, were almost solely beneficiaries of the dispossession of others - particularly of indigenous peoples. Neoliberalization represents a sustained disarticulation of, or injury to, the unnamed yet still structuring figure of the middle class settler - as sustaining this normative ideal becomes increasingly impossible. In this section I first discuss how neoliberalization modifies liberal discourses to promise of an ever-expanding horizon of freedom and possibility, even as the neoliberal subject's actual capacity to fulfill that freedom is sharply curtailed. Then, I discuss the neoliberal subject's tendency to sustain and thereby reproduce its constitutive sense of injury, by only engaging power reactively rather than with a radical imagination. Finally, I discuss how the neoliberal subject's *ressentiment* is revealed in a visceral rejection of those seen as not conforming to the ideal of the working class settler.

One of the primary victories for neoliberalism has been the successful cooptation and transformation of discourses of freedom, which is represented as the highest political aspiration. This idea of freedom, however, is primarily predicated on the ascendent individual and the diminution of all collectivities - which are refigured within neoliberal discourses as reducing and constraining the potential of the individual. Struggles for redress or self-affirmation that may rely on, or be facilitated through, the development of a collective subject and an aspirational politics, are re-presented in neoliberal discourses as individuated desires for deregulation and personal ambition. Even the seldom-actualized liberal ideal of the undifferentiated equality that is presumed to attend the collectivizing ascription of 'citizen' is supplanted by neoliberal discourses

in favour of the unbridled and atomistic concerns of the 'taxpayer'.[33] As such, the neoliberalization of political discourses displaces collective struggles over the (re)distribution of power, replacing them with a language of individualizable grievances and desires for ever-greater personal freedom.

When the individual becomes the primary site of discursive mobilizations and aspirations the political sphere is pervaded, in Brown's words, with "ambivalence and anxiety" as each and every subject becomes invested with "an extraordinary responsibility for ourselves". Anxiety permeates the neoliberal subject as well, because, despite their presumed freedom, they nevertheless remain "flanked by the problem of power on all sides".[34] Imagined as possessing a nearly unconstrained degree of freedom, the neoliberal subject is discursively contoured as eminently capable of, and therefore deeply responsible for, achieving their personal desires and aspirations. This, despite the fact that the atomized and individuated subject remains a phantasm. Actual lives are always already embedded within regimes of power and social relationships that act to both enable and (this is repeatedly obscured by neoliberal discourses) constrain their subjects. As assemblages of settler colonization, capitalism, white supremacism, misogyny, heterosexism, ableism, etc. prevail in their overlapping complexity, and as discourses of collective action aimed at challenging these processes of oppressive power are evacuated of their political purchase, neoliberal subjects are nevertheless figured as personally responsible for their own relative success or failure - regardless of their positionality within such hierarchizing systems. Moreover, as I suggested in the previous chapter, neoliberalization tends to further entrench and extend many of these oppressive systems. Processes of neoliberalization thus both "accelerate and expand" the *ressentiment* already embedded within the liberal subject.[35] The

disjunction that emerges between the neoliberal subject's imaginatively infinite capacity for self-actualization and the reality of their increasingly constrained lived existence implodes into an ever-widening chasm, repeatedly experienced as an injury. As Brown formulates it: "[s]tarkly accountable yet dramatically impotent, the [neoliberal] subject quite literally seethes with *ressentiment*."[36]

Neoliberalization, with its proclivity to further concentrate and stratify power, at once sustains and extends the ongoing processes of dispossession that are constitutive of settler colonization, leading to the material diminution and social disarticulation of an ever-growing number of communities. Glezos notes that, as various constituencies undergo neoliberalization, there is a tendency to experience these processes as an "acceleration" of change and social restructuring. In the face of an accelerated disarticulation of the community, and therefore of the self, a feeling of uncertainty and anxiety overwhelms the subject, driving them to "fear democratic consultations and crave authoritative renderings" as an anchor of certainty.[37] There is thus a turning away from the potentially more open, yet, uncertain power that exists within relational communities, and a turning towards the supposed certainty of the declarative and hierarchical powers of state institutions and leaders. Such a turn signifies a willingness or a desire within the neoliberal subject to "give up what power they do have to increasingly authoritarian structures".[38] Much like the ascetic priests in Nietzsche's *Genealogy*, there are many who seek to exploit this longing for certainty and authority to their own ends. Today, Glezos calls these the "politicians of *ressentiment*". Not only do such figures respond to the indiscriminately radiating *ressentiment* of their public, they "actively cultivate it."[39] Such leaders exacerbate the sense of injury while promising to anaesthetize it by disciplining some other party

that is figured as guilty of having caused the hurt. This is possible, they suggest, only if the public subjects itself to evermore authoritative and hierarchical regimes of power.

Equally troubling, is that when communities undergoing the accelerative effects of neoliberalization do manifest their collective power it is, Glezos asserts, often expressed "by attacking" communities that are even further marginalized.[40] These assaults can be largely self-organizing, occurring even in the absence of explicit direction from politicians of *ressentiment*. As Connolly suggests of the American political economy, though this is likely true under conditions of neoliberalization more generally, the unbridled freedom and ascendence of the neoliberal subject always remains an "illusory promise".[41] A promise that, when it goes unfulfilled, causes the neoliberal subject to either withdraw into a self-loathing isolation or, perhaps more disturbingly, to "vent their anger on the most vulnerable scapegoat available."[42] This indiscriminate venting of rancour, or proclivity towards scapegoating, is discussed more fully below; however, it is important to understand that, like all actions emergent from the condition of *ressentiment*, it is predicated on a desire to avenge a phantasmatic injury that forms below the level of consciousness.

As suggested above, this *ressentiment*-fuelled recrimination is regularly directed against anything that resembles difference and this difference is generally marked by the neoliberal subject in regards to its degree of deviation from the phantasmatic figure of the working class settler. In a study of the 2008 federal elections in both Canada and America, Tim Fowler notes that the image of the worker - unnamed as such, but always implicitly a white male settler - occupied a normative position within the political discourses of both settler colonies. He writes that the worker "is imagined as [part of] a group of hard working individuals, earning a middle

class income, who do not ascribe to 'elite' values and lifestyles." The working class settler is thus activated as a normative figure, not in order to mark a collective experience of exploitation by the powerful, but to suggest the necessity of a defence of the "'traditional' way of working class life" from a nebulous threat posed by deviant others.[43] Importantly, as Connolly suggests, the sort of traditionalism that is constructed as being in need of defence is yet another imaginative fantasy, "rooted in rosy memories" that distort and misrepresent in order to settle the subject's sense of unease.[44] Thus, difference is psychically marked as a threat to the neoliberal settler, who experiences their genuine precarity under neoliberalization not as the effects of economic restructuring or the inevitable logics of the regimes of dispossession in which they remain invested, but rather as the withdrawal of an idyllic past that was never truly present.

Production of this imaginary yet structuring figure of the once prosperous working settler functions in part to naturalize and, thereby, depoliticize the processes of neoliberalized settler colonialism. While these processes may be sublated and neutralized within the psyche of the neoliberal settler, their material effects of dispossession and concentration nevertheless continue apace and will ultimately threaten the dissolution of that same subject. In the absence of a discourse by which to critique the very systems of power in which they participate, the neoliberal settler must presume the existence of an agent(s) who is to be blamed for their genuinely increasing sense of precarity and defencelessness. Various authors note that this spectral figure is often constructed around the image of a highly racialized other, whose actions are deemed to be deviant and highly destructive of social order - that is to say, oppositional to neoliberalized settler colonialism.[45] While the mould of the deviant figure threatening the working class white settler takes many forms, and can be filled by nearly any racial, ethnic, or non-hegemonic group, in the

next section I discuss the ways in which indigenous peoples in particular are positioned within the neoliberal settler imaginary as always already constituting a threat.[46]

Brown suggests, quite astutely, that the "realization of substantive democracy," wherein subjects are able to flourish collectively, requires a "longing to share in power" rather than seek to remove oneself from the field of power.[47] In the era of neoliberalization, however, the subject of *ressentiment* is "attenuated by a historically unique form of powerlessness."[48] Put differently, the neoliberal settler, seething with *ressentiment*, has an almost singular predilection for turning away from political struggle, thereby reifying and naturalizing hierarchical distributions of power. Absent a discourse by which to understand and articulate themselves within collective (re)imaginings and (re)constitutions of power, the neoliberal settler instead affirms hierarchical and oppressive authority through repeated appeals for recognition or accommodation within a difference-blind approach to political and economic freedom. In this way, the so-called politics of the neoliberal settler are "inevitably reactionary," as they seek only to articulate grievances within the terms and conditions established by the very regime of power which is itself productive of the sense of injury.[49] Glezos notes that the all too common *ressentiment*-fuelled assaults on marginalized communities tend to only "shore up the systems" of power that instantiate the neoliberal settler's feelings of hurt.[50]

What Brown describes as the neoliberal subject's desire to "inscribe in the law and in other political registers its historical and present pain" is thus a twofold move: first, this inscription marks the foreclosure of the subject's desire or capacity to "conjure an imagined future of power to make itself."[51] That is, to strive towards the redistribution of power in less domineering, or less hierarchical ways. Second, by reifying the various regimes of domineering

power that produce this sense of injury, the neoliberal subject ensures that their wound will be continually reopened, thereby making the reproduction of unabated *ressentiment* inevitable. As Brown formulates it, this *ressentiment* reveals itself in the subject's "recrimination against action and power" and, moreover, against collectives that "affirm or embody the *possibilities* of action and power", thereby ensuring the continued circulation and reproducibility of injury.[52]

The Indignation of Settler Colonizers:

Like Nietzsche's lambs, the neoliberal settler requires a guilty agent(s) - Yolanda Jones perhaps - onto whom responsibility for an increasing sense of precarity and vulnerability can be displaced, thereby shielding the processes of neoliberalized settler colonialism and settlers themselves from painful self-critique and introspection. In chapter one I suggested that the productive capacity of settler colonialism, and of the settler themselves, depends upon the reiterative disavowal of indigenous peoples' sovereignties, peoplehoods, and even their ongoing presences within the spaces of occupation and that this is facilitated through the production of a settler *imago*. As such, when indigenous peoples (re)assert themselves the settler *imago* is disrupted, producing a psychic displacement that threatens the disintegration of the self as it has been constituted. In this section I discuss how the resurgent presence of indigenous peoples, and their affirmation of distinct sovereign relationships with Turtle Island, exacerbates and inflames the neoliberal settler's *ressentiment*. First, I discuss how, within the settler imaginary, indigenous people(s) are always already figured as a threat or danger to the settler colony and its subjects. I then explore the ways in which this supposed threat is constructed by collapsing any conceptual separation between settlers themselves and the regimes of neoliberalized settler colonization; thus, when indigenous peoples challenge such oppressive and destructive regimes, they are re-

presented as an existential danger to the regime's subjects. Finally, I suggest that by viscerally denying indigenous peoples' sovereignty, and by constructing them as a dangerous other responsible for the precarity of contemporary life, the settler engages in a *ressentiment*-fuelled act of self-reification. Which is to say, a rejection of decolonial movements that would disrupt settlers' comfortable sense of themselves with a challenge to live or act in ways that do not reproduce processes of colonization.

As suggested throughout this project, power operates, in part, through the production of subjects who act within and through that very field of power, and who remain invested in the reproduction of such regimes in order to maintain their own recognizability and identity. Riggs and Augoustinos describe this as the process of "being intelligible", a privilege which they suggest is only "extended to those [subjects] who are established through the language of the nation".[53] Regimes of settler colonial power produce the settler as an intelligible subject through the material and psychic occlusion (and preclusion) of indigenous peoples' ongoing sovereign presences, which the settler *imago* attempts to disappear. In Aileen Moreton-Robinson's words, the processes producing the settler become unmarked as the basic preconditions of social life, while simultaneously ensuring that within the "white settler imagination, [indigenous peoples] have become abject subjects", either fully erased from the settler's consciousness or transmogrified into something wretched.[54] Yet, she further suggests, that, because of the continual resistance of indigenous peoples to the processes of colonization, the settler is necessarily a subject produced with a deep anxiety over the possibility of indigenous peoples reclaiming the territories of which they are being dispossessed.[55] The existential threat posed to the settler by the assertive presence of indigenous peoples is thus a result of the fact that

indigenous sovereignties, actively exceed the capacity of settler colonial discourses to capture and subjugate them.

In the face of this seemingly intractable alterity, the settler (re)imagines indigenous people(s) as somehow inherently and pre-discursively monstrous and therefore threatening to the settler colony in general, but also to each and every individual settler in particular.[56] This sense of being threatened is sublated within the psyche of the settler by subjectively disappearing both the processes of colonization and the persistent presence of indigenous peoples. However, when assertive indigenous peoples refuse invisibility, affirming the validity of their own ways of being, and of their sovereign relationships with Turtle Island, they are confronted, as was Yolanda Jones, with "the extraordinary visceral hatred carried by Canadians for First Nations peoples who are in the way" of ever-expanding colonization.[57] This was also exemplified in chapter one, where I considered how the dispute over Anishinaabek burial grounds disrupted the smooth reproduction of the settler *imago*. From early settler colonial expansion into the era of neoliberalization, much of this 'getting in the way' has in actuality been part of a continuous and concerted effort by indigenous peoples to defend the land and their relationships with these territories from exploitation by settlers. However, invested in the (re)production of their *imago* and of settler colonialism's dispossessive drives, settlers construe these defensive actions by indigenous peoples as an immediate violence to themselves, their livelihoods, and their community. As Paulette Regan suggests:

> in a new imperial arena of backlash politics, Indigenous people's activism regarding their rights is increasingly categorized as domestic terrorism or criminal activity. Non-violent political dissent is often dismissed as the irrational or reactionary behaviour of a disgruntled minority that stands in the way of progressive socio-economic development.[58]

Unintelligible within the discourses and processes of settler colonization, indigenous peoples are resignified within those discourses as exemplifying monstrous deviants who threaten the presumably 'innocent' and 'law abiding' subjects of settler colonialism. Even where discourses of securitization are not deployed to subvert indigenous peoples' actions, neoliberalized discourses provide settlers with an apparently neutral and common sensical disposition by which to re-present decolonial struggles as the "over-entitlement" of indigenous "minority" groups, seeking to advance their personal interests at the expense of others.[59] Both these (re)figurations of the indigenous other come as neoliberalization increases the genuine sense of precarity within settler communities. Thus, when indigenous peoples rise into visibility through their decolonial struggles, they are figured within the settler imaginary as an imminent threat.

This fear of the indigenous other, though it emerges from imaginary figurations that distort and demonize real living people(s), is neither naïve nor innocent. In *The Wages of Whiteness*, David Roediger observes that very often within Marxist and other critical traditions there is a tendency to assume the "logic of trickle down racism".[60] By this he points to the proclivity that academics and activists have towards re-presenting working and poor white settlers as the passive recipients of white supremacist - and, I suggest as a necessary supplement, settler colonial - dispositions, which are foisted on them by the powerful. Contrary to this tendency, white settlers must be understood as historical subjects who, though constrained and flanked by power, act to reproduce systems of oppression that stabilize the relative privileges afforded them. As Roediger notes, white settlers are not passively manipulated into embracing white supremacism (and settler coloniality) as a matter of 'false consciousness'; rather, their

very consciousness is constituted through processes of subjectification which infold the subject with a disposition that "embraces, adopts and, at times, murderously acts" to sustain regimes of power that provide their social existence and intelligibility.[61] Bedford and Irving similarly note that the livelihoods of working settlers within the settler colonial economy are presently constructed as "dependent upon continuing exploitation of natural resources", and therefore on the unavowed but reiterative dispossession of indigenous peoples.[62] Thus, as indigenous peoples affirm their sovereign relationships with the territories of Turtle Island, and defend these lands from continued exploitation and destruction, the material and psychic investments maintained by the neoliberal settler are threatened and settler *ressentiment* is mobilized in visceral denials of indigenous peoples' sovereignty.

Settlers' uneasiness, and their rancorous reactions to the decolonial work being done by indigenous peoples, are powerful signals that these struggles are already more than a simple metaphor. Although it is imperative that settler rancour and aggression be curtailed and defused, the discomfort of settlers is an inevitable, and ultimately necessary, effect of decolonial work. Eva Mackey notes that "decolonization entails uncertainty" for settlers as it is, by definition, a disruption and rejection of the regularities and certainties of settler life that the processes of neoliberalized settler colonial dispossession continually strive to stabilize.[63] The various social, political, and economic systems of colonialism function to reproduce settler certainty, by operationalizing the structural violences that displace indigenous peoples - as well as a host of other communities.

In the words of Moreton-Robinson, the settler colony's "regulatory mechanisms" are always already "busy reaffirming and reproducing" the certainty of settler possession - that is,

reproducing indigenous peoples' dispossession.[64] For instance, as I discussed in chapter one, the laws of the settler colony actively ensure that settlers remain certain in their property rights, even when said property is situated over the bones of the Anishinaabek. Thus, as Mackey suggests, when considered only within the logics of ongoing settler colonization, the anger and anxiety that is revealed in settlers' responses to indigenous peoples' assertions of sovereignty would of course "be seen as normal".[65] Indigenous peoples' insistence on their visibility within the settler colony and affirmation of their sovereignty and ways of being as distinct from those of settlers disrupts the reproduction of settler subjectivities, threatening the dissolution of psyches that remain invested in historic and ongoing processes of colonization. Successful decolonial work within settler communities is thus a process of desubjectification. That is, of having the concept of the self disjointed, of disrupting comfortable or convenient notions of oneself as not being implicated in systems of oppression or violence, and of grappling with the ethical and political imperative of restoring proper treaty relationships with those communities whose dispossession has been the basis of settler comfort. Emma Lowman and Adam Barker insist that, as it necessarily requires that settlers recognize themselves as "personally and collectively involved and responsible for indefensible acts of cruelty and greed", decolonial work requires the discomfort of settlers.[66]

The demand that settlers come to recognize themselves as the beneficiaries and subjects of enormously and inherently oppressive power is no less pressing, even as it has now temporally converged with a growing sense amongst many settler communities that they are increasingly being victimized and disadvantaged. It does, however, mean that within the settler imaginary assertive indigenous people(s) are all too easily collapsed into the agential position

that is presumed to be responsible for the sense of precarity that is accrued through neoliberalization. In this way, the assertions of indigenous peoples' sovereignties are (re)imagined as the cause of working and poor settlers' hurt, rather than as a potential line of decolonial solidarity by which to resist regimes of dispossession. Settler *ressentiment* thus fulfills its "prudential, strategic, even ruthlessly clever" role by ensuring the "self-preservation" of the neoliberal settler's psyche.[67] With this refiguration of indigenous peoples as the cause of social disturbance, settlers escape the painful introspection that is required to actually grapple with decolonial assertions. Additionally, however, because indigenous peoples are figured as the cause of settlers' sense of injury, settlers also need not confront the ways in which their sustained material and psychic investments in neoliberalized settler colonialism are largely responsible for facilitating the unabated processes of dispossession that now threaten their own livelihoods. The *ressentiment*-filled neoliberal settler thus disavows their own position of privilege, while simultaneously reinvesting themselves in the very regimes of power that are productive of their sense of hurt, in order to punish and discipline indigenous peoples who continue to dissent from such regimes. Moreton-Robinson suggests that this acts as a mechanism by which "to protect one's perception of self and reality from an overwhelming trauma" that threatens to dissolve a comfortable self-image.[68] Ironically, this defence mechanism ultimately preserves the processes of neoliberalization, making the dissolution of the structuring phantasm of the middle class settler an inevitability - even if decolonial struggles were totally absent.

Thus, even as neoliberalization modifies settler colonialism, expanding the effects of the dispossessive drive into settler communities, settlers nevertheless actively reaffirm and re-entrench the very processes that are beginning to cause them such injury. As settlers' (self-)

affirmation leaves undisturbed the ongoing regimes of dispossession, they continue to exact enormous cruelty and suffering on indigenous peoples, as well as many other marginalized communities. Crucially, this is not, as some suggest, primarily the result of a volitional desire to maintain one's position within a hierarchical order of power.[69] Nor, I believe, is it as simple as the classic Marxist suggestion that such settlers suffer from a false consciousness. Rather, this inability or unwillingness to reject neoliberal settler colonial power emerges from the very process of subject formation itself. As Judith Butler says, the lived and felt experience of being subjected to oppressive power is:

> the paradoxical effect of a regime of power in which the very 'conditions of existence,' the possibility of continuing as a recognizable social being, requires the formation and maintenance of the subject in subordination.[70]

Failure to turn away from neoliberal settler coloniality is thus not an act of false consciousness, but rather the precondition for the continuity of the neoliberal settler's consciousness as such. To make such a turn against constitutive regimes of power, or to be forced into one, prompts aggression in the face of a dissolution of the self, as the psychic horizon of the settler is irreparably negated. The neoliberal settler is thus fuelled by *ressentiment* and unable to either contest or avow power with a radical imagination, this subject nevertheless persists in a willful state that continually denies and aggressively targets all those who seek to disrupt and redistribute power. Across Turtle Island, sovereign indigenous peoples are continually made the objects of such aggression. In the final two sections I discuss how settler *ressentiment* is politically mobilized against the Anishinaabek of the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula.

Anishinaabe Sovereignty and the Marketing of Hate:

In what remains of this final chapter, I localize my analysis, considering two prominent cases wherein settlers in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound attempt to disrupt Anishinaabe sovereignty, and how their sense of *ressentiment* boils over into a rancorous and reactionary politics that continually disavows the possibility of a decolonial future. In this section, I discuss the infamous "Summer of Hate" that occurred on the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula in 1995.[71] First, to provide context, I briefly discuss the history of events leading up to *R v. Jones and Nadjiwon* (1993), before considering how even the rather constrained decision offered by Judge Fairgrieve exacerbated the anxiety of settlers on and around the Peninsula. I explore how this anxiety materialized in the visceral and often violent ways in which local settlers sought to deny Anishinaabek sovereignty in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound. In particular, I return to a discussion of the confrontation between the mob of settlers and Yolanda Jones at the Owen Sound Farmers' Market.

The first *Fisheries Act* in British North America was passed in 1857. As if by a perversion of providence, this coincides almost precisely with the forcible removal of the Saugeen Anishinaabek from Nawash Village along shore of *Chi-wikwedong* (Owen Sound Bay) to *Neyaashiinigamiing*. Under the *Act*, settlers throughout what would shortly become Canada were granted 'public' access to navigable waterways for the purposes of fishing. Importantly, this newly constituted public right to access waterways was developed as though it existed within a vacuum. Even the extremely constrained rights that ought to have been recognized under settler law as accruing to various indigenous peoples by virtue of their treaties with the Crown were largely ignored; settler sovereignty over the water was presumed though never proven within the

legislation, as treaties received no mention in the text of the *Fisheries Act*.[72] This, despite the fact that for the Saugeen Anishinaabek - and this is likely true across much of Turtle Island - nothing within the various treaties exacted by the Crown could possibly be even misconstrued as surrendering any rights to the waters of their territories. Indeed, quite the opposite is true. As legally suspect as the various treaties regarding the territories on and around the Peninsula are, even from within colonial law, with each new compact, the Saugeen Anishinaabek were reassured of their unimpeded fishing rights.[73]

In spite of these assurances, however, the nearly unconstrained access granted by the *Fisheries Act* (1857), and its subsequent amendments, meant that settler encroachment was rampant and the Anishinaabek were largely displaced from their fisheries. It was not until 1984 that settler exploitation of aquatic resources was legislatively curbed. As fish stocks neared collapse, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) introduced a quota system designed to limit the total allowable catch. Under this new quota system the Saugeen Anishinaabek's access to their fisheries was severely limited in a number of ways. In the first instance, of the two reserve communities on the Peninsula, only the Chippewas of Nawash were granted a license and allowable catch - Saugeen First Nation was excluded entirely. Moreover, the license that was issued amounted to only two percent of the total allowable catch and restricted fishing to a "postage-sized area adjacent to" *Neyaashiinigamiing*.[74] As a result of these restrictions, it was all too common for Anishinaabe fishers to be found violating their allowable catch and to be fined or tried as a result.[75] These legalized indignities continued apace until a decision was made to contest the constitutionality of the quota system's application to the Saugeen Anishinaabek. In 1992, charges of exceeding quota were laid against fisherman Francis Nadjiwon and former

Chief of *Neyaashiinigamiing* Howard Jones; rather than pay the fine or capitulate to jail-time, the community was determined to prove their unimpeded claim to the waters around the Peninsula.[76]

At trial, the Anishinaabek did not contest the facts of their having violated the MNR imposed quota, in fact, they acceded to this. Instead, in *R v. Jones and Nadjiwon* the defence rested their case on the assertion that the MNR had no jurisdictional or constitutional authority by which to impose a quota of allowable catch on the Saugeen Anishinaabek. This defence was predicated on the fact that treaties regarding the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula could not be construed as even tangentially diminishing the Saugeen Anishinaabek's sovereignty over said waters.[77] Given the enormity of the evidence presented, and following the precedent established in *R v. Sparrow* (1990), Judge Fairgrieve recognized that the Saugeen Anishinaabek hold "priority [access to the fisheries] over all other groups after conservation needs [are] met" and, as such, that the MNR quotas were unconstitutional and represented an undue burden.[78]

While Fairgrieve declined to acknowledge that his ruling proved the continuity of the Saugeen Anishinaabek as a sovereign people in distinct relationship with the Crown, he nonetheless berated the government of Ontario for persisting in a "high-handed and adversarial approach" to negotiations.[79] Despite being a resounding victory in the fight to end the crushing quota system, the ambiguity that Fairgrieve's ruling sustained in relation to the issue of jurisdictional authority over the fisheries led to widely divergent interpretations. From the perspective of the MNR, this ruling is interpreted as requiring the Ministry to "negotiate fish quotas" with indigenous peoples, but in no way opens a "debate over jurisdictional issues" regarding ownership of the fisheries themselves.[80] Conversely, the Chippewas of Nawash assert that the Fairgrieve ruling, and the subsequent fishing agreement it necessitated, "did *not extend*"

any rights to the Saugeen Anishinaabek; rather, that "those rights existed before contact" and now merely acquired formal acknowledgement within settler law by effect of the judge's decision.[81] Regardless of subsequent interpretations, the fact remains that *R v. Jones and Nadjiwon* effectively curtailed the MNR's usage of quota systems as technologies to marginalize indigenous fishers throughout the province, and partially removed the threat of the settler state's immanent sanction or use of violence against indigenous people(s) exercising sovereignty over their waters. While the Fairgrieve decision was cause for at least moderate celebration at both Saugeen and *Neyaashiinigamiing*, it was a source of immediate consternation amongst settlers, inciting enormous and rancorous backlash up and down the Peninsula. Following *R v. Jones and Nadjiwon*, Rick Wallace notes that "the local situation became increasingly violent."[82]

Now, it is important to note that the decision itself did not cause settler anger and hatred to develop. Rather, it mobilized what is always already only partially concealed within the settler community and within the subjectivities of settlers themselves. As the Chippewas of Nawash suggest in their second report to the Ipperwash Inquiry, *Encountering the Other*, it is unlikely that court decisions themselves are to blame for clashes between settlers and indigenous peoples. Such backlash emerges from a "people who are so stuck in their own bred-in-the-bone understanding of things, that they cannot or will not see the Other except as their Adversary."[83] Despite the admittedly limited terms of the Fairgrieve ruling, the space of Anishinaabek sovereignty that it evidenced was imagined by settlers as an imminent threat to their own way of life. Hunting and gaming associations that predominantly represent local settlers asserted that the rights implied in *R v. Jones and Nadjiwon* would "ruin the economic boon" that hunting and angling activities, in particular a series of yearly derbies, brought to the area.[84] Quite clearly, the

already problematic nature of the local economy, which was undergoing neoliberalization, and the sense of precarity that many settlers in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound were already experiencing, made for a climate in which anti-indigenous hatred - always latent within the processes of settler colonization - could thrive in the open largely unchecked.

Throughout the 1990s, the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters (OFAH) sought to capitalize on the roiling tension that existed even prior to the Fairgrieve ruling, spreading a campaign of misinformation intended to provoke settlers into confrontation with indigenous peoples who dared assert their sovereignty. Information booklets distributed prior to an OFAH-sponsored conference in 1992 asserted that the NDP government of Ontario was in the process of capitulating to a plot by indigenous peoples throughout the province. The government's supposed agenda was "to turn over management and control of many of *your* natural resources to the Natives of Ontario."[85] Speaking at that same conference, Phil Morlock, then the Director of the Shimano Sport Fisheries Initiative, suggested in his address that the government was intent on bringing "apartheid to Ontario with personal rights defined by heritage."[86] This hyperbolic, and frankly imbecilic, *ressentiment*-fuelled rhetoric was common despite the fact that the government continued in the colonial tradition of effectively denying the Saugeen Anishinaabek's title to the waters around the Peninsula when it forced Jones and Nadjiwon into lengthy court proceedings in order to prove said title and, following the ruling, only recognized the need for consultations rather than full Anishinaabek sovereignty.

In order to reproduce the conditions of settler colonization, and to reinscribe the underlying sovereignty of the Crown, court rulings maintain a logic which is internally consistent with their own precedent and with the presumption of underlying Crown sovereignty. In the case

of *R v. Jones and Nadjiwon*, this meant recognizing, in however limited a fashion, the existence of persistent rights that accrue to the Saugeen Anishinaabek within the confines of settler law and sovereignty - which the province interprets only as a duty to consult on fisheries issues. Yet, to achieve this internal consistency requires that the courts modify, even minutely, the technologies and discourses by which they seek to maintain the processes of settler colonization. Given that the political climate of the area was already so deeply saturated with this barely constrained anti-indigenous hatred, Fairgrieve's decision in favour of the Anishinaabek hit settlers like a clap of thunder. David McLaren suggests that the results of *R v. Jones and Nadjiwon* "turned everything upside down for the sportsmen and for the MNR", as they could no longer use the shield of legality to justify their intransigence.[87]

This modification represents a potentially schismatic moment in the (re)production of settler subjects, as it can easily feel to those subjects, who are "long accustomed to government policies that routinely reproduce dominant attitudes and interests" in their favour, as though they were themselves under attack.[88] Such rulings are thus re-presented within the settler imaginary as inherently unjust in their divergence from discourses of difference-blind equality and supposed endowment of indigenous people(s) with 'special' or 'race-based' rights. This spectral figure of special rights is then contrasted against the phantasmatic figure of the struggling and unassisted settler (always unnameable as such) who, through hard work, earns their keep. So, while the court's ruling reinscribed settler colonization, the disjunction that is created within the settler psyche, through modifications in colonizing processes and discourses, produces a space in which settlers might disidentify themselves with the institutions of the settler colony. This is a space, however, that is also all too easily filled by aggressive and reactionary elements.

There is a seemingly endless stream of events from this time that could exemplify the ways in which settler *ressentiment* mobilizes into actions of rancour and recrimination against the Saugeen Anishinaabek and, unfortunately, there appears to be no abatement of such instances anytime in the near present either.[89] That said, I now return to the particular confrontation I described at the outset of this chapter. The rancorous crowd of sportsmen that marched through the Farmers' Market in the summer of 1995, was determined to express their sense of anger and frustration over the Fairgrieve ruling by physically intimidating Yolanda Jones and her daughter. Numbering almost one hundred people and led by prominent community members, including then MPP Bill Murdoch, there is no doubt that they represented a serious threat to the bodily and psychological security of these women. The actions of these settlers is evidence of a deep-seated sense of *ressentiment*, and of an possessive entitlement, which became politically mobilized in response to the assertion of the Saugeen Anishinaabek's sovereignty over waters which settlers' had comfortably presumed where theirs by right.

No doubt the presence of Anishinaabe fishers in waters from which they had been excluded for years, and of Yolanda Jones at the Farmers' Market, an epicentre of settler community and commerce, represented a serious psychic trauma to settlers whose sense of place and of self is largely dependent upon the production of an *imago* that strives to psychically erase indigenous peoples and then to disappear the processes of settler colonization. Seen by settlers as eruptions, rather than part of a long history of resistance to colonization, assertions of indigenous peoples' sovereignty threaten to implode what Mackey refers to as the "structures of feeling" that underpin and normalize colonization.[90] This, at the very moment when settlers are already experiencing an unaccustomed sense of precarity as the regimes of dispossession that fuel the

neoliberalized economy expand, impoverishing their own communities. In the face of forces potentiating the dissolution of the subject themselves, the *ressentiment*-filled settler seeks to regain a sense of control - and of themselves - by (re)affirming dominant and domineering structures of power. It is of little surprise then, that what Wallace describes as the mob's "violent disruption of community space" was led by a "small local elite of men" intent on proving the continuity of their authority and supremacy by materially enacting it through their physical intimidation of Jones and her child.[91]

While those who led the mob were, in Jones' own words, "pillars of the community", it is critical to recognize that they did not act because they were impelled to do so by their institutional roles.[92] Rather, they, like generations of settlers before them, acted from a sense of personal agency and from a position that presumes a right of possession that escapes pure intentionality. Their actions invoke those of the settler mob that assaulted Laurance Oliphant more than a century before, which I discussed in chapter one. Yet, the presence of MPP Bill Murdoch at the head of the crowd poses a particularly interesting theoretical question, as the Crown's representative is no longer assaulted by the mob but leads it instead. How then is Murdoch, as a public figure of relatively high office, positioned within this scene? A ready answer would be to suggest that Murdoch's position in the crowd, as the holder of public office, signifies the presence of the settler state within the body of the mob. The office that Murdoch held has historically, and to this day, been responsible for ensuring an at least tangential connection between the Crown and the territories of the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula. This then implies that, as they marched towards Yolanda Jones' stall, all the historic and contemporary

technologies used by the settler state throughout colonization, as well as its ongoing efforts to assert the supremacy of the Crown, marched with the mob in the figure of Murdoch.

This is quite a compelling interpretation, as it accounts for the evident confidence and bravado of the rabble - assured of their support from on high. I want to suggest, however, that if Murdoch's presence in this scene is worthy of remark because he was a holder of public office at the time, the focus of such an analysis ought to rest more fully on the *public* that Murdoch manifests than on the *office* he holds. I posit that, rather than the state, the phantasmatic body whose absent presence is suggested by Murdoch's corporeal position at the site of confrontation is the *demos* of the settler colony itself.[93] Murdoch em-bodies - is at once within the body and a signification of that whole body - the corpus of the public itself. As the rancorous mob of settlers pressed down upon Jones and her allies, the presence of Murdoch within their midst added exponential weight to this scene, as he signified the presence of the entirety of the public constituted by his authority as their representative. Through this menacing act, the mob - carrying within itself the entirety of the settler *demos* of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound - reasserted the principle coordinates of neoliberalized settler colonization. The violence implied and enacted by the presence of this rancorous rabble at the Market, itself obviously located on the territories of the Saugeen Anishinaabek, belies an unavowed presumption of mastery of place, interlocution, and commerce, which they endeavoured to inscribe upon the vulnerabilized body of Yolanda Jones.[94]

On the Shores of Anger:

In this final section I discuss the refusal of settlers in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound to uphold even the most explicit terms of the treaties between the Crown and the Saugeen Anishinaabek, let

alone the spirit of a treaty relationship.[95] My analysis focuses on the ongoing dispute between the Town of South Bruce Peninsula (SBP) and Saugeen First Nation over ownership of Sauble Beach. I suggest that, by their actions in this dispute, the settlers of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound and their municipal representatives reproduce the processes of settler colonial dispossession in ways that exceed even the rapacity of the settler state. By rejecting the settler state's recognition of Saugeen First Nation's specific claim under Treaty 72 (1854), settlers in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound endeavour to dispossess the Saugeen Anishinaabek of important portions of the reserve which even the Crown has established as congruent with its own colonial sovereignty. As such, I discuss the history most relevant to the current dispute, up to and including the proposed agreement which was negotiated prior to the SBP municipal elections in fall 2014. Following this, I discuss the refusal of local settlers to engage in even a very limited form of reconciliatory politics, and their turn towards a rancorous reinscription of settler colonial power. Finally, I consider the manner in which Sauble Beach has been appropriated into the settler imaginary as a canvass for colonial fantasies.

As I discussed with greater detail in chapter one, sustained settlement of Europeans in Saugeen Anishinaabek territories followed the signing of Treaty 45 1/2 (1836). Despite the fact that the Crown coerced the Anishinaabek into negotiations, and that the validity of the terms in Treaty 45 1/2 are - at best - spurious, even from the colonially constrained perspective of the Royal Proclamation (1763), many of the Saugeen Anishinaabek continue to affirm that they are part of an historically neglected but still unfolding treaty-relationship with the settlers in their territories. Former Chief Vernon Roote of Saugeen First Nation asserts that the spirit in which the initial treaties were approached implied the necessity of an ongoing relationship predicated on a

sharing of the land and its wealth between the sovereign Anishinaabek and their settler guests. He notes that, regardless of how subsequent generations have behaved, this principle of reciprocity remains the foundation of a proper treaty-relationship and the recognition of this is a necessary first step for settlers towards redressing themselves and their ongoing role in settler colonization, to the Anishinaabek.[96] Despite having such a willing and generous interlocutor in Chief Roote, settlers in SBP, which is directly adjacent to Saugeen First Nation, obstinately refuse to accede to even the most miserly interpretation of the treaties, if that should require any admission of wrong-doing or the slightest diminution in their presumptive right to possession of the beach.

The current dispute, threatening to boil over in ways not dissimilar to the events of the 1990s, can be traced back at least to the signing of Treaty 72 (1854). Under that Treaty, which the Crown took to justify settlement throughout the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula, five reserves were established. This Treaty created a reserve around the Chippewa Hill settlement and it is today known as Saugeen First Nation. The Treaty itself explicitly demarcates three boundaries enclosing this reserve, the fourth being the shoreline of Lake Huron. The Treaty delineates the eastern boundary only after establishing the southern and western boundaries, demarcating it:

> by a line drawn from a spot upon the coast at a distance of about (9 1/2) nine miles and a half from the western boundary aforesaid, and running parallel hereto until it touches the aforementioned northern limits of the recently surrendered strip…[97]

By this description the northeastern limit of the Saugeen reserve was set at the tip of a narrow strip of shoreline ending just south of the Sauble River, roughly adjacent to what is today 6th Street North, in Sauble Beach. In enclosing the land around the newly constituted reserve, the

Crown issued private landholder patents on lots running along the eastern edge of the reserve. Mindful that the reserve extended along the shoreline, the patents issued on the lots abutting the northeastern-most corner of the reserve do not indicate that private ownership extends to the water's edge, as to do so would encroach on the Saugeen reserve.[98] Despite this deliberate exclusion, it became common practice for the settlers who acquired plots along the northeastern must edge of the reserve, near the shoreline, to behave as though their property extends to the water. From as early as the 1890s, and regularly thereafter, Saugeen First Nation has written to the Crown in objection to settlers' encroachments upon the reserve lands guaranteed to them in the terms of Treaty 72 (1854).[99]

While Saugeen First Nation never ceased in its protestations over settler encroachments, settlers have progressively either repressed or genuinely forgotten where the border of the reserve is in actuality. Today, settlers have materially and psychically positioned the northeastern border of the Saugeen reserve on the southern side of Main Street in Sauble Beach - nearly two kilometres south of 6th Street North. Indeed, for several generations the shoreline from Main Street north to the south-side of Chief's Point has been billed by SBP and local businesses as Canada's best public freshwater beach - thoroughly occluding the fact that it remains reserve land. With a year-round population of just over three hundred residents, the summer population of Sauble Beach swells to thirty thousand - some estimate sixty thousand on holiday weekends.[100] Clearly, sustaining this encroachment on the Saugeen reserve has been quite a lucrative venture for many settlers, who depend upon this undisrupted waterfront access in order to attract tourists, the only source of substantive economic growth in the area. The ongoing invasion of their reserve has not, however, been a particularly beneficial arrangement for the

Saugeen First Nation. Having received no assistance from the Crown in halting the continuous and annually exacerbated encroachment of settlers on the reserve, Saugeen filed for litigation on the issue in 1990. Forced into consideration of the matter, and after conducting what it describes as "considerable factual and legal research", the federal government determined the only prudential course of action under the terms of Treaty 72 was to support Saugeen First Nation's nearly one hundred year old assertion that the northeastern edge of the reserve extends to present-day 6th Street North in Sauble Beach.[101]

Perhaps because of this signal from the Crown, in 2013 the province and SBP municipality began negotiating with Saugeen First Nation and the federal government in order to mediate an agreement. After nearly eighteen months of talks, the following terms were established. First, the northeastern border of the Saugeen reserve was acknowledged to have been set by Treaty 72 at roughly 6th Street North and, pursuant to this, Saugeen First Nation holds undisputed ownership to an additional two kilometres of waterfront north of the currently enacted boundary which has been wrongly presumed as Main Street. Second, in acknowledging Saugeen's ownership, the settlement went on to assure unimpeded "public access" to the beach in a manner consistent with current expectations. To ensure mutual benefit, the third stipulation of the settlement established joint management of the beach between Saugeen First Nation and SBP, with a stipend of five million dollars contributed to SBP by the federal and provincial governments in order to offset the municipality's cost in co-managing.[102] By protecting tourism through the assurance of continued public access and a substantial financial transfer from senior levels of government, this was likely the best outcome for the settlers of SBP.

Whether this agreement - limited as it was - could have pointed the relationship between local settlers and the Saugeen Anishinaabek in a more cooperative direction is a question that will never be answered, because the representatives of SBP walked away from the deal in its entirety. In the fall of 2014, only months after the proposed agreement was reached, a municipal election was held. SBP Council faced an electorate incensed over the terms that had been negotiated with Saugeen. A citizens' group styling themselves as the "Friends of Sauble Beach" formed in open opposition to the council and to the agreement they had negotiated. At public meetings, ostensibly held to provide information on the agreement but in fact acting as convenient space for electioneering and fear-mongering, the Friends of Sauble Beach repeatedly asserted that they feared the current Council was planning to "just give our beach away".[103] Perhaps the most virulent propagator of this campaign of fear and misinformation is Craig Gammie, who has delivered keynote addresses at meetings sponsored by the Friends of Sauble Beach, at one event he addressed a crowd of around five hundred residents. In this particular address, Gammie insisted that he had evidence to support the position that, in his words, "the reserve ends at Main St" - at once invoking the exclusion the Saugeen Anishinaabek from a spatial location, as well as from the clichéd synecdoche of middle class livelihoods.[104]

Facing this insurgent campaign, and a public increasingly hostile towards any agreement, SBP Council backed away from the deal, passing a resolution that tabled any discussions until after the election. Such discussions were, however, tabled indefinitely when a new Council was returned by the electorate. This Council was comprised largely of candidates who had supported the Friends of Sauble Beach to varying degrees - Gammie himself won office. Harnessing settler *ressentiment* into politically mobilized fear and anger, the SBP Council promptly cancelled the

agreement with Saugeen and hired new representation as they planned to proceed to litigation.[105] Chief Roote describes the Janus-faced actions of settlers and their representatives as a "slap in the mouth" and suggests that, while Saugeen remains open to negotiating co-management plans, there is no question over the ownership of the beach.[106] By refusing to adhere to the terms of an agreement that would have addressed a well established and longstanding wrong, the settlers of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound and their representatives have chosen instead to continue in a self-poisoning of their relationship with the Saugeen Anishinaabek. While the result of litigation is readily foreseeable, and Saugeen is almost certain to be affirmed in their claim of ownership, settlers have chosen to belligerently insist upon the supposition that they, and they alone, have a right to possess the beach.

The case of Sauble Beach represents the all too common occurrence of unbridled and affectively aggressive settler *ressentiment* that is consistently (re)activated as indigenous peoples assert their sovereignty across Turtle Island and when settlers feel their sense of possession disrupted by the forces of neoliberalization. Moreton-Robinson observes the same phenomenon in Australia, where settler anger and fear in the face of precarious situations are easily "deployed as a tool to mobilize public support" for political movements that all but explicitly announce their intention to violently reinscribe settler colonization.[107] Statements made by Dave Dobson, the sole private landholder implicated in the Sauble dispute, exemplify how the very possibility that indigenous peoples' claims are valid - even from *within* settler law, which is to say *without* dislodging the presumed supremacy of the Crown's underlying sovereignty - is taken into the settler imaginary as evidence of an immediate and rapacious threat. Dobson asserts that, if the Crown does not uphold his patent in the face of Saugeen's claim, then "all legal title to properties

in Canada could be worthless if caught up in a native claim."[108] Dobson thus positions Saugeen First Nation and their specific claim to Sauble Beach, a claim which is already constrained by the inherently colonial limitations of the settler state's legal system, as a synecdochical representation of the threat posed to each and every Canadian by each and every assertion of indigenous peoples' sovereignty. Indeed, within the settler imaginary even this limited claim is (re)constructed as a threat to the processes of settler colonization and thus to the neoliberal settler themselves, though this is unnameable as such from within settler discourses.

Importantly, settlers like Dobson figure this spectral threat as emerging because of the supposed inaction, permissibility, or liberality of the Crown in the face of indigenous peoples' claims. Within the settler imaginary, even the colonial technologies that Coulthard calls the "politics of recognition", with their pluralistic attempts to reconcile "Indigenous assertions of nationhood with settler-state sovereignty", are figured as an imminent threat to settlers themselves.[109] The settler state's move to acknowledge the existence of specific and limited claims by indigenous communities - critically, never acknowledging the existence of a *people* or nation in the process - is meant to render indigenous claims congruent with the reproduction of "configurations of colonialist, racist, patriarchal state power".[110] Yet, within the neoliberal settler imaginary, the state's actions are refigured as extending 'special' rights or privileges to some while excluding others, and thus as a betrayal of the basic precepts of difference-blind equality. From their perspective, the very stability of the regime of rights that settlers have relied upon to reproduce the apparent certainty of their collective and individual proprietorships is brought into question.

The turn by the neoliberal settler state towards a politics of recognition, though it sustains settler colonialism, engenders yet another schismatic moment in the reproduction of settler subjectivities. That settlers perceive threat and betrayal by their own settler state in its extension of even limited forms of recognition - even when it occurs without disrupting colonial claims to sovereignty - evidences what Lorenzo Veracini describes as settlers' "paranoiac imaginings of a conspiracy" to cause them injury or degradation.[111] That subjects other than the unnamed and unmarked figure of the settler are recognized to exist within the colony invokes a psychic disintegration within the settler. Recognition of even neutralized differences is (re)imagined by settlers - as the OFAH exemplified in the 1990s - as the first step on the road to an apartheid-style state wherein settlers fear that they will become the subjugated population. This peremptory fear reanimates the spectre of an egregious injury and of a guilty agent behind the forthcoming persecution - the bearer of these 'special' rights. Thus, the neoliberal settler remains invested in sustaining a modality of settler colonization that exceeds even the state in the aggression with which they deny indigenous peoples' claims and the rancour they display in the face of indigenous peoples' sovereignty.

While the settler state now strives to reproduce the conditions of neoliberalized settler colonization through the recognition of a neutralized and manageable variety of indigenous difference, even such limited recognition is fundamentally anathema to the neoliberal settler. The reproducibility of neoliberal settlers' subjectivities remains predicated on the total disavowal, or visceral rejection, of indigenous peoples' ongoing presences and their sovereignty. This is evidenced by the ways in which the Friends of Sauble Beach discursively reimagine the site of their conflict with Saugeen First Nation. In almost all of their informational meetings and

documents this group of self-organized settlers warn against the move by SBP Council to "just give *our* beach away".[112] Here we see the unremarked presumption of settler possession and, although they are not explicit about the matter, a curious and indeterminate assertion that this group represents the true friends of "Sauble Beach". Is their friendship extended to the beach itself as a fact of the physical landscape; in which case perhaps this is something of a colonial ecology movement? Instead, perhaps they mean to befriend the legal body that is the town of Sauble Beach; although, given their aggressive stance against SBP Council, would this not require that they articulate some higher principle beyond the institutions of government which they believe the town represents or to which it aspires? If so, they likely mobilize the *idea* of Sauble Beach as an idyllic destination for tourists, thereby relying on the nostalgic image of a past that is outside of this possessional dispute and that was only ever present within a colonially and racially exclusive imagination.[113] More still, perhaps they mean the literal people of Sauble Beach? Such an interpretation would, however, then require admission that, from the Friends' perspective, the Saugeen Anishinaabek are necessarily excluded from the category of 'people' along the beach warranting inclusion in the fold of friendship.

Set in explicit opposition to Saugeen's ownership, the possessive pronoun mobilized by the Friends' appellation of '*our*' beach is thus, in each possible permutation, a collective determiner constituted through the necessary and near total exclusion of the Saugeen Anishinaabek, who are thus both psychically and "physically erased from the beach" within the "colonial imagination".[114] Here, we see that possession of the beach by settlers - and settlers alone - is presumed and pursued in rejection of even the limited terms of recognition recently established into settler law by the colonizing power of the Crown. That is, a rejection of any

'our' that might include Anishinaabek difference - even a difference rendered neutral and amenable to the Crown's presumption of sovereignty. Saugeen's claim to the beach based on the terms of Treaty 72 and as interpreted through settler law - setting aside the continuous presence of the Anishinaabek since time immemorial as a sovereign body exceeding and preceding that law - is nevertheless rendered thoroughly invisible, inarticulable, and, perhaps, antithetical to the principles of 'friendship' constituted and rancorously defended by the settlers of SBP. As Moreton-Robinson notes, the beach, as a contestable and liminal space, is a site always already constructed through the "epistemological, ontological, and axiological violence" that founds and sustains the settler colony, while this violence is simultaneously made "invisible and negated through performative acts of [settler] possession".[115]

Importantly, this is not to say that settlers do not have genuinely affective connections to Sauble Beach, or to other territories across North America. Rather it is to insist that inasmuch as these connections sustain themselves through a *ressentiment*-fuelled rejection of any and all decolonial projects of asserting indigenous peoples' sovereignty, they remain "premised on the displacement and destruction of Indigenous peoples' pre-existing relationships to place."[116] That is, on the reproduction of settler colonialism. Further, it is also to note that settler rancour and recrimination are exacerbated by the disorienting and disarticulating effects of neoliberalization. Settlers' increasing sense of precarity and subjective dissolution leads them to embrace the sense of certainty and of self-reification that is promised by authoritative and oppressive systems of neoliberalized settler colonialism.

Conclusion:

As we have seen, the subject of neoliberalized settler colonialism is unwilling or unable to engage in critiques or political struggles that aim to redistribute power. The neoliberal settler viscerally defends and reproduces the current field of oppressive and dispossessive power as a matter of psychic necessity and subjective continuity. This turn towards their own subjection results from a continually reiterated subjective reinvestment in a seething and unabated sense of *ressentiment*, which both conditions and structures the neoliberal settler's psyche. More than merely another emotion, Nietzsche observes that *ressentiment* suffuses the very processes of subject formation; investing subjects with an obsessional sense of having been injured and an insatiable, yet unfulfillable, desire to avenge oneself against the supposed injurer.

Under the conditions of neoliberalization, this sense of having been injured is expanded exponentially for settlers, who now become targets of the very processes of dispossession upon which the stability of their possessive presumptions depend. Yet, rather than turn against the injurious processes of neoliberalized settler colonialism and engage in a radical politics of decoloniality, settlers sustain their material and psychic investments in such power by collapsing the cause of their hurt into the figure of indigenous people(s) - who are always already re/ disfigured within the settler imaginary as deviant or monstrous others. Such displacements locate the source of hurt outside of the settler, thus averting the painful process of introspection that might unveil how their investments in and dependencies on oppressive power are ultimately responsible for this sense of injury and growing precarity. Such an unveiling would result in the psychic dissolution of the settler's unavowed but structuring colonial imaginary and, thereby, threaten the very stability of the subject themselves. These displacements lead the settler to

affirm neoliberalized settler colonial power in the face of indigenous peoples' sovereign assertions, in order to shore up their otherwise dissoluble and fragile psyche.

As such, while the process is non-linear and wrought with potential failures, the impoverishing and degrading effects that neoliberalization has had - even within settler communities - only further entrenches settler colonization. This occurs on the relatively apparent level of sustaining and extending the processes at work dispossessing indigenous peoples; but also on the more subtle and insidious level of leading settlers to aggressively reinvest themselves in the processes of neoliberalized settler colonization even as it proves to be the source of their own sense of injury and inevitable abjection. Settler *ressentiment*, as mobilized by the vicissitudes of neoliberalization, is enacted in a localized politics of recrimination and revanchism wherein settlers reject even the colonial politics of recognition in favour of aggressively denying and disrupting indigenous peoples' acts of sovereignty wherever and however they occur, often with a blind rapacity and viscerality that exceeds even the settler state.

Chapter Three Notes:

[1] An excerpt from Rob's poem "Skinner's Bluff". Rob is a settler originally from London, Ontario, who has recently moved to Owen Sound. Rob quickly established himself in the local arts community. In 2015 he was named Poet Laurette for Owen Sound along with Larry Jensen. Rob's work has tended to focus on the history and culture of working class people and the possibilities of solidarities emerging amongst differently situated communities. Rob Rolfe, "Skinner's Bluff," in *Saugeen*, (Toronto: Quattro Books, 2011), 18.
[2] Marilyn Struthers, "Reflections on the Politics of Neighbourliness in Aboriginal/White Alliance-Building from the Fishing Wars of 1995," in *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, Lynne Davis, eds., (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 371. For accounts of this confrontation, please see: Chippewas of Nawash*, Under Siege*, 41. Koenig, *Cultures and Ecologies*, 27. Wallace, *Merging Fires*, 86-89.
[3] Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Mask: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), iBook, 204.
[4] Much of this work is being conducted at the community level, and is thus not necessarily 'citable' in the sense that the academy often demands. It occurs in language groups, in survivor circles, or by practicing ceremonies; and, this work is also occurring on the land, as indigenous people(s) (re)assert their relationship to the territories of Turtle Island. This work is, nevertheless, being pursued within the academy too. One could consider Coulthard's work in *Red Skin* as a very recent example, some other examples include (but certainly are not limited to): Taiaiake Alfred, *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*, (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 1999). Lee Maracle, *Memory Serves: Oratories*, Smaro Kamboureli ed., (Edmonton: NeWest Press, 2015). Leanne Simpson, *Islands of Decolonial Love*, (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2013). Catherine West-Newman, "Anger in Legacies of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and Settler States," *European Journal of Social Theory* 7, no. 2 (2004), http://jstor.org/ (accessed November 24, 2014).
[5] While I believe that this is true for both the left and the right, my discussion in this chapter is largely focused on what are clearly reactionary movements. This is not meant to be an easy out for my analysis but, rather, to reflect the actual political climate in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound today. In the future, I hope to develop this analysis with examples of how even ostensibly progressive or radical politics in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound rely upon articulations of grievance that reify systems of hierarchical power rather than contest them.
[6] Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals* and *Ecce Homo*, trans. Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale, (New York: Vintage Books, 1969), 162-163.
[7] Emphasis original. *ibid*., 74.
[8] While it is necessary to clarify this matter by presenting the development of *ressentiment* relatively schematically, in actuality it is - like all processes of subject formation - always already in the midst of reiterating itself in ways that do not conform rigidly to the system as I present it here.
[9] Emphasis mine. Nietzsche, *Genealogy*, 45.
[10] Famously Nietzsche detested unwonted cruelty. According to many accounts, his last act of lucidity, prior to succumbing to madness, was to throw himself between a coachman and a horse that was being viciously flogged. "Friedreich Nietzsche," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, plato.stanford.edu/entries/nietzsche/ (accessed April 12, 2015).
[11] Simon Glezos, "Brown's Paradox: Speed, *ressentiment* and global politics," *Journal of International Political Theory* 10, no. 2 (2014), 157.
[12] Nietzsche, *Genealogy*, 127.
[13] Robert C. Solomon, *Living With Nietzsche: What the Great 'Immoralist' Has to Teach Us*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 109.
[14] Wendy Brown, *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 67-68.
[15] Nietzsche, *Genealogy*, 127.
[16] Solomon, *Living with Nietzsche*, 90.
[17] *ibid.,* 102.
[18] Brown, *Injury*, 45.
[19] Sugarman, *Against Time*, 34.
[20] Max Scheler, *Ressentiment*, trans. William Holdheim, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), 45.

[21] Richard Ira Sugarman, *Rancor Against Time: The Phenomenology of 'Ressentiment',* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1980), 34. In *Red Skin, White Mask*, much of Coulthard's work in the chapter "Seeing Red" turns on this distinction between resentment and *ressentiment*. The Canadian settler state - and many Canadian settlers themselves - often take the actions of indigenous peoples as evidence of what is here called *ressentiment* - that being a hatred of the world itself. As Coulthard writes "what is treated in the Canadian discourse of reconciliation as an unhealthy and debilitating incapacity to forgive and move on is actually a sign of our *critical consciousness*, of our sense of justice and injustice". In the face of ongoing processes of settler colonization, indigenous peoples express a righteous and powerful indignation - perhaps resentment, but certainly not *ressentiment* - that at once resists colonial violences and affirms the multiplicity of other ways of being in relation to the world. Coulthard, *Red Skin*, 234.
[22] Sugarman, *Against Time,* x-xi. This observation by Sugarman points towards the fundamental problem that so many translations of, and work about, Nietzsche reproduce. He does not set himself against resentment as such. Rather, against its being left to fester and grow unabated. Works that collapse resentment into *ressentiment*, or vice versa, often lose a certain sense of the intransigence that Nietzsche suggests lies at the core of subjects of *ressentiment*. Such works therefore tend to suggest greater and more productive possibilities for engaging *ressentiment* than exist in actuality. For an example of this conflation, please see Solomon, *Living With Nietzsche*.
[23] Sugarman, *Against Time*, 34.
[24] Brown, *Injury*, 72-73. With this image of a wound continually reinfected with the passage time, I cannot help but be reminded of the 'writhing torso' in Richard-Yves Sitoski's poem, which I discussed in chapter two. That lacerated torso, that I suggested must belong to a settler, is perhaps the most direct suggestion that I can marshall as to the investments that settlers continue to sustain in their own sense of having been injured.
[25] Glezos, "Brown's Paradox," 157.
[26] Scheler, *Ressentiment*, 70.
[27] *ibid.,* 49.
[28] William E. Connolly, *Capitalism and Christianity, American Style*, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 58.
[29] For examples, see variously, Nietzsche, *Genealogy*, 38, 44, and 48.
[30] Emphasis original. Scheler, *Ressentiment*, 50.
[31] *ibid.*
[32] David Bedford and Danielle Irving, *The Tragedy of Progress: Marxism, Modernity, and the Aboriginal Question*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2000), 11.
[33] Wendy Brown, *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*, (Brooklyn: Zone Books, 2015), 18, 197, and 216.
[34] Brown, *Injury*, 24-25.
[35] *ibid*., 68.
[36] *ibid.,* 69.
[37] Glezos, "Brown's Paradox," 157.
[38] *ibid.,* 161. One of the primary locations to which this power is relinquished is the settler state; which, as I discussed in the previous chapter with the death of the Keynesian compromise and the neoliberalization of state apparatuses, is increasingly characterized by it's open use of coercive power - even against its own population.
[39] *ibid.,* 160
[40] *ibid.,* 161
[41] William E. Connolly, *The Ethos of Pluralization*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 83.
[42] *ibid.*, 83. In her study of the tendency for poor and working class people to disengage politically, or to vote against their own economic interests, Tina Hilgers suggests that this is not because such people "have no political vision or ideals". Rather, that "justice cannot be eaten" and the promise of filling "immediate needs" through tax cuts or deregulations, are often more enticing than the fulfillment of "long term goals". Tina Hilgers, "Reproducing Neoliberalism: The Power of Canada's Poor," *Canadian Political Science Review* 7, no. 1 (2013), 62.
[43] Tim Fowler, "Neoliberalism, Class and Culture: The 2008 Federal Elections in Canada and the United States," *Socialist Studies* 8, no. 2 (Autumn 2012), 198.
[44] Connolly, *Pluralization,* 83.
[45] Pem Davidson Buck, "Whither Whiteness? Empire, State, and the Re-Ordering of Whiteness," *Journal of the Association of Black Anthropologists* 20, no. 2 (2012), 105-117. Jeffery S. Denis, "Contact Theory in a Small-Town Settler-Colonial Context: The Reproduction of Laissez-Faire Racism in Indigenous-White Canadian Relations," *American Sociological Review* 80, no. 1 (2015), 218-242. Nina Eliasoph, "'Everyday Racism' in a Culture of Political Avoidance: Civil Society, Speech, and Taboo," *Social Problems* 46, no. 4 (1999), 479-502.

[46] Please see, variously: Philip S. Foner and Ronald L. Lewis, Editors, *The Black Worker: A Documentary History from Colonial Times to the Present*, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1978-1984). Jiwu Wang, *'His Dominion' and the 'Yellow Peril': Protestant Missions to the Chinese Immigrants in Canada, 1859-1967*, (Waterloo, ON: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation, 2006).
[47] Brown, *Injury,* 4.
[48] *ibid.,* xi.
[49] *ibid.,* 7.
[50] Glezos, "Brown's Paradox," 161.
[51] Brown, *Injury,* 66.
[52] Emphasis mine. *ibid.,* 26.
[53] Damien W. Riggs and Martha Augoustinos, "The Psychic Life of Colonial Power: Racialised Subjectivites, Bodies and Methods," *Journal of Community & Social Psychology* 15, (2005), 468.
[54] Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015), 36.
[55] *ibid.,* 138. This formula typifies what David Lloyd and Patrick Wolfe call the settler's "psychic 'state of siege'", wherein everyone outside the community of the settler colony - be they indigenous or otherwise - represent a substantial threat to the stability of the colony. Provocatively, they refer to this as the "impeccable logic of the paranoid". David Lloyd and Patrick Wolfe, "Settler colonial logics and the neoliberal regime," *Settler Colonial Studies*, (2015), 6
[56] In his study of hyper-masculinities, whiteness, and gun rights in rural Kansas, Levi Gahman writes that "the increase in fear and anxiety that white people feel often causes them to brand racialized people as criminal, threatening, animalistic, hyper sexual, and aggressive." Levi Gahman, "Gun rites: hegemonic masculinity and neoliberal ideology in rural Kansas," *Gender, Place, and Culture*, 22 no. 9 (2015), 1213. Additionally, Richard Kearney's work on the image and the ethics that emerge from an encounter with the Stranger, have helped to inform my thinking on these issues. Richard Kearney, *Strangers, Gods, and Monsters: Interpreting otherness*, (London: Routledge, 2003).
[57] Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege: How the People of the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation Asserted Their Rights and Claims and Dealt with the Backlash*, (Chippewas of Nawash, 2005), 96. Todd Gordon similarly notes that mobilizations by indigenous peoples throughout Canada have regularly caused "[a]nti-indigenous racism" to "burst into the wide open" for all to see. While I affirm the sentiment that Gordon posits, I question his recourse to the language of racism, as it seems to occlude the colonizing sentiment that is embedded within both racist and (many) anti-racist discourses. Please see the section "Settler Coloniality, a Non-Partisan Policy" in chapter one, for more discussion on this topic. Todd Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, (Winnipeg, Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2010), 105.
[58] Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada,* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), 57. Indeed, as Taiaiake Alfred suggests in his introduction to *Unsettling the Settler Within*, this backlash is not new as indigenous peoples have "always been in the way" of settlers. This resistance certainly persists today, and constitutes "a psychological, or… spiritual, barrier" to unabated settler development. Quoted in *ibid.,* ix.
[59] Rick Wallace, *Merging Fires: Grassroots Peacebuilding Between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Peoples,* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2013), 187. As David Roberts and Minelle Mahtani suggest, neoliberal discourses, in assemblage with systems of white supremacism tend to produce racialized subjects as carriers of "anti-market behaviours" and therefore as "the antithesis of the ideal neoliberal citizen". This is particularly pronounced in the languages of anti-black racism. David J. Roberts and Minelle Mahtani, "Neoliberalizing Race, Racing Neoliberalism: Placing "Race" in Neoliberal Discourses," *Antipode* 42, no. 2 (2010), 249.
[60] David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*, (London: Verso, 2007 [1991]), 9.
[61] *ibid.,* 12. It is worth noting that this formulation is in radical opposition to the way that scholars like Connolly formulate the schism between white workers and the anti-oppression movements of the latter half of the Twentieth Century. In one work Connolly suggests that the movements of the "late sixties onward betrayed the white working class" and, in another, he notes that the refusal to "build a class dimension" into political struggles over racial, gendered, or sexual liberation created an "implicit exemption" of the white male working settler from leftist organizing. However, given Roediger's work, I question Connolly's assumption that the white male settler was closed out. It seems more likely that their investments in certain privileges (along racial, gender, sexual, or colonial lines) paid consistent enough dividends that they reflexively reproduce oppressive power and that such liberatory movements represented a genuine threat to the social/psychic wages of privilege. Please see: Connolly, *Pluralization*, 113. Connolly, *Capitalism and Christianity*, 30.
[62] Bedford and Irving, *Tragedy of Progress*, 13-14.

[63] Eva Mackey, "Unsettling Expectations: (Un)certainty, Settler States of Feeling, Law, and Decolonization," *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 29, no. 2 (2014), 338.
[64] Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*, xi.
[65] Mackey, "Unsettling Expectations," 238.
[66] Emma Battell Lowman, and Adam J. Barker, *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada,* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2015), 21.
[67] Solomon, *Living With Nietzsche*, 102.
[68] Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*, 138.
[69] Here, I distinguish myself from other scholars like Adam Barker, who suggests that: "a member of colonial society is content to be oppressed as long as there is someone else upon whom they can exert power". By my understanding, which is perhaps more analytically precise than Barker's at the cost of being less politically solvent, the way power operates is through the production of subjects with unavowable investments in and dependencies on the reproduction of various regimes of subjugating power. Subjugation is at once oppressive, yet also the necessary condition for the possibility of agential subjects and psychic interiority. Thus, distinct from Barker, I suggest that the reason neoliberal settlers perpetuate oppressive power expresses a non-volitional effort to perpetuate their own subjectivity. As Judith Butler notes, a subject would rather will nothing - a seemingly-nihilistic embrace of their own oppression - than not will at all - by accepting the dissolution of the regimes of power that produce them as politically recognizable and articulable subjects. Adam Barker, "From Adversaries to Allies: Forging Respectful Alliances between Indigenous and Settler Peoples," in *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, Lynne Davis, eds., (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 319. Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 7-15.
[70] This is not to say, however, that change is impossible, for it always already in the making. As subject formation is a reiterative process with no finality, "repetition establishes a domain of risk" as the reiteration of certain normalizing processes may fail or be obstructed. Butler, *Psychic Life*, 27-28.
[71] Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 47.
[72] By the reckoning of the Chippewas of Nawash, the passage of this legislation and the largely unconstrained access that it granted settlers to waterways across the colonized territories, marks the point at which the traditionally bountiful fish stocks began a precipitous decline. *ibid.,* 31.
[73] Polly Keeshig-Tobias, *The Illustrated History of the Chippewas of Nawash,* (Chippewas of Nawash, 1996), 62-63.
[74] Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 31-32. Part of why the quota was set at such a low threshold is because the MNR relied on incomplete data when determining the average annual catch for commercial fishers in the years prior to the quota's 1984 implementation. In the case of the Chippewas of Nawash, the MNR had no data at all between 1977 and 1980 and the calculated average catch was thus artificially deflated, thereby excluding Nawash from much of the quota. *ibid.,*66.
[75] In *Under Siege*, the Chippewas of Nawash write of the almost gleeful satisfaction that some settlers received from using the letter of the law to bludgeon the livelihoods of Anishinaabe people. At a 1988 arraignment of eleven fishers from *Neyaashiinigamiing* for exceeding their allowable catch, Justice of the Peace Ross Forgrave kept the men - some of them of advanced age - "standing for two hours while he lectured them on their abuse" of the fish stocks. This episode reveals the particularly antipathetic manner in which the legal institutions of the settler colony are used to mark out and criminalize indigenous peoples' bodies, and how the veneer of legality and authority can quite easily mask the viscerality of settler's hatred of indigenous peoples. *ibid.,* 32, 37-38.
[76] Keeshig-Tobias, *Illustrated History*, 59.
[77] *ibid*., 60-68. Researchers for the defence entered more than four hundred documents into evidence, proving an uninterrupted sovereign claim to the waters around the Peninsula, see: Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 32-33, 39-41. Bruce Morito, "The Rule of Law and Aboriginal Rights: The Case of the Chippewas of Nawash," *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 29, no. 2 (1999), 263-288. Edwin C. Koenig, *Cultures and Ecologies: A Native Fishing Conflict on the Saugeen-Bruce Peninsula*, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2005), 19-36.
[78] Quoted in: Koenig*, Cultures and Ecologies*, 19.
[79] Quoted in: Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 33. Such refusals to acknowledge the full scope of implications that emerge from rulings like this are not unique to *R v. Jones and Nadjiwon*. As Michael Asch notes, "Canada has made it clear that it will not accept that 'aboriginal rights' include robust political rights, much less any that might call into question the final legislative authority of the Crown." Put differently, while the courts may recognize various cultural, economic, and social rights, they consistently refuse to acknowledge any underlying indigenous sovereignty which may undermine the ultimate jurisdictional authority of the Crown and the courts themselves. Michael Asch, *On Being Here to Stay: Treaties and Aboriginal Rights in Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 11.

[80] Morito, "Rule of Law," 270. This typifies the sort of state-led approach that Coulthard suggests is primarily concerned with "rendering things consistent" with the "unilateral assertion of sovereignty" by the settler colony. Coulthard, *Red Skin*, 201.
[81] Emphasis original, Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 65. Indeed in the years following the Fairgrieve ruling, some leaders of the Saugeen Anishinaabek became even more assertive of their continued sovereignty. In September of 1995, Chief Kahgee of Saugeen First Nation announced the Duluth Declaration, which stated the sovereign claim of the Saugeen Anishinaabek to the waters surrounding the Peninsula, any resources therein, and to the lake bed itself. While a courageous act of sovereignty, the Declaration was not unanimously supported in the communities at either Saugeen or *Neyaashiinigamiing*, and strained relationships within and between the two communities. Perhaps it was viewed by some as too assertive given the intransigence and viciousness that were put on full display by settlers in the area. Koenig, *Cultures and Ecologies*, 24-25.
[82] Wallace, *Merging Fires*, 81.
[83] Chippewas of Nawash, *Encountering the Other: Racism Against Aboriginal People*, (Chippewas of Nawash, 2007), 89.
[84] Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 60. This refrain was repeated often and loudly throughout the 1990s, reenforcing a common belief that, in Koenig's words, "an increase in native fishing activity will cause economic hardship for local non-native communities." Koenig, *Cultures and Ecologies*, 124.
[85] Quoted in: Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege,* 36.
[86] Quoted in: *ibid.,* 37. This sort of reactionary response is so common as to almost qualify as a cliche. Bedford and Irving note that similar responses were offered by settlers throughout the Maritime provinces following a similar decision on Mi'kmaw fishing rights: "[n]on-native fishers were upset at what they felt were 'special' rights for Aboriginal fishers". Bedford and Irving, *Tragedy of Progress*, 9.
[87] Quoted in: Koenig, *Cultures and Ecologies,* 21.
[88] West-Newman, "Legacies of Empire," 190.
[89] *Under Siege* provides an in-depth and community-focused account from *Neyaashiinigamiing* on the constant stream of incidents perpetrated by settlers against Anishinaabek people in the area. By way of example each of the following incidents occurred in the long 1995 "Summer of Hate" alone: a fisherman's boat from Nawash was sabotaged and graffitied; thousands yards of nets were lost that summer; four young men from Nawash were assaulted outside a bar in Owen Sound, three were "seriously stabbed" in the encounter; a fishing tugboat was torched and burnt out; shots were fired at at least one fishing boat with an Anishinaabek crew. Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 41-42.
[90] Mackey, "Unsettling Expectations," 246.
[91] Wallace, *Merging Fires*, 87.
[92] Quoted in: Chippewas of Nawash, *Under Siege*, 70.
[93] This exemplifies the observation by Nietzsche that *ressentiment* is present at the "heart of democracy", embedded within the very body of the public itself. Solomon, *Living With Nietzsche*, 110.
[94] Importantly, as signified by the bodies that set themselves between the mob and Jones, rancour and aggression were not the only recourses available to settlers that day. Indeed, many of the people who stood in solidarity with Jones were settlers and they worked to stand beside the Saugeen Anishinaabek as the Summer of Hate continued to drag onwards. Following the confrontation at the Market a loosely organized group of several dozen settlers was formed with the intention to educate other settlers on the issues involved in the fishing disputes and hopefully to avert another violent incident. This group called themselves the Neighbours of Nawash, and they premised their work on ensuring that the values of "neighbourliness" - which they believed were central to the culture of small communities like Owen Sound - were expanded to include the Saugeen Anishinaabek. The actions of these settlers at the Market, and their commitment to neighbourly conduct going forward, is representative of the ways in which subjects of the same regimes of power carry competing and often contradictory investments. Whereas the OFAH and its mob were clearly motivated by a latent - perhaps explicit - desire to maintain a sense of proprietorship and mastery, the Neighbours of Nawash concerned themselves primarily with the concept of responsibility towards one's neighbour. Even this principle proved itself to be somewhat self-limiting, however, as the Neighbours of Nawash were determined only to engage in work that focused on "the building of relationships" and thus averted anything that might lead to "direct confrontation" with other members of their community. Their inability to determine when and where the principles of neighbourliness out to be extended or withdrawn forced them to engage the rancour of their community with only half-measures, rather than confronting the ugliness of settler fear and hatred head-on. For a thorough discussion of the Neighbours of Nawash and their response to the Summer of Hate, please see: Wallace, *Merging Fires*, 78-112.

[95] As such, I put aside questions regarding the validity of the treaties themselves and, though I retain the presumption of uninterrupted sovereignty on the part of the Saugeen Anishinaabek, it does not figure prominently in the following discussion. Rather, I consider the manner by which settlers in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound act in rancorous excess of the terms of their own settler state.
[96] "Interview: Chief Vernon Roote," *Open Line*, Bayshore Broadcasting, Owen Sound, ON: CFOS, December 24, 2014).
[97] Reproduced in Keeshig-Tobias, *Illustrated History*, 85.
[98] "Fact Sheet - Sauble Beach Litigation," Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, (October 17, 2014), https://aadnc-aandc.ca/eng/ (accessed March 24, 2016).
[99] The consistency of these complaints is of critical importance within the strictures of settler law, as it proves that the claim being forwarded by the community at Saugeen has an uninterrupted continuity - and therefore centrally important position for said community. Such continuity helps to ensure that the tests established in *R v. Sparrow* can be met.
[100] David Graham, "Sauble Beach is young at heart," *Toronto Star*, (September 4, 2010).
[101] "Sauble Beach Litigation," Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. Even within the popular press it has been noted that the support of the Crown for this claim constitutes an "unusual move", as it is far more typical for the government to litigate against indigenous peoples' claims on territorial encroachment. Jeff Gray, "Divisive conflict at Sauble Beach is older than Canada itself," *Globe and Mail,* (August 30, 2015).
[102] Rob Gowan, "Town to bring Sauble land claim details to public," *Sun Times*, (July 24, 2014). Anne Finlay-Stewart, "Sauble solution will come down to trust," *Owen Sound Hub*, (August 7, 2014). Rob Gowan, "Sauble Beach claim heads to court," *Sun Times*, (April 16, 2015).
[103] Denis Langlois, "Hundreds pack into meeting on Sauble land claim," *Sun Times*, (July 6, 2014).
[104] *ibid.*
[105] Kevin Bernard, "Sauble ownership not on table: Saugeen First Nation Chief says he is open to discussions on use of land only," Bayshore Broadcasting News Centre, (February 11, 2015).
[106] *ibid.* Gray, "Divisive conflict."
[107] Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*, 68.
[108] Denis Langlois, "The Crowd Inn owner starts online petition regarding native land claim," *Sun Times*, (May 18, 2015). In an online petition, Dobson doubles down on the threat that is posed. His petition states that "Native claims are widespread throughout Canada and you may not even know that you are part of the discussion." David Dobson, "Canada Won't Honour Crown Patent Title of Private Landowner in Sauble Beach, Ontario," www.change.org (accessed March 23, 2016).
[109] Coulthard, *Red Skin*, 22.
[110] *ibid.*
[111] Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), 92.
[112] Emphasis mine. Langlois, "Hundreds pack into meeting."
[113] Indeed, some have even noted that the social climate of Sauble Beach is "stuck in the past" - attempting to revitalize an idyllic past, which relies upon an occlusion of the viciously racist and colonial sentiments and policies that pervaded the era. Graham, "Sauble Beach is young at heart."
[114] Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*, 36.
[115] *ibid.,* 46. Indeed, as if to deliberately prove that possession is performative, since the proposed agreement was rejected there has been a flurry of activity to get development projects underway at Sauble Beach. This may be a tactic to provide evidence of settler ownership through 'improvements' rendered to the land - reinstantiating a logic similar to that of *terra nullius*. Rob Gowan, "Residential development proposed for Sauble," *Sun Times*, (January 21, 2014). John Divinski, "A Town Square for Sauble Beach?" Bayshore Broadcasting, (Novemeber 23, 2015). Nelson Phillips, "Big plans for Sauble taking shape," *Wiarton Echo*, (April 27, 2016).
[116] Lowman and Barker, *Settler*, 58.

Conclusion:

"*The lumber mill has ripped the face off the hill. The people allow it in exchange for money and, in the past, a few jobs… But the jobs, like eroding pieces of the hill, are gone now. Still the money allows them to keep the land, that's what they say. The land that is slowly falling in the sea*." - Kateri Akiwenzie-Damm[1]

In this thesis, I have developed an account of the processes at work in the formation of settlers as intelligible and articulable political subjects. The account that I provided has synthesized an understanding of the ways in which the highly oppressive and dispossessive processes of settler colonialism and neoliberalization operate in an assemblage to produce the neoliberal settler. This, I suggested, is a subject at once characterized by a throbbing sense of injury and fragile precarity, while simultaneously invested in rancorous and aggressive defences of the very regimes of power that are productive of their sense of injury. In particular, I focused on how such regimes are reproduced by re/disfiguring indigenous peoples and their resurgence movements within the neoliberal settler imaginary as deviant or monstrous others, deemed to be responsible for the discomfort or pain felt by settlers. Ultimately, what I suggested was that, by displacing the source of the precarity and sense of fragility engendered by neoliberalization onto indigenous peoples, settlers reinvest themselves - materially and psychically - in regimes of neoliberal settler colonialism, often with a rancour and aggression exceeding even the settler state. This account was developed through a theoretical investigation that engaged the complex histories and contemporary politics of my own home community of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound. Considering at once the investments that this community had and continues to maintain in colonization, as well as the increasingly difficult local situation in the era of neoliberalization.

It is my hope that the research I have put forward in this project contributes to scholarly and activist debates in a number of productive ways. Particularly, I hope that other settlers who read this thesis take note of the many constitutive tensions I have emphasized throughout, and that others develop further and respond to these observations more fully. In the first place, my account describes both settler colonialism and neoliberalization as reiterative and process driven systems - acting in assemblage with one another - rather than as discrete and foreclosed *faits accompli*. While I am not the first person to make this observation, the sustained analysis that I have offered from this perspective should inform others who write on the topic and, perhaps more importantly, should particularly inform settlers who organize anti-oppression work. For settlers to reconsider that colonization is never *achieved* - but rather is reiteratively *performed* through the denial of other possible worlds - reshapes the limits of political possibility by emphasizing the fact that other ways of being have always remained possible. This imposes a new ethical requirement on settlers: asking that we understand our own complicit and active role within the reiteration of ongoing colonial processes. Not to naïvely overdraw the imminency of a radical transformation, my account of the ways in which regimes of power produce and contour political subjects contributes to a discussion concerned with why individuals remain so deeply invested in oppressive systems. By mobilizing a primarily Butlerean account of subject formation, I have intentionally highlighted the psychic life of power as shaping latent and often unacknowledged - though viscerally defended - commitments to a reproduction of a sense of self that is always already predicated on and embedded within power. This facet, in particular, draws a major distinction between my work and the work of others who would highlight the position of settlers as merely a matter of 'identity' - that is, of more or less volitional individual ascription.

While I take the fact that all subjects are embedded within power regimes - that there is no position outside of power from which to offer critique - I have striven to highlight that the field of power is unevenly dispersed - and, to a lesser degree, I have noted that multiple regimes exist in overlapping and sometimes contradictory ways. It is out of concern for maintaining this sense of heterogeneity that my project has taken the increasing sense of precarity experienced by many settlers quite seriously. As I hope my work has made clear, accounting for the growing precarity of many settler communities, resulting from neoliberalization, does not necessitate that one portray settlers as merely passive victims - it is not a matter of either perfect privilege or total abjection. Throughout this project I have attempted to construct an account of the settler - particularly poor, rural, and working class settlers - as a subject constituted in a position of liminality: their impoverishment in the era of neoliberalization does not diminish their continuing roles as the dispossessors of the sovereign indigenous peoples of Turtle Island. As I hope I have proven, the fact that many settlers do feel increasingly precarious, often contributes to their reinvestment in systems of oppression that provide material and psychic benefits - even if those same systems represent a threat to the interests of settlers as well.

Although this thesis has compiled extensive research it is, however, far from exhaustive. My foray into this field has convinced me that there remains much more left to do than what I have done - especially within the specified context of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound. Going forward my own research will continue to develop many of the same themes and concerns that I have worked through in this project. In particular, I intend to engage in more sustained auto-ethnographical and ethnographical work on and around the Bruce/Saugeen Peninsula. The goal of such research is first to situate myself and my family more fully within the complexities of

settler colonization in the area. I intend to piece together what wider forces were at work and might have caused my own ancestors to abandon established lives in England, Ireland, and Scotland and to participate in such a sustained way in the colonization of Saugeen Anishinaabek territories. Additionally, by engaging in ethnographic work with settlers on and around the Peninsula today, I hope to better understand how - if at all - settlers understand their contemporary relationships with the Saugeen Anishinaabek and their territories. In particular, I am in interested in discovering what sorts of myths, metaphors, and assumptions are mobilized by settlers to mediate these relations and how the spectre of growing precarity attenuates those discourses.

In addition to the research which I intend to pursue, I would suggest that there are several major lines of new research that ought to be pursued as a result of the work that I have developed above. The first, relatively straightforwardly, would be to use a mix of both qualitative and quantitative methods to investigate the assertions that I have posited about settler subject formation throughout this project. One method by which to conduct such research would be to use a variation of Ernest Becker's Terror Management Theory (TMT), which posits that fear of the inevitability of death is often what mobilizes the sort of aggressive and destructive (re)investments in oppressive power that I have highlighted above.[2] A necessary corollary to any research that uses a TMT methodology would be to investigate how and why it is that European and settler cultures mediate this fear of death through colonialism. This points towards the question of the origins of the dispossessive drive within European thinking and social practice, which I purposefully omitted from consideration in chapter two. New research should be conducted, excavating the genesis of the dispossessive drive within the mythological and

liturgical canons of Europe, with the aim of understanding the divergence between these traditions and the grounded normativity that is suggested to underpin various indigenous peoples' ontologies.[3] Through such considerations - and perhaps by uncovering subaltern knowledges, myths, and histories - another line of research could be developed which attempts to bridge the ontological and epistemological divides between settlers and indigenous peoples, with a particular eye towards the importance of understanding the deep implications of establishing treaty-relationships. This sort of research would contribute to the restorying of settler histories and communities, a project that is vitally important if less hierarchical and more relational regimes are to be pursued by settlers *en masse*.

Conclusion Notes:

[1] Akiwenzie-Damm is a member of the Chippewas of Nawash. Her poetry and prose, which spans many topics, is an insightful, beautiful, and sometimes haunting experience. Kateri Akiwenzie-Damm*, The Stone Collection*, (Winnipeg: Highwater Press, 2015), 2.

[2] Ernest Becker, *The Denial of Death*, (New York: Free Press, 1997).

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

Works Cited:

Akiwenzie-Damm, Kateri. *The Stone Collection.* Winnipeg: Highwater Press, 2015.

Alfred, Taiaiake. *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto.* Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 1999.

—-. *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom.* Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2005.

Armitage, Andrew. *Vanishing: Lost Places in Grey and Bruce.* Owen Sound, ON: The Ginger Press, 2015.

Asch, Michael. *On Being Here to Stay: Treaties and Aboriginal Rights in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

Assembly of First Nations. *Federal Government Funding to First Nations: The Facts, the Myths, and the Way Forward.* 2004. http://www.afn.ca/ (accessed January 13, 2016).

Barker, Adam. "Locating Settler Colonialism." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 13, no. 3 (Winter 2012). www.jstor.org (accessed August 10, 2015).

Becker, Ernest. *The Denial of Death.* New York: Free Press, 1997.

Bedford, David and Danielle Irving. *The Tragedy of Progress: Marxism, Modernity, and the Aboriginal Question.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2000.

Benzie, Robert. "Conservative MPP Bill Murdoch to ride off into the sunset." *The Toronto Star.* July 5, 2010.

Berdayes, Vincente and John W. Murphy. *Neoliberalism, Economic Radicalism, and the Normalization of Violence.* New York: Springer, 2016.

Bernard, Kevin. "Sauble ownership not on table: Saugeen First Nation Chief says he is open to discussions on use of land only." Bayshore Broadcasting News Centre. February 11, 2015.

Brown, Wendy. *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

—-. *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty.* New York: Zone Books, 2010.

—-. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution.* Brooklyn: Zone Books, 2015.

"Bruce County." *Census Profile.* Statistics Canada. 2011. http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/ (accessed February 11, 2016).

"Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound." *National Household Survey Profile.* 2011. Statistics Canada, https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/ (accessed February 11, 2016).

Buck, Pem Davidson. "Whither Whiteness? Empire, State, and the Re-Ordering of Whiteness." *Journal of the Association of Black Anthropologists* 20, no. 2 (2012), 105-117.

Butler, Judith. *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Byrd, Jodi A. "Follow the typical signs: settler sovereignty and its discontents." *Settler Colonial Studies* 4, no. 2 (2014). http://www.jstor.org (accessed August 8, 2015), 151-154.

Cairns, Kate. "The subject of neoliberal affects: Rural youth envision their futures." *The Canadian Geographer* 57, no. 3 (2013). http://www.jstor.org (accessed January 15, 2016), 337-344.

Chippewas of Nawash. *Under Siege: How the People of the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation Asserted Their Rights and Claims and Dealt with the Backlash.* Neyaashiinigamiing: Ningwakwe Learning Press, 2005.

—-. *Encountering the Other: Racism Against Aboriginal People.* Chippewas of Nawash, 2007.

Clark, David. "Neoliberalism and Public Service Reform: Canada in Comparative Perspective." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 4 (December 2002). http://www.jstor.org (accessed January 20, 2016), 771-793.

Connolly, William E. *The Ethos of Pluralization.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.

—-. *Capitalism and Christianity, American Style.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008.

Conservative MP Larry Miller's niqab comments: harsh but true. Rebel Media. YouTube. March 17, 2015 (accessed November 1, 2015).

Coulthard, Glen Sean. *Red Skin, White Mask: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014. iBook.

Davis, Lynne. Editor. *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Denis, Jeffery S. “Contact Theory in a Small-Town Settler-Colonial Context: The Reproduction of Laissez-Faire Racism in Indigenous-White Canadian Relations.” *American Sociological Review.* 80, no. 1 (2015), 218-242.

Divinski, John. “A Town Square for Sauble Beach?” Bayshore Broadcasting. Novemeber 23, 2015.

Dobson, David. “Canada Won’t Honour Crown Patent Title of Private Landowner in Sauble Beach, Ontario.” www.change.org (accessed March 23, 2016).

Duggan, Kyle. “Blackstock on tribunal ruling: ‘This is our Mississippi.’” *iPolitics* January 26, 2016. ipolitics.ca (accessed February 17, 2016).

Dunn, Scott. “Russel Brothers bankrupt: Workers lose jobs, 3-weeks of pay and severances.” *The Sun Times.* July 17, 1993.

—-. “PPG to close city plant.” *The Sun Times.* September 4, 2008. http://www.owensoundsuntimes.com (accessed February 11, 2016).

Edminston, Jake. “Tory MP Larry Miller on women wearing niqabs at citizenship ceremonies: ‘Stay the hell where you came from.’” *The National Post.* March 17, 2015.

Eliasoph, Nina. “‘Everyday Racism’ in a Culture of Political Avoidance: Civil Society, Speech, and Taboo.” *Social Problems*. 46, no. 4 (1999), 479-502.

“Fact Sheet - Sauble Beach Litigation.” Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. October 17, 2014. https://aadnc-aandc.ca/eng/ (accessed March 24, 2016).

Finlay-Stewart, Anne. “Sauble solution will come down to trust.” *Owen Sound Hub.* August 7, 2014.

First Nations Child & Family Caring Society of Canada. *Victory for First Nations Children: Canadian Human Rights Tribunal Finds Discrimination Against First Nations Children Living On-Reserve.* January 26, 2016. https://fncaringsociety.com (accessed February 20, 2016).

Flanagan, Tom. *First Nations? Second Thoughts* 2nd Edition. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2008.

Foner, Philip S. and Ronald L. Lewis. Editors. *The Black Worker: A Documentary History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1978-1984.

Fowler, Tim. "Neoliberalism, Class and Culture: The 2008 Federal Elections in Canada and the United States." *Socialist Studies* 8, no. 2 (Autumn 2012), 189-201.

Freeman, Victoria. "'Toronto Has No History!' Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, and Historical Memory in Canada's Largest City." *Urban History Review* 30, no. 2 (Spring 2010), 21-35.

"Friedreich Nietzsche." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* plato.stanford.edu/entries/nietzsche/ (accessed April 12, 2015).

Gahman, Levi. "Gun rites: hegemonic masculinity and neoliberal ideology in rural Kansas." *Gender, Place, and Culture.* 22 no. 9 (2015), 1203-1219.

Giroux, Henry. *Against the Terror of Neoliberalism: Politics Beyond the Age of Greed.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2008.

Glezos, Simon. "Brown's Paradox: Speed, *ressentiment* and global politics." *Journal of International Political Theory* 10, no. 2 (2014), 148-168.

Goeman, Mishuana. *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013.

—-. "Disrupting a Settler-Colonial Grammar of Place: The Visual Memoir of Hulleah Tsinhnahjinnie." in *Theorizing Native Studies.* Audra Simpson and Andrea Smith, Editors. London: Duke University Press, 2014. 235-265.

Gordon, Todd. *Imperialist Canada.* Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2010.

Gowan, Rob. "Residential development proposed for Sauble." *Sun Times.* January 21, 2014.

—-. "Town to bring Sauble land claim details to public." *Sun Times*. July 24, 2014.

—-. "Sauble Beach claim heads to court." *Sun Times*. April 16, 2015.

Graham, David. "Sauble Beach is young at heart." *Toronto Star*. September 4, 2010.

Graveline, Fyre Jean. "Idle No More, Enough is Enough!" *Canadian Social Work Review* 29: no. 2 (2012). http://jstor.org (accessed January 18, 2016), 293-300.

Gray, Jeff. "Divisive conflict at Sauble Beach is older than Canada itself." *Globe and Mail*. August 30, 2015.

"Grey County." *Census Profile.* Statistics Canada. http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/ (accessed February 11, 2016).

Harris, Cole. "How Did Colonialism Dispossess? Comments from an Edge of Empire." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94, vol: 1 (2004). http://www.jstor.org/ (accessed January 15, 2016), 165-182.

Harvey, David. *The New Imperialism.* London: Oxford University Press, 2003.

—-. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism.* London, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hedges, Chris, Brad Schreiber, and Mark Farkas. *Death of the Liberal Class.* New York: Nation Books, 2010.

Hegel, G.W.F. *Elements of the Philosophy of Right.* H.B. Nisbet, Translator. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Hilgers, Tina. "Reproducing Neoliberalism: The Power of Canada's Poor." *Canadian Political Science Review*. 7, no. 1 (2013), 59-64.

"Housing Reference Guide." *National Household Survey.* Statistics Canada. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/ (accessed February 11, 2016).

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. "Acts, Agreements, Treaties and Land Claims." Modified April 4, 2015, https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/ (accessed February 15, 2016).

"Individuals by total income, by province and territory (Ontario)." Statistics Canada. www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/ (accessed February 11, 2016).

"Interview: Chief Vernon Roote." *Open Line*. Bayshore Broadcasting. Owen Sound, ON: CFOS, December 24, 2014).

Kearney, Richard. *Strangers, Gods, and Monsters: Interpreting otherness.* London: Routledge, 2003.

Keeshig, Lenore. *Running on the March Wind.* Toronto: Quattro Books, 2015.

Keeshig-Tobias, Polly. *The Illustrated History of the Chippewas of Nawash.* Chippewas of Nawash, 1996.

"The Kennedy Empire." Exhibits. Grey Roots Museum & Archive. http://www.greyroots.com (accessed February 11, 2016).

The Kino-nda-niimi Collective. *The Winter We Danced.* Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Press, 2014.

Klein, Naomi. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism.* New York: Metropolitan Books, 2007.

Knadler, Stephen P. *The Fugitive Race: Minority Writers Resisting Whiteness.* Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2002.

Koenig, Edwin C. *Cultures and Ecologies: A Native Fishing Conflict on the Saugeen-Bruce Peninsula.* Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Lacy, Robert. "When Country Was Country." *Sewanee Review* 120, no. 1 (Winter 2012). http://www.jstor.org (accessed August 10, 2015), 151-156.

Langlois, Denis. "Hundreds pack into meeting on Sauble land claim." *Sun Times*. July 6, 2014.

—-. "The Crowd Inn owner starts online petition regarding native land claim." *Sun Times*. May 18, 2015.

Lloyd, David, and Patrick Wolfe. "Settler colonial logics and the neoliberal regime." *Settler Colonial Studies* (May 7, 2015). http://www.jstor.org/ (accessed December 25, 2015), 1-10.

Lowman, Emma Battell, and Adam J. Barker. *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2015.

Mackey, Eva. "Unsettling Expectations: (Un)certainty, Settler States of Feeling, Law, and Decolonization." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*. 29, no. 2 (2014), 235-252.

Mallick, Heather. "Why doesn't MP Larry Miller stay where he came from?" *The Toronto Star.* March 17, 2015.

Maloney, Ryan. "Mulcair Hammers Harper for Letting Tory MP Larry Miller Run Again." *The Huffington Post Canada.* August 7, 2015.

"Maps: 1667-1999." *Canadian Confederation.* Library and Archives Canada, http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/politics-government/canadian-confederation/Pages/maps-1667-1999.aspx (accessed June 7, 2015).

Maracle, Lee. *Memory Serves: Oratories.* Smaro Kamboureli Editor. Edmonton: NeWest Press, 2015.

Marks, Don. “What’s in a name: Indian, native, aboriginal or indigenous?” CBC News, (October 2, 2014). www.cbc.ca/news (accessed May 19, 2016).

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy Volume I.* Frederick Engels, Editor. Chicago: Charles Kerr & Company, 1906 [1867].

Mascarenhas, Michael. *Where the Waters Divide: Neoliberalism, White Privilege, and Environmental Racism in Canada.* New York: Lexington Books, 2012.

McMullen, Stephanie. “Disunity and Dispossession: Nawash Ojibwa and Potawatomi in the Saugeen Territory, 1836-1865.” MA thesis, The University of Calgary, 1997.

Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty.* Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 2015.

Morito, Bruce. “The Rule of Law and Aboriginal Rights: The Case of the Chippewas of Nawash.” *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies.* 29, no. 2 (1999), 263-288.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals* and *Ecce Homo*. Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale, Translators. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.

O’Malley, Kady. “Larry Miller, Conservative MP, recants inflammatory niqab-ban comment.” CBC News (March 17, 2015). www.cbc.ca/news (accessed March 17, 2015).

Palmater, Pamela. *Beyond Blood: Rethinking Indigenous Identity.* Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Inc., 2011.

Peace and Justice Grey Bruce. *Final Report of the Precarious Work Group.* Owen Sound, ON: Peace and Justice Grey Bruce, January 2015.

Phillips, Nelson. “Chippewas of Nawash get unanimous support from SBP for water treatment application.” *Wiarton Echo.* February 17, 2016.

—-. “Big plans for Sauble taking shape.” *Wiarton Echo.* April 27, 2016.

Povinelli, Elizabeth A. *Economies of Abandonment: Social Belonging and Endurance in Late Liberalism.* London: Duke University Press, 2011.

Regan, Paulette. *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada.* Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010.

Richardson, Tracey. “Former Goodyear plant to close.” *The Sun Times* (February 1, 2012). http://www.owensoundsuntimes.com (accessed February 11, 2016.

Rifkin, Mark. *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance.* Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

Riggs, Damien W. and Martha Augoustinos. “The Psychic Life of Colonial Power: Racialised Subjectivites, Bodies and Methods.” *Journal of Community & Social Psychology.* 15, (2005), 461-477.

Roberts, David J. and Minelle Mahtani. “Neoliberalizing Race, Racing Neoliberalism: Placing “Race” in Neoliberal Discourses.” *Antipode.* 42, no. 2 (2010), 248-257.

Roediger, David R. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. London: Verso, 2007 [1991].

Rolfe, Rob. *Saugeen.* Toronto: Quattro Books, 2011.

—-. *Hard Times.* Thornhill, ON: Aeolus House, 2015.

Rose, Jacqueline. *Sexuality in the Field of Vision.* London: Verso, 1987.

“Sask. Farmers call for return of Canadian Wheat Board.” CBC News (February 15, 2016). www.cbc.ca/news (accessed February 15, 2016).

Schech, Susanne, and Jane Haggis. “Migrancy, Multiculturalism, and Whiteness: Re-charting Core Identities in Australia.” *Communal Plural: Journal of Transnational and Crosscultural Studies* 9, no. 2 (October 2001), 143-159.

Scheler, Max. *Ressentiment.* William Holdheim, Translator. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Schertow, John Ahni. “Anishinabek outlaw term ‘Aboriginal’.” Intercontinental Cry, (June 30, 2008). www.intercontinentalcry.org/ (accessed May 19, 2016).

Schild, Verónica. “Empowering ‘Consumer-Citizens’ or Governing Poor Female Subjects? The institutionalization of ‘self-development’ in the Chilean social policy field.” *Journal of Consumer Culture* 7, no. 2 (2007). http://jstor.org (accessed January 26, 2016), 179-203.

Schmalz, Peter S. *The History of the Saugeen Indians.* Ottawa: Ontario Historical Society, 1977.

Schram, Sanford. *The Return of Ordinary Capitalism: Neoliberalism, Precarity, and Occupy.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Simpson, Leanne. *Islands of Decolonial Love.* Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2013.

Simpson, Leanne, and Kiera Ladner, Editors. *This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years Since the Blockades.* Winnipeg: Arbieter Ring Press, 2010.

Sitoski, Richard-Yves. *brownfields.* Owen Sound, ON: The Ginger Press, 2014.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodology: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* 2nd Edition. New York: Zed Books, 2012.

Snider, Laureen. "Captured by Neo-Liberalism: Regulation and Risk in Walkerton, Ontario." *Risk Management* 5, no. 2 (2003). 27-36.

Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory.* London: Verso, 1989.

Solomon, Robert C. *Living With Nietzsche: What the Great 'Immoralist' Has to Teach Us.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

The Sounds of My Home Town. Larry Jensen. YouTube. August 11, 2015 (accessed February 1, 2016).

Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. *Understanding Freefall: The Challenge of the Rural Poor.* 39th Parliament, 1st Session. December 2006.

—-. *Beyond Freefall: Halting Rural Poverty*. 39th Parliament, 2nd Session. June 2008.

Stanford, Jim. "Canada's transformation under neoliberalism." *Canadian Dimension* (March 29, 2014). http://canadiandimension.com (accessed January 25, 2016).

Sugarman, Richard Ira. *Rancor Against Time: The Phenomenology of 'Ressentiment'.* Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1980.

"Summary of events concerning Nawash burial ground reserves." *Anishinabek News.* (January 1993), 8-9.

Veracini, Lorenzo. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.

—-. "On Settlerness." *Borderlands* 10: no. 1 (2011), http://www.jstor.org/ (accessed December 20, 2015), 1-17.

Waldby, Catherine. “Destruction: Boundary erotics and refigurations of the heterosexual male body.” in *Sexy Bodies: The strange carnalities of feminism*, Elizabeth Grosz and Elspeth Probyn, Editors. London: Routledge, 1995. 266-277.

Waldie, Paul. “Family farms are fewer and larger, StatsCan says.” *The Globe and Mail* (May 10, 2012). http://www.theglobeandmail.com (accessed January 20, 2016).

Wallace, Rick. *Merging Fires: Grassroots Peacebuilding Between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Peoples.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2013.

Wang, Jiwu. *‘His Dominion’ and the ‘Yellow Peril’: Protestant Missions to the Chinese Immigrants in Canada, 1859-1967*. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation, 2006.

West-Newman, Catherine. “Anger in Legacies of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and Settler States.” *European Journal of Social Theory* 7, no. 2 (2004). http://jstor.org/ (accessed November 24, 2014), 189-208.

Wolfe, Patrick. “Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native.” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (December 2006). http://www.jstor.org (accessed March 27, 2015), 387-409.

Workman, Thom. *If You’re in My Way, I’m Walking: The Assault on Working People Since 1970.* Black Point, NS: Fernwood Press, 2009.

Younge, Gary. “Who’s in Control - Nation States or Global Corporations?” *The Guardian* (June 2, 2014). http://www.theguardian.com (accessed January 25, 2016).