ENTANGLED WITH/IN EMPIRE
Indigenous nations, settler preservations, and the return of buffalo to Banff National Park

By

Brydon Kramer

B.A., The University of Victoria, 2017

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

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Political Science

ENTANGLED WITH/IN EMPIRE
Indigenous nations, settler preservations, and the return of buffalo to Banff National Park

By

Brydon Kramer
B.A., The University of Victoria, 2017

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

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

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

ABSTRACT

This thesis mobilizes the concept of "colonial entanglement" to emphasize the deep complexity and unpredictability of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships within what is now known as the Banff-Bow Valley. Responding to various literatures—including Indigenous Studies, Settler Colonial Studies, Political Theory, and Canadian Politics—I posit that the concept of colonial entanglements offers a parallax view of contexts, such as the Banff-Bow Valley, and events like the Buffalo Reintroduction Project. Not only does such a concept reveal how Indigenous nations—both human and non-human—are targeted by the racializing and gendered entanglements of colonizing regimes that seek to break up and replace them, but it also shows how these nations continue to persist and resist despite colonizing efforts to achieve otherwise. In other words, colonial entanglements compel one to also consider how nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda also exert influence on other Indigenous and non-Indigenous life in the Banff-Bow Valley—albeit, in different ways and to different degrees.

After unpacking the concept in the first chapter, I use colonial entanglement to show how colonizing regimes and their *expansionist modes of relationship* react to the Indigenous nations they become entangled with. Using the signing of Treaty 7 and the establishment of a national park in Banff, I reveal how the Canadian state seeks to erect colonizing regimes of property that cater to capital as they transit the Banff-Bow Valley by 'breaking up' and 'breaking from' Indigenous nations and their *expansive modes of relationship*. Next, I consider how such reactionary violence is continually justified and legitimated through the articulation and reiteration of state of nature fictions that rely on notions of wilderness and tropes of Indigeneity to delegitimize the enduring presence of Indigenous nations. Specifically, I look at the Indian Act, the prohibition of hunting in the Park, and the Banff Indian Days festival to show how state of nature fictions articulate a supposed transition from a "past state of nature" to a contemporary "state of (dis)possession" entangled with white supremacist and heteropatriarchal forms of power. In doing so, these fictions make and reproduce colonial subjects who buy into and support colonizing violence and breakage that disproportionately targets those Indigenous to place. In the final chapter, I turn to focus on the Buffalo Reintroduction Project. Here, I consider how the project presents contemporary opportunities for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people to support and/or disrupt colonizing states of (dis)possession and the state of nature fictions they rely on, while also considering the project's potential for a politics oriented towards expansive modes of relationship revolving around principles of decolonization and anti-colonial internationalism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project cannot begin without first acknowledging the Indigenous nations upon whose territories I have been trespassing. Much of the thinking, research, and writing contained within these pages took place here on Lekwungen and WSÁNEĆ homelands, which I have lived on for nine years. At various times, I have also found myself on Treaty 7 territories—particularly on the territories of the Îyãħé Nakoda, Ktunaxa, Tsuut'ina, Siksikaitsitapi, Secwepemc, and members of the Cree nations. This area—which is now commonly known as the Banff-Bow Valley—not only serve as the primary site of analysis in this thesis, but it is also where I grew up for the first nineteen years of my life. In many ways, my work here is an attempt to think through the network of relationships that I exist within both in the Banff-Bow Valley and in Victoria—as well as think through ways in which I can better support the generations of resistance, resurgence, and decolonizing efforts that have taken place on these lands.

Graduate work is often a very lonely and isolating experience—especially during a global pandemic. However, I am grateful to have been supported and encouraged by a number of people and groups (both in person and virtually). This thesis would not have been possible without the extensive help and support I received from all of you over the last several years.

To my co-supervisors, Simon Glezos and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark: you both deserve endless credit for guiding me through this entire process. Simon, you have offered me exceptional kindness, concern, and patience as I slowly worked on my thesis. Heidi, your deep insights have been nothing short of exceptional and have definitely elevated this thesis to where it is today. Thank you, Simon. And *miigwech*, Heidi.

To Rita Dhamoon: despite the fact that you had to take a leave before I could finish this thesis, your guidance and insight has been foundational to my thinking both within and beyond academia. You have helped guide me as a student and a young adult since I first took courses with you during my undergraduate degree. The fierceness and brilliance you embody does not go unnoticed by your students. We're all lucky to have you in our lives. Thank you and wishing you the best of health.

I would also like to 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, the Indigenous Nationhood program, and the Faculty of Graduate Studies at the University of Victoria. In addition, I am also 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 people—both on and off campus. 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, I want to specifically thank my MA cohort as well as Shianna, Rachel, Seb, Gina, Morgan, Kenya, and Zoë. My deepest love to each of you for your wisdom and friendships. I also want to give a special thanks to Phil and Stacie who suffered through different drafts of a number of chapters and who have offered me invaluable feedback and insight.

Finally, to my family: the lessons you've taught me have led me here. Thank you for helping me through every challenge thus far and for your willingness to learn with me.

INTRODUCTION

Returning to Canada's First Park

> *My point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do.*
>
> —Michel Foucault, *The Subject and Power*[1]

On February 1, 2017, Parks Canada announced the return of buffalo to Banff National Park.[2] According to a press release, sixteen adult buffalo[3] arrived safely to the remote Panther Valley region for their "soft launch" into the Park.[4] This historic "return" officially marked the first stage of a five-year, state-funded project that seeks to reintroduce the species back to one of its former habitats.[5] According to the project management team, the herd was staying in the valley for about eighteen months before being released as a "free-roaming herd" to a 1200 square kilometer area on the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains.[6]

For many, the reintroduction project marks a truly momentous moment. Falling on so-called Canada's sesquicentennial, the return of buffalo to the Park comes after the species' equally long absence from the area. By the mid-nineteenth century, buffalo had all but become extinct on the North American continent.[7] This absence has impacted multiple generations of both human and non-human beings living in the area—all of whom have felt the effects of the animal's absence. Not only do buffalo play an important role as "ecological engineers" shaping physical landscapes through their presence, but they are also a crucial relationship for the many Indigenous nations sharing place with them.[8] For this reason, many proponents of the reintroduction project represent the return of buffalo with dual significance: not only does the project help to restore the ecological integrity of the landscapes and the region, but it also serves as an important move to reconcile relationships with the Indigenous people that "once traveled through what is now Banff National

Park."[9] Affirming this dual significance, Harvey Locke—a conservationist, writer, and trustee with the Eleanor Luxton Historical Foundation in Banff (which was instrumental in supporting the reintroduction project)—explains that the reintroduction of buffalo to Banff National Park "rights the historical wrong of the elimination of this magnificent animal. The return to the landscape represents *hope for nature* and is *an important step toward reconciliation with Indigenous people*."[10] From this perspective, it is clear that buffalo make up a crucial part of the *entangled relations* in what is now known as Banff National Park.

In this work, I use the concept of "colonial entanglement" to consider the return of buffalo to Banff National Park as a project that is deeply embedded within a particular set of diverse and messy relationships. Building on the conceptual works of Jean Dennison and Françoise Dussart and Sylvie Poirier, I define colonial entanglement as the *complex and unpredictable assemblages that make up our lived relationships and felt experiences with the human and non-human world*.[11] Drawing attention to these complex and unpredictable relationships and experiences, colonial entanglement focuses on the political effects and affects[12] of the relations that make up those places contained within colonizing states. I pay particular attention to how these entangled relations wrap around both human and non-human bodies as they move through—and make up—place,[13] which ultimately affects both one's sensibilities and their sensing-abilities in ways that can be both restricting and supportive of life.[14] In other words, I use the colonial entanglement to *think* through how different relationships and experiences are *felt* as they wrap around different bodies—both materially and immaterially—in the Banff-Bow Valley.

To do this, I ask a number of questions: how is the buffalo reintroduction project both impacted by the pre-existing entangled relationships that make up what is now known as Banff National Park, and how does the project (re)produce and/or disrupt particular modes of relationship present with/in the Park and other territories contained within so-called Canada? On a prescriptive

level, I ask how considering the notion of colonial entanglement can (re)orient different Indigenous and non-Indigenous people towards "expansive modes of relationship," which are those modes of relating that are oriented toward supporting and enhancing life across different genders, generations, and species (and which are often embodied by Indigenous nations)?[15] Such a question is crucial due to the fact that colonial contexts like Canada continue to be dominated by "expansionist modes of relationship," which are driven by notions of scarcity and possessiveness as they seek destroy and replace all modes of relating that exceed the imperatives of imperialism to concentrate power and wealth in to the hands of fewer and fewer people.[16] Within expansionist modes of relationship, that which is perceived to be different (whether this difference be ontological, epistemological, political, physical, etc) becomes targeted for domination, exploitation, and death in order break up lands, people, and laws in pursuit of capital.

Underlying these questions are at least two foundational premises. First, Indigenous nations and their modes of relationship continue to exist, persist, and resist within places like Banff National Park to this day. I borrow the term "enduring Indigeneity" from J. Kēhaulani Kauanui here to emphasize not only the ways *Indigenous peoples are themselves enduring*, but also how colonizing regimes *must endure Indigeneity*, which presses against such processes and relationships.[17] Contrary to many colonizing discourses considered below, such an enduring presence is not only evident in the participation of multiple Indigenous nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda in the Buffalo Reintroduction Project, but it also manifests as part of the modus operandi of the buffalo reintroduction project, which seeks to facilitate the return of an Indigenous species to their homelands. As will be continuously pointed to throughout this thesis, enduring Indigeneities continuously wrap around and press on the entangled relationships that make up colonial contexts like Banff National Park in intimate ways—whether or not this is explicitly felt and acknowledged.[18]

Secondly—and as already suggested—enduring Indigeneities are deeply entangled with colonizing regimes that seek to violently replace Indigenous peoples and their modes of relationship with expansionist ones premised on "mythical conceptions of the unceasing expansion of capital, untethered from physical constraints."[19] As will be revealed, this is achieved by physically enclosing and epistemologically containing Indigenous (and non-Indigenous) life in ways that deny and disavow those relations that contravene and disrupt colonizing sovereignty and capital accumulation. Through interlocking forms of dispossession, labor exploitation, enslavement and racial domination, gendered and sexual violence, cultural and spiritual defilement, and the usurpation of governing powers, what Joyce Green calls "Project Canada"—which she uses to refer to the ruling classes of the different colonies that become known as Canada[20]—seeks to replace Indigenous people and their modes of relating with individualistic, hierarchal, anthropocentric, and exploitative ways of knowing and being that enable for the flattening and smoothing over of Indigenous lands and bodies in pursuit of capital. To phrase differently, the desire to disavow and repress the 'entangledness' of the world—and all the bumpy, messy, and complicated contours this entails—requires that colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship draw on different entanglements of power to physically and metaphorically *break up* various lands, bodies, and relationships. In doing so, Project Canada and other imperial powers seek to (re)produce a flatter, smoother, and faster world where autonomy, independence, and unceasing capitalist expansion can become a (perceived) reality.

Each of the subsequent chapters below make this clear by mapping out some of the entangled relations and experience that have formed, and continue to form, over the last two centuries leading up to the Buffalo Reintroduction project. This leads me to suggest that, despite reintroducing an integral relation back to part of the Canadian Rockies' landscapes, colonizing regimes—and their expansionist modes of relationship—rely on entanglements of capitalism,

white supremacy, and heteropatriarchy (amongst other forms of power) to ensure that Project Canada continues to facilitate the transit of Indigenous homelands and the transgression of Indigenous bodies and nations. In fact, I argue that the particular modes of relationship wrapping around the Buffalo reintroduction project risks contributing to what Jennifer Wakeham describes as a series of "pageants designed to construct national happiness without sufficiently addressing the structural imbalances that continue to contour politics in North America."[21] Furthermore, in providing an illusion of real change through a declaration-styled politics, attempts to "reconcile," "progress," and/or "turn away" from "past" colonial relations all too often provides settlers—and other non-Indigenous experiences—with tempting "participatory" mechanisms to symbolically *break out* of their colonial relations by moving toward some predetermined (and often settler-proclaimed) state of reconciliatory contentment—all while redeeming and reinvesting in processes of imperialism and colonialism, war and genocide, which are foundational to Project Canada.[22] In other words, efforts to reconcile with Indigenous nations—both human and non-human—for a lamentable past by "turning away" and/or "progressing" forward possesses the danger of reinscribing colonial subjects invested in the continuous transit of Indigenous lands and the transgression of Indigenous (and non-Indigenous) bodies and nations in pursuit of capital.

This brings me to the project's central thesis: a politic that seeks to (re)orient itself toward horizons of decolonization—as well as other liberatory efforts more generally—must resist the dangerous impulse to be "good" by neatly breaking from colonizing relations and other forms of imperial domination. This is especially the case for non-Indigenous people who find themselves at various intersections of privilege that enable them to either exist within or alongside the ruling classes. For these people and others who seek to assert such a sense of autonomy and independence from—that is to *break from*—the entangled relationships that make up empire, such efforts for autonomy tend to only become further entangled with notions of scarcity and possessiveness that

are irrevocably polluted with the stains (and strains) of domination over the dispossessed. In other words, through attempts to deny, disavow, and repress the messiness and complexities involved with living an entangled life on stolen land, one simply becomes increasingly dependent on a particular relationship of domination with those deemed Other—along with the colonial breakage that these relationships (re)produce.

For this reason, those seeking to orient themselves towards horizons of decolonization must recognize that the impulse to continually deny the ways in which one's own presence in the world is intimately entangled with imperialism and its expansionist modes of relating while, simultaneously, refusing to accept these modes of relationship as the only ways of being and knowing. Following thinkers like Mishuana Goeman and Emilie Cameron, I argue that this (re)orientation means both radically mapping out—or placing—the different types of breakage that occur within colonial entanglements while, simultaneously, "(re)mapping" these same practices and modes of relationship in ways that refuse to be further staked out in dominating and possessive terms.[23] As Cameron suggests, settler efforts to engage with decolonization specifically must attempt to do "the impossible but necessary turn both toward and away from colonial relations, however contradictory and paradoxical this may seem."[24]

I understand this *impossible but necessary turn both toward and away from colonial relations* as an effort to sit with and feel out the incommensurablities and incompatibilities that emerge in the parallax gaps between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people entangled with/in places like Banff National Park. In fact, by remembering how colonial entanglements involve certain modes of relationship that rely on differential (de)valuations to contain, enclose, break up, and manage sites of resistance and persistence in the face of imperialism (and its particular weapon of colonization), one is not only able to center and engage with Indigenous ways of knowing and being otherwise—and the political orders they make and reproduce—but also reveal how the

liberatory efforts of groups of people around the globe are as intimately connected as the brutalizing regimes they struggle against.[25] Thus, it is by embracing the complexities and messiness of colonial entanglements—along with the various types of breakage that manifests from them—that one may begin to *feel out* not only the dangers that lurk within, but also the potential relationships of solidarity—or what Leanne Simpson calls, "constellations of co-resistance"—that already existing in our everyday lives.[26]

Colonial entanglements with/in Banff:

This project is my attempt to account for both the ways in which the return of the buffalo traverses and disrupts the particular relationships and modes of relating that make up Banff National Park as well as how these different entangled relations traverse and transgress the buffalo and other Indigenous nations. However, my attempt to do so may have readers asking: why use the notion colonial entanglement, and why focus on the buffalo reintroduction to Banff National Park?

To start with the concept, I understand a consideration of colonial entanglements within regimes like Canada to be of utmost significance. For one, it enables us to grapple with the fact that the very foundations of the political project that is Canada are inherently colonial—in that they have been, and continue to be, entangled with processes of imperialism and colonization, war and genocide—while not occluding the fact that Indigenous nations and their modes of relationship continue to endure. To phrase differently, considering the mess of entangled relations and lived experiences that converge to make up the Banff-Bow Valley—and other places claimed by Project Canada—enables the notion of colonial entanglement to offer a parallax view. Described as "a shift in an observer's perspective of a distant object base on a change in vantage point," offering colonial entanglement as a parallax compels one to consider the entangled processes of empire through the work and perspectives of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in order to sit with the

messiness and incommensurabilities that emerge with/in colonial contexts.[27] For one, this means that colonial entanglements can encourage considerations of how the relationships first established by imperialists seeking to gain control and authority over Indigenous territories and bodies in an effort to shore up different European empires abroad are foundational to, and reiterated through, the contemporary Canadian liberal multicultural agenda and its most recent turn towards what Glen Coulthard calls "reconciliation politics" (chapter four), on the one hand.[28] Simultaneously, colonial entanglements as parallax can also emphasize the existence, persistence, and resistance of different Indigenous nations, on the other hand—connecting this enduring presence from initial contact with European empires to both contemporary Indigenous struggles in Canada as well as struggles against imperialism elsewhere.

In offering a parallax view of these entangled relations, however, one is also able to consider how different relationships and modes of relationship not only carry different roles and responsibilities, but also different logics and desires that are underpinned by different ontological and epistemological positions. This is significant because it means one can also consider how groups of people can relate differently to each other and to the rest of the human and non-human world through the same concepts and events. For example, chapter two explores different notions of property articulated by Indigenous nations and colonizing regimes to consider the ways in which these different conceptualizations produce different effects and affects for those moving with/in the Banff-Bow Valley. Through this parallax view, one is able to engage in a deep and genuine way with different bodies of knowledge—including those embodied by Indigenous people and their nations—while also considering the limitations of individualistic, hierarchal, anthropocentric, and exploitative ways of being and knowing that are embodied by expansionist notions of private property. In the face of a global pandemic, run-away climate crisis, the sixth mass-extinction event in planetary history, ever-increasing global inequality, the recurrence of mass famine, the spread

of war that deliberately targets civilians, and increasing trends towards right-wing populism driven by racial, gendered, and religious authoritarianisms in so-called democratic nation-states, asking how we can relate differently to both one another and to the non-human world is literally a life-or-death question for the mass majority of those living on this planet. This means that such questions are not only theoretical, but also deeply personal and felt by the different human and non-human beings living in places like Banff.

In addition to a parallax, then, I use colonial entanglement to consider how the objective and subjective constraints of different modes of relationship are "felt" by differently positioned bodies within colonial contexts. In understanding colonization as a set of process and relationships that are always-already wrapping around different bodies in different ways, one is compelled to consider how colonial entanglements "feel"—both in terms of the emotional feelings and physical sensations that constitute affect. In many ways, this is akin to Dian Million's work on "felt theory," which asserts that feelings provide each of us with the frames and theories through which we perceive the world—frames that are not always immediately obvious or accessible to others.[29] As Million argues, "feelings are theory, important projections about what is happening in our lives."[30] She explains that, although these frames and projections can never be "seen" by two people in the same way, at the same time, "[t]hey are also culturally mediated knowledges, never solely individual."[31] Offering colonial entanglements as a parallax view of the lived relations and felt experiences of colonization deliberately attempts to sit with the messiness and bumpiness of these tensions and gaps. After all, being attentive to the "multidirectionality" of colonial relations and experiences is crucial because such attention to inconsistency and contradiction enables one to witness the ways in which colonizing regimes and subjectivities can be exceeded and altered towards decolonizing aims.[32]

Okay, so why Banff and the buffalo? For one, the Buffalo Reintroduction Project at Banff National Park is, in many ways, an exemplary case study for considerations of colonial entanglements. As mentioned above, the return of buffalo to the Park points to an entanglement between the human and non-human world and can be read in multiple ways. For some, the return might represent a move towards environmental justice that understands nature and culture as socially constructed concepts existing in a type of relational interdependence. For others, it can be read as a (romantic) reversal of Western civilization's progressive march forward out of the so-called "state of nature." Finally, others might understand the return as a demonstration of civilization's ability to manipulate—and, in this case, save—the natural world through technological innovation. In different ways, each of these competing and contradicting interpretations are at the heart of the debates surrounding the buffalo's return, as well as the subsequent decision to shoot and kill a bull that wondered outside the park boundaries less than a month after the herd's July 2018 release (see chapter four).

In addition to entangled relations between the human and non-human world, the Buffalo return is also marked—and sustained—by another set of relationships: namely, those between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Through the project, one is able to see the importance of the buffalo to the land and waterscapes making up Banff National Park as well as to the humans that live with/in the area. As mentioned above, the project is even represented as providing an important opportunity to reconcile a lamentable past between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. After all, not only does the return of the buffalo to Banff happen to take place on the 150th birthday of the Canadian state, but it also comes only two years after the culmination of Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada launched reconciliation politics to the forefront of dominant Canadian discourses.

As the ongoing existence, persistence, and resistance of Indigenous nations compels more non-Indigenous people to recognize that they are living on Indigenous lands claimed by a colonizing state, they are also compelled to confront the fact that they live within a place where competing legal, political, social, economic, and spiritual systems exist. This also comes at a time when much of the life on this planet continues to be devalued and degraded by imperialism and its different expansionist modes of relationship. In many ways, the Indigenous nations who have stewarded the lands making up place for many millennia provide valuable examples of what it means to live in more respectful and reciprocal ways. Consequently, many living within colonizing states have begun to take up various forms of solidarity with the Indigenous nations whose lands they occupy. This includes those non-Indigenous persons who were involved with lobbying the federal government for the return of buffalo to Banff National Park, as well as myself—who has recently come to understand Banff National Park as a technology of elimination embedded within a colonial infrastructure.

Having been born and raised on Treaty 7 territories in the small town of Canmore, I have always had a relationship to many of the places making up Banff National Park. Yet, these relationships have also been colored by my particular position as a cis-gendered, white man currently living with able-bodied and neuro-typical privileges—and whose British, Irish, Scottish, German, and Hungarian ancestors settled throughout what is now known as Ontario and Alberta. In many ways, this project has enabled me to sharpen my critical skills and, consequently, understand how entangled relations of solidarity are often tenuous at best. In fact, more often than not, such relationships fail to diagnose the ways in which the root dynamics and relationships underlying the dire conditions facing a mass majority of dispossessed and working-class people continue to wrap around us as we are (re)oriented back towards the imperial logics that facilitate the expansion of empire. This includes some of the ways in which the buffalo have been re-

incorporated and included within Banff National Park. However, this project has also enabled me to learn (and unlearn) more about the place I grew up in and to think about the different ways myself and other settlers can attempt to turn towards Indigenous nations and modes of relationship while remaining critical of colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship. Again, such a double move is both a moral *and* political imperative for those seeking to develop an anti-colonial politics that seeks to understand and addresses the detrimental, and differentiated, effects (and affects) of imperialism both within and abroad.

Chapter overview:

In looking at Project Canada generally—and the Banff-Bow Valley in particular—this work does not seek to recover history, nor do I focus on specific "encounters" between particular Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons. Instead, the following chapters offer an analysis of the buffalo reintroduction project as embedded within a series of complex and unpredictable processes and relationships that extend over time and place. To do this, I consider a number of historical phenomena and engage with a number of discrete subfields—including Indigenous studies, Settler Colonial Studies, Critical Theory, and Canadian Politics—to put forward an argument that moves between the abstract and concrete, between theory and on-the-ground experience. In doing so, I attempt to think through the different ways in which the buffalo reintroduction project becomes entangled with both the complex relationships of domination making up Project Canada as well as the different forms of life living in and moving through Banff National Park.

In the first chapter, I further unpack the concept of colonial entanglement—showing how the concept's attentiveness to the messy and bumpy realities of different modes of relationship enables scholars and activist alike to both resist the flattening effects (and affects) of colonization while, simultaneously, remaining attentive to Indigenous voices and perspectives (and the

decolonizing potentials generated by these different modes of relationship). To convey this argument, the chapter offers colonial entanglement in relation to the concept of settler colonialism to reveal three crucial contributions that the former concept builds off of the latter: one, colonial entanglement considers the ways in which different Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies and relationships continue to endure in a multitude of ways; two, it shows how these bodies and modes of relationship possess parallax gaps that are incommensurable and point to different ways of being and knowing; and, three, it considers how such modes of relationship are deeply felt, albeit in different ways. As such, colonial entanglement builds off of settler colonialism in ways that resist recentering dominant expansionist modes of relationship at the expense of Indigenous ones.

This first chapter is followed by three empirical chapters that focuses on a number of different events that take place with/in the Banff-Bow Valley over the past two centuries leading up to, and including, the Buffalo Reintroduction Project. Methodologically speaking, each of these chapters deploy a critical discourse analysis that draws on multiple Indigenous and non-Indigenous experiences surrounding both the reintroduction of Buffalo and other events taking place with/in Banff National Park. These accounts come from various different sources—ranging from official government statements to news articles; from court testimony to campaign blog posts and webpages. However, in considering the different narrative accounts offered by Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, my intention is not to judge any particular perspective in ways that are dismissive. Instead, I consider the "dangers"—in the Foucauldian sense suggested in the epigraph—that accompany each as those deploying them think through/feel out each perspective. Here, I pay particular attention to not only the impacts that each perspective holds, but also the tensions and aporia they produced when entangled with/in colonial contexts.

In chapter two, I look to the signing of Treaty 7 and the establishment of Banff National Park to consider how different modes of relationship cultivate different bodies of knowledge

through their relations to "place." Comparing the expansive relationships of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda to the expansionist relationships of Project Canada, I highlight how the latter relies on colonizing, racializing, and gendering processes of differentiation to flatten and smooth over the bumpy surfaces and relationships making up place in an attempt to erect colonizing regimes of property that cater to capital—or what I refer to as states of (dis)possession. Although focusing on the signing of Treaty 7, the last section of the chapter transitions to the establishment of Banff National Park to reveal how multiple forms of colonizing property enable what I call the double move of dispossession. This not only points to the ways in which Indigenous homelands are rendered intelligible to colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relating through processes of Indigenous dispossession, but it also ensures that further accumulation is possible through the concentration of wealth and resources into the hands of fewer people through new rounds of settler dispossession.

In the third chapter, I turn from the different systems of value produced by different modes of relationship to think about some of contradictions that arise within colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship—particularly how such regimes generally fail to destroy the Indigenous people they seek to replace in completion. Here, I look at three instances—namely, the passing of the Indian Act, the banning of hunting in the Park, and the (in)famous Banff Indian Days—to think through how the contradictions of colonization and capital accumulation are felt by different people caught up within colonial entanglements. Specifically, I consider how state of nature fictions use colonizing tropes of nature and Indigeneity to break up enduring Indigeneities. By strategically demarcating the boundaries between civilization and savagery, state-nature-fictions make and reproduce narratives that work to shore up the supremacy of white masculinities at the expense of Indigenous peoples. This not only produces colonial subjects invested in states of

(dis)possession, but it also ensures the continual transit Indigenous lands and bodies in pursuit of capital.

In the final chapter, I return focus to the buffalo reintroduction to consider how the Project supports and/or breaks up the different relationships that are entangled within Banff National Park. I argue that, despite renewing relationships between the buffalo and Indigenous people, the reintroduction project fails to disrupt the states of (dis)possession and processes of colonial subject formation described in the previous two chapters. In fact, by reiterating a type of state-of-nature fiction that casts on-going imperial war and colonial breakage in benevolent terms, the project actually provides non-Indigenous people with tempting 'participatory' mechanisms to symbolically *break from* their colonizing relationships with Indigenous nations living in the area—all while moving toward some predetermined and settler-proclaimed state of reconciliatory contentment that redeems Project Canada's genocidal agenda.

However, despite these criticisms, I also assert that the buffalo's return is not all bad. In fact, the reintroduction has provided important opportunities for the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations to not only renew their relationship with the buffalo (although in a limited and particular way), but these nations have also been able to exceed the confines of the Project by reaffirming political relations with one another through the signing of the Buffalo Treaty (2014). Through the Treaty, Indigenous planning for the buffalo renews relations between human and non-human nations while, simultaneously, renewing the valley as a site of international politics and coordination. For this reason, I suggest that such an act can be understood as "dangerous"—in the Foucauldian sense—for colonizing regimes because it possesses the capacity to ground itself in an anti-colonial internationalism that exists beyond the pale of the Canadian state's own claims to power.

ONE

On Colonial Entanglement

> *To be alive is to be entangled in relationships not entirely of our own making*.
>
> —John Borrows, *Entangled Territorialities*[1]

This chapter presents the main theoretical framework of this thesis through its consideration of colonial entanglement. I argue that, as a concept, colonial entanglement proves useful in at least three ways for those seeking to understand and disrupt colonial contexts, such as Canada. First, the notion of colonial entanglement works to emphasize the complexity, multiplicity, and unpredictability of the relationships that (re)produce life with/in such contexts. By doing so, it carves out analytic space for considerations of the various ways that both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people and modes of relationship continue to exist and endure. It also enables an analysis that cuts against universalizing and hegemonic grains by understanding how these relations and experiences often exceed (settler) colonial narratives and logics rooted in binarized and linear processes. This includes—but is not limited to—drawing attention to how non-Indigenous people and colonizing institutions are affected by Indigenous lands, bodies, and nations. Second, I argue that, through its attentiveness to the messy and bumpy reality of different modes of relationship, the concept of colonial entanglement offers a parallax view of colonial contexts by considering different events and processes form both Indigenous *and* non-Indigenous relationships in places like Banff National Park. In doing so, entanglement not only reveals how these different perspectives often produce tensions and aporia, but it also makes a deliberate effort to sit with such incommensurabilities. Finally, colonial entanglements crucially center how different modes of relationship are *felt* as they wrap around different Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies. This emphasis on feeling, and what Dian Million calls "felt theory,"[2] enables colonial entanglement to

offer added layers and perspectives to one's analysis—drawing attention to both the parallaxes that produce the uneven texture of colonization (and its breakage) as it targets specific people in their everyday lives as well as the enduring effects and affects of different processes and relationships as they play out across different scales over time and space. Taken altogether, then, the concept of colonial entanglement enables scholars and activists alike to resist the flattening effects (and affects) of colonization, while simultaneously remaining attentive to, what Leanne Simpson calls, the "constellations of co-resistance" generated by those different modes of relationships being lived out on the ground.[3]

The first half of this chapter begins by discussing the core theoretical and political premises of colonial entanglement—namely, that all existence is relational. From here, I offer the notion of "entanglement," more generally, as a helpful concept for engaging with the multiplicity and complexity of the different relationships and modes of relating that make up life—especially, when one considers the fact that the entangled relations we find ourselves caught up in always possess the potential to *break up* different lands, bodies, and nations (both physically and metaphorically). Next, I briefly discuss colonization as a *particular process (and weapon) of imperialism and its expansionist modes of relating*. As a particular process within these modes of relationship, I follow Manu Karuaka's work in understanding colonization as requiring the breaking up of various lands and bodies—particularly, those deemed Indigenous—in an attempt to facilitate the concentration of wealth and power through war and infrastructure development.[4] This section is followed up with a brief discussion on the concept of settler colonialism as the dominant framework for considering settler colonies, such as Canada; here, I consider how both the concept and the field address colonization and its expansionist modes of relationship as a form of *breakage*, while also revealing some of its limits. I suggest that such limits prevent scholars and activists who mobilize the concept of settler colonialism from recognizing relations and modes of relating that possess the potential to

(re)orient life within colonial contexts. Finally, the second half of the chapter turn to the notion of colonial entanglement as a way of building on the important concept-work done by settler colonialism, while taking seriously the criticisms offered by a number of Indigenous and settler scholars, alike.

On being-with:

A consideration of colonial entanglements within contexts like Banff National Park is fundamentally a consideration of *relationships*. In fact, one of this project's core assumptions is that all existence is relational. From this perspective, the very notion of "being" is always-already in a process of "being-with"; as Jean-Luc Nancy asserts: "[e]xistence is *with*: otherwise nothing exists."[5] This means that there is no 'self' that exists prior to its relationships *with* 'others' because all beings are (inter)dependent on their relationships to (re)produce life.[6]

Such a formulation of existence as 'being-with' is significant for a number of reasons. For one, by presenting existence in relational terms, the 'with' of being-with becomes the starting point from which being (ontology) and knowledge of being (epistemology) emerge. This also means that focusing on relationships ensures an analysis that emphasizes movement and change because, as social relationships change to reflect how entanglements of different lands, bodies, and nations produce and reproduce life with/in place, they also lead to changes in how these different bodies are thought about. As Karuka explains, "focusing on modes of relationship emphasizes that consciousness does not determine existence. Social existence determines consciousness."[7]

Another reason why shifting focus to different relationships and modes of relationship is significant is because it enables one to draw attention to the different roles and responsibilities these relationships entail. This means that an emphasis on relationships can also reveal how groups of people can relate differently to each other and to the rest of the human and non-human world.

For example, relational approaches have long been taken up by Indigenous intellectuals who have been marginalized and silenced within different colonizing bodies of knowledge. Such a fact is made clear by scholars like Umeek (E. Richard Atleo), Lee Maracle, John Borrows, Robin Wall Kimmerer, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, Sarah Hunt, Glen Coulthard, and Gina Starblanket and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark (just to name a few), who have continuously taken up and highlighted the ways in which relationships manifest in various forms and function across multiple scales.[8] Rather than being seen as more valid or not, a relational approach challenges epistemic hierarchies by understanding different methods of knowledge production as emerging from particular social relationships, which are themselves embedded in, and co-constituted through, particular material conditions. This means that one is able to engage in a deep and genuine way with different bodies of knowledge—including those embodied by Indigenous persons and their nations—because they are understood as emerging from collective relationships in and with place that are concrete and material (rather than mystical or innate)—all while simultaneously revealing the limits of individualistic, hierarchal, anthropocentric, and exploitative ways of being that are embodied by colonial modes of relationship.[9]

For example, in attempting to challenge individualizing and hierarchical modes of relationship, relational approaches can also seek to disrupt exploitative and oppressive ways of being by centering those voices and experiences that are often marginalized within particular bodies of knowledge by other forms of exploitation, dispossession, domination, and violence. This includes—but is not limited to—those voices belonging to Indigenous women, girls, queer and Two-Spirt peoples. As Gina Starblanket and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark explain:

> While women across cultures have a tendency to be associated with ideals of nature and relationship (and men with ideals of human autonomy and independence), the gendered nature of the discourse of relationship also carries particular implications in Indigenous communities because of the ways in which it is invoked as a remedy to the violence of colonialism.[10]

They go on to explain how essentializing representations of gender risk placing women and femme-identifying people in the contradictory position where they are responsible for the maintenance of community and relationships, while having less agency when it comes to deciding on how to address these relationships, which are often dismissed or seen as less significant than other issues like land reclamation.[11] Furthermore, such a binarized understanding of gender also completely occludes the forms of violence that target queer and Two-Spirit individuals.[12]

Finally, an emphasis on relationships and modes of relating can also reveal how groups of people might correct those violent and oppressive modes of relationship that have not only been taken up by humans as they interact with one another, but also in how they interact with non-human relationships. Again, Starblanket and Stark explain how a relational paradigm can encourage movement beyond hierarchical conceptions of life that privileges notions of the 'human' over the 'non-human' world.[13] From this perspective, the relations between the buffalo and other non-human animals are intimately tied to, and interdependent with, human communities as well as the landscapes that all these relationships convene on. In fact, some theorists, such as Soren C. Larsen and Jay T. Johnson, echo this point, suggesting that thinking in relational terms encourages us to consider all aspects of the entangled networks that make up the places we find ourselves living within.[14] Each of these authors also suggest that a relational approach can open us up to considering how place, itself, exercises agency by convening our being together.[15] In other words, a relational approach compels one to consider the ways in which the physical landscapes, the movement of winds and waters, and the grasses and plant species that make up places like Banff National Park affect and are affected by those living with/in them. In doing so, such an approach not only reveals the limits of dominant expansionist modes of relationship, but it can also offer alternative

conceptions of how humans might "govern and organize ourselves in relation to one another and the living earth."[16]

Living an entangled life:

To consider the relational character of existence in ways that capture the complexities and unpredictability of the human and non-human relationships making up colonial contexts like Banff, this project mobilizes the concept of "colonial entanglement" to show how the Buffalo Reintroduction Project draws on enduring modes of relationship as well as how the Project functions to promote and/or disrupt these different modes of relationship and those embodying them. However, before discussing colonial entanglements specifically, I want to briefly unpack the notion of entanglement more generally. Considering the notion in their work, Françoise Dussart and Sylvie Poirier note that Merriam-Webster dictionary defines entanglement as "the condition of being deeply involved."[17] They also add that such condition can be complicated and, even, compromising.[18] From this definition, I follow Dussart and Poirier in taking the notion of entanglement to invite a consideration of the messiness of life that goes beyond the linear and, sometimes, dichotomous dynamics that the notions of relationship and relationality sometimes invoke; rather than denoting a single connection or tie between two people or groups, the notion of entanglement evokes ideas of messiness, complexity, and multiplicity through the image of a tangled knot made up of many different materials and components. In doing so, entanglement also emphasizes a certain level of unpredictability as it incorporates a whole mess of relations into what Ann Laura Stoler calls a "tangled story."[19]

Telling a tangled story through the notion of entanglement is also important because our entangled relationships are not only complex and unpredictable; their tangled knots can also lead to us to compromising situations. Focusing on the influence that different relationships with

different people carry, John Borrows explains in the epigraph above that "[t]o be alive is to be entangled in relationships not entirely of our own making." He goes on to elaborate:

> We are born to parents whom we did not choose. Our families pre-existed our arrival. We receive languages, cultures, and worldviews before getting much choice in the matter. Our formative years are threaded with social, emotional, and economic relationships that we did not conceive. They are woven into our very being, largely without our permission.[20]

Here, Borrows names that not only is one's life inherently entangled in relation to others, but these entangled relationships also mean we do not have complete autonomy and control over the course of our own lives. This is because we do not have control over those we exist in relation with—despite some's attempts to achieve otherwise. This makes us vulnerable to both those we know and to those we do not know, who are able to negatively impact us in particular contexts.[21]

Yet, to suggest that entanglements are always negative and restricting would also be misleading. Echoing the work of Jean Dennison—which focuses on colonial entanglemnts specifically—Borrows explains, "[m]ost of what we enjoy in life flows from other people's labor, received through our entanglement with people long dead or living people whom we will never meet."[22] He adds, "[o]ur received condition can augment our growth and broaden our horizons through mutual aid and participatory structures."[23] For Borrows, Dennison, and others, it is clear that an emphasis on relationships through the concept of entanglement can reveal how our lives rely on, and are affected by, others for better or worse.[24] This includes those generations that have come before us.

To exemplify the dual potential of entanglements, we can look to the buffalo. In *All My Relations*, Fred Dubray—president of the Inter-Tribal Bison Cooperative—tells Winona LaDuke that attempts to domesticate buffalo by removing their horns has rippling effects. On the one hand, cutting off a buffalo's horns makes them easier for human management; yet, on the other hand, this practice possesses unintentional consequences for both the animal and the land.[25] Without horns,

buffalo lose a primary defense mechanism against predators. Horns also play a key role in buffalo wallowing, which provide habitats and water sources for a number of other animals living in prairie ecosystems.[26] Furthermore, cutting off a buffalo's horns also changes how they are able to relate to the one another because their horns point to each animal's uniqueness as an individual within the group.[27] Here, the life-enhancing relationships of the buffalo—which are fundamentally collective and span across a myriad of species—are restricted and constrained by a particular relationship to ranchers because cutting off a buffalo's horns changes the way they are able to relate to each other and to the land.

In addition to emphasizing the complexity and unpredictability of entanglements as well as their potentially compromising character, the notion of entanglement also functions at a visceral level. As mentioned above, to be entangled is to be *deeply involved,* and this is *intimately felt* on the body—if not always in ways that are comprehensible and communicable.[28] In other words, the notion of entanglement compels one engage in what Million calls felt theory, which considers how feelings and affect impact the ways in which people think, and move, through the world around them.[29] Again discussing what it means to take a buffalo's horns, Fred Dubray demonstrates this felt theory by telling the story of his grandmother, who had her two long braids cut off at a boarding school. For her, this experience of racialized and gendered violence—which was deeply felt and affected her throughout her life—was comparable to the buffalo having their horns defiled.[30] Reflecting on his grandmother's experience in relation to the buffalo, Dubray explains: "If you take their horn it's like cutting off our braid. It's the same."[31] By considering the ways in which our relationships affect different human and non-human beings, the concept of entanglement helps to think with *and* through the different lived relations and felt experiences that make up places like the Banff National Park.

Building on these authors and their work, then, I use the notion of entanglement to describe the *complex and unpredictable assemblages that make up our lived relationships and felt experiences with the human and non-human world*. These relationships and experiences wrap around different bodies—both materially and immaterially—affecting both our sensibilities and our sensing-abilities. In other words, entanglements are *felt* differently by different bodies as they bring us together and pull us apart through the unfolding routines and patterns of our entangled lives. Sometimes these entanglements provide us (and those we encounter) with reciprocal access to shared materials and ideas that can be used in life-enhancing ways; other times they wrap around our bodies in ways that restrict and constrain, squeezing us until we break or something breaks in/around/through us.

Here, I want to briefly offer three more points to further complicate the notion of entanglement. First, despite their power to influence our lives though the multiple relationships we find ourselves in, entanglements are never fully determining. As "subjects of power," our modes of relationship and felt experiences always-already possess the potential to exceed and/or alter the character of our own entangled relations of subjectification—albeit, in different ways and to different degrees.[32] By emphasizing the complexities and messiness of different modes of relationship and felt experiences, the concept of entanglement enables for us to call attention to the various interlocking forms of exploitation, dispossession, domination, and violence that make up Project Canada and ask how they all relate to and/or contradict one another without erasing the agency of those bodies caught up within them.

Second, the tensions and contradictions that emerge from our entangled and entangling worlds are only intensified when considering how our entangled relations function across multiple scales. In terms of temporality, entanglements work to shape how we come to remember the past, perceive the present, and imagine the future; but—in doing so—they also rely upon those bodies

entangled within them to make and reproduce the particular power dynamics from which they emerge.[33] Geographically speaking, entanglements extend and contract across different scales of both human and non-human bodies—bringing them together and pulling them apart in different ways that are intimately felt. For example, the interactions and relationships that unfold with/in place as the buffalo become reacquainted with the Banff-Bow Valley possess rippling effects throughout not only the region but also amongst the human and non-human communities living across the continent and beyond. Yet, many of these entangled relations are often ignored, disavowed, and (un)known by the expansionist modes of relationship that seek to shore up colonizing regimes. Borrows sums up the ways in which entanglements wrap around and incorporate different scales of bodies in his work, explaining that they not only apply to, and wrap around, individual people's bodies but also extend to groups, communities, nations, peoples, and species.[34] From this perspective, entanglements serve to bolster and/or hinder the capacities of not only individual human bodies, but also collective and non-human bodies as well.[35]

Finally, in naming their unpredictable character, I do not want to suggest that entanglements are random or accidental. The capacity of entanglements to support and/or restrict life tends to continually target some human and non-human beings more than others. This targeting is largely influenced by at least two things: one, the particular entanglements of power making up different places—which tend to rely on particular modes of relationship over others—and, two, one's positionality in relation to these different legal-political, social, economic, and spiritual orders. For this reason, what is unpredictable about entanglements is the particular ways in which they come to support or restrict one's life rather than whether they will be supportive or restrictive in the first place.

To help understand the ways in which our entangled relations wrap around different bodies in different and unpredictable ways that (re)direct and (re)orient (while also holding onto notions

agency and resistance), I want to now introduce the notion of *breakage*. To do this, I begin with a discussion of Katherena Vermette's *The Break.* Using this novel, I reveal how particular modes of relationship (re)produce entanglements that function to target and *break up* some bodies—more than others—often in an attempt to *break from* the very entangled relationships embodied by those who are disproportionately targeted. This is particularly the case for colonizing regimes and the expansionist modes of relationship they rely on.

Colonial breakage and imperial expansion:

In her novel *The Break*, Katherena Vermette tells the story of a community of mixed Indigenous and non-Indigenous ancestry living in the North End of Winnipeg as they grapple with the fallout of a shocking act of sexual violence that has occurred on a piece of land known simply as "the Break."[36] Through her prose, Vermette skillfully weaves together the different perspectives of ten Indigenous characters into a tangled story—all connected to this particular piece of land. In doing so, she also effectively transforms the place known as the Break into something more than just an empty space physically cutting through those neighborhoods developed on top of Indigenous lands.[37] Rather, *The Break* comes to stand in as a theoretically complex and multifaceted metaphor pointing to both the physical and psychological *breakage* that occurs through the violence targeting Indigenous people living within colonial contexts—especially, those deemed feminine and/or gender non-conforming. Like the violent act of breaking off a buffalo's horns, the breaking up of people's bodies in Vermette's novel—along with the breaking up of land—reveals how violence affects individuals and collectives in both physical and psychological ways. But *The Break* also shows readers how different characters attempt to *break from* the entanglements of power that lead to their bodily breakage in the first place. In other words, read as a story of *breakage*, Vermette's novel serves to name both the violent consequences of Project Canada for Indigenous peoples

generally—and Indigenous women, girls, and queer and Two-Spirit folks in particular—while also revealing the agency and enduring strength that manifests through notions of Indigeneity and the different modes of relationship they embody.

What I find particularly compelling about Vermette's text is the way in which duality becomes central to the *breakage* that occurs within the narrative. For example, although each character is physically and metaphorically caught up within various entanglements that result in the breakage of their own bodies (both physically and metaphorically), it is also through their entanglements with other characters that they are able to resist the violence that so-often plagues the text. Not only do the Indigenous women and girls throughout this text survive and endure multiple forms of gendered violence as they move through their daily lives within the lands claimed by Project Canada, but they often do so in ways that attempt to support and enhance the lives of those around them. Furthermore, through the character of Phoenix—a young Indigenous girl who has just run-away from a juvenile detention center—Vermette shows audiences that everyone possesses the ability to both experience and perpetuate various forms of violence.

Like the dual capacity of entanglements to be both life-enhancing and life-restricting, the concept of breakage used in this thesis also possesses a duality reminiscent of what Leanne Simpson calls an "Indigenous Aesthetics" of affirmative refusal.[38] For Simpson, an emphasis on duality challenges colonizing epistemologies (and aesthetics) because it refuses to conform to the either/or dichotomies and schematic modes of thought that are required for colonization and its expansionist modes of relating.[39] In many ways, it is the dual potential that comes out of the ways in which our entangled relations possess the capacity to, on the one hand, *break up* bodies while, on the other hand, support efforts to *break from* the conditions that lead to such violence in the first place that I seek to consider in this work. However, attending to the ways in which people seek to *break from* their entangled relations also brings us back to the critical tension raised in the

introduction—that is, the (im)possibility of *breaking from* a person or group's own entangled conditions.

One text that has proven useful in my own considerations on the (im)possibility of breaking from one's entangled relations is Judith Butler's *Frames of War*. Building from her previous explorations of precariousness and grievability,[40] *Frames of War*'s attends to the different ways affective and ethical considerations of violence are regulated through selective and differential framings.[41] Through her work, Butler underscores how such framings of violence perpetuate conditions where certain lives cannot be apprehended as injurable—and, therefore, *breakable*—because they are not apprehended as living in a full sense.[42] To address this, Butler asserts that a political project guided by an awareness of the *mutual vulnerability* experienced by all beings due to our shared interdependency carries with it the potential for greater responsiveness to the vulnerability of others—especially those whose precarity is particularly intense.[43]

What I want to highlight here is how much of the violence that Butler examines is itself the product of particular modes of relationship that cultivate subjects who react to other people (and modes of relationship) in ways that seek to valorize and fetishize notions of autonomy and independence. Such modes of relating imagine that it is possible to *break from* their own conditions of interdependency by buying into, and perpetuating, what some call a "naturalist ontology," which presupposes a world from which "spirit and subjectivity were long ago evacuated."[44] As a result of this process of "disenchantment,"[45] human beings (or, at least, those deemed to be human in a full sense) are understood as emerging as autonomous agents on at least two levels: first, they are separated from their worldly surroundings on the basis of their supposed rationality and, second—as distinct rational entities—they are also able to exercise control and/or influence over their surroundings. In other words, the processes and relationships that distinguish "man" from "his environment" are co-constitutive of the processes and relationships of empire in that both rely on

logics of containment to physically and epistemically break up the world through the colonizing mentality of divide, define, and conquer.[46]

Following Karuka, I describe such modes of relationship seeking to divide and define the world in order to control and accumulate as "expansionist modes of relationship."[47] From within such modes of relating, orientations towards projects of imperialism (and Empire)—which seek to shore up notions of autonomy and independence by proliferating the accumulation capital into fewer and fewer hands—are understood as not only natural but inevitable despite the immense and intense levels of violence and breakage that are required to maintain these relationships.[48] As Karuka suggests, expansionist modes of relationship imagine the world through "mystical conceptions of unceasing expansion[…] untethered by physical constraints."[49] However, as Butler asserts, the task of securing one's own invulnerability (whether individual or collective) by attempting to break from their entangled relationships—i.e. the task of securing sovereignty (in a colonial sense of the term)—is, in reality, an impossibility. In fact, such efforts can only ever amount to mobilizing different strategies and tactics aimed at minimizing one's vulnerability by accumulating resources and power *in relation to others*—which, in turn, maximizes their vulnerability. In other words, expansionist attempts to establish a(n authoritarian) sense of control and independence over individual and collective life produces a reactionary politics that exposes human and non-human beings to processes of exploitation, dispossession, domination and violence, which all bring with them different forms of physical and epistemic *breakage*. For this reason, Butler suggests that any effort to *break out* of one's conditions of vulnerability—conditions born out of the very nature of our entangled lives—only ever works to establish a "differential distribution of precarity" wherein certain bodies become more exposed to injury (and breakage) in an attempt to minimize the injurability (and breakability) of others.[50]

Butler's primary example of expansionist modes of relationship is the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories. Here, Butler explains how recourse to Israeli military strategies against Palestinian civilians draws on and perpetuates the "denial of the colonizer's precariousness in the name of invulnerable self-defense." [51] To phrase differently, Butler shows how colonized Palestinian subjects face increased levels of "precarity"—which result in increased forms of colonial *breakage* that targets their bodies of flesh, bodies of knowledge, and bodies politic—all because of Israel's desire to *break from* its own conditions of vulnerability via the theft of Palestinian homelands and destruction of the Palestinian nation.[52] I want to extend this particular example of expansionist modes of relationship—and the logic of colonial breakage it points to—in several ways. First, in turning to Banff National Park, I argue that attempts to deny one's vulnerability—which is at its core a denial of the fact that one's life is entangled with others—is not only exemplified within colonial contexts like Israel/Palestine or Canada; instead, it functions as a constitutive feature of colonizing regimes and the expansionist modes of relationship they rely on. Building on Vermette and Butler's works, I argue that colonization—as a specific process of imperialism—is fundamentally premised on expansionist modes of relating that seek to differentially (de)value certain lands, bodies, and nations in order to facilitate the concentration of resources and wealth both within and beyond colonial territories for the benefit of the ruling class(es). This is enacted through the interlocking processes of dispossession, labor exploitation, enslavement and racial domination, gendered and sexual violence, cultural and spiritual defilement, and the usurpation of governing powers (amongst others)—which all convene to make up the imperial project that is Canada. Echoing this, Manu Karuka explains that colonization functions by turning notions of abundance into scarcity, interdependence into isolation, and a sense of safety and security into vulnerability; as he explains, "Colonialism produces a desolate and lonely

wasteland, through mass destruction of life, and mass destruction of the consciousness of life[…] *Colonialism is predicated on mass extinction and genocide*."[53]

However, despite this ongoing violence and breakage resulting from colonial modes of relationships, other modes of relationship also exist simultaneously within place. This includes—but is not limited to—those modes of relating embodied by some Indigenous nations, which seek to support and enhance life across different genders, generations, and species. As exemplified by the modes of relationships embodied by nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, "expansive modes of relationship" seek to support and enhance life in all its forms as they extend across time and place. But this is not done in ways that not only seek to include difference in a contained and manageable way that can still facilitate the transit (and transgression) of Indigenous lands and Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies; these modes of relationship seek to foster a type of universal kinship that counters the death and destruction wrought by colonizing regimes by fostering and renewing relationships rooted in care and accountability through treaty processes.[54]

As a concept, colonial entanglements not only seek to describes the particular relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people; it also points to the different modes of relationship that are entangled with and embodied by these relationships. In doing so, it seeks to sit with the tensions that emerge between different Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, while deeply considering the messiness and complexities that result from such a myriad of place-based relationships extending across different genders, generations, and species. After all, simply attempting to *break from* the entangled relations that make up the colonial contexts we find ourselves in is itself a move that assumes one can become independent from the relationships that make up life. This is why a consideration of colonial breakage in relation to the entangled relations that make up and reproduce life is fundamental; it is through the notion of entanglement that we see that one can never simply make a clean *break from* the relationships we find ourselves living

with/in. But this does not mean that we cannot learn how to relate differently by *embodying different modes of relationship.*

Yet, before discussing colonial entanglements further, I want to first consider one of the dominant conceptual framework surrounding colonization as it manifests in Canada—namely, settler colonialism. In doing so, I consider two things: first, what are the key contributions that settler colonialism—as a concept and a field of study—makes in terms of understanding the expansionist modes of relationship that make up Project Canada and, second, in what ways is the concept limited. From here, I move into a deeper discussion of colonial entanglements, including both how the concept compliments settler colonialism, while also pushing further to (re)orient Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships towards horizons of decolonization.

Logics of elimination:

Increasingly, one of the main conceptual frameworks used to analyze and critique colonization's role in the Canadian context is the analytic of settler colonialism. Such a concept suggests that colonial projects like Canada—along with the US, Australia, New Zealand, and Israel—are marked by a specific structural dynamic. Unlike other forms of colonization—such as franchise colonialism—settler colonialism signals the fact that "the colonizing group not only occupies and extracts wealth from Indigenous lands but also has settled on them."[55] Building on other literature—especially, that offered by Indigenous scholars and activists[56]—the concept of settler colonialism has been mobilized by many to articulate the ways in which colonial violence and breakage within contexts like Canada seeks to eradicate Indigenous life and modes of relationship only to replace these ways of knowing and being with expansionist modes of relating that lend themselves to capital accumulation. The scholarly mobilization of settler colonialism has also led

to both the institutionalization and proliferation of the concept and field within academia and beyond.[57]

Perhaps most famous of these works is Patrick Wolfe's "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," which argues that settler colonial states are premised on a "logic of elimination" that seeks to "eliminate the native."[58] Responding to questions concerning the relationship between settler colonialism and genocide, Wolfe argues that a settler colonial logic of elimination is "inherently violent but not invariably genocidal."[59] This distinction emerges because—in addition to the fact that genocide can (and must) occur without settler colonialism—the logic of elimination does not only refer to "the summary liquidation of Indigenous people, though it includes it."[60] As Wolfe makes clear, settler colonialism has both destructive and productive dimensions: "Negatively, it strives for the dissolution of native societies. Positively, it erects a new colonial society on the expropriated land base."[61] In other words, while settler colonialism seeks to destroy Indigenous peoples *as peoples* by breaking up Indigenous bodies and their relations to community and territory as well as past and future generations etc., it does so in an attempt to *replace* these nations with a settler nation-state. Again, this occurs through violent—often genocidal—acts of spatial removal, mass killings, and cultural assimilation, etc.; but Wolfe is clear that such violence also serves as a productive organizing principle that structures newly erected settler societies. As he suggests, "settler colonizers come to stay: invasion is a structure not an event."[62]

As a distinct theoretical concept, many have taken settler colonialism to understand the specific ways that settler states and their populations produce particular modes of relationship that lead to colonial *breakage* as they attempt to "eliminate" Indigenous peoples to access Indigenous lands and waters. This has led some to conceptualize settler colonialism in terms of its everyday modalities.[63] Others point to the ways in which race, gender, sexuality, class etc. are constitutive

features of settler colonialism, which has ultimately led to intellectual and political synergies with a number of other fields, including: queer and feminist theories;[64] Indigenous and critical race theories;[65] and anti-capitalist and analysis.[66] Some have also suggested that an emphasis on settler colonialism's structural character ultimately offers important tools for better understanding ways to potentially proceed (or not proceed) in *breaking up* these structures of power.[67] As Alex Trimble Young states: "by analyzing invasion as 'a structure not an event,' settler colonial studies have enabled a productive mode of critique that examines how eliminatory violence can subtend even the most unlikely discourses of liberation in settler colonial circumstances."[68]

At its best, then, settler colonialism—as an analytic and a field of study—has sharpened critiques of the particular expansionist modes of relationship being lived out in places, such as Canada. As Wolfe reminds us:

> In replacing [Indigenous life worlds] with a social system based on an instrumental concept of land as alienable property, settlers create a new and fundamentally alienated alternative life-world of their own. Settler social institutions are not less tied to land than Native ones. *They are differently tied*.[69]

This is certainly the case in Banff National Park where the Canadian state and its colonial subjects have continuously enacted processes of dispossession, labor exploitation, enslavement and racial domination, gendered and sexual violence, cultural and spiritual defilement, and the usurpation of governing powers to transit and transgress those territories contained within the Park in pursuit of capital. However, analyzing the historical and political context of the Banff-Bow Valley through a settler colonial analytic also remains limited in several ways.

One of the central limitations of settler colonialism is the ways in which an overemphasis on settler colonial logics of elimination fails to account for the fact that Indigenous nations continue to exist, persist, and resist. To phrase differently, as an on-going process—that is, as a structure not an event—settler colonialism's eliminatory logic has (almost always) failed to actually eradicate

Indigenous nations and modes of relationship in completion.[70] This is primarily because Indigenous peoples refuse to let it be so—or, as Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark puts it, "Indigenous resistance and persistence would never allow it."[71] But it is also because of the ways in which colonizing regimes and their colonial subjects come to depend upon Indigenous people, as peoples, to articulate and reiterate their distinct claims to sovereignty and superiority (see chapter two and three).[72] Yet, by overemphasizing its eliminatory logic, settler colonialism—as a field and analytic—tends to occlude both of these facts. This is because the analytic so often fails to recognize that settler colonial power dynamics emerge *in relation to Indigenous peoples and their distinct modes of relationship*.

Such an occlusion has a number of consequences. For one, focusing primarily on a logic of elimination at the expense of settler colonialism's more 'productive' aspect risks reproducing a particular form of the 'elimination of the native,' itself. As J. Kēhaulani Kauanui argues, "to exclusively focus on the settler colonial without any meaningful engagement with the indigenous—as has been the case in how Wolfe's work has been cited—can (re)produce another form of 'elimination of the native.'"[73] Echoing Kauanui, Vimalassery, Hu Pegues, and Goldstein suggest that settler colonial studies itself contributes to what they call "colonial unknowing."[74] For these authors, focusing primarily on the settler state and its project of settlement preforms a type of unknowing where colonial, white supremacist orders are (re)centered all while Indigenous peoples and modes of relationships become "willfully ignored."[75]

Furthermore, by dismissing enduring Indigenous presence and modes of relationship, a settler colonial analysis also dismisses the potentially liberatory knowledges and experiences that Indigenous peoples carry. As Wanda Nanibush points out, "the impacts of colonialism are different for those bodies that benefit from it than those whose labor, bodies, emotions, lands and children are taken without permission."[76] As will be revealed within the context of Banff, those who are

Indigenous to place carry with them knowledges of place that have been passed down generationally since time immemorial. Placing too much emphasis on an eliminatory logic fails to center such Indigenous voices and the liberatory knowledges of place they carry. This only works to limit settler colonial studies in ways that, at best, flatten and smooth over the liberatory alternatives offered by such relations and experiences and, at worst, risk reifying (and possibly replicating) the violent erasure of Indigenous peoples—along with other racialized non-white bodies that have been marginalized and exploited by the colonizing regimes of states like Canada. In other words, solely relying on settler colonialism not only risks intensifying colonizing power dynamics that are meant to be subverted, but it may also work to 'eliminate the Native' by further dismissing and *breaking up* Indigenous modes of relating.

These analytic limitations and lack of a political project ultimately converge to reinforce the ways in which settler colonialism's 'structural' character risks (re)centering the settler state and its colonial subjectivities (especially those perceived as white and masculine etc.) by representing each as natural and inevitable.[77] As a 'structure not an event,' Stoler suggests that settler colonialism is often invoked as "an ontological state rather than a fractious historical condition."[78] Vimalassery et al. also suggest that this emphasis on structure over event is actually "symptomatic of the stabilization of colonial unknowing through binaries and schematic modes of thought."[79] For them, not only does this risk attributing a false sense of stability and "fixity" to the concept of settler colonialism and its illegitimate claims to Indigenous lands, but it also works to isolate it from other colonial and imperial trajectories. This elides both the complex entanglements of power and differential (de)valuations that extend across continents and oceans as well as the decolonizing possibilities that respond to these brutalizing regimes.[80]

In response to these limitations, Kauanui has introduced what she calls "enduring indigeneity" to point to the fact that Indigenous people and their modes of relationship continue to

endure in a two-fold way. For one, enduring Indigeneity points to the fact that Indigenous peoples around the world are enduring because they continue to "exist, resist, and persist" *as peoples*—that is, as place-based political collectives whose sovereignty is derived from original occupancy.[81] Second, by mobilizing the notion of "enduring indigeneity" to point to ongoing Indigenous existence, persistence, and resistance, she also notes that colonizing regimes must also "endure indigeneity, as [they] hold[…] out against it."[82] In other words, Kauanui's concept not only shows us how an emphasis on elimination risks rearticulating what Vimalassery, Hu Pegues, and Goldstein call processes of colonial unknowing—which occlude and invisiblize the ways that Indigenous nations and their modes of relationship continue to endure within colonial contexts like Canada;[83] by centering Indigenous nation and modes of relationship, it reveals how Indigenous presences also exert different kinds of force on these entangled relationships *by virtue of their continued existence, persistence, and resistance*.

Enduring Indigeneities are exemplified within Banff National Park where the presence of Indigenous nations, such as the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, the Siksikaitsitapi, the Tsuu T'ina, the Secwepemc and the Cree continue to be felt by the Canadian state and its colonial subjects. In fact, much of the state's own desires to enter treaty with local nations in the latter half of the nineteenth century emerges as a reaction to the ways in which Project Canada had already become caught up with Indigenous nations and their modes of relationship, which wrapped around and pressed on the colonizing regime. As will be discussed further in chapter two, entering into a treaty relationship enabled the Canadian state to achieve two things: namely, it both helped to subdued potential Indigenous resistance, and it enabled Canada to distinguish itself as a sovereign state with ultimate authority over the territories it claimed.[84] These goals were then further intensified with the introduction and implementation of the Indian Act, which will be considered in chapter three.

Thus, rather than simply eliminating Indigenous peoples—which would establish a *break from* Indigenous nations that settler colonies so desperately seek—colonizing regimes like Canada and the US can never truly *break from* Indigenous bodies and their modes of relationship. Instead, each state—as projects of empire—is forced to respond and react to enduring Indigenous presences in particular places. Yet, when understood solely through a settler colonial lens of elimination, one risks buying into colonizing nation-building narratives that mute, displace, and erase the enduring presences of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, the Siksikaitsitapi, the Tsuu T'ina, the Secwepemc and the Cree, which also wrap around colonizing bodies and modes of relationship. By emphasizing that Indigenous nations continue to endure in various ways, Kauanui's enduring Indigeneity draws our attention to the fact that Indigenous (and non-Indigenous) people exist within highly complex relationships that not only shape collective ways of living in specific places; her concept also opens one's analysis to the fact that such modes of relationship and bodies of knowledge also make and reproduce particular affective regimes that "land" on—and are *felt by*—both Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies in different ways. As significant as a settler colonial analytic may be for analyzing contexts like the Banff National Park, the affective regimes associated with the colonizing modes of relationship it seeks to interrogate only ever make up part of an even broader spectrum of the feelings and experiences with/in colonial entanglements. By centering Indigenous voices and experiences through the notion of enduring Indigeneity, Kauanui rejects the essentializing tendencies of settler colonialism to (mis)translate local particularities into a universalizing narrative whereby the only choices available to Indigenous subjects are to either resist or be co-opted and settler subjects only ever facilitate colonization.

To better consider enduring Indigeneities within Banff National Park (and beyond), the next two sections turn to different aspects of the notion of colonial entanglement. In the first, I argue that a consideration of colonial entanglements offers a *parallax view* that enables one to recognize

both on-going colonial breakage, while also grappling with the fact that Indigenous presences continue to endure in Kauanui's dual sense. For this reason, I assert that colonial entanglements compel scholars and activists to recognize that colonizing regimes are not only affected by how Indigenous peoples engage with them and the non-human world, but it also enables them to follow Karuka in understanding colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship as *a reaction to Indigenous nations and their modes of relating*—or what he refers to as "countersovereignty."[85] This section is then followed by a discussion of colonial entanglements as felt theory—which blurs the lines between thinking and feeling—to further reveal the many tensions and incommensurable gaps that manifest between different modes of relationship.

A parallax view of enduring entanglements:

In *Duress,* Ann Stoler discusses the importance of the concepts we use and how they often emerge as "seductive and powerful agents."[86] Reflecting on the promise of authority that such invested affiliations are imagined to offer as well as the corresponding omissions that must take place to sustain the power that a concept holds, she invites readers to think through the work that concepts do both "for *and* upon" us as we invoke them.[87] As she explains:

> Rather than acquiesce to the resolute security that concepts may be marshalled to confer, we might better look to the unmarked space between their porous and policed peripheries, to that which hovers as not quite 'covered' by a concept, as 'excess' or 'amiss,' that which cannot be quite encompassed by its received attributes, when 'portability' is not self-evident, to that which spills across its edges.[88]

In many ways, I understand the notion of colonial entanglement as taking up Stoler's call to think about the work concepts do as we invoke them and to think beyond the limits and boundaries of a particular concept—in this case, settler colonialism.

When applied to colonial contexts like Canada generally—and Banff National Park specifically—colonial entanglements allow us to consider the ways in which different bodies

become entangled in particular places. In this sense, the concept functions similarly to settler colonialism in that it reveals how Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies and nations become caught up and entangled with Indigenous homelands in ways that tend to expose the former to intense levels of physical and epistemological *breakage*. But, through its emphasis on complexity and unpredictability, colonial entanglements also direct attention to the unmarked space that exceed or "break out" from the conceptual framing offered by settler colonialism.[89] These are the spaces that refuse to be policed by settler colonialism's dichotomous tendencies, which—at times—overemphasize the Indigenous/settler binary in ways that flatten and smooth over the bumpiness of those tangled knots of relations that make up life.

One of the ways colonial entanglements carve out analytic spaces that emphasize how the particular modes of relationship wrapping around colonizing regimes are multiple and complex is by understanding these modes of relationships and experiences as enduring. This includes the different Indigenous and non-Indigenous modes of relationship that exist, persist, and resist despite the efforts of colonizing regimes to flatten and smooth over them as the latter attempts to claim authority and control over the different territories and bodies. Colonial entanglements reveal how different Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies come together in place in ways that become "irreversibly connected."[90] Whether in direct or indirect proximity, these relationships continue to affect one another in ways that are intimately felt through their—sometimes absent—presences in the present. And, although those modes of relating that exceed expansionist relationships are disproportionately embodied by Indigenous people—especially, Indigenous women, children, and queer and Two-Spirit people—they also can be found in the relations and experiences of non-Indigenous people as well—especially, for people of color, queer and gender non-conforming people, disabled people, poor/working-class people, etc.—whose lives do not neatly map onto the logics and desires of Project Canada. After all, the lived relations and felt experiences of Indigenous

and non-Indigenous people are never as contained and coherent as the Indigenous-settler binary suggests.

For example, as will be discussed in chapter two, white—predominantly male—settlers arriving in the Banff-Bow Valley in and around Banff National Park enacted multiple different notions of property in their attempts to replace Indigenous forms of property under the legal authority of the Canadian state. This included both the individual right to that which one can stake out and improve under the *Dominion Land Act* as well as the rights of expansionist corporations seeking to accumulate capital through corporate-state collusion. Although these particular conceptions of property were valorized as (racially) superior, a number of incoming groups of settlers, including Mennonites, Mormons, Icelanders, and Doukhobors, also sought collective ownership as well.[91] Despite being demonized, the Canadian state's desperation to politically and racially "swamp" Indigenous nations and their modes of relationship—which understood property as not only a right to access and benefit from something/someone, but also as a set of responsibilities or obligations—compelled it to (often violently) incorporate these setter-squatters who were acting beyond the jurisdiction and desired plans of the state.[92] By centering colonial entanglements, one is able to consider not only these different notions of property but, also, how each of the notions and its corresponding modes of relationship become entangled in enduring ways that have now come to affect what the buffalo return to Banff National Park looks like and how it is implemented.

In centering colonial entanglement, my work follows Jean Dennison's *Colonial Entanglement* and Françoise Dussart and Sylvie Poirier's *Entangled Territorialities*, which each use the concept of entanglement to consider the colonial contexts of United States and Canada and Australia, respectively.[93] Although writing from the field of anthropology, each of these texts invokes the notion to recognize the often overwhelming power dynamics that press on Indigenous

bodies to (re)produce colonial power formations and imperial dispositions while, simultaneously, gesturing towards the complexities and unpredictability of life that refuses to fit neatly within these narratives. Furthermore, in calling attention to the complex and unpredictable ways in which colonizing regimes press themselves on colonial subjects through their entangled relationships, each of these authors also ensures the agency of these subjects is not erased.

By engaging with colonial entanglements as enduring, my thesis seeks to extend Dennison and Dussart and Poirier's use of concept by considering how both Indigenous *and* non-Indigenous people become entangled within colonial contexts. Whereas each of the above texts use colonial entanglement to show how Indigenous peoples and their distinct modes of relationship are caught up within, and affected by, colonization and its expansionist modes of relationship, I ask how non-Indigenous people and the colonial institutions that claim to govern them are also affected by their Indigenous counterparts.[94] In doing so, I offer a *parallax view* that argues that—similar to Indigenous lands, bodies, and nations—colonial entanglements prove to be both potentially constraining and liberating for the non-Indigenous bodies they wrap around (albeit in different ways and for different reasons).

As described in the introduction, a parallax view emerges from "a shift in an observer's perspective of a distant object based on a change in vantage point."[95] By shifting one's vantage, observations of an object or event change as this parallax reveals things that may be hidden from certain viewpoints. Slavoj Žižek expands on this by applying parallax to language. As he explains, a parallax is "the illusion of being able to use the same language for phenomena which are mutually untranslatable and can be grasped only in a kind of parallax view, constantly shifting perspective between two [or more] points between which no synthesis or mediation is possible."[96] He continues, suggesting that a parallax view asserts "antinomy as irreducible, and conceive[s] the point of radical critique not as a certain determinate position as opposed to another position, but as

the irreducible gap between the positions themselves."[97] Building on these visual and linguistic applications of the term, an understanding of colonial entanglements from a parallax view points to the fact that different modes of relationship not only interlock with one another in ways that affect different human and non-human beings, but also how these interactions result in tensions and incommensurable gaps. Too often these tensions and incummensurabilities are either explained away too quickly or simply denied outright in an effort to break from them and the feelings of uneasiness and anxiety they tend to provoke.[98] However, by looking for—and sitting with—such gaps, a parallax view of colonial entanglements directs attention to the complex and idiosyncratic ways in which colonial subjects act as they move through their entangled lives, revealing the unevenness of risk and vulnerability that is felt and experienced by Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. In other words, by providing a parallax view that considers the perspectives and experiences of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, the concept of entanglement enables one to sit with and hold on to the different modes of relationship that endure within colonial contexts—along with the actions, behaviors, and perspectives that emerge—even if these are rendered irreducible to one another.

Here, I want to make clear that my effort to bring settlers and non-Indigenous people into the fold of colonial entanglements is not to recenter them or their colonizing regimes. Instead, I seek to think seriously about the ways *all of us* are always-already entangled with/in different modes of relationship with colonial contexts—albeit, in different ways that make and reproduce multiple tensions and contradicitons.[99] For this reason, considerations of colonial entanglements as a parallax view of these different modes of relationship works to recognize the continued existence, persistence, and resistance of Indigeneity in the face of colonizing regimes that Kauanui calls for above. Furthermore, in recognizing these colonizing relationships through a parallax view, one is

also able to recognize the fact that colonizing states and their populations must also "endure" Indigeneity, while they hold out against it in their efforts to erect and maintain settler societies.[100]

In fact, I assert that embracing the concept of colonial entanglement compels scholars and activists to recognize that colonizing regimes and the societies they seek to erect are not only affected by how Indigenous peoples relate with the human and non-human world, but also manifest as *a reaction to the enduring presence of Indigenous nations and their modes of relationships*.[101] As a reaction to distinct Indigenous nations and modes of relationship, expansionist modes of relationship and their claims of sovereignty over Indigenous territories amount to what Karuka calls "countersovereignty."[102] Such a reactionary claim to authority proceeds by declaring colonizing modes of relating as superior to the complex networks of relationships already existing between "humans, nonhuman life forms, and inanimate processes that together constitute a distinct place in the world."[103] In doing so, countersovereignty also continuously seeks to *break from* those Indigenous modes of relationship that endure despite its best efforts to control, contain, and eliminate. In this sense, bringing the colonizing state and its populations into the fold reveals how these regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship actually constitute a *reactionary politics* that relies on "counterintelligence, counterinsurgency, and counterrevolution, all modes of reactive anxiety, fragile modes of power that can take overwhelmingly violent form[s]."[104]

Thus, to consider colonial entanglement as a parallax view of enduring relations and modes of relationship is to center the lived relations and felt experiences of the different bodies caught up within colonial contexts—including those bodies whose relations and experiences spill across the edges into the unmarked spaces that exceed or "break out" of the conceptual framing of settler colonialism. In the case of the buffalo reintroduction to Banff National Park, this means centering the voices of Indigenous people, like the Îyãħé Nakoda, who are working with Parks Canada to support the return. But it also means centering the voices of those who refused to remain contained

within this Project—as well as those who refused to remain contained in the Morley reserve at the turn of the twentieth century. Furthermore, considering colonial entanglements also means listening the voices of non-Indigenous people. This includes those involved with projects like the Buffalo Reintroduction as well as those who were dispossessed and displaced from their own proprietary claims over Indigenous lands laying within the Park in the name of corporate profit. Finally, it means showing how all of these entangled relations are themselves connected to not only one another, but also to other political struggles elsewhere.

However, an emphasis on a parallax view of these enduring relationships and experiences making up places like Banff National Park does not mean that the colonial entanglement focuses exclusively on the structural and macro-levels of analysis between Indigenous and non-Indigenous nations. Although the notion recognizes that colonial contexts and imperial dispositions are not one-off events (similar to settler colonialism),[105] colonial entanglements also point to the fact that entangled relations press on and are felt (and not felt) by those caught up within them—both physically and metaphorically. As will be discussed below, the colonial breakage that targets different bodies is often intended to (re)structure whole communities and nations in particular ways that render such violence as a natural and inevitable part of a broader structure; but this does not mean that particular episodes of violence are not intimately felt by those individuals whose lives are affected. Thus, by invoking the notion of colonial entanglements—along with the complexities and unpredictability this entails—one is also able to shift their analytical starting point from positions that distinguish between either abstract structures of power or phenomenological experiences to a conceptual framework that refuses to toggle between these two scales. This is because colonial entanglements press on different bodies in ways that are both deeply personal and social.

Entanglements as "felt theory":

In *Marxism and Literature*, Raymond Williams uses the term "structures of feeling" to refer to the "actively lived and felt" relations and experiences that intricately interact with and, at times, defy conceptions of formal, official, and fixed social forms.[106] For him, the term connotes a way of designating "those elusive, impalpable forms of social consciousness, which are at once as evanescent as 'feelings' suggests, but nevertheless display a significant configuration captured in the term 'structure.'"[107] As Williams explains:

> We are talking about characteristic elements of impulse, restraint, and tone; specifically, affective elements of consciousness and relationships: not feeling against thought, but thought as felt and feeling as thought: practical consciousness of present kind, in a living and interrelating continuity. We are then defining these elements as a 'structure': as a set with specific internal relations, at once interlocking and in tension.[108]

Rather than simply reduced to a social or political form, conceptualizing colonial entanglements as structures of feeling enables one to consider how these relations press upon different bodies—wrapping around them in particular ways that are both *intensely social and personal*. But this is not the subjective or personal as most of colonial epistemology conventionally understands it, which so often is juxtaposed against objective facts and reality in dismissive ways. Following Williams, the personal and subjective are understood as equally valid as broader social analysis of material processes and structures of power—which actually co-constitute each other in inseperatble ways.

Several others have deployed William's structures of feeling to explore different facets of colonialism. For example, Mark Rifkin and Eva Mackey both explore how projects of settlement produce particular "modes of feeling"—which tend to be dominated by feelings of anxiety and insecurity—through what they label as "settler structures of feeling" and "settler states of feeling," respectively.[109] For both, "understanding settlement as a structure of feeling entails asking how emotions, sensations, and psychic life take part in the (ongoing) process of exerting non-Native

authority over Indigenous politics, governance, and territoriality."[110] For Mackey specifically, this not only reveals how settlers (re)invest in colonial projects through their everyday actions—which tend to affect Indigenous peoples negatively—but also how "settler states of feeling" limit the former's conditions of possibility. As she explains, considerations of settler states of feeling reveal how coloniality harms settler's ability "to see beyond their own limited vision, a vision that cannot allow the conceptual shifts that may be required for imagining how to decolonize settler-Indigenous relations."[111]

I understand both Rifkin and Mackey's use of William's structure of feeling as doing important work to think through the ways in which colonialism is felt by colonial subjects. In my reading of Williams, however, both fail to fully engage with the ways in which 'feeling' and affect complicates structures of power. Consequently, each scholar tends to reproduce a settler colonial narrative that reduces Indigenous and non-Indigenous agency. To phrase differently, I argue that both tend to fall into the trap that Jacqueline Rose observes within many sociological accounts on subjectificiation: namely, the assumption that subjects of power have fully and completely internalized the dominant normative framework and, consequently, lack agency to challenge and disrupt such norms.[112] As a result, anti-colonial and decolonizing efforts are foreclosed to non-Indigenous people who—in turn—are (re)centered at the expense of Indigenous people and notions of Indigeneity.

In contrast to Rifkin and Mackey's work, Dian Million's *Therapeutic Nations* offers a similar account to the notion of structures of feeling through a set of chapters that embody what she calls "felt theory." For her, such an approach highlights not only how affect shapes, and is shaped by, material conditions, but also how affective experiences vary in unpredictable ways. Describing colonialization as "a felt, affective relationship,"[113] Million uses felt theory to explain how "Canadian colonialism is 'felt' in that it is a broad spectrum of nuances, valences/practices with the

power to generate emotionally charged meaning as *common knowledge.*"[114] For Million, this knowledge and theory is "felt" for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people typically through a diverse range of "moral stigmata produced and attached to notions of race, gender, sexualities, [etc.]."[115] As she explains, such moral stigmata tends to (re)produce particular structures of feeling, which are "intuited, perceived, felt, and, finally, in this circuit expressed as emotions."[116] By understanding colonization as a *felt, affective relationship*, Million's work carves out space to recognize that such affective experiences "land" on different bodies in unpredictable ways—ways that can, at times, subvert the aims and intentions of power.

For example, although Million focuses on the power of shame on Indigenous people specifically, she also recognizes the multiple valences that such an emotion carries for different bodies and how an affective experience also goes beyond any particular person or emotion. As she explains, "[a]ffect eludes, present before and beyond any singular consciousness."[117] Million continues by explaining that affect can be more intense and/or less perceptible to one than there is social means to express it, and it can also be both an animating and inhibiting force.[118] For me, it is this variability and unpredictability that attributes affect with a sense of duality in Million's work—a duality that can—on one hand—work to *break up* bodies through its circulation within colonial contexts along highly racialized, gendered, sexed etc. lines and—on the other hand—liberate these same bodies by empowering people to *break from* their colonial constraints and imperial dispositions by relating differently.

In working with Million's felt theory, understanding the entanglements at play in the Banff National Park as structures of feeling is valuable because it enables us to extend our thinking of how both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people continually navigate the powers of affect within projects like the Buffalo reintroduction. This compels us to think through the scale of the social, the political, the environmental etc., which includes geopolitical questions on Indigenous

dispossession and state domination as well as environmental catastrophe. But it also includes asking how these social and political relations and experiences are racialized, gendered, sexed, species-ed etc.[119] Understanding colonial entanglements as structures of feeling opens one up to the personal, which points to the "complexities, the experienced tensions, shifts, and uncertainties, the intricate forms of unevenness and confusion" that are experienced by different bodies—whether human or non-human—in ways that resist more reductive forms of social analysis.[120] This includes the ways in which some people are targeted by more conventional notions of violence that are "conceived as an event or action that is immediate in time, explosive and spectacular in space, and as erupting into instant sensational visibility," such as imperial war and invasion, white supremacist attacks, gendered and sexualized violence, etc.[121] But, in remembering how colonial entanglements are enduring, it also includes those types of violence that are not always immediately perceptible—the types of destruction that Rob Nixon calls "slow violence," which occur "gradually and out of sight, a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all."[122]

By remaining open to not only these different scales but also these different intensities of feeling generally—and violence and breakage in particular—one is compelled to look at projects like the Buffalo Reintroduction in different ways. For example, although the return fails to necessarily disrupt the colonial transit and transgression of Indigenous lands and bodies in pursuit of capital, the presence of buffalo—like the presence Indigenous nations—matters. The presence—by which I mean not mere presence, but an active presence that is at least conducive to a partial thriving—of those Indigenous to place activates particular physical, affective, and spiritual relationships that cannot always be entirely communicated. As Williams reminds us, structures of feeling is a "conception, or sensuous knowledge, of a historical materialism characterized constitutively by the *tangle* of the subjective and the objective, experience and belief, feeling and

thought, the immediate and the general, the personal and the social."[123] For this reason, it is by taking the lived relations and felt experiences of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people as indicative of what is happening in our lives that colonial entanglement offers a more complex telling of what it means to live *entangled with/in empire*.

***Conclusion*:**

To sum up, the notion of colonial entanglement does a lot of work. As a concept, colonial entanglement functions as a descriptor that points to the ways in which we "feel" as we are wrapped up within colonial relations as well as a set of interwoven processes and relationships that are co-constitutive of these feelings and experiences. As mentioned above, these entangled relations can be both supportive and/or constraining, which means that the entanglements making up the buffalo reintroduction can be neither exclusively good nor bad; instead, they are complex—sometimes contradictory and unpredictable—and this is largely because of the fact that entanglements, themselves, are non-linear in how they incorporate and include a mess of relationships. This last point is important in reminding us that entanglements may never be fully untangled or distilled, and indeed my goal is not driven by the desire to do so when it comes to considering Banff National Park and the buffalo's return to this area.

But, it is also the ways in which colonial entanglements point to this non-linearity and bumpiness in spite of colonialism's constant desire for flatter, smoother, faster surfaces that renders it more than simply a descriptor of colonial experiences or of the particular modes of relationship that make up colonial processes; rather, a deeper consideration of colonial entanglements also necessitate a particular methodological approach that compels one to consider Indigenous and non-Indigenous modes of relationship in a ways that offer a parallax view of the colonizing contexts from which they are embedded. To demonstrate this, the next chapter considers how different

modes of relationship produce drastically different notions of property and, consequently, relationships to place. Ultimately, it is by offering a parallax view that one can see how differently entangled bodies collide and collude (sometimes forcefully, sometimes more gently; sometimes directly, other times indirectly) in ways that lead to both the breaking up of bodies and modes of relationship as well as different attempts to break from the very conditions that come to dominate the colonial context of the Banff-Bow Valley after the nineteenth century.

TWO

Erecting States of (Dis)Possession

> *The meaning of property is not constant. The actual institution, and the way people see it, and hence the meaning they give to the word, all change over time. We shall see that they are changing now. The changes are related to changes in the purposes which society or the dominant classes in society expect the institution of property to serve.*
>
> —C.B. Macpherson, *Property*[1]

In the fall of 1883, a group of Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) workers stumbled upon a mist-filled cave on the forested slope of a mountain.[2] Within the cave resided a pool of hot, mineral-rich waters that proved to be ideal for bathing and relaxation. Despite often being represented as discovering the area, William and Tom McCardell and their partner Frank McCabe's encounter with the cave was not the first. Not only had a number of Indigenous nations frequented the hot spring to preform ceremony and bath in the waters for centuries, but a number of European explorers had also visited the cave and its warm waters.[3] Like other white men before them, the three had found themselves caught up in the natural beauty of the Canadian Rockies—in spite of the fact that they were there to perform a particular economic purpose. However, unlike the others, McCabe and the McCardell brothers were the first to stake out the land in and around the cave, making a proprietary claim over what William McCardell described in his journal as "…some fantastic dream from a tale of the Arabian Nights."[4]

This act of staking out what is now known as the Cave and Basin (or the Banff Hot Springs) as private property involved a number of elements. It included the acts of writing a letter to the federal government in Ottawa as well as erecting a fence and a small log cabin near the entrance of the cave. In doing so, the three participated in a tradition entangled with racialized and gendered notions of use and improvement that was also codified in British common law.[5] But this proprietary claim also involved an epistemic move to deliberately ignore and unknow the fact that many

Indigenous nations—including the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, Ktunaxa, Tsuut'ina, Siksikaitsitapi (specifically, the Pikunni, Siksika, Kainai), Secwepemc, and members of the Cree nations—all had prior and ongoing relationships to the hot springs. Thus, in staking their proprietary claim, Frank McCabe and the McCardell Brothers helped to extend expansionist modes of relationship and a particular system of property and value relying on Indigenous dispossession that they were already entangled with/in. However, little did they know that this same dispossessory force would also come to target the three business partners, whose claim to the area would be rendered null and void two years later when the federal government create a 26km^2 Hot Springs Reserve dictating that the area was "reserved from sale or settlement or squatting."[6]

In this chapter, I consider the particular systems of value at play in the establishment of Banff National Park by understanding how they emerge from different bodies of knowledge that are made and reproduced by particular modes of relationship. More specifically, I look at how different modes of relationship produce and reproduce different conceptions of property, which become entangled with one another and with place in ways that often produce tensions and incommensurabilities. Here, I use the concept of property to not only include different colonizing conceptions of property (e.g. state property vs. private property), but also different Indigenous notions of property. In recognizing the effects (and affects) of these different notions of property—and the modes of relationship they emerge from—I make two interrelated claims. First, I argue that Banff National Park emerges as part of a *reactionary political project* based on expansionist modes of relationship seeking to erect colonial regimes of property catering to the sovereignty of capitalism—or what I call states of (dis)possession. This has—and continues to—require physical and epistemic violence meant to break from the prior and ongoing modes of relationship embodied by Indigenous nations living in the area. From this perspective, Banff National Park functions as part of the colonial infrastructure and technology meant to dispossess and displace Indigenous

people and their modes of relationship, rather than an effort to conserve the wilderness and wildlife—as conservationist discourses dominating the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries try to have us believe. Second, to ensure that capital can continue to accumulate, colonizing regimes not only require the dispossession of Indigenous people; they must also possess the ability to target those non-Indigenous people who buy into the dispossession of others with various forms of dispossession, exploitation, domination, and violence in order to guarantee the further accumulation of capital into fewer hands. In this sense, the *epistemic breakage* that expansionist modes of relationship rely on is necessary to not only naturalize and normalize the physical breakage and psychological terror targeting Indigenous people(s) through processes of dispossession, but it also occludes the fact that colonial breakage has the capacity for, and a history of, targeting non-Indigenous people—albeit, in different ways.

In turning to the establishment of Banff National Park, it is also important to first understand the particular context from which the Park emerges. To do this, the chapter begins by discussing the particular notions of property emerging from the expansive modes of relationship embodied by the Îyãħé Nakoda. These notions of property—and the modes of relationship they emerge from—are then contrasted to the expansionist modes of relating that seek to facilitate the establishment of colonizing regimes of property. Next, I show how the Canadian conquest of the "North-West" culminates in the signing of Treaty 7 in the late nineteenth century. Here, the Treaty is used to consider how expansionist modes of relationship—and the bodies of knowledge these relationships make and reproduce—differ in significant and incommensurable ways from those modes of relationship embodied by the Îyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations, which leads to different understandings and articulations of the Treaty. In the final section, I return to the establishment of the Park described above to reveal how the dispossessionary force of colonial breakage also has the capacity to target those settlers buying into Indigenous dispossession.

Ĩyãħé Nakoda relations and notions of property:

For thousands of years, the valley carved out by the glacier-fed Bow River has been home to a diverse range of human and non-human life. Located on the eastern slopes of the Canadian Rockies and extending along the adjacent foothills and into the prairies, what is now referred to as the Banff-Bow Valley is part of a unique montane ecoregion inhabited by an equally unique range of life. Various different types of flora and fauna grow throughout the area, all having co-evolved with one another to form distinct, yet dynamic, networks of relationships. This includes the reeds growing along the banks of the glacier-fed river, which support other life ranging from small birds and insects to the Indigenous peoples, who harvest the reeds to make bows with.[7] In the past, the Banff-Bow Valley was also inhabited by large herds of migrating buffalo who roamed the mountainous landscape for millennia.[8] As a keystone species, the presence of buffalo shaped the physical landscapes they lived in relation with, which—in turn—shaped other animal and plant nations as well as the human nations they lived in relation to. For Winnona LaDuke, the buffalo represent a "particular way of life," which was drastically altered when they were hunted to verge of extinction in the nineteenth century.[9]

Of the numerous nations who continue to maintain an entangled relationship to the area, the Banff-Bow Valley has slowly become particularly significant for and associated with the Ĩyãħé Nakoda peoples, who have inhabited its foothills and mountain ranges ever-more frequently during the past few centuries due to the destruction of buffalo herds.[10] In the past, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda—who now consist of the Chiniki, Wesley, and Bearspaw First Nations—used to be members of the Oceti Sakowin (Sioux) and Nakoda Oyadebi (Assiniboine), who lived throughout the plains of North America.[11] However, due to buffalo migration patterns, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations broke from their relations with the larger Oceti Sakowin several centuries ago, which was followed by a later separation from the Nakoda Oyadebi with the further decline of buffalo herds in the

eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[12] During this time, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda gradually made the Banff-Bow Valley region a more permanent home due to their previous knowledge and relationships with the area as abundant with food sources. One Nakoda elder explains:

> While at times my people did not permanently reside in this area, as for centuries we followed the buffalo herds throughout the plains of North America…in years of drought or when we had troubles finding the herds…we would rely on food sources closer to the mountains…you know like the bighorn, elk and goats.[13]

Thus, as buffalo herds became more threatened by colonizer encroachment, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda were forced to rely more heavily on the Banff-Bow Valley for subsistence, which transformed their relationship to the Valley. By occupying the foothills along the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda could easily access both the plains and mountain regions for seasonal encampments and hunting grounds, which helped them to adapt to declining buffalo herds.[14]

Here, we see how changing buffalo migration patterns produce a change in shifting social relationships for the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations, ultimately leading the former to *break from* other nations and claim the Banff-Bow Valley as a more significant part of their homelands. However, this *breaking from* is not a denial of relationships of interconnectedness and, instead, is a transformation in terms of proximity and political autonomy that is meant to support and enhance life for both the human nations and non-human nation living in relationship with one another. In fact, spending more time in the Banff-Bow Valley and surrounding areas can be read as both an effort by the Ĩyãħé Nakoda to renew relationships with a declining buffalo population by turning to other non-human relationship for sustenance, while also easing their reliance on territories to the east of the valley that were being traveled more frequently by other nations. Such sentiment is reflected in oral histories offered by elders, such as Ĩyãħé Nakoda Chief John Snow. He explains that, despite separating due to declining buffalo populations, kinship and linguistic relations between the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, the Oceti Sakowin, and the Nakoda Oyadebi remain in ways that

recognize past relationships in the present while also affirming each nation's political autonomy.[15] As demonstrated by Snow, the contours of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and their relationship to place have always been intimately connected to, and co-constitutive of, their relationship with both other human and non-human beings.[16]

However, the change in the Ĩyãħé Nakoda's relationship to the Banff-Bow Valley in response to their changing relationships to other human and non-human life does not mean that their *modes of relating* necessarily alter and change completely (although it also does not exclude it). Like many Indigenous nations living in the area, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda continue to predominantly take up *expansive modes of relationship* that seek to enhance the well-being of life across different genders, generations, and species. This is because Ĩyãħé Nakoda understandings of place and their relationships to the Banff-Bow Valley embody a relational paradigm similar to the one discussed in chapter one. However, such an approach not only tends to emphasize relationality and interconnectivity by recognizing the ways in which all life is connected in ways that render us interdependent; an Ĩyãħé Nakoda mode of relationship is also fundamentally oriented towards what Manu Karuka calls "the social reproduction of peaceful interdependence."[17]

This is clearly demonstrated by Ĩyãħé Nakoda conceptions of property, which revolve around forging and renewing relationships of care and mutual obligation. For example, despite developing a more sustained relationship to the area, many from the Ĩyãħé Nakoda continue to view the lands and waters making up the Banff Bow-Valley as something that cannot be owned or possessed by individual people or nations and, instead, was meant to be shared. As Ĩyãħé Nakoda elder Lenny Pouchette explains:

> We shared the land and everything on it with other Native peoples… like when we would invite the [Ktunaxa] from over the mountains to come meet us and go hunting… We would camp at Banff and they would let us to hunt in the surrounding areas… We were happy to share with people that respected the land.[18]

Here, one can see that, although the area played a crucial role in sustaining Ĩyãħé Nakoda bodies, this proprietary relationship was not construed in terms of scarcity and possessiveness. Instead, proprietary relations to the lands (and waters) making up the Banff-Bow valley are construed in expansive terms that are meant to benefit all who respect those lands (and waters). From this perspective, responsibilities and obligation towards lands and waters (as well as to other human and more-than-human bodies) are emphasized over any individual or collective right to benefit from these bodies. Echoing this in an interview with Courtney Mason, an anonymous Ĩyãħé Nakoda man explains: "We've never owned the land… The land always has and it always will own us."[19] For him, Ĩyãħé Nakoda "possession *by* their homelands" is just as significant as "a possession *of* those lands."[20]

Ĩyãħé Nakoda conceptions of property and practices of distribution, which revolve around supporting a diversity of life, are also clearly demonstrated through the nation's hunting practices, which seek to distribute food and resources across different genders and generations. As Snow explains, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda did not travel as a unit when hunting; instead, they often broke-off into smaller, extended-family groups, which provided the context for both knowledge (re)production as well as material distribution.[21] Within these extended-family units, the sick and elderly would remain in central locations—receiving the distribution of food and medicines from a few men who returned to the camps every couple of days—while the rest travelled along the prairies and into slopes of the mountains in search of wildlife.[22] Although a gendered division of reproductive labor can be seen here—with men tending to those living with limited physical mobility—the roles of hunting and collecting medicines were taken up by any adult members of an extended family demonstrating the skills necessary for either activity, which was often observed by others early on in a person's life.[23] To phrase differently, it was by supporting individuals through the collective redistribution of food and other life necessities that the nation sought to foster and develop

individual skills and passions. These skills and passions were then collectively recognized—a role often taken up by older family members—in order to determine one's role in Ĩyãħé Nakoda society.[24] Here, one sees how Ĩyãħé Nakoda theories of property and modes of relationship are expansive, in that they seek to generate and enhance a diversity of life ways across different genders and generations, while also expanding and emphasizing kinship relations.

Furthermore, in attempting to reproduce peaceful interdependence in the Banff-Bow Valley, Ĩyãħé Nakoda hunting practices also seek to enhance the well-being of both the human and non-human relationships existing beyond their nation as well. Snow explains that, prior to the arrival of European settlers, "the hunt was never for the sake of killing;" according to him, hunting was only done when people were hungry and, even then, only after proper protocol was observed.[25] This included sharing portions of a kill with the non-human world.[26] By distributing the products of one's kill to both their human and non-human relatives and ensuring that all parts of animals are honored through ceremony, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda nation ensures that they "kill[ed] with reverence," establishing and renewing relationships of interdependence and reciprocity across different genders, generations, and species.[27]

Thus, Ĩyãħé Nakoda notions of property are not about exerting one's will on that which lacks agency; instead, their proprietary relationships are practiced between the human and the non-human world in reciprocal ways that are meant to foster an abundance of life and enhance collective well-being through peaceful interdependence. However, these are not the only conceptions of property at play within the Banff-Bow Valley. In addition to other Indigenous nations—who each hold their own distinct relationships with the Valley—European colonizers also had begun to impose their modes of relationships and conceptions of property in the area by the early 1800s.[28] In fact, with the introduction and intensification of European encroachment in the latter half of the nineteenth century, much of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations' proprietary

relationships quickly become entangled with, and confronted by, colonizers and their expansionist modes of relating. Rather than seeking to forge new relationships based on peaceful interdependence, these people and their modes of relationship revolved around an attempt to replace Indigenous modes of relationship with expansionist ones oriented towards capital accumulation. In the next section, I briefly consider the ontological and epistemological frameworks informing expansionist modes of relationship before discussing colonizing regimes of property themselves and the processes of dispossession they rely on. Here, I argue that colonizing regimes of property rely on a logic of containment to achieve the double move described by Rob Nichols, where colonizing property emerges from both the *transfer* and *transformation* of proprietary relationships on Indigenous homelands.

The double move of (dis)possession:

Like Indigenous modes of relationship, non-Indigenous modes of relationship are extremely diverse. For this reason, each is best considered within the particular times and spaces from which they emerge. In fact, even within a particular context, numerous modes of relationship can exist simultaneously as different bodies become entangled with one another, and each of these modes of relating produce different conceptions of property and practices of distribution. Yet, despite this diversity, I want to focus on some common characteristics that underlie the specific expansionist modes of relationship driving imperial projects and their regimes of property—especially, those emerging out of the European contexts over the last five centuries.

In contrast to the ontologies and epistemologies informing Ĭyãħé Nakoda and other relational paradigms, expansionist modes of relationship tend to reify and fetishize autonomy and independence of the individuated subject over relationality and interdependence through what can be called a naturalist ontology.[29] As mentioned in chapter one, such an ontology presupposes a

world where universalizing subjects (read here as white, masculine, cis, heterosexual, able-bodied, neurotypical) are separated from, and superior to, their surroundings due to their supposed capacity for reason. From this perspective, particular individuals emerge as full "subjects" capable of owning and appropriating property for their use and benefit. In contrast, those deemed to be incapable of such qualities due to their lack of agency are, therefore, subject to the will of those deemed to be full subjects (see chapter three for more discussion).

However, central to the exaltation of this universal subject is the ability to delineate and contain—or at least attempt to contain—the continuous flow and messiness of those relationships that constitute life. From this "logic of containment,"[30] different relations and experiences can (easily) be sorted—and managed—into distinct categories that can then be used to explain the world.[31] Once divided into their containers, imperial epistemologies seek to understand the relationship between the different containers/categories.[32] In other words, by creating categories/containers (as well as the inevitable binaries and barriers that this entails in order to represent people/places/things as distinct), one is able to divide and define—both spatially and temporally—the world that they experience on a basis of that which is perceived to be different.[33]

In many ways, then, this logic of containment can be understood as an effort to make sense of—both in terms of one's sensibilities and their sensing-abilities—the entangled world in which we live. By containing all that is continuously in flux into neatly labeled categories that can be experienced and observed in a supposedly 'objective' manner, one is said to gain knowledge of the hidden workings of the universe and—as a result—is able to establish a sense of order, certainty, and security by possessing and controlling 'his' surroundings.[34] In fact, a logic of containment can be found at the heart of the so-called "Enlightenment spirit" and its imperial pursuit to 'know' (and possess) all that can be seen because it is by epistemically delineating and containing the world that one can, in turn, physically enclose and interrogate it (and vice versa).[35] Furthermore, to

'know' the world is to be able to speculate, predict, and prepare for what may come in the future by collecting, manipulating, and controlling in the present.

However, one of the problems with beginning from a set of fixed containers is the fact that those people using particular categories to sort through and smooth out the messy and bumpy aspects of life are always-already caught up in entangled relationships themselves. Not only are these entangled relationships rarely interrogated (a point that Michael Asch makes clear),[36] but the process of dividing and defining according to a set of preconceived containers and categories also fundamentally requires the "apprehension" and *breakage* of those aspects of life that do not fit neatly.[37] To phrase differently, knowledge (re)production within imperial epistemologies requires acts of *knowing* those aspects of life that are perceived to conform to and stabilize the sets of categories one wishes to deploy while, simultaneously, ignoring, disavowing, and—consequently—*unknowing* those aspects that threaten to exceed, disrupt, and *break up* such categories. For this reason, imperial logics of containment require that acts of willful ignorance and deliberate disavowal be aggressively made and reproduced, affectively invested in, and effectively distributed in addition to material acts of violence. Such epistemic violence is required to stabilize both the containers and categories being deployed and—with them—the grounds for what can be considered reasonable and intelligible.

In their article entitled "Colonial Unknowing and Relations of Study," Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein elaborate what they call processes of "colonial unknowing," which they explain refer to those responses that "strive[…] to preclude relational modes of analysis and ways of knowing otherwise."[38] For them, the bodies of knowledge produced with/in imperialism and its expansionist modes of relating emerge as "an epistemological counter-formation" that takes shape "in reaction to the lived relations and incommensurable knowledges."[39] This is particularly the case for Indigenous modes of relationship, which tend to emphasize

interdependence and individuality through relationships to others.[40] As Karuka explains elsewhere, colonization "seeks to annihilate the collective, destroying and homogenizing life and consciousness in place[…] Where Indigenous modes of relationship provide a context for individual voices to differentiate themselves, colonialism homogenizes."[41] Here, Karuka points to the fact that colonization not only destroys—or violently reconfigures—the ways that a place physically sustains life, but it must also epistemologically breaks up and contains those who challenge and disrupt colonial modes of relationship with the goal of making them forget how to relate otherwise.[42]

One example of this dual process of breakage involving both physical and epistemic violence is the practices and institutions entangled with, and making up, colonial regimes of property. Similar to expansive conceptions of property (such as those articulated by Ĩyãħé Nakoda modes of relating above), colonial regimes of property function to create and maintain certain relations between the human and more-than-human worlds; however, for expansionist modes of relationship underpinning colonizing regimes, colonial notions of property—along with the notions of ownership and the capacity to appropriate that they rely on—seek to facilitate the accumulation of wealth. Within the current colonial context of Canada, colonial regimes of property cater to, and are often dictated by, the accumulation of capital in ways that produce what I call states of (dis)possession—in that they seek to facilitate capital accumulation through acts of dispossession that replace Indigenous modes of relationship with colonizing ones. In doing so, expansionist modes of relationship transform "abundance into scarcity, interdependence into isolation, [and] security into vulnerability."[43]

Commenting on colonial understandings and relationships to land, Mishuana Goeman reveals how colonizing regimes tend to render land in ways that all too easily translate and collapse it into capitalist notions of property.[44] This is often achieved by recasting those territories where

non-capitalist modes of relating exist as empty expanses of land through particular colonizing conceptions of nature and wilderness. Relying on the works of political theorists like John Locke—who equated land use and improvement solely in terms of English agricultural production—expansionist modes of relationship use particular understandings of wilderness as "wastelands" to actively unknow other ways of relating to and, consequently, using land and waters that were not based in colonizing notions of private property.[45] Bhandar explains that, from a colonizing perspective, "without [colonial] ownership, and the law that accompanies it, there could be no civilization. The distinction between cultivated land and wasteland ultimately became the basis, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, upon which European colonial powers justified their legal doctrines of terra nullius and discovery."[46] From this perspective, to know land within expansionist modes of relationship, then, entails acts of both physical enclosure and epistemic containment that work to "apprehend" all the complex and unpredictable relationships that are associated with place. To know land within colonial modes of relationship is to separate it from—that is, break up and break from—the webs of entangled relationships that make up place. But expansionist modes do not stop here. To render land into the supposedly bloodless terms of colonizing property necessitates both actively unknowing those relationships that contradict colonial and capitalist relationships of ownership *as well as* the violent breakage necessary to *break from* them.

Echoing Goeman, Rob Nichols breaks down these process of (un)knowing bodies of land and water as colonial property further by attending to the notion of dispossession specifically as a "unique species of theft."[47] For Nichols, the colonizers' theft of Indigenous lands is actually a double move in that it *produces* the colonial notion of property that it sets out to steal in the first place. As he suggests: "Colonization entails the large-scale transfer of land that simultaneously *recodes* the object of exchange in question such that it appears *retrospectively* to be a form of theft

in the ordinary sense. It is thus not (only) about the *transfer of* property, but the *transformation into* property."[48] Here, Nichols clearly demonstrates how acts of land theft—which require the physical violence and the breakage of Indigenous relationships with place and with the human and more-than-human relations that help make up place—also requires a particular form of unknowing. However, such epistemic breakage not only seeks to cover its colonial tracks by invisibilizing the physical violence and breakage it necessitates but, also, by occluding this process of unknowing itself. In doing so, colonizing regimes enable themselves to recognize Indigenous relationships to land as exclusively a thing of the past that have 'naturally' ceased to exist in the present. In other words, colonizing modes of relationship that valorize and fetishize the possession and commodification of land are generated by and for colonial subjects through the absolute negation of the possibility that Indigenous modes of relationship can still exist.

In attempting to transform abundance into scarcity and interdependence into isolation through the alienation of Indigenous relationships to land and water, processes of unknowing—and the acts of ignorance they entail—involved in the erection of states of (dis)possession are not staked out in the bloodless terms that colonizing narratives of expansion would have us believe; nor do they occur in isolation of other processes and relationships of power. As Vimalassery et al argue, processes of colonial unknowing involved in acts of dispossession are "[p]roduced and practiced in concert with material violences and differential devaluations," which target Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies in an effort to smooth out and flatten social and ecological relationships in ways that cater to capital accumulation.[49] This material violence and breakage has already been highlighted in the form of the genocidal violence seeking to dispossess Indigenous peoples from their homelands, [50] but it also includes various other interlocking forms of exploitation, dispossession, domination, and violence. For example, many have pointed out that the possessive logic of ownership and the capacity to appropriate underlying colonizing notions of property are

fundamentally connected to: racializing regimes (and their instantiations of whiteness as structures of power) that have continuously functioned to dominate, displace, and exploit Indigenous peoples and people of color legally and socially;[51] gendered and sexual violence targeting Indigenous and non-Indigenous people generally—and Indigenous women, girls, and queer and Two-Spirit people specifically—in an effort to shore up colonizing regimes through the establishment cis-heteropatriarchy and heteronormativity;[52] policies of biological warfare using disease and famine to destroy and subdue Indigenous nationhood, law, and governance;[53] institutions of state domination, including the criminal justice system and the residential school systems, which rely on policing and imprisonment to physically and psychically discipline Indigenous people and their modes of relating as well as other alternative modalities;[54] the anthropocentric violence targeting different species of Indigenous life, such as the buffalo, for mass extinction and genocide;[55] and a myriad of other forms of violence and oppression that become entangled together within Project Canada as it seeks to *terrorize* human and non-human life in an effort to *territorialize* Indigenous homelands.[56]

Thus, although only one aspect of the complex array of processes, acts of dispossession prove crucial for colonizing regimes because they involve at least two moves: first, acts of dispossession function to *break up* relationships to land and water through theft and displacement and, second, they also attempt to *break from* the conditions that enable prior modes of relationship to exist by recoding and re-making Indigenous lands and waters into distinct systems of property. This requires processes of (un)knowing Indigenous (and non-Indigenous) modes of relationships that exceed and destabilize colonial bodies of knowledge and their regimes of power. In fact, it is through such processes that colonial epistemologies seek to break up various entangled relationships *as well as* break from those relational modes of analysis that are attentive to such ways of living.[57] Through this double move of dispossession, expansionist modes of relationship

rely on logics of containment to facilitate the colonial transit of expropriated Indigenous homelands and the domination and exploitation of those Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies deemed to lack the capacity for ownership. In other words, colonizing regimes of property serve as the "outpost" of capital, the fort and port of imperial expansion—in that they function as a mechanism that concentrates capital and resources into the hands of a few through different processes and relationships of power and differential (de)valuation. This is what I refer to as the process of cultivating and erecting states of (dis)possession.

To further reveal how colonial bodies of knowledge rely on logics of containment and practices of (un)knowing to break up—and break from—Indigenous modes of relationship and replace them with colonial relations and ways of knowing (that are rendered along racialized, sexed, gendered, etc. lines), I want to turn to Treaty 7. As will be shown below, the interlocking forms of dispossession, exploitation, domination, and violence that make up Project Canada are all very much present within the context of the Banff-Bow Valley as the Canadian state attempts to erect states of (dis)possession in the area. However, to understand how different modes of relationship and their respective understandings of property become entangled with/in Treaty 7, I want to first place the treaty within its broader context of colonization, imperialism, and enduring Indigeneities. This includes recognizing both Project Canada's push to acquire the "North-West" from the Hudson's Bay Company as well as Indigenous responses to this imperial project.[58] Each of these efforts play a crucial role in influencing the negotiations of Treaty 7 in 1877. Furthermore, in comparing these two political projects, I also want to reveal how the bodies of knowledge and notions of property emerging from Canadian expansionism and Indigenous modes of relationship differ politically. Specifically, I reveal how the former possesses inherently reactionary politics in that—in their efforts to expand and extend expansionist modes of relationship—they must constantly seek to violently replace other modes of relationship to maintain their own capitalist

status-quo. In contrast, Indigenous responses to Canada's burgeoning imperial project remain grounded in expansive modes of relationship that not only seek to renew pre-existing relationships, but also forge new relationships that carve out space for diverse ways of knowing and being to coexist.

Conquest of the North-West:

In 1870, the newly formed Canadian state finalized its purchase of so-called "Rupert's Land"—or what many simply referred to as the "North-West"—from the Hudson's Bay Company. Although there are a number of factors contributing to Canada's push to acquire the North-West, I want to briefly name three, which ultimately lead to what Doug Owram calls the "Canadian expansionist movement."[59] To start with, one of the central factors leading to the Canadian state's purchase of the North-West was the global crisis that emerges in 1846-7 due to the over accumulation of capital within different European imperial projects.[60] This led capitalists around the world—including those within "British North America"—to seek out territorial expansion as a solution, which David Harvey argues "put the major capitalist powers on the path of globalism[…] through imperial conquest and inter-imperial rivalry that was to reach its apogee in World War I—the first global war."[61] Commenting on the 1846-7 crisis, Owen Toews notes that, while interest in empire within European countries and their colonies varied in its intensity across space and time, in the late 1800s this "global economic context of overaccumulation made imperial conquest—formal or informal—a capitalist necessity."[62]

Another factor compelling the Canadian state to expand its imperial control was the growing specter of US domination over capitalist markets in so-called 'North America.' After the UK's decision to cease its policy of "imperial preferences" in the 1840s, many in British North America were forced to turn to the US as their primary economic partner, which worried both

Ottawa and London.[63] This, in turn, boosted interest in colonizing the North-West, which the Toronto Board of Trade expressed as early as 1856.[64] However, such interests in the North-West and concerns regarding the US would not become fully entrenched within the national development agenda until the 1860s when events surrounding—and immediately following—the American Civil War led the US to terminate its economic reciprocity agreement with the British colony in 1866.[65] As Toews explains: "with the closing of trade opportunities in both the US and the rest of the British Empire, Canadian capitalists began to view the forcible creation of a new market in the North-West under direct Canadian control as the most viable path toward continued profitability." [66] Consequently, the newly emerging imperial project of "Canada" began to expand its sights from focusing on those Indigenous territories it already claimed control over to those further west.[67]

These two factors highlight how the burgeoning project of Canadian imperialism is not only intimately entangled with those Indigenous bodies whose territories it occupies and exploits but, also, with other projects of empire, such as US and the UK. As demonstrated here, these imperial projects are entangled in ways that are not always supportive of one another as each seeks to extend and expand their own spheres of influence and control. Although this can sometimes result in imperial projects competing with one another, Canadian expansion into the North-West can be understood as at least partially congruent with American and British imperialism due to a third factor leading to the push to territorialize the North-West: namely, the Canadian state's racializing project of white supremacy—which, in the mid-1800s, had begun to blossom in new ways through the grammar of Western scientific discourses. In fact, entanglements of colonization and racialization—along with other forms of differential devaluation, such as cis-heteropatriarchy and heteronormativity—played a crucial role in not only providing the necessary foundations to justify white supremacy and anglo-superiority within the context of Project Canada but, also, in the

reactionary revaluation of the territories making up the North-West as prosperous and well-suited for settlement by white men (and their families).

Up until the 1850s, the North-West had been coded as an "irreclaimable wasteland" that was "too arid for grain growing, exposed to recurrent frosts and grasshopper plagues, fit only for Indians, half-breeds and fur traders."[68] Much of this racist view of Indigenous space as "degraded, worthless, and backwards" drew on an entanglement of colonizing bodies of knowledge that equated private property and ownership with white civilization and a 300-year-old European tradition of anti-Native racism, which located Indigenous peoples as closer to an imagined "state of nature" and, therefore, inferior to white civilization.[69] Furthermore, the views espoused by capitalists in British North America also drew on colonial notions of gender and sexuality imported from the UK to code the transient life of both Indigenous people *and* fur traders as one beyond the scope of colonizing notions of white civility—which at that point was largely measured in relation to Victorian heteropatriarchal norms and values underpinning the modes of relationship driving a burgeoning agrarian capitalism in the UK.

However, in an attempt to respond to the crises generated by capital overaccumulation, Canadian expansionists sought to redirect anti-Native racism and the devaluation of transient labor to facilitate the cultivation of states of (dis)possession in the North-West. They did this by attempting to recode and revalue the area by articulating an explicitly white supremacist and heteropatriarchal conception of Canadian manifest destiny that viewed the region as a place that "could be a prosperous, comfortable home for white people."[70] This involved initiating a series of special geographic expeditions to the area that were sponsored by eastern capitalist with the sole purpose of producing 'scientific' backing for emerging rumors that a sub-region of the North-West held particular agricultural value.[71] As Toews explains, "in the settler-colonial 1800s, a place's suitability to European-style agricultural production was the primary measure of its potential for

so-called civilization and white occupation."[72] By attempting to recoding large swathes of the region as part of a "fertile belt," Canadian expansionist sought to represent the region as possessing mass-viability for European-style agricultural methods, which could then be translated into mass profitability.

Here, I want to also briefly emphasis that it was the particular entanglements of white supremacy *and* heteropatriarchy that facilitate a shift in the revalutation of the North-West—along with its subsequent colonization. As a number of scholars have shown, an unacknowledged—yet crucial—role in the colonization of the prairies was that occupied by white women (and femme-presenting people), who were understood as helping to 'finalize' the domestication of space.[73] With the arrival of white women to places like the Banff-Bow Valley, heteropatriarchal norms and gender roles compelled white men—who had often lived 'transient' lives as 'explorers' and fur traders—to 'settle down' and cultivate the land through those European agrarian techniques understood as a primary indicator of 'civilization.' Such a (de)valuation of the fur trader's lifestyle in relations to the farmer not only plays on the racialisms that Cedric Robinson argues were a key aspect of the "ordering idea[s]" of European society before the entrenchment of capitalism,[74] but it also fundamentally relies on emerging Victorian gender roles and norms that understood femininity as wedded to the 'domestic' sphere and reproductive labor.

Thus, in responding to the crises generated by capitalist modes of relationship and their expansionist agendas by seeking further expand these same relationships outward through the erecting of new states of (dis)possession, we can begin to see how colonizing regimes like Project Canada tend to produce reactionary modes of relating. Rather than addressing the root problems generating global crises in the mid-nineteenth century, British and Canadian expansionism instead sought to renew capitalist modes of production through expansionist modes of relationship with the hope of maintaining and sustaining their white, capitalist, and heteropatriarchal status-quo. This

required not only the creative destruction of the actually-existing Indigenous and fur trade-based human geographies—which were replaced with states of (dis)possession entangled with white supremacy and heteroatriarchy—but, also, the epistemic disavowal of these particular geographies as well. In other words, extending expansionist modes of relationship and their states of (dis)possession into the North-West in the mid-1800s also required the production of a distinctly "Canadian" body of knowledge on the North-West that completely ignored, erased, and dismissed the Indigenous modes of relationship they sought to *break from*.[75] By doing so, Project Canada worked to epistemically contain this vast expanse of Indigenous territories in ways that sought to justify the physical violence and enclosure it necessitated by *reactively unknowing* both this violence and the predominantly Indigenous social, political, and economic geographies of the region.[76]

Yet, this epistemic reaction and its corresponding colonial breakage did not go unchallenged by Indigenous peoples living in the area. For example, as Canadian surveyors began measuring land belonging to Métis member André Nault in 1869, they set off a chain of events that the Canadian state refers to as the Red River Rebellion.[77] According to Toews, the Rebellion—or what Indigenous and anti-colonialist refer to as the Red River Resistance—was based on "the simple yet radical belief that the people of the Red River and the North-West had the right to decide the fate of their own community."[78] First and foremost, this meant that the people of Red River would be able to continue to decide how they accessed and distributed land, which drew on a "Red River tradition of economic equality to oppose the enslaving power of money and [colonizing] property."[79] Led by Louis Riel, Red River residents—which included Métis, First Nations, and European settlers—chased Canadian surveyors and political representatives out of their community and established a provisional government that refused to recognize the "authority of Canada."[80] This refusal emerged as part of the Red River Peoples' critique of Canada for its colonizing methods

and its failure to seek consent of the Red River People due to troubling ideas of racial superiority.[81] Such efforts ultimately led the ratification of the Manitoba Treaty in 1870, which was understood by those in Red River as a treaty between nations (i.e. the newly formed Legislative Assembly of Assiniboina and the Canadian state).

Despite Indigenous resistance to Canadian white supremacist and heteropatriarchal expansionism and Métis calls to remain an autonomous territory, the Canadian state immediately re-presented the Manitoba Treaty as a piece of domestic legislation signaling the newly formed province of Manitoba's decision to join Canada. Simultaneously, John A. MacDonald deployed 1,400 troops led by General Garnet Wolseley to crush the newly formed Legislative Assembly and occupy the Red River region through a military campaign of white supremacist terror, which turned the area into a militarized zone with the deliberate intention of breaking up Indigenous relationships.[82] Project Canada's reaction to Indigenous modes of relationship and resistance had rippling effects (and affects) that were felt by Indigenous and non-Indigenous people(s) living throughout the North-West for years—including those living in the Banff-Bow Valley. For Indigenous nations, it signaled a warning from a slowly solidifying imperial project that would only become increasingly willing to refuse to recognize Indigenous peoples as sovereign and self-determining nations. For white capitalist and settlers, it signaled that a new 'fertile-belt' was (more or less) open for business and could be staked out by any white man (and his family) ready to invest in part of Canada's radically new cultural geography that depended on, and was supported by, entanglements of Indigenous dispossession, colonial law, capitalism, white supremacy, and heteropatriarchy. In fact, with the transfer of part of the North-West to Canada in 1870 following the military conquest over the Red River Resistance, the Canadian state sought to direct much of its white population in the east towards the Rockies by presenting the promise of buying into Project Canada and profiting from its speculated value.

However, at the same time, the Canadian state also realized that Indigenous peoples were not powerless subjects as it had been forced to endure significant resistance from those living along the Red River (and elsewhere). Despite unleashing a campaign of white terror against the people of Red River in order to force them into submission and subsume Manitoba under Canadian authority, the Canadian state decided it was no longer able to ignore or disavow the enduring presence of Indigenous bodies and their modes of relationship. To avoid further conflict, it turned to a different, more diplomatic, mechanism: namely, the process of treaty making. This is exemplified by the signing of Treaty 7 at Blackfoot Crossing in 1877. As will be shown, although this treaty process forced the Canadian state to engage with Indigenous peoples as politically sovereign nations, the incommensurable gaps the existed between interpretations of the treaty emerging from both of the different modes of relationship generally—and different notions of property specifically—embodied by Indigenous and non-Indigenous signatories (as well as between those on the ground and those in Ottawa) enabled the Canadian state to eventually falsify a reinterpretation of treaties as a surrendering of land. Such a reinterpretation not only functions to unknow Indigenous modes of relationship, but it also ensures that the white supremacist and heteropatriarchial agenda of Canadian manifest destiny can be (at least partially) realized.

Treaty entanglements:

On September 13th, 1877, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda joined the Tsuut'ina, Pikunni, Siksika, and Kainai in traveling to the Blackfoot Crossing of the Bow River to negotiate a treaty with the representatives of the Crown.[83] These negotiations occurred over several days, culminating on September 22nd with the signing of what would become known as Treaty 7.[84] Having arrived with Methodist Missionary, John McDougall—who acted as interpreter—representatives of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations living along the southwestern corner of the North-West negotiated with lieutenant-governor of the

North-West Territories, David Laird, and the superintendent and inspector of the NWMP, James Macleod. In this section, I consider how multiple narratives and understandings of Treaty 7 emerged with/in the signing of the treaty itself. These different narratives and understandings are informed by, and entangled with, particular bodies of knowledge and notions of property that emerge from particular modes of relationship. By considering some of these perspectives, I show how Treaty 7 emerges out of these colonial entanglements in complex and unpredictable ways that are deeply felt by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

Similar to other Indigenous signatories of Treaty 7, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda understood entering a treaty as a way to secure their homelands and their distinct ways of life by also establishing *peaceful relationships of interdependence* with both other Indigenous nations and encroaching non-Indigenous populations. Following the rumours from what he calls the "moccasin trail," John Snow notes that the first significant encounters between Ĩyãħé Nakoda and non-Indigenous people had occurred when trappers and fur traders began to enter the region in the early nineteenth century.[85] By the latter half of the nineteenth-century, however, non-Indigneous presence in the Banff-Bow Valley started to result in tensions between Indigenous peoples and the mostly white settler population, as the latter began attempting to assert their own territorial claims to the area. Such a fact was at least partially the product of the final sale of the North-West to the Dominion of Canada as well as the construction of a national railway—which began in the area in 1873. Furthermore, colonizing invasion across the plains had dramatically reduced buffalo herds on the continent, leading to competition for food amongst Indigenous nations that often resulted in conflict.[86] All of these tensions were only intensified after the stories surrounding the Red River Resistance made their way to the Valley.[87] Such an entanglement of factors slowly wrapped around the Ĩyãħé Nakoda in ways that constricted their everyday lives. However, rather than adopting a reactionary politic that sought to restore Ĩyãħé Nakoda relationships by destroying perceived threats from

outsiders and those deemed Other, the nation sought to counter the destruction of life by forging and renewing relationships through a peace treaty.

This understanding of Treaty 7 as a peace treaty is pervasive across Îyãħé Nakoda accounts to this day. For example, Îyãħé Nakoda elder Lou Crawler Sr. explains that the treaty was "a peace agreement between First Nations and Europe."[88] Recalling discussions between Chief Bearspaw and Chief Crowfoot, Crawler Sr. and other Îyãħé Nakoda elders explained that Bearspaw told Crowfoot that the Îyãħé Nakoda had two options: to go to war and fight back or to sign the treaty and "be without any worries and […] be happy with each other."[89] Worried about the losses of life for all sides, but especially violence targeting Indigenous women and children, the two chiefs made peace. This was also exemplified by the fact that the Îyãħé Nakoda chiefs and others insisted that James Macleod and his troops turn NWMP cannons aimed at Indigenous nations away because the intention of the Treaty was to foster peaceful relationships not war. However, elder Lily Wesley makes clear that the peace that was agreed upon was not a surrender of land; instead, it was oriented towards the creation and preservation of life, the expansion of relationships, and the maintenance of peace.[90]

Aware of the many broken promises made by the Canadian government to Indigenous peoples in the east, the Îyãħé Nakoda—as well as the other Indigenous signatories—actively sought to protect their lands and nations from growing imperial encroachment by not only establishing peace, but also forging relationships of interdependency.[91] This is exemplified by the notions of property and practices of distribution articulated by the Îyãħé Nakoda during negotiations. Again, rather than surrendering rights and title to their territories, the Îyãħé Nakoda understood the Treaty as permitting the Canadian state and its subjects access to and use of their homelands in return for becoming obligated to offer various types of care and (mutual) aid. This not only looked like promises of money but also education, medical assistance, and access to European agricultural

techniques and technologies.[92] Commenting on the process of treaty negotiations in the area, Harold Cardinal argues that Indigenous leaders had much to offer in return for the respect and reciprocity they expected.[93] This is also echoed by the elders of Treaty 7, who collectively suggest that many of the leaders involved in the signing of Treaty 7 understood themselves and their people as holding an important position of negotiation with the newly established Canadian state.[94] As Snow explains:

> Even the government realized that if plans for large-scale development were to become a reality, then some agreement would have to be reached with us. We were there first and, although we had no concept of 'owning' land individually, we believed everyone had a right to use it to survive and sustain life, we might object if our way of life was disturbed.[95]

Here, Snow clearly articulates how Treaty 7 was understood as part of Ĩyãħé Nakoda theory and practices of property that revolve around "forging and renewing relationships of care and mutual obligation."[96] From this perspective, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda's interpretation of the treaty can also be read as a practice of internationalism described by Karuka: in recognizing a kind of universal kinship amongst all human (and non-human) beings, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda's approach to treaty rejected notions of scarcity and radical independence espoused by imperial discourses.[97]

In contrast to the Ĩyãħé Nakoda's expansive understanding of Treaty 7—which also shares deep affinity with other Indigenous nations involved with the Treaty—the Canadian state's intentions for, and interpretations of, Treaty 7 differed in significant and often incommensurable ways. For the state and its expansionist agenda, the signing of Treaty 7 represented the penultimate chapter of an almost decade-long effort to secure the North-West for white anglo-settlers and agricultural production. In fact, expansionist modes of relationship animating the Canadian state required that Treaty 7 be reductively understood as a surrendering of Indigenous homelands over to the Crown, despite the fact that this directly contradicted multiple Indigenous accounts of treaty

negotiations on the ground.[98] Commenting on the state's understanding and approach to Treaty 7, John Snow contends:

> The territorial government was concerned primarily with enacting legislation concerning taxation, property rights, the judicial system, public roads, and other local problems. Only incidentally was it concerned with making a treaty with us regarding land, and then only because of the government's concern for controlling Indian land."[99]

He adds: "it is now clear to my people that the contemporary government saw the treaties as an expedient way of resolving the question of our aboriginal rights to this continent."[100] Thus, rather than an attempt to remedy increasing tensions by fostering peaceful relations of coexistence and addressing growing food (in)security, the Canadian state used the signing of the Treaty to concoct a veneer of legality over its violent efforts to *break up* and *break from* enduring Indigenous relationships with the Banff-Bow Valley area—despite the fact that all Indigenous groups that participated in Treaty 7 unanimously agree that they continue to understand the agreement as a peace treaty and not a ceding of land.[101] In doing so, Treaty 7 enabled the Canadian state to impose new regimes of property that could alienate and exploit these lands through the cultivation of cash crops that financiers and railway companies in the east could profit from. As a result, a new market could be built for eastern manufactured goods as well as the formation of new groups of property-owning citizens who would buy into Project Canada. In other words, the treaty functioned in the colonial imaginary to (legally) flatten and smooth out Indigenous lands and waters for colonizing transit in the pursuit of capital accumulation—or, as Snow put it, "the treaties were the vehicle through which the government achieved its objective of opening up the west to settlement and commercial exploitation."[102]

As suggested above, these differences and incommensurabilities between state and Indigenous intentions and interpretations of Treaty 7 emerge largely due to the different onto-epistemological paradigms informing them. As Nichols' work on dispossession reminds us above,

Project Canada is not only able to expand itself by representing Treaty 7 as a transference of Indigenous homelands, but it also relies on the (re)production of an epistemological counter-formation that targets Indigenous people and their modes of relating through a logic of containment and processes of colonial (un)knowing. As Treaty 7 elders reveal, to know the lands and waters making up Treaty 7 territories as vacant space that can be possessed required that enduring Indigenous relations be ignored and disavowed by the state, *including those relationships that were forged and renewed on the ground during treaty negotiations*. In other words, by understanding Treaty 7 as a surrender of land, the state and its colonial populations not only seeks to break up and break from the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous modes of relationship to secure colonial access to land, but they also fundamentally transform the ways in which relations to land take place by forgetting and disavowing the political and economic aspects of Indigenous ways of knowing and being. As Goeman argues, "all that matters in this formulation [of land as property] is an imperial geographer's sense of space in a sense—or who has the legal power at the moment."[103] She adds that this not only fails to recognize land as a "storied site of human interaction," but it also fundamentally "*obfuscates the power of land to possess us.*"[104]

In many ways, then, this *double move of (dis)possession* is a form of epistemic violence that can perhaps be best described as a form of structural gaslighting where the territorializing processes of colonizing (dis)possession are ignored through the very language of (dis)possession. As Nichols notes, many nations face the paradoxical dilemma that emerges when using the term dispossession to refer to the fact that "Indigenous peoples have had the territorial foundation of their societies (i.e., their ancestral lands) stolen from them while, simultaneously, asserting that these lands were not 'property' in the (pre-colonial) first instance."[105] To address this paradox, many tend to reduce (dis)possession to the privatization of possession through violent theft. But, as Nichols points out, this reductive move fails to grapple with the complexities and messiness of

the entangled relationships facilitating Indigenous dispossession in ways that invisiblizes its transformative character. In fact, by reducing (dis)possession to either theft or privatization, colonizing bodies of language enable for the further transit and transgression of Indigenous lands and bodies by only recognizing Indigenous title through the title holder's alienation from this title. As Nichols explains, colonizing states have "routinely affirmed certain forms of Indigenous property rights because they have recognized that, in a consolidating colonial context, Indigenous peoples can only actualize their property through alienation."[106] In other words, rather than possessing the standard form of a property right—that is, the "exclusive rights to (a) acquisition, (b) use and enjoyment, and (c) alienation"—Indigenous peoples possess a "truncated form of property that can only be fully expressed in the third moment, that is, alienation."[107] Here, one can see in a very real way Karuka's observations that colonialism transforms abundance into scarcity and interdependence into isolation.[108] By reducing collective access to land to the right to alienate, colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship seek to break up and break from Indigenous modes of relating otherwise.

Unlike Indigenous people—who were not able to hold Indian status and property simultaneously until 1961 when the Indian Act was amended to get rid of its legislation on compulsory enfranchisement—non-Indigenous people have always been able to legally enjoy property rights within Canada's colonizing property regime in a full sense. But even these rights are often highly constrained too, depending on one's identity. In the mid- to late-nineteenth century, full property rights were often reserved to only those white settler men who were willing to use their labor to develop the North-West into productive agricultural lands. As Toews suggests, an essential aspect of Canadian colonization in the North-West was the state's attempt to lure agricultural labor from the white working-class men—along with the unpaid reproductive labor offered by their presumably nuclear families—living in the east through promises of land

ownership and citizenship into a burgeoning state project. Within this expansionist project, it was white men, specifically, who were deemed to have the proper racial and gendered sensibilities and work ethic for agrarian labor.[109] In fact, such a perspective was legally codified with the passing of the Dominion Lands Act (1872), which promised each white man a 160-acre parcel of land for free if he promised to *use and improve* it. As a result, over 70 million acres of Indigenous land was "gifted" by the Canadian state to individual white male settlers between 1870 and 1930.[110] Between these "gifts" and a combination of formal and informal policies rooted in misogyny and anti-Asian and anti-Black racism, the Canadian state largely succeeded in implementing its own unique brand of Canadian manifest destiny by the early 20th century.[111]

Thus, the Canadian state used Treaty 7 to achieve two central purposes. By disregarding the verbal treaty negotiations, Project Canada used the Treaty to concoct a thin veneer of legality for its newly emerging regimes of property that would enable the flow of capital. It did this by attempting to ensure that property was concentrated into the hands of white male settlers. After all, owning land as private property not only confirms one's heteropatriarchal whiteness—which Moreton-Robinson describes as the ability to impose one's will on those presumed to lack agency—in ways that instantiate and reproduce colonial regimes of power, but such acts of (dis)possession also represent an investment in the affective structures of colonizing regimes of property and the flow of capitalism themselves.[112] This is significant because expansionist modes of relationship not only rely on the reconfigurations of land and labor through theft but, also, the formation of particular subjectivities who become explicitly and/or implicitly invested in the heteropatriarchal and white supremacist structures of the colonizing state and its project of Indigenous dispossession.[113] Here, we can see how the material acts of theft that result in the physical and epistemic transformation of bodies of land and water into colonizing property also require the making and reproducing of an (often highly racialized and gendered) group of colonial subjects

who are invested in Indigenous dispossession. It is both the establishment of these property regimes and the processes of subject formation, then, that combine to form what I refer to as a state of (dis)possession.

However, in claiming absolute legal authority over both territorial and corporeal bodies in order to facilitate capital, colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship make sure that, ultimately, no one is immune from colonizing violence and the breakage it produces. At the end of the day, expansionist modes of relationship animating colonizing regimes that seek to physically enclose and epistemologically contain different Indigenous bodies and territories in the name of capital also require that such violence is also able to target those invested in Indigenous dispossession for the same detriment and breakage in order to continue to contain and concentrate wealth. For this reason, the next section looks to the formation of Banff National Park as an example of the ways in which colonizing violence and its breakage can turn back on the individuals complicit in Indigenous dispossession due to the state's allegiance to capital.

Reiterating the double move of (dis)possession:

Despite popular mythology, the colonization of the North-West in general, and of Treaty 7 territories in particular, shows that colonizing frontiers are never the product of individual settler attempts to make a better life alone. Instead, what also proceeds is intense colonizing conquest as imperial projects seek to open up Indigenous territories to the flow of capital.[114] Commenting on this, Karuka argues that processes of (dis)possession involved within expansionist modes of relationship often occur through the collusion of states and corporations, or what he describes as the "war-finance-nexus."[115]

Pushing back against capitalist myths of meritocracy, Karuka explains how colonizing claims to private property have continually relied on military, police, and mercenaries operating as agents of the state.[116] He adds:

> The history of capitalism in North America is not a history of a free market, governed by the principles of competition between self-interested individuals. It is, in large part, a history of the administration of colonial control over Indigenous communities through the accumulation and valorization of corporate capital.[117]

Yet, just as the flow of capital has relied on state violence to contain and break up Indigenous (and non-Indigenous) modes of relationship that exist beyond the fray of capitalist capture, the state has equally relied on corporations to uphold its claims to sovereignty on the ground. Looking to the initial acts of conquest, Karuka explains: "the rights of corporations served the interests of imperial sovereigns. Corporate charters delineated protocols for relations with Indigenous nations and colonial subjects, ranging from diplomacy to war, providing for the organization and maintenance of standing armies, predefining places as empty of political and economic claims."[118] Here, Karuka's work reveals the impossible task of disentangling the state and corporation—despite liberal efforts to present these two as distinct. As Karuka asserts, "where imperial states granted charters[…] corporations established the terms of actual colonial power."[119]

Such a relationship between the state and corporations is particularly clear in the colonial context of Canada's North-West generally—and with Treaty 7 territories in particular. Acting on behalf of corporate charters, trappers and fur traders—later followed by Canadian Pacific Railway surveyors—explored and mapped out the region while establishing relationships with the local nations. These efforts were fundamental to British (and, later, Canadian) imperialism as it produced a particular body of knowledge of the area from which colonizing conquest and capital could flow.[120] In return for exploiting their knowledge and relationships in the area, corporations like the Hudson's Bay Company also benefitted significantly. Although over 70 million acres of land was

granted to white male settlers between 1870-1930, a vast amount of the land surveyed in the North-West was also redistributed to large corporations—with the HBC receiving property rights to 45,000 acres of land around its 120 trading posts in addition to seven million acres (or 20 per cent) of the region's fertile agricultural lands without the consent of any of the Indigenous (and non-Indigenous) people actually living on these lands.[121] Because the HBC never legally owned these Indigenous territories, Toews argues that this "deal mirrored the British decision to pay reparations to former slave owners—rather than formerly enslaved people—as compensation for abolishing slavery in 1833."[122] Thus, despite the Crown's termination of the 1670 Charter granting Rupert's Land to the HBC, which marked its attempt to break up and break from fur trade economies in a transition to export-agriculture, the HBC—which was one of the largest and oldest corporations in the world during the 1800s—also benefited immensely from the restructuring.[123] In many ways, the establishment of Canada's first national park in the Banff-Bow Valley also exemplifies state-corporate collusion.

Existing on the edge of the so-called North-West, the western part of the Banff-Bow Valley presents a unique ecoregion where the Rocky Mountains meet the prairies. Consequently, the area plays a different role for both Indigenous and colonizing modes of relationship than the flat and fertile soils of the prairies. For the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, the mountains were significant for storing valuable knowledge and cultural practices. Emphasizing the secrecy of Ĩyãħé Nakoda knowledge, Jackson Wesley explains: "You see these mountains around us? All of our secrets are in these mountains…millions of our secrets are held in these mountains and they are not meant to be shared."[124] Echoing this, John Snow writes:

> The Rocky Mountains are sacred to us. We know every trail and mountain pass in this area. We had special ceremonies and religious areas in the mountains. These mountains are our temples, our sanctuaries, and our resting places. They are a place of hope, a place of vision, a place of refuge, a very special and holy place where the Great Spirit speaks with us. *Therefore, these mountains are our sacred places*.[125]

Here, Wesley and Snow exemplify what a growing body of literature on social memory argues: namely, that landscapes can present themselves as critical sites of remembrance.[126] For example, Cruikshank suggests that culturally significant landforms provide archives of sorts that store individual and collective memories for communities.[127] From this perspective, the landscapes of the mountains in the Banff-Bow Valley area are understood as acting on the Îyãħé Nakoda and others just as much as they act on and with the mountains.

In contrast to the Îyãħé Nakoda's expansive modes of relationship that recognize the mountains as agents in their own right, imperialists entering the area on behalf of corporate interests viewed the rivers, mountains, and glaciers making up the Western part of the Banff-Bow Valley in terms of what their expansionist modes of relationship could extract and accumulate through colonizing regimes of property. This is exemplified by the fact that early encounters with both the mountainous landscapes and the local nations by white explorers, such as David Thompson, understood the area as a considerable, but a conquerable, obstacle to progress and profit.[128] Thompson and other individuals—who were usually under the employment of companies like HBC and the Northwest companies—often entered the Valley seeking to find a link to the Pacific and to Asian markets.[129] However, along the way, many also saw new opportunity to profit from the region.

With the construction of the railroad through the valley in early 1880s, colonizing efforts to extract wealth from the mountains in the Banff-Bow Valley only intensified. But, unlike the prairies and other parts of the North-West, this required that a slightly different system of value be applied to the rugged landscapes of the Banff-Bow Valley specifically—and the Rocky Mountains more generally—that was not measured by a place's suitability for European-style export-agriculture. In fact, rather than export agriculture, the Rocky Mountains were quickly deemed

valuable by capitalists in central Canada in at least two ways. First, the Banff-Bow Valley area was recognized as possessing valuable natural resources that could be extracted and exported back to central Canada.[130] This included timber sales throughout the valley; coal mining in Anthracite, Bankhead, and Canmore; cement production and gravel extraction in Exshaw, and mining for precious metals in Silver City. Second, the rugged features of the Rockies and the seeming abundance of wildlife (even with the absence of the buffalo) was understood as conducive to fostering a world-class tourist industry. This was especially the case for the Canadian Pacific Railway company, which sought to ensure that it would benefit economically from the Valley. As the railroad was built through the area, general manager William Van Horne worked closely with John A. Macdonald to ensure that government policy favored the CPR's interests.

Here, we see how corporate-state collusion creates space for CPR to slither along through Indigenous territories to accumulate capital. For Macdonald, the white supremacist dream of Canadian manifest destiny containing the northern part of the continent within one state required the linking of the country together. CPR's railroad would do just this, further opening the "West" to development and resource extraction, which would—in turn—also lead to the production of a new market for manufactured goods from central Canada. For Van Horne, the mountains presented the opportunity to establish a world-class tourist attraction, which he wanted to ensure the CPR would benefit from.[131] However, increasing settler encroachment into the newly forming mountain towns made a monopoly on tourism difficult. As Leslie Bella explains, "Van Horne wanted to control development in the mountain valleys, to protect the scenery from squatting and enable the CPR to monopolize development."[132] For Van Horne, the best solution to this problem facing the CPR was to make the area a nature preserve, with the title of the land for the park resting with the CPR or himself.[133]

This desire to own and control the land in the Banff Bow Valley only intensified with the so-called "discovery" of the hot springs near the new town-site of Banff. As described in the introduction of this chapter, the McCardell brothers and Frank McCabe were the first colonizers to attempt to claim the Banff Cave and Basin as their own property in 1883.[134] However, despite their efforts to 'cultivate and improve' the land, they were told that the Dominion Lands Act did not extend to the mountains.[135] In response, the three also attempted to claim mineral rights and rights as "discoverers" but were only met with evasive replies from colonizing authorities.[136]

Viewing the hot springs as part of the inanimate landscape, these colonizers mostly relied on Lockean notions of private property codified in colonial law to impose their claims to the mineral-rich area. This greatly contradicted Îyãħé Nakoda understandings and relationships to the hot springs that continue to be shared to this day. Commenting on the significance of the warm waters to the Îyãħé Nakoda and the impact of a colonzing presence in the area, Îyãħé Nakoda Chief Katanga Mani (Walking Buffalo) explains in an interview in 1956:

> [The Îyãħé Nakoda] would bathe in the springs because of the medicine in them. Then they would drop something in the water as a sacrifice, as a thank you to the spirits for the use of their water… But since the white people came, the strength has gone out of the water. That mysterious power that comes from the spirits is there no more. Probably the white peoples do not pray to get well. In the old days, the Indians used to pray to the spirits to cure them of their sickness. Then they were healed by the mysterious strength of the waters (Clark, 1960, 95-96).

In addition to the healing properties of the hot springs, oral accounts from the Îyãħé Nakoda suggest that the area was also significant for harvesting medicines and for ceremonial gathering with other Indigenous nations.[137] Like the Mountains in the Banff-Bow Valley more generally, colonizers seeking to stake claims to the hot springs required the deliberate unknowing of Îyãħé Nakoda relationships to the springs as well as the bodies of knowledge these relationships produced. As a consequence, the area was almost exclusively understood by these colonizers and others moving through the area in terms of ownership and profit.

However, by opening up Indigenous territories to colonizing regimes of property catering to capitalism in the first place, the Canadian state also requires that those involved in acts of dispossession can also be targeted by the same state violence and dispossessionary force in order to continue to accommodate the flow of capital in the area. This is exemplified by Canada's decision to establish a park in the Banff-Bow Valley. Just as the McCardells and McCabe's Lockean notions of individual private property are incommensurable with Ĩyãħé Nakoda relations, they were also deemed to compete and contend with the systems of valuation that emerge within Canadian expansionist modes of relationship. Unlike the prairies where capitalist modes of relationship saw value creation almost exclusively in terms of land cultivation for export-agriculture, the value of the Rocky Mountains exists in both the material resources that can be extracted *and* the tourist dollars that can be attracted. Yet, these two systems of value—which both emerge from the expansionist modes of relationship at the heart of capitalism—exist in tension and, consequently, require coordination at a scale not possible if individual property owners are able to stake out the area for their own usage. In other words, the mountains required those with enough capital (whether in the form of the state or private companies like CPR) to closely control (and balance) the seemingly competing interests of resource extraction and tourism for maximum profit.

Consequently, after a dispute between the McCardell brothers and McCabe as well as extensive lobbying from CPR, the federal government engaged in a campaign of lawfare against the very colonizers who had extended the states own authority on the ground by staking out property claims in the area. In doing so, it established a 26 km^2 nature preserve around the Cave and Basin Hot Springs in 1885.[138] Two years later, the Rocky Mountains Park Act—which established the Rocky Mountains Park that would later be renamed as Banff National Park with the passing of the National Parks Act in 1930—expanded the nature preserve surrounding the Cave and Basin Hot Springs from 26 km^2 to 673 km^2, officially establishing Canada's first national

park.[139] The establishment of the park not only rendered all proprietary claims to the area null and void, but it also meant that land could only be leased moving forward. Although the CPR hoped to obtain title of the land in the park itself, it received a 999-year lease to large parcels of land.[140] Since all other leases for homes and businesses in the area only last 42-years, it is clear that state lawfare was deployed in the case of Banff and the hot springs to create a space for the CPR to slither in and through Indigenous lands and accumulate capital. Here, the future of individual corporations not only presupposes the future of the state while, in turn, asserting the future of colonial sovereignty,[141] but the colonizing state also reserves the right to not renew individual private property within the boundaries of the park. In this sense, rent ensures that the state, as a corporation, retains a level of flexibility for capital accumulation that enables for the balancing of contradicting projects of resource extraction and tourism. As Karuka explains, "rent captures the futures of place."[142] This is particularly the case in Banff, as the state not only asserts its own regime of property but also the sovereignty of capital in ways that reveal how the dispossessionary forces enacted by colonizers can always turn back on the very people that facilitate Indigenous dispossession in the first instance. After all, captial knows no borders and holds no allegiances other than to furthering the accumulation of capital.

Conclusion:

By mapping out the area as a space that could by possessed, colonizing regimes and their subjects not only came to understand the Banff-Bow Valley as unclaimed territory waiting to be staked out in proprietary terms, but they also actively worked to ignore Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations' notions of property and modes of relationship as they sought to violently dispossess and replace them. As has been shown, these processes of material violence and epistemic unknowing disproportionately target Indigenous modes of relationship—such as those embodied by the Ĩyãħé

Nakoda—largely because of the ways in which these modes of relationship offer diverse and collective forms of knowledge and meaning that challenge or disrupt hyper-individualizing and hierarchal notions of colonizing sovereignty and property. In fact, by looking to the Banff-Bow Valley and the establishment of the Park, it becomes clear how colonizing encroachment in the area—and the expansionist modes of relationship animating it—emerges as a reactionary political project as it not only seeks to physically destroy and break up the ways in which the Valley sustains life, but it must also epistemologically contain and homogenize collective diversity by intentionally forgetting relational modes of knowing and being. Furthermore, the establishment of the nature preserve at the Banff Hot Springs, specifically, also reveals how this reactionary material and discursive violence and breakage can also target those non-Indigenous people who invest in Indigenous dispossession in order to further concentrate the accumulation of capital.

To me, this threat of state violence as it attempts to maintain both colonizing regimes of property and the sovereignty of capital provides a very real political incentive for most non-Indigenous persons to seriously consider those projects of decolonization spear-headed by different Indigenous nations whose territories they live on. After all, despite the state's continuous efforts to break up and break from Indigenous modes of relationship, nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda—along with their modes of relationship, bodies of knowledge, and the systems of property and value—continue to exist, persist, and resist expansionist modes of relationship to this day. Furthermore, these nations and the bodies of knowledge they (re)produce continue to be felt by projects like the buffalo reintroduction, which—in turn—also presses on both Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies as they continuously become entangled with/in place. For this reason, one must ask how a project like the buffalo reintroduction reproduces particular modes of relationship and the bodies of knowledge. What kind of conceptions of property are at play and what does this mean for both Indigenous decolonization as well as liberation more generally. However, before unpacking these

questions, the next chapter shifts focus to look at how colonizing modes of relationship seek to manage and endure the ongoing presence—and modes of relationship—of nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda with/in places like the Banff-Bow Valley.

THREE

Rendering Colonial Subjects Triple

> *Here an imperial romance with the wilderness frontier(s) and social Darwinist notions about Indigenous peoples as morally infantile and unfit for citizenship enabled European settlers to characterize these spaces as 'free land' and to represent Indigenous peoples as having no legally recognizable land tenure.*
>
> —Margot Francis, *Creative Subversions*[1]

In this chapter, I focus on how the interlocking entanglements of power making up colonizing regimes must continuously react to the presence of enduring Indigenous nations and their expansive modes of relationship to stabilize—and even naturalize—their states of (dis)possession. I show that, in addition to ongoing material violence and breakage, one of the primary ways colonizing regimes react to enduring Indigenous nations is by making what can be called "state of nature fictions," which re-present these regimes as homogenous and whole entities that are distinct from past states of primitiveness—often defined by their proximity to nature.[2] By articulating these fictions as part of what Karuka calls "the prose of countersovereignty,"[3] colonizing regimes invoke highly racialized and gendered tropes of Indigeneity that tie Indigenous people to colonizing notions of nature in order to mistranslate, devalue, and contain Indigenous people and their modes of relationship. In fact, by re-presenting Indigenous people as *continuously turning between supposedly (primitive) states of nature and (civilizing) states of (dis)possession* through these colonizing tropes, state of nature fictions not only work to justify and legitimate colonizing violence and breakage; they also make and reproduce particular colonial subjectivities who support and (re)invest in imperial war and conquest deliberately targeting Indigenous people (along with other poor and dispossessed peoples) in the name of white supremacy and masculine superiority.

However, in considering the ways in which Indigenous and non-Indigenous people turn toward (or away) from colonizing regimes through state of nature fictions, I also show that such

processes of subject formation are never complete and, instead, become part of an inherently instable and ambivalent set of entangled relations. Although reiterating the supremacy of the white heterosexual man in relation to Indigenous (and other non-Indigenous) persons enables colonizing regimes to adapt to different contexts, it is also through these reiterations that state of nature fictions and other prose of countersovereignty risk being disrupted and subverted. By emphasizing complexity and messiness through the notion of colonial entanglement, I show that colonizing discourses not only produce particular bodies of knowledge and claims to political authority that *both* Indigenous and non-Indigenous people alike can resist, but also that these colonizing bodies of knowledge and modes of relationship are not the only ways of being and knowing; both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people are also entangled with Indigenous modes of relationship and notions of political authority that revolve around supporting a diversity of life across different genders, generations, and species. Thus, I argue that those caught up within colonial entanglements carry the *triple potential* to both turn towards and/or away from colonizing regimes necessitating the subjugation of the poor and dispossessed *as well as* to refuse such dichotomous ways of thinking by (re)orienting themselves through other modes of relationship.

To convey this argument, the first half of the chapter begins by considering how state of nature fictions function as part of the prose of countersovereignty. This largely theoretical divergence from the entanglements of Banff lays the seeds for the three case studies in this chapter, as well as the following chapter's consideration of the Buffalo Reintroduction Project. It does this by pointing out how state of nature fictions use colonizing tropes of wilderness and Indigeneity to establish *epistemic breaking points* that achieve at least two things: first, state of nature fictions serve to index the different kinds of proprietary claims that colonizing regimes can make as they extend their authority and control across Indigenous territories and, second, it also establishes an original position from which the autonomy of a supposedly universal modern subject (read as

white, cis-hetero, able-bodied, neuro-typical, male, etc.) can be measured against. Furthermore, I show how such prose of countersovereignty ultimately renders Indigenous and non-Indigenous people as partial—or, as Fanon explains, triple—subjects through white supremacist and heteropatriarchal entanglements that compel them to turn towards/away from colonizing authority and modes of relationship.[4] However, as *triple subjects*, I also reveal that those caught up within colonial entanglements possess a *triple potential* to not only conform to and/or resist colonizing modes of relationship, but to also refuse such binarized terms altogether by (re)orienting themselves through expansive modes of relationship. This triple potential is explored in the latter half of the chapter, which looks at the introduction of the Indian Act, the banning of hunting within Banff National Park, and the Banff Indian Days, respectively.

State of nature fictions:

As noted in chapter one, colonizing regimes like Canada and the US continuously fail to completely destroy and replace the Indigenous peoples whose territories they claim. In the Banff-Bow Valley, this failure is evidenced by the ongoing presence of Indigenous nations like the Îyãħé Nakoda, Ktunaxa, Tsuut'ina, Siksikaitsitapi, Secwepemc, and members of the Cree, and it manifests for numerous reasons. This includes both Indigenous peoples' ongoing persistence and resistance as well as the ways colonizing regimes have become entangled with Indigenous nationhood—becoming legally and politically dependent on Indigenous sovereignty for their own assertions of authority as sovereign states.[5]

This inability to completely eliminate Indigenous people within colonizing contexts, however, results in a significant challenge for the flattening and smoothing effects (and affects) of imperial projects like Canada and the US. As Mark Rifkin suggests, the continuing existence of Indigenous people "continues to generate a fundamental tension within the jurisdictional imaginary

of the [nation]."[6] For him, the enduring presence of Indigenous peoples "troubl[es] the effort to posit an obvious relation between the rightful authority of the state and the territory over which it seeks to extend that authority."[7] In other words, Indigenous life haunts colonizing projects seeking to re-present themselves as whole and coherent entities that rule over Indigenous peoples and places. This produces what Rifkin calls the "endemic crisis [of] legitimizing settler sovereignty."[8]

Confronted by enduring Indigeneities, then, colonizing regimes seeking to replace expansive modes of relationship with expansionist modes of relationship must *constantly react to enduring Indigenous presences* in order to sustain the thin veneer of autonomy and absolute authority that these regimes concoct and claim. As discussed in chapter one, Manu Karuka has theorized the *reactionary character* of colonial sovereignty through the notion of countersovereignty. [9] Unlike expansive modes of relationship and their emphasis on interdependence and reciprocity, Karuka argues that countersovereignty's expansionist modes of relating necessitate various strategies of *breakage* to react to and counter the Indigenous nations and modes of relationship it seeks to replace. This includes practices of physical violence and terror that target people along racialized, gendered, sexed, etc. lines, but it also includes producing and reiterating discourses of misinformation and devaluation to form a particular mode of authorship and transmission, which Karuka describes as the "prose of countersovereignty."[10] For him, such prose is oriented "toward delegitimizing Indigenous modes of relationship and solidifying a colonial sovereignty unmoored from them."[11]

Perhaps one of the most common genres of the prose of countersovereignty is the state of nature fiction. Appearing in colonizing discourses ranging from seventeenth and eighteenth century social contract theory to twenty-first century environmental campaigns, state of nature fictions rely heavily on colonial logics of containment. In doing so, these fictions create a series of narratives that enact various processes of spatialization, dividing and demarcating along geographic,

temporal, and social/cultural lines. Through such distinctions—which Bill Ashcroft calls "imperial binaries"[12]—state of nature fictions articulate and reiterate the transition *from a past state of primitiveness and savagery to a contemporary state of civilization*—usually defined by the establishment of colonizing property regimes catering to capital, or what I have been calling colonizing states of (dis)possession. In doing so, these fictions enable those who invoke them to demarcate whole and homogenous nation-states, which are juxtaposted to prior Indigenous life and forms of relationship that are simultaneously re-presented as sites for the accumulation of capital.

As indicated in the name, one of the primary ways that state of nature fictions perpetuate expansionist modes of relationship is by drawing on polysemic notions of nature[13] to divide and demarcate bodies of land and flesh in a number of ways. For one, drawing on colonizing notions of nature enables state of nature fictions to establish geographic distinctions that re-present those places deemed to be natural as a constitutive outside of and/or a priori to colonizing states of (dis)possession. Recalling the ways in which the North-West was revalued and devalued (as discussed in chapter two), notions of nature are used to make physical and epistemic breaking points that serve to index the different "kinds of claims within the sphere of the sovereign's territorial reach."[14] Furthermore, in emphasizing their interest in 'nature' and territory, colonizing regimes like Canada and the US have also sought to justify and legitimate the intense levels of colonial violence and breakage targeting Indigenous people—along with Black people and other people of color—by distinguishing themselves from other colonizing projects.[15] Thus, it is through imperial notions of nature and wilderness that state of nature fictions enable particular colonizing regimes to shore up their property claims through ideas of use and improvement,[16] while also setting their dispossessionary sights of 'new' bodies of land (and flesh) re-presented as existing beyond the pale of civilization (and its colonizing laws).

In addition to making geographic demarcations, state of nature fictions also enable expansionist modes of relationship to physically and epistemically expand and extend themselves into Indigenous territories by articulating progressive notions of history that distinguish between the past, present, and future in a linear and teleological way. Although often cast as historically factual, state of nature fictions function by articulating abstract—and often arbitrary—*breakages* in "colonial time" to establish temporal hierarchies that justify and legitimate the repressive spatial boundaries enacted by imperial war and conquest.[17] This is because the temporal breaks articulated by state of nature fictions not only function to cast certain places (and groups of people) as "left behind," but they also function to situate colonizing violence and breakage as a thing of the past.[18] As John Borrows suggests, state of nature fictions effectively (and affectively) de-emphasize and/or deny "a past era's complex entanglements" in order to "distinguish a group's contemporary circumstances from a perceived simpler, purer past."[19] Constructing what he calls "post-something worlds"—which include post-Edenic, post-evolutionary, post-contact, post-social contract, post-colonial, post-industrial, and post-reconciliation etc.—Borrows shows how state of nature fictions enable those who use them to resist the ways in which a perceived past—whether represented as a particular person, place, or thing—presses on, and is entangled with, a group's contemporary circumstances.[20]

Finally, in making and reproducing a temporal and geographic distinction, state of nature fictions also render different groups of people along social and cultural lines. Within colonizing regimes, these social and cultural distinctions are often heavily inscribed in colonizing terms that often invoke the savage-civilized binary in an effort to access and exploit new bodies of land and flesh.[21] Through such a binary—which distinguishes between savage and civilized humans (and non-humans) as well as savage and civilized modes of relationship—colonizing discourses cast certain groups of people as irrational, inferior, and—consequently—"unable to be modern and

autonomous agents" while others are cast as rational and independent.[22] Possessing these proper qualities, those belonging to the latter category are deemed to be proper, modern subjects (read as white, masculine, able-bodied, neuro-typical, etc.) who are able to buy, use, and sell property through their "movement of self-appropriation that resists the type of alienation that social-economic formations (wage labour, for instance) demand of modern subjects."[23] This means that the proper subject is not only able to own property through the appropriation of parts of his exterior world as he exposes aspects of himself that are alienable (i.e. Labour), but he is also able to conserve and protect his power of appropriation through rational self-reflection.[24] In other words, the modern, possessive subject is able to buy into colonizing states of (dis)possession by turning inward, while simultaneously breaking up the external world that is understood as distinct from his "interior life."[25]

Yet, by exalting the (white) European man as the *proper possessive subject* within colonizing regimes, state of nature fictions must also be able to point to and contain those who are deemed to be "primitive" and "savage" others. Although colonial entanglements of differential devaluation target a myriad of lived relations and felt experiences—including those of women, children, people of color, and queer and/or gender non-conforming people as well as those living with different mental and physical abilities—Byrd shows how colonizing regimes expend particular attention (and force) to contain, devalue, and break up of Indigenous nations through particular representations of Indigenous people.[26] Through colonial entanglements of differential devaluation, these regimes make and produce a diverse range of tropes and stereotypes that deliberately target and recast Indigenous peoples as culturally, spiritually, politically, economically, and/or biologically inferior to their (white) colonizing counterparts. Referring to these tropes and stereotypes through the figure of the Indian—or "Indianness"—Byrd explains how the racialized, gendered, sexed, etc. category functions as a mobile figure, conflating colonization

with other entanglements of power in ways that "tend to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion."[27]

Thus, by re-presenting Indigenous people as an inferior Other through racialized and gendered notions of primitiveness and savagery, tropes of Indigeneity specifically help state of nature fictions to shore up colonizing regimes by making and reproducing colonial subject who view colonizing states of (dis)possession as legitimate and Indigenous sovereignty as illegitimate. In fact, it is through both these colonizing notions of nature and tropes of Indigeneity that imperial projects are able to extend their savage-civilized binaries onto a global scale.[28] This is because, if colonizing notions of nature are part of the rational plan to "empty lands of presence via the discourses of terra nullius in order to refill them with British imperial laws,"[29] crucial to these notions of nature—as a space consisting of primitive conditions—are particular understandings of those living with/in these Indigenous territories as primitive and/or savage and, therefore, lacking reason. In other words, it is largely by discursively 'emptying out' Indigenous bodies of their rational capacities that colonizing discourses can make and reproduce colonial subjects willing to accept and buy into the intense levels of colonizing violence and breakage that are associated with the war and conquest necessary to establish colonizing regimes and their states of (dis)possession.

Here, one can also begin to see how—like the colonizing regimes that require notions of Indigenous sovereignty to articulate their own independence—state of nature fictions make and reproduce colonizing subjects who at least tacitly require the presence of the Indigenous Others they seek to suppress in order to articulate their own exalted status. In fact, rather than signaling the end of Indigenous people and the colonizing violence that targets them, the supposed transition from primitive states of nature to civilized states of (dis)possession articulated through state of nature fictions simply provides an alibi for imperial war and conquest to continue on—albeit, in different forms and often at different scales.[30] But, again, crucial to the continuation of such

violence and breakage of Indigenous lands and bodies are colonizing tropes that cast Indigenous peoples as inferior to the colonizing agents of imperial projects. As Byrd argues, such colonizing tropes make up part of "the ontological ground through which[…]settler colonialism enacts itself."[31]

To better understand the political effects and affects of state of nature fictions, I want to further consider how articulations and reiterations of colonizing tropes of Indigeneity function to delegitimize the enduring presences of Indigenous peoples and their modes of relationship in places like the Banff-Bow Valley—all while, simultaneously, attempting to shore up and solidify Canadian sovereignty. For this reason, the next two sections theoretically consider how colonizing notions of Indigeneity result in both *material and immaterial effects for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people* caught up with/in colonial entanglements. Here, I argue that these effects and affects ultimately seek to render colonial subjects as partial—or, as Fanon calls, triple—subjects responsible for their personhood, their perceived identities, and their ancestry. However, as *triple subjects*, I also argue that those caught up within colonial entanglements also possess a *triple potential*. This important theoretical work is then applied to the Indian Act, the prohibition of hunting in the Park, and the Banff Indian Days—respectively—as well as in the final chapter of this thesis, which looks at the Buffalo Reintroduction Project.

Colonizing tropes:

As mobile figures emerging from the culmination of entanglements of different discourses and stereotypes, colonizing tropes of Indigeneity are tropes in the sense that they deviate and 'turn' away from the actual lived relations and felt experiences of Indigenous peoples. In fact, many have suggested that the racist and gendered tropes of Indigeneity actually say more about colonizing regimes—along with the lives and relationships of those embodying their expansionist modes of

relationship—than they do about Indigenous peoples.[32] However, in turning away from these lived relationships and felt experiences, colonizing tropes simultaneously press on Indigenous (and non-Indigenous) people in ways that attempt to (re)orient them towards the goals and desires of colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship. In other words, colonizing tropes are entangled with colonizing power dynamics in ways that both respond to and produce real material effects and affects.

Such a fact is exemplified by the ways in which tropes of Indigeneity are invoked to racialize—and, consequently, depoliticize—Indigenous nations and the impacts of colonization. As discussed in chapter two, colonizing tropes draw on centuries of anti-Native racism that re-presents Indigenous people as primitive and savage due to their supposed proximity to the state of nature.[33] By entangling and even conflating colonization and racialization (along with other entanglements of power), these tropes of Indigeneity serve to reiterate false doctrines of discovery and terra nullius that re-present Indigenous nations and their territories as void of any collective legal-political orders while also re-present these nations as unable to "provide care, indeed *to* care" for themselves.[34] Consequently, colonizing tropes re-present Indigenous nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda as being "under an equal doom" to the declining buffalo herds they depended on due to their supposed racial and cultural inferiority.[35]

Such a move is crucial within colonizing regimes because it enables the physical transit (and transgression) of Indigenous lands and bodies in pursuit of capital to continue in at least three ways. For one, entanglements of colonization and racialization enable the impacts of the conquest to be misdirected and clouded over by racializing discourses that effectively 'turn' the impacts of colonial geopolitical violence into an indicator of racial and/or cultural inferiority. As Byrd notes, the conflation of colonization and racialization ultimately "masks the territoriality of conquest by assigning colonization [and its impacts] to the racialized body."[36] Second, the reassignment of the

impacts of colonization through tropes of Indigeneity not only enables colonizers to re-present Indigenous peoples as racially and culturally inferior, but it enables colonizing regimes to justify further violence and colonial breakage by recasting "place-based political collectivities as (racialized) populations subject to [state] jurisdiction and management."[37] No longer understood as part of a politically sovereign collective, Indigenous peoples are instead re-presented as a member of a minority that can be "then policed in its degree from whiteness"—i.e. an ability to integrate into the body politic of the white, heteropatriarchal state.[38] In fact, through colonizing tropes, Indigenous people are not only re-presented as lacking systems of governance, but such tropes also enable colonizing regimes to reframe citizenship as a form of remediation for the incredible amounts of violence and colonial breakage that both have occurred in the past and continue to occur in the present (even though this access to citizenship is never enough to 'cure' them of their perceived racial and cultural inferiority). This leads to the third point: offering citizenship as a form of remediation not only fails to grapple with "the fact that such discourses further reinscribe the original colonial injury,"[39] but it also enables Project Canada to re-present itself as a benevolent and just nation—all while continuing to delegitimize Indigenous people and their modes of relationship. In fact, failure to accept the offer of citizenship into a white, heteropatriarchal body politic only results in further containment and marginalization, as Indigenous peoples are re-presented as "melancholic citizens dissatisfied with the conditions of inclusion."[40]

Through colonizing tropes of Indigeneity, then, any sign of enduring Indigenous presence becomes broken up (both literally and metaphorically) and recast as deserving pity at best—but never grief, which would entail an actual apprehension of the systems and modes of relationship animating colonial breakage; at worst, Indigneous people are re-presented as hopelessly contaminated, not "real," and, therefore, uninjurable at worst.[41] This enables state of nature fictions

to leave Indigenous people as figuratively "turning" between a long-lost past and an impossible present. To phrase it differently, Indigenous people and their enduring presences are considered as never able to occupy the "here" and "now;" instead, they are re-presented as ahistorial, having always either disappeared (and, therefore, *outside of time*) or as being remnants on the verge of disappearing (and, consequently, quickly running *out of time*).[42]

By re-presenting Indigenous nations as minority population that can be managed by the state, colonizing tropes help to justify and legitimate the continued policing (and criminalization) of Indigenous peoples in their everyday lives as they become subject to racist and sexist norms and values that have been codified within colonizing law. Through such physical violence, these tropes help make and sustain the "Manichaean world" described by Frantz Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth* (and exemplified in chapter two), where the colonizer and colonized are "penned-in" through opposing terms that ultimately facilitate the imposition of expansionist modes of relationship in pursuit of capital.[43] Yet, in describing this "world divided in two," Fanon also makes clear that such division and breakage does not only manifest in objective terms.[44] In the Manichaean world, the colonizer is not content with physically limiting the space and resources accessible to the colonized; instead, his racism and contempt for Indigenous peoples takes on a life of its own as they seek to turn the colonized figure into "a kind of quintessence of evil" that can then be internalized.[45]

Subjective breakage:

In *Location of Culture*, Homi K. Bhabha discusses these psychoaffective and phenomenological dimensions of subject formation under colonization. For him, to make sense of that which is being identified within colonizing discourses, racializing and gendering acts of enunciation do not only seek to reduce the colonized body to the colonizer's opposite as they turn towards colonizing

authorities; instead, colonizing discourses seek to discursively split and break up colonial subjectivitivies.[46] By breaking up colonial subjects, Bhabha argues that colonizing discourses are able to dismiss and disavow that which is considered "excess" (i.e. does not conform to the tropes and stereotypes being invoked) by re-presenting it as *different*—as "a mutation, a hybrid."[47] For Bhabha, this splitting and rupturing is ultimately necessary due to the limits that constrain processes of identification. He suggests that any act of identification is always "insufficient unto itself" because the symbols of culture that processes of identification rely on "have no primordial unity or fixity."[48] This means that "the same signs can be appropriated, translate, rehistoricized and read anew."[49] As a result, colonizing discourses become a series of flickering signs that are constantly articulated and enunciated within colonial contexts in ways that attempt to shore up colonizing power, but always risk slipping. It is through a strategy of disavowal that colonizing discourses can produce the "space of hybridity"—which he defines as the *ambivalent third space "in-between" the self and the other, the colonizer and the colonized*—to stabilize colonizing processes of identification.[50] Within this metaphorical space, one is provided with "the terrain for elaborating strategies of self-hood."[51] When caught up within colonial entanglements, then, Bhabha argues that hybridity often works to reinforce colonizing discourses by tethering the colonized subject to "treacherous stereotypes of primitiveness and degeneracy."[52]

By disavowing that which does not fit within such tropes being projected onto their bodies, the colonized subject is consequently dismembered and dislocated by colonizing discourses seeking to render them as continuously turning between an imagined past and an impossible present.[53] Using the infamous passage in *Black Skin, White Masks*—where Fanon is confronted by a young Parisian girl who fears him solely because of the color of his skin—Bhabha underscores this process of subjective breakage (and containment) by showing how Fanon's humanness and complex personhood must be repeatedly broken up, disavowed, and contained from his Black

body.[54] In fact, by turning in ways that produce such splitting and breakage, Fanon reflects that his body is actually rendered triple:

> Assailed at various points, the corporeal schema crumbled, its place taken by a racial epidermal schema… It was no longer a question of being aware of my body in the third person but in a triple person… I was responsible for my body, for my race, for my ancestors.[55]

Through Bhabha's reading of Fanon, it becomes clear that colonizing discourses (and actions) seeking to erect and maintain colonizing regimes do not simply seek to spatially contain the colonized body; such regimes mobilize colonizing tropes to psychically *break up* the colonized subject as well through processes of internalization.

Although writing about french colonization in Martinique, Bhabha's reading of Fanon proves insightful for understandings of colonizing discourses in so-called North America. Just as the white colonizer's gaze breaks up the Fanon's subjectivity, the various agents of the Canadian state also physically and metaphorically target the bodies of Indigenous peoples like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda—burdening them with the myriad of tropes and stereotypes of primitiveness and degeneracy. Caught up within these discursive entanglements, personhood, race, and ancestry risks becoming fractured apart as colonizing tropes tether Indigenous persons to an inferior past in an effort to justify the physical and material violence necessary to erect colonizing states of dispossession. It is this tethering that ultimately allows nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda to be perpetually dispossessed, displaced, and contained by the colonizer under the guise of (white) civic virtue. In fact, displacement and dispossession is almost always recast as a benevolent managing of a "dying race" who can never be integrated completely within the white body politic due to their inherent racial and cultural inferiority.[56]

However, Bhabha's work also reveals how the weight of these colonizing discourses is felt by those who wield tropes of Indigeneity—albeit, in different ways. For him, colonizing discourses

produce another figure of perversion: just as the presence of colonized body is tethered to a dehumanizing past that dismembers and dislocates its presence, the figure of the colonizer is re-presented through the "image of the post-Enlightenment man tethered to, not confronted by, his dark reflection, the shadow of the colonized man."[57] For Bhabha, the colonizing subject is not produced in relation to the colonized Other, but through "the disturbing distance in-between"—that is, the space of hybridity.[58] It is ultimately through this space that colonizing discourses establish the figure of colonial otherness through processes of disavowal and unknowing that demarcate the self and the other, the colonizer and colonized.[59]

But, in establishing this space of in-betweenness that constitutes the colonizer and colonized, the colonizing subject is also subjected to processes of splitting and breakage in a number of ways. For one, by tethering oneself to the figure of otherness that is attached to the colonized subject, the colonizing subject must not only break up and contain the colonized other, but they must also 'turn' to disavow and break up those aspects of their complex personhood that do not fit neatly into the image of a post-enlightenment man. Furthermore, not only is the colonizer's body rendered in highly colonizing and racializing terms that can also prove to be confining and constraining along lines of gender and sexuality, but in tethering themselves to the image of the colonized through the space of hybridity, the colonizer is also confronted with a fundamental crisis of identity: in invoking colonizing tropes, the colonizer's discursive strategies tether themselves to tropes and stereotypes of Indigenous people whose real presence possesses disturbing and anxiety-inducing effects and affects for both colonizing subjectivities as well as the regimes they seek to support and buy into. This is because Indigenous people—whether re-presented as tethered to treacherous stereotypes of a primitive and degenerate past or not—possesses the capacity to counter not only colonizing state of nature fictions that suggest that they cannot belong in the here and now, but their very presence also contradicts what is supposed to be

an unavowable—yet constitutive—loss that helps to demarcate and stabilize the colonizer's 'internal world.' Thus, although invoking colonizing tropes enables the colonizer to break up Indigenous bodies to produce their own superiority, they also compel the colonizer to recognize the colonized person's existence, which carries with it the potential to shatter colonizing frames of reference established by state of nature fictions and other colonizing discourses.[60] In other words, similar to the colonized subject, the discursive turning through which the colonizer comes to gain his supposed superiority also produces a similar rupture and breakage that renders them a partial—and, even, triple—subject.

It is due to this breakage and instability that physical violence must always linger within the background of colonial contexts and their entanglements of power. This is not only because physical violence is conceived of as the most effective tool for dealing with the uncivilized and inferior, but also due to the fact that physical violence helps to reaffirm the colonizing difference that regimes of countersovereignty necessitate. As Razack suggests, on the one hand, the physical violence visited on "Indigenous bodies imprints colonial power on the skin" in ways that are meant to make them disappear (both physically and metaphorically); on the other hand, this violence also produces colonizing subjects who buy into and support countersovereignty's claims to control Indigenous bodies of land and flesh.[61] In fact, within colonizing regimes, colonizing subjects are actually entangled with structural violence not as an aberration from supposedly civilized—i.e. liberal, multicultural—norms, but as the primary way in which they (attempt to) secure colonizing entitlement to Indigenous lands (and bodies). As Karuka explains:

> War […] is not a fleeting element of an evolutionary transition from savagery to civilization. War has been a central function of the emergent capitalist state, flourishing over the high period of liberal imperialism. Imperialist wars ripen the fruits of civilization, producing the most irrational destructiveness through the most rational outlooks.[62]

From Karuka, it becomes clear how state of nature fictions—and their tropes of Indigeneity—function to normalize and occlude this colonizing violence and breakage. By using the supposed transition from primitive ways of living to states of (dis)possession, these fictions justify and legitimate not only the violence and breakage of the past, but also the violence and breakage of the present and future by providing "cover for the continuation of war by other agencies, and by other uniforms."[63]

In many ways, the argument sketched thus far is bleak in its implications. For this reason, the final theoretical section of this chapter mobilizes colonial entanglement to not only sit with the messiness and complexities of processes of subject formation mapped out so far, but to also point to the ways in which individuals always exceed the confines and containment of colonizing tropes and discourse. Specifically, I show how the subjective 'turn' invoked by colonizing tropes not only possesses oppressive aspects; like other discursive entanglements, these colonizing discourses press on colonial subjects in ways that both restrict and constrain them as well as "initiate and sustain their agency."[64] As will be shown, colonizing tropes—and colonizing discourses more generally—also carry with them the subversive potential to challenge colonizing power dynamics through anti-colonial action. However, I also build on this duality between assimilation and resistance by also pointing out how Indigenous (and non-Indigenous) people also possess the capacity to refuse such a dichotomy by (re)orienting their lives around modes of relationship that exist beyond the containment of colonizing regimes.

'Feeling out' triple subjectivities:

In understanding colonization as—at least partially—facilitated through a series of flickering signs and symbols meant to justify and legitimate its material effects and immaterial affects, Bhabha argues that the space of hybridity also possesses a subversive potential. Because of the slipperiness

of colonizing discourses, he suggests that the space of hybridity exists not only as a space of "in-betweenness," but also as an uncertain and, even, unrepresentable space.[65] In embracing this uncertainty, Bhabha suggests that it is possible to take up a "pathos of cultural confusion" and turn it "into a strategy of political subversion;" he explains, "[f]or in occupying two places at once [through the processes of doubling], the depersonalized, dislodged colonial subject can become an incalculable object, quite literally difficult to place."[66] Here, Bhabha reveals how a pathos of confusion, or what he also calls the "strategy of the supplement," can enable the space of hybridity to serve as a subversive tool enabling colonial subjects to challenge the oppressive dynamics of those entanglement that they are caught up within.[67]

In focusing on how hybridity can be used as a tool of subversion, however, Bhabha's work focuses exclusively on processes of subjectification within dominant discourses. As a result, an individual's decision to turn towards or away from colonizing power and spaces of otherness is reduced to the imperial binary of subjugation/assimilation or resistance. Commenting on Bhabha's notion of hybridity, Byrd explains that "such a schema does not emphasize an escape from binaries; instead, even as a third space is opened with the space of the slashed rupture, the dialectic life and death struggle between self/other occurs."[68] This is largely due to Bhabha's lack of a consideration of how different subjectivities in general, and colonial subjects in particular, are also entangled with a vast array of relationships and political authorities, including enduring Indigenous forms of political authority and modes of relationship. Despite being caught up within colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship, these expansive modes of relationship also press on Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies—albeit in different ways. Rather than simply a turning towards or away from the spaces of otherness articulated by colonizing power, Indigenous and non-Indigenous people living within and moving through colonial entanglements may also respond to those forms of authorities that colonizing regimes are, themselves, attempting to ignore and

disavow. Furthermore, Byrd suggests that Bhabha's theory solely focuses on race and, consequently, fails to fully address "the intersectional loci of class or gender" in relation to colonization.[69] By failing to account for both enduring Indigenous presences and modes of relationship as well as the ways in which class, gender, sex, etc. contribute to colonial entanglements, Bhabha's hybridity once again risks reiterating 'the elimination of the native' articulated by Kaunaui in chapter one. Like those writing within settler colonial studies—and (post)colonial studies more generally—Bhabha's work ends up presenting a universalizing narrative whereby the only choices available to Indigenous people is to either resist or be co-opted and non-Indigenous people only ever facilitate processes of colonization.

To address these concerns, thinkers like Byrd and Kevin Bruyneel have introduced the notions of "cacophony"[70] and "the third space of sovereignty,"[71] respectively, to demonstrate the complexities and messiness of those dynamics affecting "peoples as they move and are made to move within empire."[72] Both of these concepts pay particular attention to how both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, political authorities, and modes of relationship come together to produce a number of "discordant incommensurabilities and misapplied representations that try to pass themselves off as coherent, consistent, and real."[73] My understanding of colonial entanglement is heavily influenced by both of these works. Like cacophony and the third space of sovereignty, colonial entanglement emphasizes the messiness and complexities that are a part of being caught up with/in colonial contexts. It also emphasizes the ambivalence that is (re)produced through colonizing power and its expansionist modes of relationship—especially those moments when the representational logics *break down*.

However, rather than centering the field of sound and discourse as Byrd and Bruyneel tend to do—which is a marked difference from colonizing epistemologies' tendencies to favor the field of sight and vision[74]—I use the notion of entanglement to consider how the objective and subjective

constraints of different modes of relationship are "felt" by differently positioned bodies within colonial contexts. In understanding colonization as a set of process and relationships that are always-already wrapping around different bodies, one is compelled to consider how colonial entanglements "feel"—both in terms of the emotional feelings and physical sensations that constitute affect. This brings me back to Dian Million's work on felt theory discussed in the introduction and chapter one. Recalling Million's work, colonial entanglements focus on how feelings provide each of us with the frames and theories through which we perceive the world—frames that are not always immediately obvious or accessible to others, or even ourselves.[75] As Million argues, "feelings are theory, important projections about what is happening in our lives."[76] By offering a parallax view of the lived relations and felt experiences of colonization, colonial entanglement deliberately attempts to sit with the messiness and bumpiness produced as different bodies and modes of relationship interact with one another in particular contexts. In doing so, the concept enables one to consider how Indigenous and non-Indigenous people are not only entangled with expansionist modes of relationship that press on their bodies in particular ways and turn them in particular directions, but also those expansive modes of relating otherwise. Again, being attentive to the "multidirectionality" of relations and experiences is crucial because such attention to the ways different people are compelled to turn within colonial entanglements enables one to witness the ways in which colonizing regimes and subjectivities can be exceeded and altered towards decolonizing aims.[77]

To better understand the ways in which individuals take up different modes of relationship as they move through colonial entanglements, the remainder of this chapter explores how Indigenous and non-Indigenous people engage with state of nature fictions within the Banff-Bow Valley. Specifically looking at the racialized and gendered discourses surrounding the implementation of the *Indian Act,* the prohibition of hunting in Banff National Park, and the Banff

Indian Days, I mobilize colonial entanglements to consider the complex and unpredictable relationships that wrap around and press on the bodies of different colonial subjects. In doing so, I reveal that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people not only perpetuate and/or resist articulations and reiterations of state of nature fictions and colonizing power—albeit in different ways and to different degrees—but also how both are intimately entangled with Indigenous nationhood and their expansive modes of relationship. In other words, just as colonizing discourses seek to render colonial subjects triple as they turn towards countersovereignty, these subjects also possess a triple potential to not only conform and resist, but also to refuse these binaries altogether by (re)orienting their lives around different modes of relationship and political authority.

Indian Act entanglements:

Perhaps one of the single most significant instances of Project Canada deploying colonizing tropes to turn and (mis)translate Indigeneity into a racialized category comes through the "Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws Respecting Indians, S.C. 1876, c. 18."[78] More commonly known as the Indian Act, this piece of legislation amalgamated and bolstered various pieces of legislation pertaining to Indigenous people that had already been put in place by the newly confederated dominion while also borrowing from laws passed prior to Confederation.[79] In doing so, the Act manifests as one of the first truly Canadian pieces of legislation, signaling both the congealment of Project Canada—as a growth of British empire—and its approach to relationships with Indigenous nations. As Tyler Shipley explains, the Indian Act was "a profound statement of what Canada was and what it would be."[80]

Whereas treaty negotiations recognized Indigenous nationhood in many ways, the Indian Act legally bolstered the Canadian state's simultaneous efforts to subjugate Indigenous nations and perpetuate the division of places like the Banff-Bow Valley in terms of a Manichean world. For

example, the Act amalgamated both the Gradual Civilization Act (1857) and the Gradual Enfranchisement Act (1869), which defined who an "Indian" was as well as a number of ways that Indigenous people could become enfranchised under colonial law—all of which sought to break up individual Indigenous relations to their broader, collective nation.[81] By incorporating such legislation, the Indian Act legally entrenched the category of "Indian" in ways that were fundamentally premised on anti-Native racism, which actively sought to "breed-out" Indigenous people from their nations along highly racialized lines.[82] As Bhandar argues, the Indian Act juridically codified racist tropes of Indigeneity seeking to re-present Indigenous nations as (racialized) minorities subject to state Canadian containment and control.[83] Thus, just as state (re)interpretations of the Treaty facilitated territorializing processes that dispossessed and displaced Indigenous bodies, the Indian Act further perpetuated colonial breakage by recasting "place-based political collectivities as (racialized) populations subject to [state] jurisdiction and management."[84]

In addition to white supremacy, expansionist modes of relationship underpinning the Indian Act were also rife with entanglements of heteropatriarchy leading to gendered and sexualized violence. This is exemplified at an institutional level by the fact that the "marry-out" clause in the Indian Act—which also helped to established the category of "Indian" as a racialized category—relies heavily on a heteropatriarchal framework that values notions of masculinity over femininity and establish Indian status in patrilineal and patriarchal terms.[85] In doing so, the state not only sought to (and continues to seek to) actively break up Indigenous nations by separating Indigenous women and children who married non-status men from their communities, but it also contributed to the disempowerment and devaluation of Indigenous women in their societies relative to men—all while completely erasing queer and Two-Spirit people.[86] Such institutionalized heteropatriarchy combined with the everyday policing of Ĩyãħé Nakoda women and girls to sites of domestic and

reproductive labor in places like the Banff-Bow Valley established a gendered division of labor on the Morley reserve, further echoing heteropatriarchal gender norms. In doing so, agents of the state established a physical division, behind which Indigenous women, girls, queer and Two-Spirit people could be disproportionately targeted by acts of sexual and gendered violence lurking as an ever-present backdrop of colonizing regimes of power.[87]

In fact, one of the main consequences of the Indian Act and its colonizing discourses was that—in addition to claiming Indigenous territory—Indigenous persistence and resistance is itself largely confined and contained. For example, although Treaty 7 designated 640 acres at Morleyville (later renamed Morley) to the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, amendments to the Indian Act enabled the Canadian state to render the space of the reserve as an ever-shrinking prison for the nation, enabling the state to criminalize Indigenous mobility.[88] Within a decade of signing the Treaty, the McDougalls, the NWMP, and newly-appointed Indian agents all worked together to physically confine the Ĩyãħé Nakoda to the reserve through a network of colonizing policies falling under the Indian Act.[89] This included the pass system, which Heidi Stark argues "restricted Indigenous leaders by structuring their mobility as a measure of loyalty to the state, labeling Indigenous men as hostile and disloyal if they left their reserves."[90] By rending Indigenous mobility as criminal, Stark argues that the Canadian state is able to assert its own jurisdiction over sovereign lands and bodies by hiding its own failure to uphold its treaty promises as it shifts to assimilate (and eliminate) Indigenous peoples.[91]

Physically confined and contained within the space of the reserve, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous people living in the area became increasingly forced to live out the territorializing and assimilationist practices imposed on them by the colonizing regime. This included European-style agriculture practices imposed on them by Indian Agents as well attending the local church and—perhaps most terrifying—watching their children be forced to attend the Methodist Church-

run day school, which would impose Christian values and rigid gender norms on children and would later become an official part of Canada's genocidal Residential School system.[92] Those who refused the demands of these state agents were often subject to criminalization, forced labor, and/or physical imprisonment along with other forms of physical violence enacted by the police and other state agents.

For the Canadian state, then, the Indian Act comes to function as part of the initial phases of a larger network of colonial infrastructure that included the railroad, Indian reserve, nature preserve, and other rural and urban development within places like the Banff-Bow Valley—all of which sought to *break from* Ĩyãħé Nakoda and their modes of relationship by *breaking up* their bodies and their modes of relationship under the immense weight and terror of empire. But what is particularly significant about the Indian Act is the ways in which it legally codifies racialized and gendered tropes of Indigeneity in ways that enable the Canadian state to criminalize Indigenous persistence and resistance. Rendered criminal, Stark argues that the Canadian state is able to assert its own jurisdiction over sovereign lands and bodies and hide its own failure to uphold its treaty promises.[93] Echoing this, Harold Cardinal explains that the Indian Act "was one of the first major steps taken by the government of Canada to weaken the treaties signed with our people."[94] Thus, by invoking and legally codifying tropes of Indigeneity, the Indian Act recast the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations in racializing and gendered terms that depoliticized and dismissed the effects and affects of colonization while, simultaneously, rendering these nations as racialized minorities that can and ought to be controlled and managed by the state. In other words, the Indian Act further reiterates state of nature fictions that shore up colonizing regimes as they transit and transgress the territorial, corporeal, and political bodies of Indigenous nations.

Yet, despite legally codifying tropes of Indigeneity, the Canadian state continues to fail to assimilate (and eliminate) Indigenous nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda into its expansionist modes of

relationship. In the next section, I show how this failure to eliminate or assimilate Indigenous nations is evident in the Banff-Bow Valley—pointing to both the enduring presence of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, while also showing how such failures can become co-opted by colonizing discourses within the space of the Park. Following this, the next section argues that enduring Indigenous presences also reveal how the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations continue to orient themselves around Indigenous modes of relationship and notions of political authority. From this parallax perspective, Indigenous presences in the park can be understood not only within the dichotomy of co-optation and resistance, but also as a form of refusal to engage with, or a rejection of, such a colonizing politics more generally.

Containing wild(er)ness in the Park:

In many ways, the establishment of Banff National Park proves to be a central part of colonizing infrastructure in the Banff-Bow Valley. For one, the establishment of the Park functions as a technology of elimination by physically extending Project Canada's claim over the area through a network of colonizing law and park wardens meant to assert state authority and control in ways that shore up states of (dis)possession. But in establishing the Park as a space to 'preserve nature,' it also explicitly appeals to and upholds state of nature fictions that re-present nature and Indigenous people as disappearing. In fact, similar to the Indian Act and its establishment of the Indian reserve, Banff National Park emerges at the turn of the twentieth century when many colonizing thinkers and writers had not only begun to declare the passing away of Indigenous nations, but also the passing away of the frontiers of North America—and, with them, the 'free lands' and wild(er)ness that lay beyond them.

Perhaps one of the most (in)famous examples of this is historian Frederick Jackson Turner's work on the frontier, which attempted to describe the sweeping processes and relationships at the

heart of US empire as it inserted and asserted itself on sovereign Indigenous territories. Defined as "the outer edge of the wave—the meeting point between savagery and civilization," Turner argued that the notion of the frontier largely contributed to the development and formation of the US's national character.[95] For him, the (supposedly) "free land" that lay beyond the edge of civilization proved to be one of the primary driving forces of the extension of expansionist modes of relationship into Indigenous territories.[96] Not only did the promise of free land and resources offer a material incentive for incoming colonizers to buy into colonizing violence and breakage targeting Indigenous nations, but crossing the frontier also represented "something elemental" for individuals as they were supposedly compelled to suspend their morals and ethics in an effort to claim Indigenous territories as their own.[97] Through its proximity to nature and those living in "primitive conditions," Turner argued that the frontier was bestowed with "a fluidity of life" bearing hundreds of potential possibilities for the colonizers who break the "bonds of custom."[98] However, as Karuka and others note, Turner's dynamic excitement and enthusiasm for the frontier is also entangled with feelings of melancholia.[99] For, just as they gleefully throw off the "fetters of civilization to renew themselves," the colonizer finds that their very arrival brings with it a civilizing effect leading to states of (dis)possession.[100] As Karuka points out, it is melancholy that fuels the repetition of the frontier process and its dynamic—extending expansionist modes of relationship along the way.[101]

Although not the only work on the frontier, Turner's rearticulation of state of nature fictions through the myth of the vanishing frontier gains particular prominence as it emerges entangled with a number of other racialized and gendered discourses in both Canada and the US. Increasingly, popular media had begun expressing fears that white-collar men were suffering the effects of "overcivilization" and "efficacy"—problems that could "weaken citizens' personal and racial health."[102] Within this context, it is perhaps no surprise that colonizing discourses latch on to the

particular notions of wilderness articulated by Turner's thesis, which re-present nature as a place of individual rejuvenation and national regeneration. In fact, such nostalgia for romanticized notions of nature and a fear of that white male effeminization all help to popularize the creation of national parks as protecting the national character of colonizing regimes. This is evident by the fact that popular Canadian magazines claimed that the best cure for this "brain-fag" was a wilderness holiday, which were acquiring increasing popularity amongst the middle and upper classes—particularly those boys and men in need of releasing their pent-up frustrations from "urban confinement."[103] Consequently, in addition to emerging within expansionist modes of relationship that seek to transit and transgress Indigenous bodies in pursuit of capital, the Banff nature preserve that eventually becomes Banff National Park is also entangled within discursive entanglements of (de)valuation seeking to shore up white supremacist and heteropatriarchal power.

It is within this context of making and reproducing colonizing regimes and their states of (dis)possession by simultaneously shoring up white supremacy and heteropatriarchy that the tropes of Indigeneity prove doubly crucial within the space of the Park. For one, to secure access to "natural" spaces where the "bonds of custom are broken and unrestraint is triumphant" required that tropes of Indigeneity be invoked to enable colonizing regimes and subjects to further confine, contain, and break up Indigenous nations as they excluded them from the space of the Park.[104] However, this was not out of some attempt to render the space of the park as void of human relationships; instead, the exclusion of nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda manifests due to the logics of scarcity underpinning expansionist modes of relationship. Because such state of nature fictions re-presented wilderness and nature as passing away, whatever remnants remained required careful conservation and proper use in order to most effectively maximize their reinvigorating potential.

One of the primary ways this was achieved was through hunting and fishing regulation and restrictions. For example, in 1886—not even a decade after the signing of Treaty 7—a revision to

the Indian Act empowered the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to "declare that …the laws respecting game in force in the Province of Manitoba or the Western Territories, or respecting such game as is specified in such notice, shall apply to Indians within the said Province or Territories."[105] Although Treaty 7 stated that Indigenous signatories retained the "right to pursue their vocations of hunting throughout the tract surrendered as heretofore described," this new piece of legislation enabled the state to quickly reinterpret the intentions of the treaty in contradictory ways.[106] Exploiting this institutionalized tension and messiness, the state and its colonizing subjects tended to enforce hunting and fishing policy on the ground in ways that favored colonizing subjects and corporations seeking to access and exploit territory belonging to the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations.

However, such a reinterpretation of the hunting rights recognized by Treaty 7 was only made possible due to efforts from both Park staff and other non-Indigenous people on the ground bought into state of nature fictions and their colonizing tropes. For example, the same year that the Indian Act declared that hunting and fishing legislation applied to Indigenous people, William F. Whitcher—who was appointed to advise the government on the management of the park—had explicitly singled out the Ĩyãħé Nakoda for their 'problematic' hunting and trapping practices. Attempting to put forward an argument against a complete ban on hunting in the park to enable non-Indigenous big game hunting to continue, Whitcher wrote:

> Exceptions of no kind whatsoever should be made in favor of Indians. Those who now invade that territory are stragglers and deserters from their own reserves, where they are well cared for in food and clothing at the public expense. Any misplaced indulgence could only serve to entice them away from their settled homes and tempt them to frequent and traffic meat… with all the attendant demoralization so fatal to aborigines.[107]

Echoing Whitcher's report, George Stewart—the park's first superintendent—claimed in his first annual report a year later: "it is of great importance that if possible the Indians should be excluded

from the Park. Their destruction of the game and depredations among the ornamental trees make their too frequent visits to the Park a matter of great concern."[108] In each of these reports, both men clearly articulate an explicit concern, and even disgust, regarding the Ĩyãħé Nakoda's hunting and trapping practices. Not only were such practices viewed as an impediment to their necessary assimilation, but Ĩyãħé Nakoda hunting and trapping practices also disrupted the colonizing myth that Indigenous nations are meant to either assimilate or die off. By invoking tropes of Indigeneity that re-present Indigenous hunting practices as degenerate and a threat to remaining natural landscapes, both Whitcher and Stewart recast Indigenous nations as savage populations that can, and ought to, be contained and managed in an effort to preserve wild spaces for those who can properly use them.

Such feelings of disapproval for Ĩyãħé Nakoda hunting practices are further echoed in dominant discourses on sport hunting from the time. In fact, so-called sportsmen, who—ironically—viewed themselves as 'conservationists' of big game, often took it upon themselves to oppose Indigenous hunting practices because they perceived such practices as offending the civilized values of sport hunters in various ways. [109] According the William T. Hornaday's *Sportsman's Code of Ethics*, "the value of wild game as human food should no longer be regarded as an important factor in its pursuit," and that "in the settled and civilized regions of North America there is no real *necessity* for the consumption of wild game for food purposes."[110] Consequently, those promoting the Sportsman's code often argued that "an Indian has no more right to kill wild game, or to subsist upon it all the year around, than any white man in the same locality."[111] Reiterating colonizing tropes about Indigenous people, these non-Indigenous hunters worked hard to ensure that subsistence hunting was painted in vitriolic terms that would evoke intense disgust from other non-Indigenous people. According to this perspective, experiencing wilderness through

hunting in places like Banff ought to be reserved to those who could do so in a proper and civilized fashion.

Here, we see that the introduction of hunting regulations and legislation within the Banff-Bow Valley area was by no means an exclusive attempt to protect nature from human contact; instead, such regulations sought to protect the wilderness of the Banff nature preserve for particular type of use—i.e. big game hunting—by particular people—i.e. wealthy, white men. For this reason, when these unsustainable hunting practices—along with the implementation of policies like "predator control"—lead to decreasing animal populations in the Park, such a fact was largely attributed to Indigenous "overhunting."[112] Again, both state agents and citizens relied on tropes and stereotypes to devalue the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations by re-presenting them as "greedy savages" with a "thirst for blood and raw flesh."[113] Consequently, when all hunting was officially prohibited in Banff National Park in 1890, politically and economically influential and active park staff and sport hunters were adamant that the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous peoples should be held to the hunting prohibition—even though many of these same non-Indigenous men continued to hunt within park boundaries.[114]

However, these colonizing exclusions were not only based on white supremacist values; Indigenous exclusion from national parks have been—and continue to be—entangled with capitalist desires for profit. As discussed in chapter two, corporate and state interests in the Banff-Bow Valley understood the area as holding the potential to become a "world-class" tourist destination for the wealthy classes. In contrast to the cultural, spiritual, and political significance of spaces like the hot springs to the Ĩyãħé Nakoda —which, for example, was a place where healing and international interactions would occur—imperial discourses produced jointly by both the government as well as individuals and corporations involved in the tourist industry attempted to gloss over the entirety of the Park by re-presenting the area as a potential space where city dwellers

could become 'reinvigorated' by nature. In doing so, these groups hoped to take advantage of the ideas of wilderness on display in the area—which was envisioned as "a male homosocial space beyond the feminized, mundane, and domestic details of daily living."[115]

In fact, this also led large corporations like the CPR to not only seek to restrict access to the Park for Indigenous people, but also for non-Indigenous people as well in order to control park imagery and re-presentations in ways that ensured maximum tourist appeal. As Leslie Bella argues, national parks were built:

> to centralize control of the landscape in the hands of the railroads. That control was used to reduce competition in the parks, and to restrict access to the mountains. Businesses that might be patronized by the working class were not sufficiently aesthetic. Access to the mountains was provided instead to upper- and middle-income tourists willing to pay substantial sums for a sanitized view of the mountains.[116]

Such a classist position—and the particular notions of white masculinity it sought to reproduced—is also articulated in national debates discussing the function of Rocky Mountain Park. Some members of Parliament questioned whether the park would only serve the wealthy urban elite and not the majority of Canadians. As John Kirk argued: "Why should [the government] go into the business of preparing public parks as a resort—for whom? Not for the people of Canada, not for the people who pay taxes, but for the wealthy people of the cities of the Dominion and the cities of other countries."[117] Here, Kirk explicitly names the class division at play in the debates surrounding the Rocky Mountain Park. He suggests that, given that a majority of the population working in agriculture, industrial factories, mines, and logging camps are very familiar with strenuous labor under the current capitalist conditions, the idea of hiking in nature was presumed to possess little enjoyment or potential relaxation for most people.[118] This also included the hundreds of men working within the park at the time—including the imprisoned laborers who worked in internment camps within the park boundaries during the First and Second World Wars.[119] Banff and other national parks did not seek to serve the interests of the majority of working class people but, rather,

sought to cater to and capitalize on the travel and mobility of the bourgeois class—all while simultaneously erasing and invisibilizing other meanings, understandings, and bodies that occupied the space, including those of the Îyãħé Nakoda.

Thus, through entanglements of colonial law, capitalism, sportsman codes of ethics, and the tropes of Indigeneity, the Canadian state and its colonizing subjects not only worked to devalue and criminalize the Îyãħé Nakoda and other nations for subsistence practices, but they also sought to cultivate and curate a highly tailored wilderness aesthetic within the Park in an attempt to maximize tourism in the area. Even though this included excluding those non-Indigenous people who contributed to and bought into the development of the park, breaking up and regulating Indigenous relationships with/in the Banff-Bow Valley area remained top priority for government officials seeking to assimilate the the Îyãħé Nakoda and other nations. Yet, despite all these efforts to exclude a large array of people from the space of the park, enduring Indigenous presences were never truly gone. Instead, the Îyãħé Nakoda and other nations continued (and continue) to move through the lands now claimed by the park, pressing on those human and more-than-human beings living in the area.

For the Îyãħé Nakoda specifically, maintaining and sustaining relationships with the Banff-Bow Valley was more accessible than for those nations whose reserves were located further away geographically. As experts on the mountainous terrain, they were often able to slip in and out of the region with great ease, continuing to hunt and perform ceremony in the lands now claimed by the Park.[120] In fact, Îyãħé Nakoda knowledge of the area was often consulted by non-Indigenous hunters who would sometimes hire the former hunters as guides.[121] Even in the face of protest from sportsmen and strict regulations that eventually led to bans on hunting in the park, the Îyãħé Nakoda continued to maintain their traditional patterns of land use whenever and wherever possible—including activities that were criminalized as ‘poaching’ under colonial law after 1890.[122] By

refusing to adhere to hunting bans, Ĩyãħé Nakoda hunters (at least partially) provided subsistence for their families and nation—enabling them to resist the imposition of expansionist modes of relationship.

However, this enduring presence cannot be simply reduced to acts of resistance. For one, racist re-presentations of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda as poachers—while overlooking the activities of white settlers—were often embraced by capitalist corporations in the park who used such imagery to contributed to the production of the national park as a type of liminal space at the "edge of the British Empire and perhaps even on the edge of civilization itself."[123] As cultural historian Patricia Jansen claims, it was often the lure of "wild things" that drew people to places like Banff.[124] By invoking colonizing tropes of Indigeneity, the presence of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous people in the Park is also able to be co-opted in ways that play a crucial role in fostering as sense of 'wilderness' that would be used to attract countless numbers of tourists to Banff National Park over the course of the twentieth century.

Yet, reading Ĩyãħé Nakoda presences within park boundaries through a binary between resistance and co-optation also does not fully capture the entangled relationships animating Ĩyãħé Nakoda presences in the Banff-Bow Valley. In fact, such a binary way of thinking risks occluding the fact that the Ĩyãħé Nakoda continued to practice their own modes of relationship that revolved around enduring Ĩyãħé Nakoda nationhood. To better understand the ways in which enduring Ĩyãħé Nakoda presences within the Banff-Bow Valley navigate these entangled modes of relationship, the final section of this chapter mobilizes the concept of colonial entanglement as it turns to one of the most popular annual tourist attractions in the park: the Banff Indian Days.

Banff Indian Day Ambivalence:

As mentioned above, Banff and other national parks not only worked to reify and naturalize class orders along particular notions of whiteness and masculinity, but such institutions emerged out of an attempt to create and maintain imperial notions of wilderness that are central to Canadian state of nature fictions as original myths. This is because the cultivation and curation of notions of wilderness serves to renew and recreate investment in the project of settlement by pointing to curated examples of a past state of nature, which are distinct from civilized states of (dis)possession. Here, the preservation of nature and wildlife functions as a 'plug-in' of sorts that enables and ensures reinvestment in the (white) possessive logic crucial to expansionist modes of relationship and the flow of capital within Project Canada. Within these frameworks, nostalgia for (and even romanticizations of) past states of nature are made possible because so-called civilization and its colonial regimes of property always serves as the axiomatic point of reference.

As mentioned above, crucial to colonizing representations of wilderness are also colonizing representations of Indigeneity. In fact, not only must countersovereignty's prose make sure to re-present Indigenous people as stuck within the state of nature, but—in doing so—these colonizing tropes actually become fundamentally connected to imperial notions of nature and their corresponding states of (dis)possession. Consequently, colonizing tropes of Indigeneity emerge as not only the supplement of colonial discourses and their processes of disavowal and unknowing, but also as "the symptomatic return of the repressed" as such tropes serve as a constitutive outside and originary position contained to the state of nature.[125]

For example, such a fact is exemplified within the origin of nature parks as a colonizing institution, which were originally sold as preservers and purveyors of all things natural in a modern era—much like colonizing museums. Often credited with the invention of nature parks—along with his portraits of Indigenous people—the American painter George Catlin first envisioned national parks as (racialized) spectacles where the civilized individual could come to view the

preserved remnants of both human *and* animal "specimens."[126] Buying into state of nature fictions claiming that Indigenous peoples were equally as doomed as the buffalo, Catlin imagined that the state could create:

> A *magnificent park,* where the world could see for ages to come, the native Indian in his classic attire, galloping his wild horse, with sinewy bow, and shield and lance, amid the fleeting herds of elk and buffaloes. What a beautiful and thrilling specimen for America to preserve and hold up to the view of her refined citizens and the world, in future ages![127]

This vision of national parks understood such institutions as preservers and purveyors of the "Native Indian" in his natural environment—that is, the "untouched" and "virgin" wilderness that existed prior to civilization.

However, to ensure that national parks continue to serve as spatio-temporal museums, they must also possess those bodies that are deemed to be 'natural.' In fact, by the turn of the twentieth century, many non-Indigenous people had come to associate imperial notions of nature with pre-colonial representations of Indigeneity.[128] Yet, with Indigenous access to the Banff-Bow Valley becoming more difficult after the creation of the Park, several business owners in Banff actually solicited the Îyãħé Nakoda to participate in the events that would become known as the Banff Indian Days.[129] Officially beginning as an annual tourist event in 1911, the Banff Indian Days quickly became a significant part of the Park imagery, helping to bolster the Park's sense of wilderness. In fact, by 1922, 71,540 tourists arrived in the Park to take part in the festivities with 600 Indigenous participants.[130]

For many years, the festival proved to be an important economic generator for the CPR, tourism entrepreneurs, and the Îyãħé Nakoda. But in order to capitalize on the event, the state and capitalists attempted to control and regulate Indigenous people in ways that would cater to the colonizer's imagination of what Indigenous people looked like prior to colonization. For this reason, some practices and activities, such as beadwork, were deemed worth preserving and

showcasing while other activities that contradicted notions of 'primitivism' and 'naturalness'—like arriving in a vehicle—were rejected.[131] Furthermore, those practices that were viewed as threatening on-going colonization—such as subsistence hunting or engaging in political and social practices that contravened state of nature fictions that sought to empty out Indigenous peoples and lands of legal-political orders—were outright prohibited.[132]

Colonizing tropes of Indigeneity were further entrenched by state and capitalist efforts to re-present the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations as a homogenized Indigenous Other. Even though the Banff Indian Days often saw Indigenous participants from several nations, the organizers and advertisers of the festival worked to present a homogenized representation of these different nations.[133] As Mason suggests, "all Indigenous participants were actively represented under the single generic term of "Indian," which worked to homogenize heterogeneous groups as one single cultural group."[134] Regardless of which nation they were from, those participating in the Banff Indian Days were re-presented under the label 'Indian,' accompanied by all the expectations and stereotypes that this invoked for tourists.[135]

Although the inclusion of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous people through the Banff Indian Days was at least partially an attempt to invoke the image of primitiveness to attract more capital through tourism, largely at stake was the Park's own ability to shore up colonizing regimes by making and producing colonial subjects willing to buy into state of (dis)possession. In fact, in addition to commodifying representations of the Indigenous Other that draw on highly racist and sexualized tropes, the Banff Indian Days also offered those buying into colonizing states of (dis)possession with the ways to articulate and reiterate their superiority over Indigenous people and their modes of relationship. As Marianna Torgovnick argues in *Gone Primitive*: "What is clear now is that the West's fascination with the primitive has to do with its own crises of identity, with its own need to clearly demarcate subject and object even while flirting with other ways of

experiencing the universe."[136] In coming into contact with the carefully curated representations of Indigenous people, colonizing subjects not only emerge as unscathed and clearly demarcated, but they do so by experiencing a "new delight, more intense, more satisfying than normal ways of doing and feeling."[137] As an annual event, the festival promised to provide continuous access to the wild and primitive through the Indigenous Other as colonizing subjects attempted to reinscribe and maintain the colonizing *status quo* not only for themselves, but for Project Canada more broadly.

In many ways, then, non-Indigenous organizers' regulations and containment of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous peoples to ensure the (re)production of tropes of Indigeneity through the exoticized and temporalized festival participants and performers functioned to shore up colonizing states of dispossession. Not only did such representations contribute to financial gain for colonizing subjects and corporations, but it also enabled incoming non-Indigenous people to "plug-in" to nature in ways that further facilitate the state of nature fictions underpinning Project Canada. This is because such colonizing discourses and representations contribute to colonizing bodies of knowledge that not only devalue Indigenous people and their modes of relationship, but ultimately render them inviolable as colonizing regimes and their subjects seek to transit and transgress Indigenous bodies of land and flesh in pursuit of capital. However, despite the fact that the Banff Indian Days often articulated and reiterated harmful and oppressive tropes to shore up colonizing regimes, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda were by no means passive bystanders. In fact, to re-present them and members of other nations in such a way would miss the many ways in which Indigenous people not only push back and resist colonizing regimes, but exceed them through their own modes of relationship.

For instance, reiterations and recirculations of colonizing tropes were often challenged and, at times, subverted by the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous groups, forcing organizers to once

again react to Indigenous agency in controlling and oppressive ways. This was exemplified when the numerous Îyãħé Nakoda families began to transport themselves to Banff via automobile in the 1950s and 1960s.[138] Disapproving of such modes of transportation because of the ways they contravened tourist expectations of Indigeneity, event organizers stressed that vehicles could not enter the festival space.[139] Similar restrictions were often applied to participants and performers regarding dress and attire. Although many Îyãħé Nakoda took a great deal of pride in displaying their forms of ceremonial dress, some—especially the youth—refused to cooperate and, instead, wore 'cowboy' attire to events like the Banff Indian Day parades.[140] Such subversive actions drove organizers to prohibit any participants who chose to wear 'modern' attire during the festival as early as 1913.[141] Here, the Îyãħé Nakoda and members of other nations take up a "pathos of cultural confusion" (as described by Bhabha above) by turning their attire "into a strategy of political subversion."[142] By dressing in ways that exceed colonizing tropes of Indigeneity, Îyãħé Nakoda youth and others come to occupy "two places at once," becoming "incalculable" and "difficult to place."[143]

But what I want to emphasize here is not only how the Îyãħé Nakoda and other nations resisted and subverted colonizing tropes and expectation through the Banff Indian Days; in addition to challenging colonizing representations of Indigeneity, the Îyãħé Nakoda and other nations also continued to uphold their own modes of relationship and notions of political authority. For example, most of the Îyãħé Nakoda considered the events surrounding the Banff Indian Days as a continuation of earlier gatherings in the same location.[144] Rather than something new, the Indian Days presented an opportunity for the Îyãħé Nakoda and other nations to return to important sites within the park boundaries, continuing to maintain their relationships with/in an area that was largely restricted and regulated after the establishment of the Park. In fact, perhaps part of the

reason why there is contestation over the actual year in which the festival began is because Indigenous nations had been gathering in the area at roughly the same time every year for centuries.

In visiting this area, Indigenous nations that had maintained relationships to the area for millennia were able to renew these relationships to both the place itself as well as the people who moved through it. For example, the Îyãĥé Nakoda often performed important ceremony and storytelling within the festival grounds, which were at the base of the sacred Cascade mountain.[145] This not only presented them with the ability to renew their relationship to the area, which contained teachings and history for the Îyãĥé Nakoda and other nations,[146] but to engage with one another as well. In fact, the Indigenous nations that gathered for the Indian Days often held their own events in conjunction with the festival, which often took place in the evenings away from colonizing gazes.[147]

Furthermore, the Indian Day festivities provided an important opportunity to build and maintain social and political relationships that were entangled with—and often oriented towards—Îyãĥé Nakoda modes of relationship. This included building relationships with tourist and political dignitaries who frequented the Indian Days.[148] For example, the Îyãĥé Nakoda often took the Indian Days as an opportunity to raise awareness about the impacts of colonization on their nation and ways of life.[149] But the Indian Days were also used to adopt non-Indigenous people who supported the Îyãĥé Nakoda into the nation.[150] This meant that one had not only supported the nation in the past, but it also further entangled non-Indigenous people within Îyãĥé Nakoda modes of relationship by establishing a future responsibility to the nation.

By far the most significant opportunity provided by the Banff Indian Days, however, was the ability to maintain and sustain relationships within the Îyãĥé Nakoda nation itself. As Îyãĥé Nakoda elder Poucette passionately explains, a central rationale for gathering in the evening was to provide an opportunity for elders to share their stories with Îyãĥé Nakoda youth:

> What we [Ĩyãħé Nakoda community members] appreciated the most about coming down to Banff was the telling of stories of how life is and at the same time to express to all the young people what life is all about. Events may happen during the day… games and sports, but it was during the night that the elders had time to sit down with the young people and talk to them.[151]

Here, Poucette demonstrates a refusal to limit Ĩyãħé Nakoda participation in the Banff Indian Day to an imperial dichotomy between assimilation or anti-colonial resistance. Not only do they explain how the Ĩyãħé Nakoda resist and subvert colonizing regimes by raising awareness about "how life is" under the weight of colonization, but they also make clear that the main motivating factor for the Ĩyãħé Nakoda was the (re)production of their modes of relationship. Such a fact is echoed further by another elder, who explains:

> There are so many stories that I heard there. The stories were about what we should do in the future and what not to do… they told us who our relatives were and taught us to respect them as well as Mother Earth. All this and more… I learned there.[152]

Thus, for Poucette and this unnamed elder, entangled with the colonizing tropes of Indigeneity and the expansionist modes of relationship that often dominated the Banff Indian Days were also Ĩyãħé Nakoda modes of relationship. Although these modes of relationship did not always press on different Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies in the same ways and to the same degrees as expansionist ones, their presence was nevertheless felt by those moving through the Banff-Bow Valley as these modes of relating sought to turn human (and non-human) beings in ways that support and enhance life across different genders, generations, and species.

Conclusion: In conclusion, this chapter has shown how colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship invoke state of nature fictions in response to enduring Indigenous presences. These fictions rely on highly racialized and gendered tropes of Indigeneity that tie Indigenous people to colonizing notions of nature in order to mistranslate, devalue, and contain Indigenous people and their modes of relationship. In fact, by re-presenting Indigenous people as *continuously*

turning between supposedly (primitive) states of nature and (civilizing) states of (dis)possession, these state of nature fictions not only work to justify and legitimate colonizing violence and breakage, but they also make and reproduce particular colonial subjectivities who support and (re)invest in colonizing regimes.

However, by looking at events surrounding Banff National Park and the Banff Indian Days, I also show that such processes of subject formation are never complete and, instead, become part of an inherently instable and ambivalent set of entangled relations. Although reiterating the supremacy of the white heterosexual man through colonizing tropes enables colonizing regimes to adapt to different contexts, it is also through these reiterations that state of nature fictions and other prose of countersovereignty risk being disrupted and subverted. In fact, by looking at how the Ĩyãħé Nakoda continue to engage with the Park and events like the Banff Indian Days, I show that colonizing discourses not only produce particular bodies of knowledge and claims to political authority that *both* Indigenous and non-Indigenous people alike can resist, but also that these colonizing bodies of knowledge and modes of relationship are not the only ways of being and knowing; both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous people moving through the space of the Park are also entangled with Ĩyãħé Nakoda modes of relationship and notions of political authority that revolve around supporting a diversity of life across different genders, generations, and species. For this reason, events like the Banff Indian Days carry a *triple potential* where those entangled with/in them can both turn towards and/or away from colonizing regimes *as well as* refuse such dichotomous ways of thinking by (re)orienting themselves through other modes of relationship. This triple potential to be conform, resist, and refuse colonizing modes of relationship is particularly significant within the Buffalo Reintroduction Project, which will be explored next.

FOUR

Redistributing Reconciliation's Returns

> *What buffalo means to me is life itself on this continent. And our culture itself[…] When we talk about restoring buffalo itself, we're not just talking about restoring animals to the land, we're talking about restoring social structure, culture, and even our political structure.*
>
> —As cited in Winona LaDuke's *All Our Relations*[1]

Thus far, this thesis has shown some of the ways in which expansionist modes of relationship—driven by the desire to establish and extend colonizing regimes of property that cater to capital—become entangled with Indigenous peoples and their modes of relationship. In doing so, it has also been shown how these entangled relationships result in intense forms of physical and epistemic violence that are intended to break up different lands, bodies, and nations while, simultaneously, seeking to justify and legitimate such violence and breakage by making and reproducing colonial subjects willing to buy into and reproduce colonizing states of (dis)possession entangled with capitalism, white supremacy, and heteropatriarchy. In the Banff-Bow Valley, specifically, expansionist modes of relationship have sought to extend and expand themselves through entanglements of military conquest and infrastructure development that look like an initial wave of settler encroachment led by police and missionaries; the signing and deliberate misinterpretation of Treaty 7; the recasting of Indigenous nations as racialized minorities through a diverse range of policies falling under the Indian Act; the development of the transcontinental railway; and the establishment of Canada's first national park amongst other things. Taken altogether, these efforts (and others) have functioned to ensure that colonial violence and breakage can continue to proliferate—albeit, in different clothes and under different uniforms—as the state and corporations work together to dispossess Indigenous (and non-Indigenous) people in pursuit of capital.[2]

However, by invoking the notion of entanglement to describe colonial contexts like the Banff-Bow Valley, I have also emphasized how nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda continue to endure despite the efforts of Project Canada to ensure otherwise. Just as expansionist modes of relationship wrap around different Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies in ways that are intimately lived and felt (if not always explicitly), so too do Indigenous modes of relationship continue to exist, persist, and resist within colonial contexts. Both Treaty 7 and the Banff Indian days exemplify those complex entanglements of different peoples and modes of relationship. Although both emerge from Indigenous practices, Project Canada and its colonial subjects react to treaty making processes and Indigenous gatherings at the base of Cascade Mountain in ways that seek to make and reproduce states of (dis)possession. Furthermore, I have revealed that—although the violence and breakage inherent to colonizing regimes disproportionately targets Indigenous people(s) (especially Indigenous women, children, and queer and Two-Spirit people)—expansionist modes of relationship can, and do, target non-Indigenous people as they attempt to further concentrate the accumulation of capital into the ruling class. Much of these material realities are often ignored, occluded, and dismissed by colonizing discourses, however, which seek to normalize and naturalized the immense and extensive levels of violence and colonial breakage that are necessary to maintain and sustain colonizing regimes of power like Canada. In the case of Banff National Park, colonizing notions of wilderness and the tropes of Indigeneity have proven to be integral to stabilizing states of (dis)possession by re-presenting colonizing violence as natural and inevitable.

In this final chapter, I return to the Buffalo Reintroduction Project at Banff National Park to see not only how colonial entanglements wrap around and direct such projects, but also how these projects can influence and direct these entanglements. To do this, I ask how the project's supposed environmental and cultural significance becomes entangled with different Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons, places, and nations, considering how the reintroduction engages with different

notions of property, wilderness, and Indigeneity considered above. I also ask how the entangled relationships involved with the project function to support and sustain or disrupt and break up colonizing states of (dis)possession and enduring Indigenous presences, respectively. In considering these questions, I make two claims regarding the buffalo reintroduction. First, although returning the buffalo possesses deep potential and significance for the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations (both human and more-than-human), Project Canada's involvement with the reintroduction of buffalo to Banff National Park risks reiterating and rearticulating state of nature fictions that function to shore up colonizing states of (dis)possession. To phrase differently, I argue that the reintroduction project not only returns buffalo to the park, but it also makes and reproduces colonial subjectivities that turn towards and buy into the returns of empire—namely, colonial property and the accumulation of capital. Second, despite the state's articulation of state of nature fictions, I argue that the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations have found expansive ways to engage with the project. For example, not only have such nations taken the project as an opportunity to renew and restore their relationships to the buffalo, but also their relationships with the nations and groups of people who transit the territories now claimed by Banff National Park.

For this reason, I argue that, rather than turning towards—and engaging with—the Canadian state, non-Indigenous engagement with the Buffalo return and other projects ought to revolve around holding up and empowering Indigenous voices and perspectives oriented towards expansive modes of relationship. In fact, non-Indigenous efforts to support decolonization and Indigenous liberation more generally ought to seek to move beyond state-centric frameworks because such frameworks as never intended to disrupt the colonizing states of (dis)possession and expansionist modes of relationship they rely on. However, in keeping with the messiness and bumpiness of entangled relations, I argue that these processes of turning away from colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship must always be two-fold: one must simultaneously turn towards

other modes of relationship and Indigenous notions of political authority while also remaining attentive to how these processes and efforts may still risk reiterating the dynamics of domination and oppression that support and uphold colonizing regimes in the first place. Again, the idea of making a clean break from colonizing regimes is itself a product of imperial ways of thinking that imagine a world that can be neatly divided and demarcated.

To demonstrate this argument, the first part of the chapter considers how the Buffalo Reintroduction Project is taken up by Project Canada in ways that enable for the iteration and rearticulation of expansionist modes of relationship. For example, claiming the return of buffalo as contributing to nature and Indigenous culture specifically enacts state of nature fictions that ensure that colonizing regimes of property catering to capitalism remain unchallenged. In fact, by representing the return as possessing reconciliatory significance, dominant discourses double down on state of nature fictions designed to construct national happiness through notions of forgiveness and reconciliation while, simultaneously, shoring up colonizing regimes. This is painfully exemplified by the relocation and murder of two bulls who wondered outside of the boundaries of the park in August 2018, which was justified to protect private property. In the final section, I look at the potential that the Reintroduction Project possesses for supporting and enhancing Indigenous nations and their expansive modes of relationship. Here, I reveal how the buffalo reintroduction not only restores an essential relationship to the Banff-Bow Valley area, but also how the restoration of this relationship generates political, economic, cultural, and spiritual potential if left to flourish beyond the constraints of colonizing regimes and their logics of containment. This is demonstrated by the fact that, in returning the buffalo to Banff, a number of Indigenous nations were able to gather in Banff National Park to not only welcome the return of the animal to the area, but to also engage in a type of anti-colonial internationalism that seeks to uphold both their

relationships to the buffalo and the non-human world as well as to one another as political collectivities.

Buffalo Reintroduction Project:

As discussed in chapter one, the past movement of buffalo herds literally shifted and transformed entire regions and ecosystems. Through their grazing patterns, the buffalo left behind wallows that served as habitats for insects and smaller animals; for larger species, the massive bodies of the buffalo provided a source of food that could sustain whole groups for some time; and, for the human beings living in relation with the animal, the buffalo provide not only a source of subsistence, but also an important relationship that held cultural, political, and spiritual significance.[3] With their hooves, their horns, and the large humps on their backs, the species moved collectively through the prairies and into the Rocky Mountains—improving the landscapes along the way to support the flourishing of a diversity of life forms.

As part of the European invasion, destruction of the buffalo was deliberate policy of conquest. In an attempt to break up Indigenous modes of relationship that are oriented towards supporting and enhancing life, Karuka notes that the expansionist modes of relationship seeking to extend across the continent also sought to terrorize *all* Indigenous life.[4] This is reaffirmed by Tasha Hubbard, who reveals how the slaughter of the buffalo constitutes an act of genocide in two ways: not only is it genocide against the buffalo as a species, but it also contributes to the genocidal project against Indigenous life more broadly because it targets a crucial relationship for hundreds of Indigenous nations—both human and non-human.[5] As indicated above, although the British (and later Canadian) state never took a deliberate approach to Buffalo genocide like the US, they did fail to discourage the killing of buffalo by an ever-increasing colonizing population that targeted large animals for sport. Furthermore, the fact that buffalo herds do not adhere to an

imagined (and imposed) imperial border means that the explicitly genocidal policy against the buffalo in the US was dramatic felt across the continent—including in places like the Banff-Bow Valley.[6] Consequently, by 1887—when the Rocky Mountain Park was established—the buffalo had completely disappeared from the area. As Karuka reminds readers, colonization—which is predicated on mass extinction and genocide—proceeds by terrorizing all life that is indigenous to place.[7] After all, it is the wreaking havoc on the ecological and social bases for life that enables expansionist modes of relationship to concentrate capital into progressively fewer hands.

After nearly 150 years of absence, Parks Canada officially announced its intention to embark on a reintroduction project that would seek to restore this crucial relationship in 2015.[8] Two years later, sixteen adult buffalo arrived at the remote Panther Valley region for their "soft launch" in the Park on February 1, 2017.[9] With the Buffalo Return Project now well underway, the animal's return is already being felt in multiple ways as their presence reactivates place. For example, the project has already had considerable material and ecological impacts for the Banff-Bow Valley. As Karsten Heuer—the manager of the reintroduction project—explains, the buffalo "are revisiting many of the areas their ancestors did and as they're literally grazing down the grasses in places, they're revealing old wallow spots that would have been there from hundreds, or even thousands, of years ago and in fact they're reactivating them."[10] Heuer continues, explaining that the wallows are reactivating the ecosystem: "birds are being tempted back to the meadows while amphibians are finding new itinerant habitats in the imprints left behind by buffalo as they roll in the grass."[11] In many ways, the return of the buffalo is helping to support and enhance life by restoring a relationship that has not been felt for over a century.[12]

The return of wild buffalo to Banff National Park is also considered culturally significant. For example, the reintroduction of wild buffalo is considered to be a historic feat for conservationist efforts both within Canada and abroad. After only a handful of buffalo were 'saved' by

conservationists at the turn of the twentieth century, many have feared that the population would not survive over the years. Such fears have often been further complicated by the fact that species reintroduction projects in general—but especially when concerning larger animals like the buffalo in particular—often bring with them multiple complex problems that can produce high financial costs and even loss of life. With the buffalo population in Banff showing signs of thriving as its healthy population slowly grows and develops in their new home, the Banff Buffalo Reintroduction Project promises to establish one of only four wild buffalo populations in North America who are roaming and interacting with their historical environment.[13] To again cite Locke—one of the projects main public proponents and a member of the Luxton Foundation—the Reintroduction Project is considered as "one of the great days for wildlife conservation in the history of North America."[14]

In addition to its ecological significance and contribution to conservationist history, the buffalo reintroduction is also being felt by those human populations living in the area. For example, Indigenous nations who move through and have a relationship with the Banff-Bow Valley more generally have officially welcomed the buffalo back to the area through ceremony and through the historic gathering and signing of the "Northern Tribes Buffalo Treaty."[15] Originally spearheaded by Leroy Little Bear—a member of the Blood tribe from the Blackfoot confederacy—the Buffalo Treaty is an open peace treaty that signed between Indigenous nations living on either side of the imperial border.[16] In addition to highlighting the deep significance of the buffalo to Indigenous nations, the Treaty also entails a commitment to restoring and renewing relationships with the buffalo, which have been damaged and broken up through colonization. With the return of the buffalo to Banff National Park being announced less than a year after the Treaty was initially signed, those nations living in the Banff-Bow Valley sought to join as treaty signatories in an effort to recognize, honor, and revitalize their relationships with the buffalo that would be returning to

the Park's landscapes. Consequently, in August 2015, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and the Samson Cree Nation met in Banff National Park—notably, without any representation the Canadian state—to sign on to the Buffalo Treaty, reaffirming their relationship to the buffalo.[17] As a member of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda put it, "The Buffalo Treaty is a collective agreement to honor and recognize the time immemorial relationship that we have with the Buffalo, and the importance of providing free range habitat to the Buffalo in our Traditional Lands, and that we may nurture each other culturally and spiritually."[18]

Finally, the cultural and spiritual significance of the buffalo return to Indigenous nations has not been lost on non-Indigenous people either, who represented the return as providing an opportunity to do the important work of reconciling their relationship with Indigenous nations living in the area. For example, Peter Poole—another trustee of the Luxton Foundation in Banff—states: "what's really meaningful is that through the bison restoration effort, we are starting to honor the deep knowledge of Ktunaxa, Blackfoot, Ĩyãħé Nakoda, Cree, Métis, and Dene Elders of this valley and the culture of the buffalo. As a community, I think we're are starting to listen."[19] Such reconciliatory significance is also affirmed by Parks Canada. On their webpage celebrating the reintroduction of the buffalo, they state that to honor the "connection between Indigenous cultures and bison," Parks is committed to "welcoming indigenous peoples to reconnect" through the sharing of traditional knowledge, participating in ceremonies or getting involved in on-the-ground activities."[20] Lower down on the Parks webpage, they give the example that, prior to the buffalo's reintroduction, Parks Canada hosted Treaty 6 and 7 Nations and the Métis Nation of Alberta to "help give bison a proper blessing before the herd began their journey to the mountains."[21] For both Poole and Parks Canada, it is clear that the Buffalo's return to the landscape not only represents "hope for nature" but also "an important step toward reconciliation with Indigenous people."[22]

Although the return of the buffalo is no doubt materially, culturally, and spiritually significant for places like the Banff-Bow Valley—as well as the human and non-human communities living in the area—I am concerned with the ways in which the Reintroduction Project has been taken up and represented within dominant discourses revolving around the Canadian state and its expansionist modes of relationship—especially, how the project has been represented as an act of "reconciliation" with both the human and non-human world. By offering the project as an opportunity for non-Indigenous people to redeem themselves from a lamentable past defined by acts colonizing violence and ecological degradation, dominant discourse on the buffalo reintroduction make several moves to subtly invoke colonizing notions of nature and Indigeneity through state of nature fictions designed to stabilize and reify Project Canada and its expansionist modes of relationship. In other words, rather than engaging with the colonial entanglements of differential (de)valuation that continue to facilitate the transit and transgression of Indigenous lands and bodies in ways that seek to disrupt and subvert colonizing power, dominant non-Indigenous engagement with the buffalo reintroduction project actually reiterates the prose of countersovereignty that justifies and legitimates colonizing violence and breakage in the first place. For this reason, the next two sections consider how efforts to represent the buffalo reintroduction project as both ecologically and culturally significant rely on colonizing notions of nature and tropes of Indigeneity that shore up colonizing regimes. I then turn to consider how these state of nature fictions are entangled with, and reiterated through, the project's reconciliatory framing.

Returning back to nature:

As indicated above, much of the discourses surrounding the return of buffalo to Banff National Park emphasize the project as ecologically significant. This significance tends to be defined in two ways: not only will the project help support the conservation of a keystone species, but it will also

restore and preserve nature more generally. In fact, Parks Canada lists supporting "bison conservation" and preserving "ecological integrity" as two of the Project's four main contributions.[23] In other words, the act of returning buffalo to the park enables the Reintroduction Project to contribute to the preservation of one of the last remaining havens of wilderness in North America. However, by representing the buffalo return as ecologically significant in this dual sense, dominant discourses surrounding the return of buffalo to Banff National Park also subtly draw on particular notions of wilderness that are entangled with colonizing bodies of knowledge that shore up and secure white dominance within global networks of capitalism. This is largely because the understanding of wilderness mobilized by both Parks Canada and mainstream media coverage continues to buy into and perpetuate representations of the Park as preserving the remnants of a past state of nature—a state of nature where Indigenous lands and bodies are emptied out of law and rationality, respectively.

Although many have noted that natural spaces have almost never been devoid of human contact and relationships, embedded within the parks understanding of nature is the underlying imperial binary separating out nature and culture in highly racialized and gendered ways. Buying into this dichotomy that is articulated through the state of nature fictions discussed in Chapter 3, much of the discourses surrounding the reintroduction project reiterate myths of the vanishing frontier where wild lands void of any legal-political orders capable of structuring and containing so-called civilization all but disappeared as colonizing regimes extended themselves across the continent. Through acts of enclosure and the erection of states of (dis)possession that were distinguished from the wild(er)ness of nature, the colonization of the continent brought an end to the wild lands—and the wild animals and peoples that populated them—as nation-states like Canada and the US were represented as emerging whole and complete. However, as the story goes, recognizing the significance of nature and the wild things that inhabit it, a small number of future-

thinking men saw the importance in setting aside some lands that were deemed to have particular 'natural' significance and value. Commenting on these narratives, Cronon explains, "it is no accident that the movement to set aside national parks and wilderness areas began to gain real momentum at precisely the time that laments about the passing frontier reached their peak."[24] He continues, "to protect wilderness was in a very real sense to protect the nation's most scared myth of origin."[25] According to these state of nature fictions, within the space of the park, lay the last remnants of the wild lands that once made up the continent.

To ensure that parks serve as spatiotemporal museums of sorts that reveal how things were prior to so-called civilization, these institutions must also possess bodies deemed to be 'wild.' Even after becoming virtually extinct from the area, Parks Canada has endeavoured to "reintroduce" wild buffalo within the confines of the park. By returning the buffalo, the Reintroduction Project is understood as bolstering nostalgic romanticizations of nature similar to the Banff Indian Days in chapter three, as both the Project and the Festival present "wild humans and animals" in their natural habit. Such a fact is even recognized by Parks Canada, which writes that, as "emblematic of the wild Canadian west," returning the buffalo contributes to Banff's ability to provide an "authentic national park experience."[26]

But, in providing an 'authentic experience,' Parks Canada—as both a set of agents and institutions of the Canadian state—uses the buffalo and their reintroduction to stabilize colonizing regimes of property that cater to capitalism in at least two ways. For one, by pointing to and containing nature and all things wild within the demarcated space of the park, both the buffalo reintroduction and national parks more generally serve as a constitutive outside for colonizing regimes. This is because national parks contribute to a figure of "nature" that is imagined through state of nature fictions as existing outside of so-called civilization and their states of (dis)possession. By serving to capture and 'protect' such states of nature within the confines of

national parks, these natural spaces function as a jurisdictional hinge point that exists both within the state's supposed legal framework, yet—simultaneously—beyond it. In other words, despite contributing to the supposed enhancement of nature, the project does so in ways that continue to represent Project Canada and its states of (dis)possession as the axiomatic point of reference by ensuring that the colonizing property regimes both within and beyond the park remain unquestioned.

In addition to shoring up colonizing property that caters to capitalism, the Buffalo Reintroduction Projects also invokes particular racialized and gendered notions of wilderness to make and reproduce colonial subjectivities invested within such states of (dis)possession. This occurs in at least two ways. First, the buffalo project invokes notions of wilderness that help to shore up white colonial masculinities as the universal subject position that it caters to. As discussed in chapters two and three, the establishment of Banff National Park not only functions to reify and naturalize class orders by serving wealthy, upper-class travellers, but it also functions to perpetuate racialized and gendered notions of wilderness that shore up colonizing notions of whiteness and masculinity. In fact, national parks emerge as a reaction to many contradictions of empire by functioning as places where white-collar working men (and their sons) could come to shed the restraints of industrial civilization and its emasculating effects. Although the Buffalo Reintroduction Project does not explicitly draw on these racialized and gendered notions of nature, it functions to bolster a sense of wild(er)ness that enables those who visit to come into contact with wild animals in ways that draw on past desires to experience a controlled yet uncorrupted form of nature before returning to a more 'civilized' environment. In other words, through the reintroduction project, Banff National Park promises to offer an entanglement of place, activities, and subjectivities that can make and reproduce the white (patriarchal) possessive logic necessary to shore up colonial regimes of property catering to capital by also attracting more tourist dollars.[27]

Secondly, shoring up white supremacist and heteropatriarchal entanglements of power, the Buffalo Reintroduction Project also crucially functions to simultaneously delegitimize Indigenous nations by occluding and unknowing their modes of relationship and forms of political authority. For example, although the project recognizes Indigenous presences by explaining the cultural and spiritual significance of the buffalo for many Indigenous people, it deliberately fails to recognize the political significance of the relationship between buffalo and Indigenous nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda. As a way of life, relationships to the buffalo shape the way nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda move through place and relate to one another, ultimately influencing their legal-political orders. By only emphasizing the cultural and spiritual significance of the buffalo to the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous peoples, discourses surrounding the reintroduction of buffalo to Banff National Park reiterate colonizing tropes of Indigeneity that fail to recognize Indigenous peoples as place-based political collectivities and, instead, recasts them as racialized minorities that can (and ought to) be subject to the state's authority

This is exemplified by the fact that the Parks Canada website explicitly restricts and confines the ways in which Indigenous participation and engagement with the buffalo reintroduction can occur. As outlined on the website, Indigenous reconnection with the buffalo is welcomed in two main ways: namely, either through traditional knowledge sharing and/or through ceremony.[28] Without dismissing the political significance of ceremony, not only does restricting participation in such ways confine and contain local nations from exercising decision-making power, but an emphasis on traditional knowledges also implicitly draws on tropes of Indigeneity that represent Indigenous people as respecting nature due to "an intrinsic or natural sense of ecology."[29] As suggested by Charlotte Coté, this particular trope, which she calls the "ecological Indian," has been conveniently exploited by social movements since the 1800s.[30] As Coté makes clear, such an image is only engaged with when Indigenous people are doing what ecologists or

animal rights activists want them to—regardless of whether this is actually in the best interest for the environment and the relations in question. For example, despite the fact that non-Indigenous hunting practices accounted for a vast majority of wild life destruction, the Îyãħé Nakoda were largely restricted from the park for decades in the name of wildlife conservation. By restricting participation to knowledge sharing and ceremony, Parks Canada not only fails to understand and appreciate both the deep and long-lasting relationships different nations have with the area—as well as the legal-political orders these relationships have made and reproduced over time—but staff and the institution actively participate in epistemically containing Indigenous lands, bodies, and nations to facilitate ongoing colonization.

Such a fact is made even more egregious, however, when one considers how Banff National Park has functioned as a technology of elimination, continually attempting to displace and dispossess Indigenous nations, such as the Îyãħé Nakoda, from their territories in pursuit of capital. Nowhere on the Parks webpage nor in the dominant media sources covering the reintroduction is there any mention of the fact that Banff National Park is established on stolen land—as exemplified by ongoing land disputes in the area.[31] Neither is there any mention of the fact that the Îyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations were effectively banned from the park area for the better part of the twentieth century through entanglements of colonial law, policing, and wild life conservation discourses—having only been officially welcomed back in 2010. By failing to name and acknowledge these practices of colonizing containment and breakage, the state and its non-Indigenous population—including institutions like the Eleanor Luxton Foundation in Banff (a foundation established to celebrate and commemorate the Luxton and McDougall families who were responsible for both the initial organization of the Banff Indian Days and the Mission in Morley)—actively reiterate colonizing tropes of Indigeneity, which depoliticize and devalue

Indigenous people by representing them as intimately connected to colonizing conceptions of nature devoid of legal-political order.[32]

Thus, by contributing to the "ecological integrity" of so-called "nature," the buffalo reintroduction presents yet another opportunity for affluent—mostly white—people to (re)invest in colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship. Furthermore, choosing to focus only on cultural and spiritual dimensions of the Project as well as the possibility of sharing traditional ecological knowledges while dismissing the political and economic potentials enables the Canadian state to further render the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations as racial and cultural minorities subject to colonial sovereignty. Such a mistranslation ultimately dismisses and diminishes Indigenous nationhood and their different ways of relating to the buffalo. Within this context, the reintroduction of the buffalo not only serves to bolster images of wilderness that are so important to the space of the park, but, in the process, the buffalo themselves become objects to be conjured and possessed by the colonizing state; objects to be forever consumed as they are regulated and monitored in ways that determine how they live and when they must die. To phrase differently, the buffalo—like other Indigenous life in the park—come to live within a highly colonized space where they are confined and rendered—that is, broken up—into colonized subjects whose futures are possessed by and for the ends of Project Canada. Perhaps nowhere is this clearer than when park wardens relocated one bull buffalo and shot and murdered another after the two "escaped" from park boundaries in August of 2018.

(Un)Free to roam:

Throughout this thesis, I have shown that Banff National Park and other nature preserves serve less as technologies of conservation and more as part of the infrastructure that seeks to contain, control, and unknow Indigenous modes of relationship. However, in understanding nature preserves as

such, one must also understand that institutions like Banff National Park are not actually oriented towards supporting and enhancing life across different generations and different species; instead, they are intimately entangled with expansionist modes of relationship oriented towards notions of scarcity and possession that radiate outwards through death and dispossession. Consequently, the entanglements of the places, activities, and subjectivities that make up Banff National Park are largely dominated by an insatiable and predatory desire to accumulate and possess. Although this may support and overlap conservation efforts at times, it can just as quickly lead to death and destruction. For this reason, the park ought to be understood as an institution where the necropolitical and biopolitical meet to both cultivate those possessive subjects driven by expansionist modes of relationship, while simultaneously conjuring those who are to be accumulated and (dis)possessed through processes of domination and exploitation.

Nowhere is this more evident than when one of the newly reintroduced bulls was relocated and another was shot and killed outside the park boundaries less than a month after the herd's official release into the "wild." According to the Banff National Park's "Bison Blog," on August 17, 2018, "two bulls ventured eastward well beyond the park boundary and were within a day's walk from private lands."[33] The blog goes on to explain that Parks Canada's reintroduction plan and their commitment to different stakeholders through the province promised that the buffalo would be kept out of these areas—i.e. off of private property making up the bordering ranchlands.[34] With one of the bulls quickly nearing these private ranchlands, Parks Canada explains that "public safety" became a factor. Furthermore, there were also increasing concerns that the buffalo could *come into contact with cattle or damage other property*.[35] Consequently, Parks Canada staff made the difficult decision to "euthanize" one of the bulls while relocating the other. Reflecting on the decision, Parks staff wrote: "decisions to relocate and destroy an animal are difficult for our team

and are made only after we have considered all other options. These two bulls were determined to travel eastward past any obstacles in their way, and they taught us a lot."[36]

The shooting and relocation of the bulls immediately led to many questions for me. For example, what does it mean to say that buffalo are "free-roaming," yet relocate or murder these animals if they wander into certain areas? What systems of value are at play to calculate that private property—including cattle and other non-human beings—are more "valuable" than the life of a buffalo who is supposedly an integral species to the area? Little in terms of answers to these questions are immediately obvious in the statements issued by Parks Canada. Also absent is any perspective from any of the Indigenous nations that the Project is meant to reconcile Canada's relationship with.

After reflecting on this loss of life, I believe that the murder of the bull underscores a number of things. First, despite dominant colonizing discourses discussing the dual ecological and cultural significance of the return of the buffalo, the murder reveals that state intentions for the reintroduction to Banff National Park have always sought to contain the buffalo in ways that would ensure that the project does not threaten either the stability of the state or the ability for corporations to transit and transgress Indigenous territories in pursuit of capital accumulation—in fact, the project seeks to actively facilitate this transit and transgression by (re)producing colonial subjects who buy-into colonizing regimes. But this means that, in transiting colonizing boundaries themselves, the bulls' proximity to private grazing lands and those cattle living on them became a threat—both physically and metaphorically. Physically, the buffalo's capacity to destroy both people and property means that they do not belong within the neat confines of civilization. Although the physical power of the buffalo is no doubt true, they are also inscribed with racializing and colonizing terms that represent them as wild "beasts." Furthermore, these colonizing notions of savagery and bestiality are intensified by suggesting that contact with these wild things might

contaminate that which is deemed civilized. In fact, media coverage of the 'escape' often represented buffalo as a "disease-ridden" species that threatens to contaminate cattle herds and other domesticated animals through physical touch.[37] According to this perspective, if left to come into contact, the wild bulls would no doubt contaminate whole herds with their diseases (and savagery) resulting in hundreds of thousands—if not millions—of dollars in property damage for ranchers in the area.

Second, in addition to the threat that the buffalo pose to property and people in the form of physical violence and disease, the buffalos' transgression of boundaries also represents a deeper psychic threat. The bulls' desire to roam through the same prairies that their ancestors once did is not only rendered as a threat to the people and cattle they may come into physical "contact" with, but their very presence beyond the confines of the national park threatens to destabilize the barriers and boundaries of so-called civilization. The physical presence of the buffalo outside the confines of the Park fundamentally disrupts the logics of containment underpinning colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship. As the two bulls crossed the invisible line demarcating the Park's boundaries, their bodies—as loaded symbols of wild(er)ness—refused to be contained. Such an act of refusal evokes sensations of fear and anxiety amongst those invested in the colonizing order as supposedly "wild beasts" roam around where they do not belong because their movement fundamentally disrupts the segregated logics of containment underpinning expansionist modes of relationship. In fact, the bull's refusal to remain contained within the confines of the park points to the fact that such boundaries are by no means natural, and much like those Indigenous nation who govern themselves according to their own expansive modes of relationship, the buffalo's transgression of park boundaries ignores the confines of colonizing states of (dis)possession.

However, on the flip side, the state's reaction reveals how colonizing regimes not only rely on violence and breakage to maintain their categories and boundaries, but that they will not hesitate to take life to uphold them. Forced to murder or displace, the state's decision to relocate and kill the bulls also reveals how colonizing violence and breakage remains a necessary part of state projects. In fact, murdering the bull actually functions to imprint colonizing power on his body in ways that have rippling effects. The bull's dead body signals to his human kin what happens when one oversteps colonizing boundaries. After all, countersovereignty and its regimes of terror have long targeted non-human life and relationships like the buffalo with genocide as part of a broader attempt to replace *all Indigenous life* living in/with place. Tasha Hubbard demonstrates this, explaining that "in the language of imperialism, Indigenous peoples and buffalo became conflated, both categorized as brutes that needed to be erased."[38] Winona LaDuke further contextualizes the relationship between violence against buffalo and violence against Indigenous nations living in relations to them. For her, the deliberate killing of buffalo is an example of not only a colonizing war on nature, but also as a war that is intimately and deliberately connected to Indigenous peoples who share a kinship relation with the buffalo being targeted for death.[39] As she describes it, a war with buffalo is "a war on the psyche, a war on the soul."[40] In murdering and relocating the bulls, the Canadian state—through Parks Canada—reveals how this genocidal violence and colonizing breakage continue at pace within colonizing regimes like Canada.

Thus, by framing murder and relocation as the only options, the Canadian state shows the extent to which it will go to maintain states of (dis)possession. Literally ready to kill a species that was once considered extinct, we are reminded of Karuka's claim that "colonialism is predicated on mass extinction and genocide."[41] Yet, it is important to remember that not all state violence and colonizing breakage takes the form of slaughter and displacement; in fact, imperial war and colonial conquest can look like state-sanctioned slaughter as well as more subtle practices, such as

processes of domestication and assimilation, which has been used to break up Indigenous relationships. Furthermore, it can also mean representing projects like the Buffalo Reintroduction in reconciliatory terms that suggest a break from the colonizing violence of the past, despite clearly indicating otherwise. In fact, I argue that framing the return as an act of 'reconciliation' (with both the human and non-human world) actually doubles down on state of nature fictions meant to maintain and shore up expansionist modes of relationship by (re)producing colonial subjects who buy into expansionist modes of relationship. In other words, invoking the language of reconciliation within the context of the Buffalo Reintroduction Project functions to shore up and perpetuate the very practices and relationships it claims to address—an assertion that also extends to dominant discourses on reconciliation more generally. For this reason, the next section considers how—what Glen Coulthard calls—the "politics of reconciliation" emerges as a distinct discursive phenomenon that tends to reiterate state of nature fictions meant to shore up Project Canada before considering how such a politics is taken up by buffalo reintroduction project. But, to understand how reconciliation politics emerges within Canadian dominant discourses more generally, a brief outline of Canada's use of residential schools is necessary.

Reconciliation's returns:

For over a century, Indian residential schools (IRS) functioned as one of the main pillars in Canada's genocidal project to break up and replace Indigenous peoples and their modes of relationship with colonizing regimes. Between 1831 and 1996, roughly 150,000 Indigenous children were stolen from their families and placed within live-in schools run by the state and a number of major Christian denominations.[42] Within these institutions, physical and sexual violence were a rampant part of everyday life.[43] This abuse, along with disease and neglect, led to shockingly high mortality rates as well as deep-rooted and long-lasting consequences for survivors

and their communities.[44] In fact, the intergenerational trauma caused by this institution, which includes disproportionate levels of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, domestic abuse, community conflict, compromised health, incarceration, and suicide amongst survivors and their families, has led many to argue that the IRS system constituted genocide against Indigenous nations.[45]

However, despite the devastating effects and affects that IRS continue to possess for individuals, families, communities and nations, Indigenous persistence and resistance has made sure that Indigenous people did not disappear—whether through physical elimination or assimilation into the Canadian body politic—nor have they remained silent about the Canadian state's attempts to do so through IRS.[46] Since at least the 1990s, survivors of IRS and their communities have actively fought for an official inquiry that would "investigate and publicize the outrages associate with the [Indian Residential] schools."[47] Largely led and supported by Indigenous women and femme-identifying persons, Million reveals how these efforts found success in mobilizing medicalized discourses on trauma and healing,[48] which Coulthard and James note were empowered by Indigenous land defense and resistance efforts happening in places, such as Oka.[49] As a result, a class-action lawsuit was brought against the Canadian government and the churches that ran IRS by the representatives of over 80,000 claimants.[50]

After drawn out legal battles, the Canadian state reluctantly approved the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA) on May 10, 2006.[51] In addition to offering an official apology and financial compensation for IRS survivors, the IRSSA included a call for a national truth commission that would acknowledge and document "the effects and consequences of the IRS system" to "contribute to truth, healing and reconciliation" between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada.[52] This led to the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC), which was officially initiated on June 2, 2008. Through seven national events, numerous community truth and reconciliation events and commemorative

initiatives encouraged by the Commission, the TRC sought to fulfill its mandate of acknowledging Residential School experiences, impacts, and consequences by providing survivors with the power to determine how they presented their truths to the Canadian public.[53]

Out of this context of the official apologies and truth commissions emerges what Glen Coulthard calls "reconciliation politics."[54] For him, reconciliation politics refers to the convergence of two dominant discourses; namely, discourses on a newly emerging "global health industry" and "slightly older forms of recognition."[55] For the former, Coulthard notes that a new industry has emerged globally that promotes "the issuing of official apologies advocating 'forgiveness' and 'reconciliation' as an important precondition for resolving the deleterious social impacts of intrastate violence, mass atrocity, and historical injustice."[56] He explains that such an industry originally emerges within state contexts that sought to undergo formal "transitions" from more openly authoritarian regimes to more democratic forms of rule—which he notes is known in the literature as "transitional justice."[57] More recently, however, these industries (and their discourses) have been taken up by more "stable, liberal democratic states" like Canada and Australia.[58] Within these supposedly stable and democratic states, this industry has converged with "a slightly older 'politics of recognition"—which generally refers to "the now expansive range of recognition-based models of liberal pluralism" that seek to "recognize and accommodate a range of group-specific claims without having to abandon their commitment to a core set of fundamental rights."[59] Consequently, Coulthard argues that reconciliation politics manifests as the newest, most progressive set of neoliberal multicultural policies and legislation.

A decade after the initiation of the TRC, reconciliation politics still positions itself as one of the newest, and most progressive sets of policies and legislation within Canada's recognition politics. As such, reconciliation politics seeks to address Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations by subtly shifting emphasis from seeking to "reconcile" Indigenous assertions of nationhood with

Canadian sovereignty within a rights-base framework to acknowledging and witnessing past wrongs, especially survivor experiences and the impacts and legacy of Residential Schools.[60] Furthermore, reconciliation politics not only expands what can be recognized in an effort to confront and redeem 'past wrongs,' but it also expands the realm of who can participate. In other words, reconciliation politics opens up what was formerly based on formal acts and procedures to the broader colonial population who can now take up and address the 'burden' of colonial trauma to facilitate Indigenous healing. This has meant that a growing number of activities and programs are being implemented by a diverse range of governments, institutions, organizations, and individuals attempting to address and take up the 'burden' of colonial trauma and facilitate Indigenous healing—including the Buffalo Reintroduction Project in Banff National Park. However, by seeking to signal the inauguration of a "new chapter" in Canada's relationship with Indigenous people, dominant iterations of reconciliation politics promise to serve as not only the newest and most progressive form of recognition politics, but also as a rearticulation of state of nature fictions that seek to maintain and sustain colonizing states of (dis)possession.

This is because, although not directly invoking notions of nature, reconciliation politics in general—and the Banff Buffalo Reintroduction in particular—invokes a narrative of liberal progress and multicultural inclusion that establishes a temporal break. By dividing and demarcating people and places, reconciliation politics functions to distinguish Canada's current moment by putting "the events of the past behind us so that we can work towards a stronger and healthier future."[61] Recalling chapter three, state of nature fictions construct "post-something worlds" in order to deemphasize or deny "a past era's complex entanglements" with the present moment.[62] According to reconciliation politics, Canada's decision to embark on processes like the TRC and other projects like the Buffalo Reintroduction mark its transition from a past defined by racist intolerance and horrific colonizing violence and breakage. Knowing better now, such a politics

represents non-Indigenous Canadians as attempting to right these past wrongs and transition to a state where Indigenous and non-Indigenous people peacefully coexistence. As indicated in the TRC Mandate: "there is an emerging and compelling desire to put the events of the past behind us so that we can work towards a stronger and healthier future."[63] By learning from past wrongs, the "common experiences" of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people "will help to set our spirits free and pave the way to reconciliation."[64]

In articulating this temporal break in Canadian colonial history, reconciliation politics functions similar to other state of nature fictions that seek to maintain colonizing regimes and their expansionist modes of relationship. This is because although reconciliation politics suggests that acknowledging and accommodating Indigenous claims and experiences through processes and institutions like the TRC offers new ways to smooth out and flatten the messy and knotted relationships between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian state by "establishing new relationships embedded in mutual recognition and respect that will forge a brighter future," it fails to actually engage with and interrogate the underlying structures that make such violence possible in the first place (i.e. colonization, capitalism, white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, etc.).[65] Consequently, by invoking notions of "forgiveness" and "reconciliation," such a politics actually enables the Canadian state to flatten and smooth over the bumps and messiness of colonial entanglements that it perceives as barriers to expansionist modes of relationship by epistemically containing its colonizing violence and breakage that continues to disproportionately target Indigenous people to the past—all while enabling the (re)production of colonial subjects who buy into expansionist modes of relationship through narratives of progress.

This is exemplified by projects like the Buffalo Reintroduction in Banff. Rather than engaging with and interrogating the property regimes that continue to require the death and destruction of buffalo and the displacement and delegitimization of nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda,

the Reintroduction Project confines and contains the buffalo to the wild spaces of the park. In doing so, it presents Indigenous and non-Indigenous people alike with the opportunity to actually re-invest in colonizing states of (dis)possession by briefly escaping 'back to a state of nature' before returning to their banal—yet often brutal—lives within so-called civilization. However, because the buffalo are rightfully noted to be significant to the Indigenous people that "once roamed the area," these colonial subjects can feel good about the project, despite the fact that it continues to take place on stolen land. Within dominant state discourses, no where is there any suggestion of Indigenous co-management of the Reintroduction Project, let alone co-management or a return of the parklands more generally.

In addition to assuming the continued existence of a whole and homogenous nation-state, reconciliation politics' progressive narrative also subtly includes a number of white supremacist assumptions about the supposed superiority of the Canadian state and its (white) population in relation to Indigenous nations. By remaining silent on issues, such as land and the political status of Indigenous nations, the buffalo reintroduction specifically—and reconciliation politics more generally—not only lacks the capacity to substantively address its relationship with Indigenous peoples, but these institutions and processes actually enable for the Canadian state and its body politic to redeem colonizing futures by recasting Canadian colonization through the guise of the "benevolent peacemaker myth."[66] For example, although discussing survivor testimony or the Park's role as a technology of elimination can both unsettle and disrupt the idea that Canada is a benevolent nation of peacemakers by chronicling the colonizing violence and breakage that many non-Indigenous people do not want to hear, reconciliation politics also valorizes the role of non-Indigenous participation in ways that enable these participants to recuperate their role as benevolent peacemakers. In fact, by providing the illusion of real change through its declaration-styled politics, dominant discourses on reconciliation provide participants with a tempting array of symbolic

participatory mechanisms designed to "construct national happiness without sufficiently addressing the structural imbalances that continue to contour politics in North America."[67] Furthermore, by investing in such mechanisms through one's participation, participants also risk making and reproducing themselves as colonial subjects heavily invested in the imbalances and violence underpinning colonizing regimes of power and their states of (dis)possession.[68] In fact, non-Indigenous participation in reconciliatory efforts like the Buffalo Reintroduction Project can even been argued to amount to simply another of what Tuck and Yang refer to as "settler move to innocence," where supposedly well-intentioned settlers work to assuage their own guilt for their complicity in ongoing Indigenous dispossession all while, simultaneously, reinvesting in colonial states of (dis)possession.[69] For this reason, non-Indigenous participation tends to be understood as performing sympathy to symbolically wash their hands of the blood of empire, at best, or as participation in quasi-pornographic spectacle of trauma and suffering that enables colonizers to reiterate their own superiority through the consumption of Indigenous pain and suffering, at worst.

Finally—and perhaps most insidiously—by reiterating the benevolence of the Canadian state and its non-Indigenous populations, reconciliation politics also subtly reiterates colonizing tropes of Indigeneity that represent Indigenous people as culturally and racially inferior to their white colonizing counterparts. By offering participation within processes and projects like the Buffalo Reintroduction, dominant articulations of reconciliation assume that Indigenous participants are seeking inclusion within the Canadian society, which targeted their nations and ways of life in the past. From this perspective, offering ceremony or sharing knowledge about the buffalo is perceived as the desire to share these relationships and experiences with the Canadian body politic as part of its shared history, which Indigenous people are assumed to be part of. In fact—recalling chapter three—embracing this membership into the (white) Canadian body politic is even tacitly offered as remediation for past colonizing violence and breakage. But underlying

this offer is not only the assumption that membership within colonizing regime is a normative good that all individuals ought to desire, but also that Project Canada and its expansionist modes of relationship can offer better forms of healing and restoration and, consequently, are superior to other modes of relationship. This includes the modes of relationship embodied by Indigenous nationhood, which dominant discourses on reconciliation fail to engage with at a political level and, consequently, subtly represented as inferior to Canada's (white) body politic.

To understand inclusion within the liberal multicultural order as remediation, then, requires that reconciliation politics rearticulate colonizing tropes of Indigeneity that recast Indigenous peoples as racial and cultural minorities lacking the capacity to govern themselves on their own territories and, therefore, in need of state management. In doing so, such a politics not only conflates processes of colonization and racialization similar to other state of nature fictions, but it does so in ways that fundamentally fail to grapple with the distinctions between the two systems of domination.[70] As Jodi Byrd explains, "the conflation of racialization into colonization and indigeneity into racial categories dependent upon blood logics underwrites the institutions of settler colonialism when they proffer assimilation into the colonizing nation as reparation for genocide and theft of lands and nations."[71] Not only does this enable non-Indigenous people to happily reinvest in colonizing states of (dis)possession by depoliticizing Indigenous nations, but such a conflation of colonization and racialization also enables colonizing regimes to "mask the territoriality of conquest" by assigning the effects and affects of colonization to Indigenous peoples, who are then policed in its degrees from whiteness.[72] Consequently, when Indigenous people resist the continued effects and affects of colonization that disproportionately target their bodies and their lands, non-Indigenous people can point to things like the completion of the TRC or the reintroduction of buffalo as evidence that colonization is over and that Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples' relationship is reconciled. This leaves those who refuse to be assimilated

within the colonizing regime deemed melancholic subject who are simply ungrateful and, therefore, 'unable to move on.'

Thus, dominant iterations of reconciliation politics manifest as yet another form of countersovereignty seeking to contain and breakup Indigenous nations and their modes of relationship while reproducing colonial subjects invested in colonizing regimes and their states of (dis)possession. In fact, in addition to returning the buffalo to the space of the park, the Reintroduction Project also facilitates its own financial returns by enabling colonial subjects to continuously transit Indigenous territories at the price of a park admission fees. This is made particularly clear when one considers the ways in which the buffalo's bolstering of the Park's sense of wild(er)ness contributes to a multi-billion-dollar industry. However, like all actions that take place within different colonial entanglements, there is also a significant subversive potential that comes with restoring such a relationship to the land. In the last section of this chapter, I use the concept of colonial entanglement to offer a parallax view of the buffalo reintroduction that thinks through the ways in which the Project not only possesses the potential to restore and renew past relationships, but also to embrace expansive modes of relationship oriented towards supporting and enhancing life rather than accumulating capital.

The Buffalo Treaty:

In embracing the complex messiness of colonial entanglements, one must recognize that the Canadian state's attempts to confine and contain the buffalo within the Reintroduction Project fails similarly to its attempts to replace Indigenous nations more generally. One of the reasons this failure occurs is because, in its attempts to depoliticize Indigenous nations, the Canadian state also seeks to minimize the political relevance of the buffalo to different Indigenous nations by ignoring and disavowing this significance. Yet, this process of

unknowing fails to understand the power and significance of the relationship between the buffalo and different Indigenous nations living within the Banff-Bow Valley specifically, and across the North American plains generally.

As cited in the epigraph, Fred Dubray clearly articulates the deep significance of the buffalo to Indigenous nations living in relation to the animal. For him, the buffalo is "life itself on this continent."[73] He continues, "When we talk about restoring buffalo itself, we're not just talking about restoring animals to the land, we're talking about restoring social structure, culture, and even our political structure."[74] Here, Dubray explicitly connects relationships to buffalo to the support and enhancement of Indigenous nations as enduring political collectivities that hold their own legal-political orders, which govern both themselves and their relationships with other Indigenous nations—both human and non-human. Restoring relationships with buffalo not only supports and enhances these legal-political orders due to the material and cultural significance that buffalo hold for many nations, but also because these nations understood their relationship with the buffalo as a *political relationship between nations.*

This political relationship is recognized and affirmed within the context of the Banff-Bow Valley through the historic gathering and signing of the "Northern Tribes Buffalo Treaty" in 2015—as mentioned above.[75] For each of the Treaty's signatories, the Buffalo Treaty recognizes the Buffalo as not only a significant relationship, but also as a relative:

> Since time immemorial, hundreds of generations of the first peoples of the FIRST NATIONS of North America have come and gone since before and after the melting of the glaciers that covered North America. For those generations BUFFALO has been our relative. BUFFALO is part of us and WE are part of BUFFALO culturally, materially, and spiritually.[76]

As is made clear in this passage of the Treaty, Indigenous peoples living on the northern plains/prairies and into the Rocky Mountains are culturally, materially, and spiritually connected

to the buffalo. In other words, rather than imagining themselves as independent or as living in a hierarchical relationship, the Buffalo Treaty recognizes and affirms that Indigenous signatory nations are interdependent with buffalo—and with one another.

For this reason, signing the Treaty not only recognizes the political relationship between Indigenous nations and the Buffalo, but it also carries with it an obligation. In signing the Treaty, nations commit to honoring and revitalizing their relationship with the buffalo by welcoming them to "once again live among us as CREATOR intended."[77] As the Treaty states, this entails "doing everything within our means so WE and BUFFALO will once again live together to nurture each other culturally and spiritually."[78] Thus, in addition to highlighting the deep and multifaceted significance of the buffalo to these nations, signing the Treaty also entails a responsibility to restore and renew relationships with the buffalo and with other nations that have been broken up and damaged within colonizing regimes and their modes of relationship. As Leroy Little Bear explains, "the buffalo is the portal, the centerpiece for all our people to come together to work on issues of culture, economics, and health."[79]

The Buffalo Treaty, however, is not the first or only version of Indigenous nations coming together in expansive ways to support and enhance life; rather, it belongs to—and draws from—a long history of what scholars and activists like Leanne Simpson and Nick Estes call Indigenous internationalism.[80] For both Simpson and Estes, Indigenous nations have often entered into treaty relations with other nations for alliance, kinship, war, and peace purposes, and—like the Buffalo Treaty—both authors emphasize that such agreements were not only with other human nations but also among non-human nations as well.[81] In fact, Simpson points out that one of the fundamental differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous conceptions of internationalism is that for Indigenous nations, internationalism manifests from the thought and practice rooted in a "grounded normativity," which centers the series of entangled relationships with plant nations, animal nations,

insects nations, bodies of water, air, soil, and spiritual beings in addition to the Indigenous nations who all share a relationship to place.[82] Within such a framework, treaties and other acts of international politics function to recognize and further entangle the place-based relations and experiences of different nations—both human and non-human—to one another in ways that also extend beyond to broader, more global scales as well.

Turning to the Banff-Bow Valley, specifically, we can see how the Buffalo Treaty comes out of a long history of Indigenous internationalism embodied by both the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations. Prior to European contact, different nations continuously practiced internationalisms with other Indigenous nations as they made treaties that navigated alliances, kinships, wars, and peace. For the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, this continued largely unencumbered right up until 1895, when members of the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, the Ktunaxa, and the Secwepemc gathered to address arising hostilities between each of the nations. Due to increased colonial encroachment, members of Ĩyãħé Nakoda had entered into the Upper Columbia Valley region west of the Rockies in search of food and subsistence.[83] Because this region was particularly significant to both the Ktunaxa and the Secwepemc—who were also feeling the effects and affects of colonization—Ĩyãħé Nakoda presence in the area sparked a conflict between the three nations as the Ktunaxa and Secwepemc were concerned of that Ĩyãħé Nakoda presence could result in overhunting in the area.[84] However, out of the gathering, an agreement was made that would allow the Ĩyãħé Nakoda to hunt "as far West as the Columbia and Kootenay Rivers, and that the [Ktunaxa] and the [Secwepemc] shall have the privilege of hunting as far East as the base of the Rocky Mountains, on the Eastern Slope thereof."[85]

The 1895 agreement reveals a number of things—all of which exemplify a tradition of Indigenous internationalism that is reiterated by the Buffalo Treaty. For one, the agreement comes out of an explicit concern with the ways in which different hunting practices are felt by a number of animal nations in the area, especially those that were entangled with colonizing modes of

relationship oriented towards the death and destruction of Indigenous life in pursuit of profit. Although no plant or animal nation is specifically invoked as a signatory of the agreement, these nations were no doubt being considered by the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, the Ktunaxa, and the Secwepemc as they entered into an agreement that recognizes the deep entanglements between Indigenous economies and the non-human world. Furthermore, the fact that these nations decided to come together at the turn of the twentieth century to address Ĩyãħé Nakoda presence in the Upper Columbia Valley is also reflective of how local land-based relations and experiences are caught up in the broader social and political conditions that persisted in those territories claimed by Project Canada as well as abroad at the time. In fact, across the continent, Indigenous nations entangled with different colonizing regimes were attempting to assert their own authority—often through the language of the right to self-determination.[86]

Although the 1895 agreement marks one of the few examples of the formal agreements and treaties that have occurred over the last 150 years, the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations have continued to gather and convene together, asserting their enduring presence across cultural, economic, political, and spiritual lines. This has been exemplified in chapter three, which discussed the ways in which the Banff Indian Days festival was used as a way of extablishing and renewing relationships between different nations living in the area. Furthermore, as demonstrated by both the 1895 agreement and the Buffalo Treaty, traditions of Indigenous internationalism are firmly rooted in modes of relationship that imagine worlds far beyond the simple inclusion into the colonizing order. Rather, these entangled relations recognize and affirm modes of relationship that exist outside expansionist modes of relationship and their entanglements with capitalism, white supremacy, and heteropatriarchy. In doing so, they affirm modes of relationship that are oriented towards the support and enhancement of life across different genders, generations, and species.

Through the Buffalo Treaty, then, this spirit of Indigenous internationalism is once again visible as a number of Indigenous nations have come together to recognize, honor, and restore their relationships with both each other and with the buffalo. For the Indigenous nations living in relationship with the Banff-Bow Valley and elsewhere, maintaining and sustaining a relationship with the buffalo is recognized as requiring a collective effort that extends across multiple nations, territories, and generations—it is an expansive relationship that fundamentally exceeds the imperial borders established between Canada and the US. But this collective effort promoted by the Buffalo Treaty also recognizes that the sovereignty of each nation is enduring, even though it is deeply entangled with the cultural, social, political, economic and spiritual life of other Indigenous nations. Furthermore, the sovereignty and political autonomy of Indigenous nations is also recognized as intimately interconnected with the non-human world as well, which are also seen as political agents and communities. Such a political commitment is made clear in the text of the Treaty, which calls for both other "nations, states, and provinces" claiming political authority in those areas where buffalo roam to join on as signatories of the Treaty, which recognizes and honors "the interrelationships between us and 'all our relations' including animals, plants, and mother earth."[87] Finally, by inviting other nations, states, and provinces to enter into a treaty with its Indigenous signatories, the Buffalo Treaty embodies an expansive mode of relationship that recognizes the ways in which all life is interdependent, while still reaffirming the autonomy of each of its signatory nations.[88] Unfortunately, the Canadian state—and its colonizing populations—continue to fail to understand such entangled relations the same way.

Conclusion:

Thus, like all actions that take place within different colonial entanglements of power, the Buffalo Reintroduction Project carries with it the capacities to both enhance and restrict life. For the

Canadian state and its dominant discourse, choosing to focus on the cultural and the spiritual, as well as the possibility of sharing traditional ecological knowledges, while dismissing the political and the economic enables Project Canada to subtly shore up its states of (dis)possession that render the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations as racial and cultural minorities subject to colonial sovereignty. Such a mistranslation dismisses and diminishes different Indigenous modes of relating to the buffalo—all while Project Canada and its colonizing populations that deliberately destroyed buffalo herds in the first place recast themselves as benevolent peacemakers who have learned from the past and now honor and cherish their relationships with Indigenous nations. Although expansionist modes of relationship may no longer rely explicitly on imperial war against nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, these modes of relationship continue to disproportionately target Indigenous life with colonizing violence and breakage as lands, bodies, and nations are (mis)translated into more palatable "experiences" that work to reinscribe and maintain the *colonizing status quo*. For this reason, representations of the buffalo return as a move to reconcile past ecological and cultural wrongs tends to constitute yet another "settler move to innocence" that ensures that colonial subjects remain turned towards colonizing regimes in ways that continue to proliferate capital into fewer and fewer hands.

However, as I have tried to emphasize throughout this thesis, there is also a significant subversive potential that comes with restoring such a relationship to the land. Again, recalling Fed Dubray's quote in the epigraph, the buffalo represent a particular way of life for those nations living on the prairies/plains of North America, and this way of life exists beyond the bloodied edges of expansionist modes of relationship. Through their relationships to the buffalo, nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda embodied expansive modes of relationship that supported and enhanced life across different genders, generations, and species. Similar to how the species' return reactivates the landscape in particular ways, the Buffalo Reintroduction Project also possesses the capacity to

renew such modes of relationship by reactivating particular songs, dances, stories, teachings, ceremony, and more within different Indigenous nations. This not only renews cultural and spiritual practices within particular nations by restoring relationships with the buffalo, it also renews relationships between these different Indigenous nations as well—as demonstrated by the signing of the Buffalo Treaty. In other words, the buffalo reintroduction also extends beyond the confines of the colonizing regime that seeks to contain it, becoming entangled with expansive modes of relationship that understand the Banff-Bow Valley as a site of international politics. For this reason, it is of crucial importance that people seeking to support the buffalo's return (re)orient themselves around such understandings of the project as articulated by nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda. In doing so, the buffalo reintroduction project possesses the potential to foster an anti-colonial internationalism that emphasizes solidarity and coordination between different nations and groups as they attempt to embrace and enhance life across different genders, generations, and species.

EPILOGUE

Towards an anti-colonial internationalism

> *We live in deadly times. The world is on fire. From wildfires in central Africa, Indonesia, and Siberia; intentional fires deforesting the Alberta Tar-sands and throughout the Amazon; from the gunfire of cops, soldiers, abusive men, self-deputized vigilantes, white supremacists, and unmanned drones; we are under fire or we are under the constant threat of fire. When it is too expensive to live—when we are disciplined by the fear of hunger, homelessness, incarceration, and disease—it can be a death sentence to be unemployed or to get fired[…] I think these times have really forced us to confront some fundamental questions. We ask, for example, whose lives matter? Do Black lives matter? Do Native lives matter? Do the lives of missing and murdered Native women, girls, queer, trans and gender non-conforming people matter? Do trans lives matter? Does life matter?*
>
> –Christina Heatherton, Panel Discussion on Anti-Imperialism[1]

In many ways, my thesis has attempted to tackle the line of inquisition evoked by Christina Heatherton in the quote above by considering the different modes of relationship that are entangled with/in the Banff-Bow Valley. In doing so, I have asked how we can relate to one another and to the non-human world in more supportive and expansive ways that value a diversity of life; to phrase this differently, I have asked how we can practice an anti-colonial politics that refuses to accept the notions of scarcity and possessiveness articulated and enacted by projects of empire, which think of the deaths of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people(s) as acceptable collateral damage in the name of profit.

To answer these questions, I mobilized the concept of colonial entanglement to consider the Banff-Bow Valley from a parallax view. In doing so, I have shown how Indigenous nations like the Îyãhé Nakoda endure. Furthermore, these nations and their modes of relating can offer powerful examples of expansive modes of relationship aligning with, and through, the biological and geological processes of the area.[2] Such modes of relating can prove helpful for not only restoring and revitalizing relationships with buffalo, but with other human and non-human nations

as well. After all, efforts to re-establish relationships with the buffalo through traditions of Indigenous internationalism like the Buffalo Treaty are also efforts to re-establish and (re)new relationships of peaceful interdependence with other nations and political collectivities. Such a Treaty recognizes both how multiple different political communities can live in and be connected to one another through place, yet still retain a sense of autonomy and uniqueness.

In contrast to Indigenous nations and their expansive modes of relating, I have also argued that the Canadian state—along with other imperial projects—is incapable of adopting a politics that challenges imperialism's destructive ways. This is because Project Canada is fundamentally entangled with the expansionist war and genocide that continues to target and break up indigenous life in the name of colonizing regimes of property that cater to capital. Through actions and events like the Buffalo Reintroduction and its reconciliatory discourses, Project Canada and other colonizing regimes show that the most they can do to challenge expansionist modes of relating is deploy of extensive state of nature fictions that seek to dismiss and unknow such violence and breakage—all while subtly delegitimizing Indigenous peoples and their modes of relationship in order to *redeem* colonizing futures. In so doing, these colonizing regimes seek to make and reproduce colonial subjects that materially and affectively continue to invest in the transit and transgression of different corporeal and territorial bodies in pursuit of capital—even if this is ultimately to their own detriment. Again, capitalism holds no allegiances other than to further proliferating profit.

In fact, by offering the Buffalo Reintroduction Project as a progressive effort to reconcile Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations without substantively addressing structural injustices that have resulted in the concentration of the vast majority of wealth into the hands of the ruling class, Project Canada actually prepares its colonial subjects to adopt an explicitly fascist politics. As Walter Benjamin writes, the problem with the liberal concepts of progress is that "[they] recognize

only the progress in the mastery of nature, not the retrogression of society; [as such] it already displays the technocratic features later encountered in Fascism."[3] Although referring to Social Democrats in Germany prior to WWII, such a critique is equally applicable to the notion of progress animating colonizing conceptions of the Buffalo Reintroduction Project. By invoking state of nature fictions to establish a temporal break, dominant discourse surrounding the Project focus on a "boundless, universal, technocratic future, unfolding with the gradual, peaceful and harmonious evolution of society."[4] Max Haiven suggests that this understanding of politics and history plays directly into the hands of fascists who claim that: first, they can bring about the real culmination of progress; and, second, that they can do so by purging the body politic of racial and ideological burdens that are posed as the real cause of oppression.[5] For those non-Indigenous people—especially those racialized as white—who have both received marginal material benefit for buying-into the dispossession of Indigenous peoples, yet who are also feeling the detrimental effects of financial capitalism, projects like the Buffalo Reintroduction's failure to substantively address expansionist modes of relationship underpinning colonizing regimes will no doubt play into the race-baiting, reactionary politics of fascism—which offer white supremacy as it seeks to divide and demarcate the poor and the dispossessed in order to facilitate its own growth financially and territorially. Thus, just as it failed to serve the poor and the dispossessed at the time of its inception, Banff National Park—along with its dominant iterations of Buffalo Reintroduction Project—fail to materially benefit the vast majority of people living in the region.

Taken all together, then, the concept of colonial entanglement has been mobilized to cultivate an analytical and political space where Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, alike, are able to make the double move alluded to in the introduction. On the one hand, this entails (re)turning towards Indigenous nations as political collectivities with legitimate claims to the territories occupied by Canada by aligning with the expansive modes of relationship demonstrated

in their struggles for self-determination. On the other hand, it also means, simultaneously, turning towards Project Canada and its expansionist modes of relationship to actively confront (and destroy) them.

Placed within the Banff-Bow Valley, such a double move ultimately compels those of us seeking to adopt this anti-colonial politics to do at least three things. First, unlike reconciliation's declaration-styled politics that confines and contains Indigenous relations and experiences in delegitimizing ways, this means centring Indigenous voices and experiences by both supporting projects driven and directed by Indigenous peoples on the ground while also carving out spaces for Indigenous law, culture, and ways of knowing otherwise. For non-Indigenous people, this also means being ready to recognize and orient towards these governance systems when such opportunities are presented and not simply defaulting to colonizing regimes when convenient. Second, rather than solely striving to prevent future generations from the violence and breakage, we must also seek retribution for those of past generations. This involves going beyond a mere politics of inclusion and adopting substantive actions that fundamentally seek to challenge and disrupt expansionist modes of relationship by redistributing lands and resources—all while remaining aware of the ways in which our entangled relations may still reiterate colonial domination and its entanglements with white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, and capitalism. Finally, we must also think through how the struggles taking place in the Banff-Bow Valley are connected to others struggles against colonization and imperialism elsewhere. This includes those struggles in other areas of so-called Canada, such as Secwepemc resistance to the Trans Mountain Expansion Project, Wet'suwet'en struggle against Coastal Gas Link, and Mi'kmaq assertion of their right to fish in their waters. But it also includes the struggles of the poor and dispossessed living elsewhere, such as those efforts led by the Black Lives Matter and Abolition movements, the Palestinian Liberation movement, and the Indigenous and class struggles against the attempted coup in Bolivia.

By connecting these movements of resistance against different brutalizing regimes and their entanglements of power, we can begin to make and reproduce an anti-colonial politics that is oriented towards an internationalist framework. Such a politics not only continues the work of past decolonization and liberation efforts while remaining vigilant about how expansionist modes of relationship might manifest themselves within our everyday lives, but it also does so in ways that are attentive to the fact that our different liberatory struggles "are as connected as the brutalizing regimes" we struggle against.[6] In the face of a global pandemic; run-away climate crisis; the sixth mass-extinction event in planetary history; ever-increasing global inequality; the recurrence of mass famine; the spread of war that deliberately targets civilians; and increasing trends towards fascism driven by racial, gendered, and religious authoritarianisms in so-called democratic nation-states; we need to be asking ourselves questions about how we can relate to one another and to the non-human world in more supportive and expansive ways. Once agin, this is quite literally a life-or-death question. As Karuka explains, "there is no alternative. Decolonization, or mass extinction."[7]

Introduction Notes

[1] Michel Foucault, "On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress," in Afterword, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, ed. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

[2] Lisa Monforton, "Wild bison roam Banff National Park for 1st time in more than century," *CBC News*, August 14, 2015, http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/bison-buffalo-banff-national-park-1.3969106

[3] The terms 'buffalo' and 'bison' tend to be used interchangeably to refer to the large mammal that used to freely roam the plains of what has come to be known as "North America." Although 'bison' is represented as the official and scientific name for the animal, 'buffalo' is the preferred term for most Indigenous peoples living in relation to the species. For this reason, this work privileges the latter term.

[4] Plains bison reintroduction," Parks Canada, accessed October, 5, 20202, https://www.pc.gc.ca/en/pn-np/ab/banff/info/gestion-management/bison

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

[9] As Parks Canada explains, the absence of buffalo since the nineteenth century has left a void in "both the ecosystem and in the human communities that depended on them." They add, "for thousands of years, many indigenous nations traveled through what is now Banff National Park, hunting bison and burning forests and meadows to improve habitat quality for bison and other animals." Ibid.

[10] Emphasis added. Monforton, "Wild bison roam Banff National Park."

[11] Jean Dennison, *Colonial Entanglements: Constituting a Twenty-First-Century Osage Nation* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Caroline Press, 2012); Françoise Dussart and Sylvie Poirier, *Entangled Territorialities: Negotiating Indigenous Lands in Australia and Canada* (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2017).

[12] As Dian Million asserts, colonization can be understood as more than simply a relationship of power—for her, it is a "*felt*, affective relationship." By invoking colonial entanglement, I consider the ways in which different relationships are felt by different bodies. This includes those experiences that can be summed up through emotional categorizations as well as those that exceed effability. Here, colonial affect can be more intense and/or less perceptible to one than there is social means to express it, and it can also be both an animating and inhibiting force. Dian Million, *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2014), *46.*

[13] I use the idea of place to refer to all aspects of the entangled processes and relationships that come together to form the contexts with/in which we find ourselves. This includes both the human and non-human beings *as well as* those entities that form bodies of land and water. As Kwagiulth scholar Sarah Hunt states in the public lecture "Justice at the Shoreline: Rethinking Sovereignty through Coastal Wisdom" (2018), there is no separation between Indigenous bodies and lands in their pursuit of freedom from state-imposed systems and colonial injustice. In this paper, I extend Hunts statement to consider the ways in which Indigenous people, buffalo, and the various landscapes that connect them all exist as sovereign "Indigenous bodies" who find themselves entangled with other "non-Indigenous" people with/in the colonial context of Banff. Although I focus specifically on the relationships between different human nations and the buffalo, this conversation does not exclude other plant and animal nations as well as the bodies of land and water that all come together to make up place. For more discussion on notions of place, see also chapter one.

[14] I borrow this idea of sensibilities and sensing-ability from Kelly Aguirre who presented a paper entitled, "Called to Witness: Methodology and the Ethical Imperative of Storytelling in Indigenous

Political Theory Scholarship," at the *Canadian Political Science Association* Conference (Vancouver, BC, 2019).

[15] This definition is heavily influenced by chapter two of Manu Karuka's *Empire's Tracks*. In thinking about expansive modes of relationship, I draw heavily from this chapter's discussion about Indigenous modes of relating and how they compare and contrast to colonial modes. However, in an effort to challenge the ways in which binaries contain and categories in general, and the Indigenous-settler binary in particular, I use expansive modes of relationship to refer to both Indigenous and non-Indigenous modes of relationship that are oriented towards supporting and enhancing life. Such a distinction comes from a politic that seeks to think through and live out ways of thinking and being that do not confine non-Indigenous presence to mere agents of empire, even though this remains an ever-present potential. See Manu Karuka, *Empires Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2019). For discussion on the significance of the Indigenous-settler binary see, Bonita Lawrence & Enakshi, "Decolonizing Antiracism," *Social Justice 32*(4): 120-143; Dean Itsuji Saranillio, "Why Asian settler colonialism matters: a thought piece on critiques, debates, and Indigenous difference," *Settler Colonial Studies,* 3 no. 4, (2013): 280-294; Nadita Sharma & Cynthia Wright, "Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States," *Social Justice* 35 no. 3, 2008: 120-138; Corey Snelgrove, Rita K. Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel, "Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3 n. 2 (2014): 1-32 Partick Wolfe, "Recuperating Binarism: a heretical introduction," *Settler Colonial Studies*, 3 no. 4, 2013: 257-279.

[16] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks.*

[17] J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "'A Structure, Not an Event': Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity." *Lateral* 5 no. 1, (2016), http://csalateral.org/wp/issue/5-1/forum-althumanities-settler-colonialism-enduring-indigeneity-kauanui

[18] Here, I follow Lisa Lowe's understanding of the notion of intimacy as not only indicating close "personal" connections that are often construed as sexual in character but, also, those connections that are less visible and often stretch across vast spatial distances. Lisa Lowe, The Intimacies of Four Continents (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015), 18-19.

[19] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 65.

[20] Joyce Green uses the term "Project Canada" to refer to the state constructrd from the colonies by colonial and then settler elites, evolving but firmly grounded on the original and continuing appropriation of indigenous land and resources, and built on racist and sexist practices that create the forms of privilege that dominate the state today. Joyce Green, "Canaries and the Mines of Citizenship: Indian Women in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 4 (2001): 716.

[21] Jennifer Wakeham, *Taxidermic Signs: Reconstructing Aboriginality* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2008), 205.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Mishana Goeman, *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations,* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013). Emilie Cameron, *Far Off Metal River: Inuit Lands, Settler Stories, and the making of the Contemporary Artic* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2015). In *Mark My Words,* Mishuana Goeman defines (re)mapping as "[t]he labor Native authors and the communities they write within and about undertake, in the simultaneously metaphoric and material capacities of map making, to generate new possibilities" (p. 3). She adds, "[t]he framing of the 're' with parentheses connotes the fact that in (re)mapping, Native [people] employ traditional and new tribal stories as a means of continuation" (p. 3). However, this is not simply about "regaining that which was lost and retiring to an original and pure point in history, but instead understanding the processes

that have defined our current spatialities in order to sustain vibrant Native futures."[23] For Goeman, (re)mapping addresses "the violent atrocities while defining Native futures" (p. 13). Speaking to non-Indigenous efforts to support decolonization, Cameron echoes this double move, recognizing how settlers must both attempt to look beyond colonizing regimes to Indigenous legal-political orders as well as still remaining attentive to the ways in which colonizing violence continues to manifest in different ways.

[24] Cameron, *Far Off Metal Rivers,* 19.

[25] Manu Karuka, Christina Heatherton, and Lara Kiswani, "Anti-imperialism with Manu Karuka, Christina Heatherton, and Lara Kiswani." Red Nation (podcast), November 2019m accessed November 5, 2020. https://soundcloud.com/therednationpod/anti-imperialism-w-manu-karuka

[26] See Chapter 12 in Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Freedom* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017), 216. I recognize that Indigenous pathways toward decolonization will undoubtedly be related-but-different to those pathways taken by non-Indigenous people—especially, white settlers. As Leanne Simpson explains, this is due to the different responsibilities these differently lived relations and felt experiences entail, which may result in some aspects of the former's pathways remaining intentionally opaque and unknowable to the latter.

[27] Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 29.

[28] Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin White Masks: Rejecting a colonial politics of recognition,* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

[29] Million, *Therapeutic Nations.*

[30] Dian Million, "Felt Theory: An Indigenous Feminist Approach to Affect and History," *Wicazo Sa Review* 24 no. 2 (2009), 61.

[31] Ibid, 61.

[32] As Byrd states, "multidirectionality is what creates the possibility for memory and resistance to forge alliances across historical and cultural experiences in opposition to the competitions upon which colonialism relies." Byrd, *Transit of Empire,* 53.

Chapter One Notes

[1] John Borrows, "Foreword," in *Entangled Territorialities: Negotiating Indigenous Lands in Australia and Canada*, ed. Françoise Dussart and Sylvie Poirier (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2017), vii.

[2] Dian Million, *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2014).

[3] Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Freedom* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017), 216.

[4] Manu Karuka, *Empire's Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2019), 205.

[5] Jean-Luc Nancy, *Being Singular Plural* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 4.

[6] For what this means for notions of self-determination, see Joëlle Alice Michaud-Ouellet, "On the Relationship between Vulnerability and Sovereignty in Québécois Settler Self-Determination and the Shift to a Relation Conception of the Self as Treaty Partner" (PhD diss., University of Victoria, 2019).

[7] Looking to prairie ecosystems much like those along the eastern edge of the Banff-Bow Valley, Karuka explains:"[t]he movement of wind and water, of grass species, of massive buffalo herds,

and of groups of people who follow them, are dynamic and interrelated. Modes of relationship theorize dialectics in place." Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 20.

[8] See Umeek (E. Richard Atleo), *Principles of Tsawalk: An Indigenous Approach to Global Crisis* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2011); Lee Maracle, *Memory Serves* (Edmonton, AB: NeWest Press, 2015); John Borrows, *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law* (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2002); Robin Wall Kimmerer, *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge, and the Teachings of Plants* (Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions, 2013); Leanne Simpson, *As We Have Always Done* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota); Sarah Hunt, *Witnessing the Colonialscape: Light the Intimate Fires of Indigenous Legal Pluralism* (PhD diss., Simon Fraser University, 2014); Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin White Masks: Rejecting a colonial politics of recognition,* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2014); Starblanket Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, "Towards a Relational Paradigm—Four points for Consideration: Knowledges, Gender, Land, and Modernity," in *Resurgence and Reconciliation: Indigenous-Settler Relations and Earth Teachings,* ed. Michael Asch, Borrows, J. & Tully, J. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018).

[9] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 20; Starblanket and Stark, "Towards a Relational Paradigm," 175.

[10] Starblanket and Stark, "Towards a Relational Paradigm," 184.

[11] Ibid, 185; Sarah Hunt, "Violence, Law and the Everyday Politics of Recognition," Paper presented at *Comments on Glen Coulthard's "Red Skin, White Masks:" Native American and Indigenous Studies Association*, Washington DC, June 6, 2015.

[12] I follow Leanne Simpson's use of queer and Two Spirit as an umbrella term to refer to Indigenous Two Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, pansexual, transgender, transsexual, queer, questioning, intersex, asexual, and gender-nonconforming people. In explaining the use of Two Spirit, Simpson cites Sarah Hunt who writes: "Two-Spirit is used by some Indigenous people to describe the diverse roles and identities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, trans and/or gender-fluid Indigenous people in North America. At the 1990 Winnipeg gathering of the International Gathering of American Indian and First Nations Gays and Lesbians, 'Two-Spirit' was chosen as a term to move away from the anthropological term 'berdache' in describing Native queer identities and communities. Following this usage, and that of some recent Two-Spirit scholarship, I choose to capitalize this term." Sarah Hunt, "Witnessing the Colonialscape: lighting the intimate fires of Indigenous legal pluralism" (PhD diss., Simon Fraser University, 2014), xv. Simpson notes that the term queer is used to recognize that "not all Indigenous queer people use the term Two Spirit to identify." Simpson, *As We Have Always Done,* 255. I have also chosen to not shorten Two Spirit and Queer to an abbreviation in an effort to not reduce these identities and experiences to abbreviations that so often become additives in our daily discourse.

[13] Starblanket & Stark, "Towards a Relational Paradigm," 175.

[14] Soren C. Larsen and Jay T. Johnson, *Being Together in Place: Indigenous Coexistence in a more than Human world* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, 2017).

[15] As Larsen and Johnson explain, "whether we acknowledge it or not, place convenes our being together, bringing human and nonhuman communities into the shared predicaments of life, livelihood, and land." They add that in doing so, "place has agency. Place is not just a site of forced engagement, but is actively initiating and sustaining coexistence struggle in lands that have been exploited and degraded but that are still claimed by the Indigenous peoples who assert their belonging, guardianship, and sovereignty." Following these scholars, this project assumes that, just as one cannot talk about being without the 'with,' one similarly cannot talk about relationships between one another without also talking about relationships to the place. Soren C. Larsen and Jay T. Johnson, *Being Together in Place*, 1-2.

[16] Starblanket and Stark, "Towards a Relational Paradigm," 175.
[17] "Entanglement," Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, accessed October 9, 2019, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/entanglement, as cited in Françoise Dussart and Sylvie Poirier, "Knowing and Managing the Land: The Conundrum of Coexistence and Entanglment," in *Entangled Territorialities: Negotiating Indigenous Lands in Australia and Canada*, ed. Françoise Dussart and Sylvie Poirier (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2017) 4.
[18] Dussart and Poirier, "Knowing and Managing the Land," 4.
[19] Anne Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkely, CA: University of California Press, 2010), 2.
[20] Borrows, "Foreword," vii.
[21] Here, Borrows claim that 'to be alive is to be entangled' can be reiterated as: to be alive is to be exposed to others and, therefore, vulnerable due to this exposure. Such shared exposure and experience of vulnerability is precisely what Butlers points to through her notion of precariousness, where "[p]recariousness implies living socially, that is, the fact that one's life is always in some sense in the hands of the other. It implies exposure both to those we know and to those we do not know; a dependency on people we know, or barely know, or know not at all." Judith Butler, *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* (New York, NY: Verso, 2010), 14.
[22] Borrows, "Foreword," viii-ix. Jean Dennison, *Colonial Entanglements: Constituting a Twenty-First-Century Osage Nation* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Caroline Press, 2012).
[23] Borrows, "Foreword," ix.
[24] Further echoing this duality, Gina Starblanket and Heidi Stark suggest that our relationships with others possess the "dual potential to function as either empowering or restrictive." Starblanket and Stark, "Towards a Relational Paradigm," 178. This dual potential of entanglement is also evident in the etymological root of the word. Derived from Scandinavian (compare dialectal Swedish *taggla* "to disorder" and Old Norse *þongull* "seaweed") and Prot-Germanic (*thangul,* which is the source of the Frisian *tung*, Dutch *Tang,* and German *Tang* "seaweed") sources, the original sense of the word tangle referred to "seaweed"—as something that entangles (itself, or oars, or fishes, or nets). Here, the restrictive sense of entanglement is emphasized by the root usage of tangle-as-seaweed. But, like the entanglements we find ourselves in, seaweed also possesses a productive potential in that it is both a form of life itself as well as a life-enhancing entanglement of sorts that provides both food and shelter to various aquatic species. Thus, just like seaweed, entanglements can both empower and restrict the individual bodies of flesh, social bodies of knowledge, and bodies politic of the nations caught up within them.
[25] Winona LaDuke, *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life* (Cambridge: South End Press, 1999), 159.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Approaching buffalo from a relational paradigm also can shed light on how difference/alterity can be conceptualized from a relational perspective. Through her conversation with Dubray, LaDuke points out that one cannot simply relate to the individual buffalo; instead, it is about the herd as a whole (159). It is through their relationship to the herd, that the individual buffalo gains unique status. In other words, relationships to others provide the context for a sustained and maintained sense of individuality (Karuka, 30). This is also a core lesson that Dubray feels is critical for understanding Lakota struggles as collective struggles as well. Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*; LaDuke, *All Our Relations*.
[28] As indicated in the introduction, I follow Lisa Lowe's understanding of the notion of intimacy as not only indicating close "personal" connections that are often construed as sexual in character

but, also, those connections that are less visible and often stretch across vast spatial distances. Lisa Lowe, The Intimacies of Four Continents (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015), 18-19.
[29] Million, *Therapeutic Nations.*
[30] LaDuke, *All Our Relations*, 159.
[31] Ibid.
[32] This project's understanding of power and subjectification is indebted to Judith Butler's seminal work on processes of subjectification in *Psychic Life of Power*. For Butler, power, which at first appears as an external force that presses against a subject simultaneously assumes a "psychic form that constitutes the subject's self-identity" (p. 3) Following Foucault, Butler argues that power "is not simply what we oppose but also, in a strong sense, what we depend on for our existence and what we harbor and preserve in the beings that we are." (p. 2) From this perspective, subjectification signifies the paradoxical process whereby one becomes subordinated by the very power that also initiates and sustains their agency. To phrase slightly different, power is simultaneously both oppressive and productive in that it is through subordination that the subject emerges/is produced.

Butler goes on to add that, because the subject's own production relies on its subordination/oppression to power, "no subject emerges without a passionate attachment to those on whom he or she is fundamentally dependent" (P. 7). She continues, "subordination proves central to the becoming of the subject[…] the desire to survive, 'to be,' is a pervasively exploitable desire." In fact, any notion of autonomy or freedom is itself conditioned by subordination—even though this founding subordination or dependency is often rigorously repressed to maintain liberal notions of freedom. However, this is not to say that a subject is fully determined from without. In fact, Butler suggests the subject can never be explained as fully determined by power nor its passionate attachment(s) because power itself relies on the subject to for its own reiteration (p. 14). Here, she uses the term "subject *of* power," suggesting that the "of" connotes both "'belonging to' and the 'wielding' of power;'" For her, "the subject eclipses the conditions of its own emergence; it eclipses power with power" (p. 14). In other words, systems of power not only actively shape subjects through their subordination but, in doing so, are also shaped by subjects. Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997).
[33] A theory of entanglements provides openings to subversive action in many ways. For example, although they may constrain and compel bodies to move and act in certain ways in an effort to reproduce particular relationships, the "temporal lag" of these reiterated relationships enables for subversive acts to exceed and/or alter—that is, *break from*—power's purpose. For more on the "temporal lag" and how this produces a space of subversive action, see the discussion of Homi K. Bhabha's notion of the "third space of hybridity" in chapter three. See also Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004).
[34] Borrows, "Foreword," vii. This includes Indigenous and settler legal-political orders, which are fundamentally entangled—to varying degrees—in place. As many Indigenous scholars have demonstrated, despite attempts to blanket over patterns of Indigenous law emerging from deep connection and relationships with a particular place, colonial legal orders coexist with Indigenous legal-political orders. In fact, as Borrows explains, many of the ceremonies and stories of different nations Indigenous to different places have even been partially incorporated in, and extracted from, these legal systems (p. 4) Nevertheless, these legal-political entanglements wrap around our individual bodies of flesh and the bodies of knowledge produced through different experiences—pulling us physically and mentally into particular positions and directions that affect how we perceive and react to the world around us. See, Borrows, *Recovering Canada*; See also; Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*; Hunt, *Witnessing the Colonialscape*; Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states* (Durham: Duke University Press,

2014); Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*; Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, "Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land," *Theory & Event* 19 no. 4 (2016): Project MUSE.
[35] Dennison, *Colonial Entanglements*, 7.
[36] Katherena Vermette, *The Break*, (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2016).
[37] Vermette, *The Break*, 3.
[38] Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, 200-201.
[39] Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, 201. See also, Mishuana Goeman, "Land is Life: Unsettling Logics of Containment," in *Native Studies Key Words* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2015), 71-89.
[40] Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (New York, NY: Verso, 2006).
[41] Butler, *Frames of War.*
[42] As she explains, "if certain lives do not qualify as lives or are, from the start, not conceivable as lives within certain epistemological frames, then these lives are never lived nor lost in the full sense." Butler, *Frames of War*, 1.
[43] Ibid, xxii.
[44] Marshall Sahlins, *How "Natives" Think: About Captain Cook, for Example,* (Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1995), 163.
[45] Here, the Weberian term refers to the idea that reality can become directly accessible by overcoming certain "obstacles to unbelief," such as myth, magic, and the supernatural. Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age,* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2007), 26.
[46] This establishment of human beings as separate from their environments is clearly evidenced in the ways in which different schools of Western political thought have imagined notions of the self. As Tzvetan Todorov reveals, different Western schools have constantly tended to downplay, obfuscate, and/or deny the positive and fundamental role played by relationships in the construction of notions of the self, which becomes the central political agent in Western liberal theory. Tzvetan Todorov, *Life in common: an essay in general anthropology*, trans. Katherine Golsan and Lucy Golsan (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001). As will be discussed further in chapter three, this has resulted in the Western philosophic-political canon presupposing notions of wholeness and self-sufficiency as essential to political autonomy and agency, which has led notions of a bounded—or buffered—self-existing prior to its relations with others to become a defining feature in the Western political imaginary over the past few centuries. One only needs to consider the works of thinkers, such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacque Rousseau, and Immanuel Kant—amongst others—to see how these canonical thinkers highlight autonomy (whether of persons and/or nation-states) as crucial to state-building projects and their sense of certainty, order, security, happiness, freedom, etc. And, although the last several centuries have seen the category of 'personhood' be interrogated and, consequently, extended to those typically excluded in the past, the underlying logic of exclusion and the separation of human and nature still remains at the heart of Western liberal conceptions of personhood. This will be taken up further in Chapter 3.
[47] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*.
[48] My understanding of colonization and imperialism is influenced by two different works. First, I follow Manu Karuka's use of Amiya Kumar Bagchi, who defines imperialism as "the persistent tendency of mature capitalist state systems to generate violent conflicts." Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 205
[49] Ibid, 65.

[50] As Butler explains, "the generalized condition or precariousness that establishes a certain equality of exposure is denied in favour of a differential distribution of precarity" Butler, *Frames of War*, xxv.
[51] Ibid.
[52] In contrast to the notion of precariousness—which points to the existential feelings of vulnerability that all life experiences on the basis of (co)existence—the notion of precarity signals the fact that different bodies are exposed to different levels of vulnerability due to the specific political, social, and economic conditions that they find themselves in. In other words, although all life is precarious, some lives are more vulnerable due to their particular positionalities and, therefore, are more likely to be injured. Yet—and this is part of Butler's broader claim—rarely is such violence apprehended as such by those in hegemonic positions because the lives of those facing increased precarity are often not understood to be "real" and, therefore, "grievable." Butler, *Frames of War*, xxv.
[53] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 31.
[54] See chapter's two and four for further examples of treaty relations through expansive modes of relationship.
[55] Emilie Cameron, *Far Off Metal River: Inuit Lands, Settler Stories, and the making of the Contemporary Artic* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2015), 17. In (post)colonial discourses, settler colonialism is often used to distinguish between two types of colonies: namely, 'settler colonies' and 'colonies of occupation.' However, the notions of 'settler colonies' and 'colonies of occupation' should be thought of as abstract poles on a continuum rather than precise descriptive categories or paradigms.
[56] Snelgrove, et al., and Kauanui note that the presence of settler colonial studies as a field is often framed as "emerging" field rather than as building on a site of ongoing struggle already critiqued by Indigenous people. Corey Snelgrove, Rita K. Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel, "Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 3 n. 2 (2014): 1-32; J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "A Structure, Not an Event": Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity. *Lateral* 5 no. 1, 2016, http://csalateral.org/wp/issue/5-1/forum-althumanities-settler-colonialism-enduring-indigeneity-kauanui
[57] As Snelgrove et al. note, the journal *Settler Colonial Studies* moved from an open access format to a large academic publishing house (Taylor & Francis) within two years of being established. In addition, this institutionalization has been coupled with a proliferation of academic conferences, workshops, courses, and has also moved beyond academia through blogs, websites, workshops and teach-ins (p. 9). They argue that, although the institutionalization of settler colonial studies as a field (rather than Indigenous studies) is a significant shift in academia, this shift also comes with the risk of displacing, overshadowing, or even masking over Indigenous studies—especially, feminist and queer Indigenous work centering resurgence (p. 9). Although has Veracini rightfully points out how the move away from an open access format demonstrates lack of funding and institutional support and leads to a paywall that separates potential readership (p. 15, note 32), his claim that the observation offered by Snelgrove, et al. is an unfair comment fails to recognize how different power dynamics function to render access to a major publishing house as an unavailable option to most, including many journals centering Indigenous studies. Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel, "Unsettling settler colonialism," 9. Lorenzo Veracini, "Decolonizing Settler Colonialism: Kill the Settler in Him and Save the Man," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 41, no. 1 (2017): 15.

[58] Patrick Wolfe, "Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): 387.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid, 388.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.
[63] For example, Mark Rifkin discusses the notion of "settler common sense" and Adam J. Barker posits that settler colonialism is "a distinct method of colonizing" that involves "the creation and consumption of a whole array of spaces by settler collectivities that claim and transform places through the exercise of their sovereign capacity." Both of these works reveal that the project of settlement itself is not only led by elite ruling classes, and instead must also be taken up and perpetuated by broader populations. See Mark Rifkin, *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2014); Adam J. Barker, "Locating Settler Colonialism," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 12 no. 3 (2012): 1.
[64] Scott L. Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Mark Rifkin, *When Did Indians Become Straight: Kinship, the History of Sexuality, and Native Soveriegnty* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Joyce Green, *Making space for Indigenous feminism* (Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2017); Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*; Hokulani K. Aikau, Maile Arvin, Mishuana Goeman, and Scott Morgensen. "Indigenous Feminisms Roundtable." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies,* 36, no, 3 (2015): 84-106.
[65] Lawrence and Dua, "Decolonizing Antiracism;" Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Ingrid R.G. Waldron, *There's something in the Water: Environmental Racism in Indigenous and Black Communities* (Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, 2018); Tiffany Lethabo-King, *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2019).
[66] Coulthard, *Red Skin White Masks*; Nick Estes, *Our History Is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* (Brooklyn, NY: Verso, 2019); Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*.
[67] Analyzing the historiographical evolution of settler colonialism as both a analytic and a field of thought, Lorenzo Veracini's work suggests that settler colonialism—"and not colonialism elsewhere or the fantasy of an indigenousless encounter"—has been crucial for drawing public attention to the inevitable relationship between "settlement" and "invasion"(p. 325). In fact, he suggests that this increased awareness has led to current trends that seek to address settler colonial power relations by instituting 'reconciliation' processes and issuing 'apologies' to Indigenous peoples in settler states like Canada (p. 325). Yet, recalling Wolfe's emphasis on the productive element of settler colonialism also places these reconciliatory trends under suspicion. In its attempt to eliminate Indigenous nations in order to access their territory, Wolfe (2006) suggests that a settler colonial state tends to also make moves to "recuperate indigeneity in order to express its difference—and, accordingly, its independence—from the mother country" (p. 289). From this perspective, a settler colonial state's identity as a state is inherently unstable because Indigenous people can never be truly eliminated if the state is to represent itself as different and independent. On one hand, this observation points to an element of contradiction that can be exploited in ways that challenge and further break up settler colonial states; yet, on the other hand, it also reveals a certain level of durability and adaptability that allows eliminatory violence to subsist even in so-called 'progressive' discourses. Thus, works like Wolfe and Veracini's show how settler

colonialism as an analytic can provide insight into the ways in which settler colonial states work to break up Indigenous nations, while also offering aid for theorizing how attempts to dismantle and break up these structures may be potentially undermined through settler colonialism's recuperative power. See Lorenzo Veracini, "Settler colonialism: career of a concept," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 41 no. 2 (2013): 1-22; Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native."

[68] Alex Trimble Young, "A Response to 'On Colonial Knowing,'" *Theory & Event* 20 no. 4 (2017): 1039

[69] Patrick Wolfe, "Recuperating Binarism: a heretical introduction," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3 no. 4 (2013): 268-9.

[70] See the Beothuk and how European colonizing violence directly led to their extinction of a peoples.

[71] Stark, "Criminal Empire." Importantly, this is not to say that the horrific experiences of colonial violence are not real nor is it to deny the feelings of terror that transpire as colonial modes of relationship target Indigenous (and, to a less extent, non-Indigenous) bodies for colonial breakage. Countless have suffered great pain and despair as they become caught up with and targeted by imperial war and colonial conquest. After all, colonial modes of relationship are deeply destructive, and these destructive capacities have often resulted in the diminishment of individual and collective capacities—sometimes beyond repair. However, alongside this violence and colonial breakage remains the fact that Indigenous people and their modes of relationship *continue to endure* in ways that seek to support and enhance life.

[72] Stark, "Criminal Empire"; Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native."

[73] Kauanui, "A Structure, Not an Event."

[74] Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein, "Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing," *Theory and Event* 18 no. 4 (2016): n.p. See also Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein "Colonial unknowing and relations of study," *Theory & Event* 20 no. 4 (2017): 1042-1054.

[75] For Vimalassery et al., colonial unknowing refers to a response that "strives to preclude relational modes of analysis and ways of knowing otherwise"—in other words, it is "an epistemological counter-formation" that takes shape "in reaction to the lived relations and incommensurable knowledges." Vimalassery et al., "Colonial unknowing and relations of study," 1042.

[76] Walter D. Mignolo and Wanda Nanibush, "Thinking and Engaging with the Decolonial: A Conversation between Walter D. Mignolo and Wanda Nanibush," *Afterall: The Journal of Art, Context and Enquiry* 45 no. 1 (2018): 26.

[77] Commenting on this, Macoun and Strakosch suggest that settler colonial theory "is primarily a settler framework" that is largely focused on settler intentions to think through colonial relations. Although not a problem in and of itself, they point out that this tends to (re)center settler relations at the expense of Indigenous peoples. Alissa Macoun and Elizabeth Strakosch, "The ethical demands of settler colonial theory," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3 no. 2 (2013): 426433.

[78] Ann Laura Stoler, *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in our Time* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 60.

[79] Vimalassery et al., Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing," n.p.

[80] For example, rendering settler colonialism as distinct from other colonial and imperial imperatives occludes the ways in which settler colonies also rely on entanglements of different racializing regimes—including anti-blackness and anti-Asian racism—to shore up and sustain claims to Indigenous lands. Vimalassery et al., Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing." Echoing these concerns, Snelgrove et al. note that an overemphasis on the Indigenous/settler binary that

emerges out of settler colonialism's structural logic also risks treating it as a meta-structure, which erases both its "contingency and the dynamics that co-constitute racist, patriarchal, homonationalist, ableist, and capitalist settler colonialism." Snelgrove et al., "Unsettling settler colonialism," 9. Furthermore, it also separates and contains the ways in which the political struggles taking place in the Banff-Bow Valley with the buffalo are intimately connected to struggles on the other side of the Rocky Mountains in Secwepemcul'ecw with the salmon as well as other the struggles taking place across imperial borders (see Chapter 4).

[81] Kauanui, "A Structure, Not an Event,"

[82] Ibid.

[83] Vimalassery et al, "Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing;" Vimalassery et al, "Colonial unknowing and relations of study."

[84] Stark, "Criminal Empire."

[85] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks.*

[86] Stoler, *Duress*, 8.

[87] Ibid, 9.

[88] Ibid, 9.

[89] For a discussion on the idea of "breaking out" and "breaking from," see also Butler, *Frames of War*, 11-12.

[90] Echoing this complexity and unpredictability, Stoler suggests that "colonial constraints and imperial dispositions have tenacious presences" that are not always "simply mimetic versions of earlier imperial incarnations;" instead, they manifest and distribute themselves in various—often less obvious—ways. Invoking Albert Einstein's idea of "spooky action at a distance"—which he used to describe how particles become entangled with one another—Dussart and Poirier reiterate this sentiment, suggesting that, as one part of a system comes to systematically affect the state of another, it does so in unpredictable ways—regardless of how far apart the respective parts are. From this perspective, considering colonial entanglements means that no part can any longer be described independently no matter how far apart they are. Once again, we are reminded here that being is always *being with* and that all existence is relational. Yet, Dussart and Poirier also make clear that, despite this connection and correlation, "each thread-entity-agent-world involved in entanglement keeps its identity, relative autonomy, and potentiality." Dussart and Poirier, "Knowing and Managing the Land," 5-6.

[91] Owen Toews, *Stolen City: Racial Capitalism and the Making of Winnipeg* (Winnipeg: ARP, 2018), 54.

[92] Ibid.

[93] Dussart and Poirier, "Knowing and Managing the Land;" Dennison, *Colonial Entanglements*.

[94] Although Dussart and Poirier's work does, at times, engage with the fact that processes of entanglement affect both Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations, their work largely focuses on the effects and affects of entanglements on Indigenous knowledge and land-based practices (p. 4). In many ways, Dennison's focus on the Osage nation replicates a similar analytic focus on Indigenous people within colonial contexts. This anthropological lens proves useful for complicating discussion regarding Indigenous peoples living in Canada, the US, and Australia, but I argue that it fails to fully consider Indigenous nations function as political agents who not only exercise influence over their own lives but also the lives of their colonial counterparts—albeit, in different ways and to different degrees. Dussart and Poirier, "Knowing and Managing the Land;" Dennison, *Colonial Entanglements.*

[95] Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 29.

[96] Slavoj Žižek, *The Parallax View* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006), 4.
[97] Crucial here is a renouncement of all attempts to reduce "one aspect to the other (or, even more so, to enact a kind of 'dialectical synthesis' of opposities)." Žižek, *The Parallax View*, 20.
[98] Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The witness and the archive* (New York: Zone Books, 2003), 12.
[99] Drawing attention to the ways in which non-Indigenous people are affected by as well as affect Indigenous bodies and modes of relationship, however, is not to say that Indigenous people and settlers exert the same amount of pull on the lives of one another nor is it meant to disregard the ways in which colonial differences are lived and felt. Rather, in emphasizing the complexities and unpredictability of entanglements, I take seriously the ways in which Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies exert influence on one another in complex and messy ways. By emphasizing the messiness and unpredictability of entangled relations, it becomes clear that the lived relations and felt experiences of colonial subjects do not always fit neatly into dominant settler colonial narratives. According to such narratives, the only choices available to Indigenous peoples are either to resist or be co-opted all while anti-colonial actions are foreclosed for settlers. In other words, the notion of entanglement enables one's analysis to center a more complex understanding of agency because it takes seriously how Indigenous bodies of flesh, bodies of knowledge, and bodies politic exercise influence on, and are influenced by, their settler counterparts.
[100] Kauanui, "A Structure, Not an Event."
[101] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks.*
[102] Ibid.
[103] Ibid, xii.
[104] Ibid.
[105] As Dussart and Poirier suggest, "whatever is entangled, in a given place and time (context), cannot easily be undone." Dussart and Poirier, "Knowing and Managing the Land," 5.
[106] Williams, *Marxism and Literature,* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1977).
[107] Terry Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction* (New York, NY: Verso, 1991), 48.
[108] Williams, *Marxism and Literature,* 132.
[109] See Mark Rifkin, "Settler States of Feeling: National Belonging and the Erasure of Native American Presence," in Caroline F. Levander and Robert S. Levine's *A Companion to American Literary Studies* (Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 342-355; Eva Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty, Land and Settler Decolonization* (Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, 2016).
[110] Rifkin, "Settler States of Feeling," 342, as cited in Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations,* 19.
[111] Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations,* 36.
[112] Jacqueline Rose, *Sexuality in the Field of Vision* (London: Verso, 1987), 90.
[113] Dian Million, *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2014), *46.*
[114] Million, *Therapeutic Nations,* 46.
[115] Ibid.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Ibid., 49
[118] Ibid., 46-48.
[119] Sarah Hunts discussion of different scales of violence in Hunt, "Violence, Law and the Everyday Politics of Recognition."

[120] Williams, *Marxism and Literature,*129. As Williams explains, structures of feeling are "a kind of feeling and thinking which is indeed social and material" and it is also "embryonic" in the sense that it is not "fully articulate[d]" or yet part of a "defined exchange." Ibid., 131
[121] Rob Nixon, *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011), 2.
[122] Nixon, *Slow Violence,* 2.
[123] Emphasis added, as cited in Avery Gordon, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, 2008), 200.

Chapter Two Notes
[1] Emphasis added. C.B. Macpherson, *Property: Mainstream and critical positions* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), 1.
[2] "Cave and Basin National Historic Site," Parks Canada*,* accessed October, 5, 2020, https://www.pc.gc.ca/en/lhn-nhs/ab/caveandbasin/decouvrir-discover.
[3] Rocky Mountain Outlook, "Banff Cave and Basin book offers, clarity on history of hot springs," *Rocky Mountain Outlook*, Februrary, 15, 2018, https://www.rmotoday.com/mountain-guide/cave-and-basin-book-offers-context-clarity-on-history-of-hot-springs-1572005
[4] "Cave and Basin National Historic Site."
[5] Brenna Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018).
[6] Ibid.
[7] Plains bison reintroduction," Parks Canada*,* accessed October, 5, 20202, https://www.pc.gc.ca/en/pn-np/ab/banff/info/gestion-management/bison
[8] Ibid.
[9] Commenting on their impact, Winona LaDuke explains that "Buffalo determine landscapes. By their sheer numbers, weight, and behaviour, they cultivate the prairie, which is the single largest ecosystem in North America." This same role was also extended to the mountainous regions of the Banff-Bow Valley. Winona LaDuke, *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life* (Cambridge: South End Press, 1999), 143.
[10] Courtney Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies: Reasserting an Indigenous Presence in Banff National Park* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 23.
[11] Ibid.
[12] Ibid, 24.
[13] As cited in Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies,* 24.
[14] Ibid. See also, John Snow, "*These mountains are our sacred places: The story of the Stoney Indians"* (Calgary: Fifth House, 2005).
[15] Snow, *These mountains are our sacred places*, 3.
[16] Ibid 4-5. Such a fact is also demonstrated by other nations living in the Banff-Bow Valley. Echoing Snow, Betty Bastien explains how Siksikaitsitapi (Blackfoot Nation) relations also changed overall with the demise of the Iiniiwa (buffalo): "as these relationships were altered, the traditional responsibilities and alliances between Siksikaitsitapi and Iiniiwa were also changed. The entire Siksikaitsitapi universe was affected[…] One breach affects all other alliances." (18). Similar to the Ĩyãħé Nakoda, the declining populations of the buffalo led the Siksikaitsitapi to also change their patterns of life as they began to travel through the Banff-Bow Valley less frequently (largely due to their increasing containment by and dependency on the newly forming colonial state). Betty Bastien, *Blackfoot Ways of Knowing* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2004).

[17] Manu Karuka, *Empire's Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2019), 23.
[18] As cited in Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies,* 28
[19] Ibid.
[20] Karuka also makes a similar observation regarding the Lakota nation and their understandings of property. Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 60.
[21] Snow, *These mountains are our sacred places*, 6.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid, 7.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid, 4-5.
[26] Ibid, 5.
[27] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 21.
[28] Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies,* 27. See also Snow, *These Mountains Are Our Sacred Places.*
[29] Right away, I want to offer some nuance to this distinction between relational and naturalist ontologies and the corresponding expansive and expansionist modes of relationship they make and reproduce. Although there is a clear "gulf" between the two positions, it is important to note that people are still able to engage with different ontologies to varying degrees. As Asch explains, people are not "uni-ontological" in that they are not limited to the use of a single ontology. See Asch, "Afterword," in *Resurgence and Reconciliation: Indigenous-Settler Relations and Earth Teachings,* ed. Michael Asch, Borrows, J. & Tully, J. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018), 257-258. In moving around and through these different positions, individuals are able to form (at least partial) relationships of compatibility with others, and these relationships bridge what would otherwise be an incommensurable void. For this reason, it is perhaps best to conceptualize different ontological positions as poles on overlapping continuums rather than precise descriptive paradigms. In fact, to ignore the messiness and entangled relationships that different people hold to different ontological positions is to enact a logic of containment, which is itself integral to colonial/naturalist ontologies.
[30] I borrow this term from a number of Indigenous scholars who have used it to describe the logic and character of colonialism in general, and settler colonialism specifically. As Noelani Good Year-Ka'ōpua asserts, "such containment can manifest in geographic forms as reservations or small school spaces, in political forms as legal recognition frameworks that seek to subsume sovereignty within the settler state's domestic laws, and in ideological forms as school curricula that allow a sprinkling of Indigenous history and culture only to maintain its marginality." Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School*, First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 26. See also Starblanket Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, "Towards a Relational Paradigm—Four points for Consideration: Knowledges, Gender, Land, and Modernity," in *Resurgence and Reconciliation: Indigenous-Settler Relations and Earth Teachings,* ed. Michael Asch, Borrows, J. & Tully, J. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018), 182. Mishuana Goeman, "Land as Life: Unsettling the Logics of Containment," in Teves, Smith, and Raheja, *Native Studies Keywords*, 72.
[31] Commenting on this, Michael Asch explains that Western ontological and epistemological frameworks tend to work from the assumption that all things that are alike can be "placed" in the same fixed container, and all things different—but the same with respect to each other—in a separate one. Asch, "Foreword," 258.
[32] Ibid.

[33] Michael Asch notes that what is important here is that such a way of knowing must always begin with a fixed container first; it is only after establishing the containers from which to sort and categorize phenomena that one is able to gain knowledge regarding the relationship between these different phenomena being experienced. Ibid.

[34] This reliance on logics of containment is also echoed by Leroy Little Bear, who suggests that Western colonial epistemological frameworks tend to emphasize linearity, singularness, stasis, and Objectivity. As he explains, notions of linearity enable one to draw clear lines around spatial and temporal phenomena in ways that can then be socially organized along hierarchical terms where value bigger, higher, newer, or faster over small, lower, older, or slower. Singularity and stasis ensure that each container is unique across time and space, which results in a social structure consisting of specialists that can be ranked. Finally, objectivity is a process that relies on physical observation and measurement of that which is observed. As Little Bear explains, objectivity is" an externalization but also an appropriative process. Objectivity results in an emphasis on materialism. Objectivity concerns itself with quantity and not quality. Leroy LittleBear, "Jagged Worldviews Colliding," in *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*, ed. Marie Battiste, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2000), 77–86.

[35] Commenting on Western science, Bastien explains that "scientific inquiry is the pursuit of discerning the knowable qualities of an objectified universe. The rational goal of objectifying observation is to identify the various discrete parts that are assumed to exist and from which understanding and knowledge are derived." Bastien continues: "By identifying the component parts of the universe, or understanding how these parts are interconnected, the knower garners the power to control, manipulate, and predict the movements of people and objects." Bastien, *Blackfoot Ways of Knowing,* 98. Echoing the ways in which expansionist modes of relationship (re)produced the Enlightenment and its project of modernity, Linda Tuhiwai Smith explains how imperialism serves as an integral part of "the development of the modern state, of ideas and of the 'modern 'human person." As she explains:

> 'Discoveries' about and from the 'new 'world 'expanded and challenged ideas the West held about itself. The production of knowledge, new knowledge and transformed 'old ' knowledge, ideas about the nature of knowledge and the validity of specific forms of knowledge, became as much commodities of colonial exploitation as other natural resources (62).

Thus, expansionist modes of relationship often seek to commodify 'new 'discoveries and the knowledge they produced in order to possess such knowledge as property belonging to the cultural archives and bodies of knowledge that make up the "West." In possessing such knowledge, imperial projects are not only able to develop a sense of self through notions of intellectual superiority, but also imagine the possibilities of new worlds of wealth and possessions that can come to be dominated and exploited by their expansionist modes of relationship. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples,* (Second Edition) (Dunedin: Zed Books, 2012).

[36] Asch, "Foreword," 258.

[37] I use apprehend here in a dual sense. To apprehend includes both the act of perceiving and understanding as well as to stop and/or arrest processes and relationships of flux as they take place.

[38] Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein "Colonial unknowing and relations of study," *Theory & Event* 20 no. 4 (2017): 1042.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Karuka, *Empire's* Tracks, 30.

[41] Ibid, 31.

[42] In reflecting on Deloria's Waterlily, Karuka suggests that "remembering means being conscious, a predicate for fulfilling relationships." He adds, that "individual and collective memory are central to Indigenous modes of relationship." However, this means that acts of forgetting create a context where failing to fulfill relationships, which is a defining feature of colonialism according to Karuka, becomes commonplace. Ibid, 24-25.
[43] Ibid, 25-26.
[44] Goeman, "Land as Life," 72.
[45] Brenna Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018), 49.
[46] Ibid, 49.
[47] Rob Nichols, "Theft Is Property! The Recursive Logic of Dispossession," *Political Theory* 46, no. 1 (2018): 3-28.
[48] Emphasis in original. Nichols, "Theft Is Property!" 14.
[49] Vimalassery, Hu Pegues, and Goldstein "Colonial unknowing and relations of study," 1042. Focusing specifically on other forms of colonialism and imperialism, Vimalassery et al suggest that the ignorance evoked by colonial unknowing "endeavours to render unintelligible the entanglements of racialization and colonization, occluding the mutable historicity of colonial structures and attributing finality to events of conquest and dispossession." See Vimalassery et al "Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing," n.p. Although entanglements of colonialism and race are centred in their piece as an attempt to de-center whiteness, the authors also note that processes of unknowing also function along heteropatriarchal, homonationalist, ablest, and capitalist lines. Vimalassery et al, "Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing." Also see, Corey Snelgrove, Rita K. Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel, "Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3 n. 2 (2014): 9.
[50] Patrick Wolfe, "Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006); Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin White Masks: Rejecting a colonial politics of recognition,* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2014); Nick Estes, *Our History Is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* (Brooklyn, NY: Verso, 2019).
[51] For Moreton-Robinson, (heteropatriarchal) whiteness instantiates colonizing and racializing regimes driven by a possessive logic where one demonstrates their whiteness—whether implicitly or explicitly—by claiming possession over the bodies of others. In his examination of what he calls "shareholder whiteness", Manu Karuka echoes Moreton-Robinson by explaining that whiteness, as a form of property, need not only be demonstrated by claiming possession to Black and Brown bodies and lands but "to a more generalized share in the dividends arising from Black [and Brown] suffering" (p. 159). For both thinkers, (heteropatriarchal) whiteness is ontologically premised on the notion of possession, which "occurs through the imposition of one's will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will, thus it is open to being possessed" (Moreton-Robinson, 50). In other words, whiteness does not simply denote a socially constructed racializing category of identity but, rather, a structural position that is rendered along racialized (and gendered) lines. Ibid. Brenna Bhandar echoes both these scholars, pointing out that colonial encounters not only produced the context from which colonial regimes of property that facilitate the flow of capital emerge, but these encounters also made and reproduced various racializing regimes of power that provide the conceptual apparatuses from which justifications for colonial notions of property also emerge. These entanglements of differential devaluation persist to this day, leading Bhandar to argue that legal forms of property ownership and remain bound to a concept of human that is

thoroughly racialized (as well as gendered, sexed, classed, etc.) 4-5. Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous sovereignty* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015); Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*; Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property.*

[52] For texts considering the ways in which women and femme-identifying people become targeted by expansionist modes of relationship, see Audra Simpson, "The State is a Man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the Gender of Settler Sovereignty," *Theory & Event* 19 no. 4 (2016): Project MUSE; Sarah Deer, *The Beginning and End of Rape Culture: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America,* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015); Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and the American Indian genocide* (Cambridge: South End Press, 2005); Silva Federici, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the body and primitive accumulation*, Second edition (Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2014). For texts exploring the intersections between colonization, cis-heteropatriarchy, and heteronormativity more generally, see Joyce Green, *Making space for Indigenous feminism* (Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2017); Hokulani K. Aikau, Maile Arvin, Mishuana Goeman, and Scott Morgensen. "Indigenous Feminisms Roundtable." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies,* 36, no, 3 (2015): 84-106; Leanne Simpson, *As We Have Always Done* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota); Mark Rifkin, *When Did Indians Become Straight: Kinship, the History of Sexuality, and Native Sovereignty* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Scott L. Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Qwo-li Driskill, Chris Finely, Brian Joseph Gilley, and Scott Lauria Morgensen, *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics, and Literature* (Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 2011); Robert Alexander Innes and Kim Anderson, *Indigenous Men and Masculinities: Legacies, identities, regeneration* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2015).

[53] See James W. Daschuk, *Clearing the Plains: Disease, politics of starvation, and the loss of Aboriginal life* (Regina: University of Regina Press, 2013)/

[54] See Jordan T. Camp and Christina Heatherton, *Policing the Planet: Why the Policing Crisis Led to Black Lives Matter* (New York: Verson, 2016); Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, "Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land," *Theory & Event* 19 no. 4 (2016): Project MUSE; Andrew C. Crosby, *Policing Indigenous Movements: Dissent and the Security State* (Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2018).

[55] Tasha Hubbard, "Buffalo Genocide in Nineteenth-Century North America: "Kill, Skin, and Sell," in *Colonial Genocide in Indigenous North America,* ed. Andrew Wolford, Jeff Benvenuto, Alexander Laban Hinton (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014).

[56] As Karuka notes, "Imperialism works through territorialization, circumscribing places with territorial lines, within which imperial states enact monopolies of violence. Territorialization proceeds through terror, inscribing a certain space as a space of violence. Scholars of territory have drawn an etymology for the term not to terra, meaning land or terrain, but to terrēre, to frighten, so that territory and terrorism are profoundly linked in conceptions of imperial sovereignty." Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 32.

[57] Vimalassery et al, "Colonial Unknowing and Relations of Study," 1042.

[58] The North-West refers to the whole area between the Great Lakes and the Rocky Mountains, north of the forty-ninth parallel Owen Toews, *Stolen City: Racial Capitalism and the Making of Winnipeg* (Winnipeg: ARP, 2018), 33. The Banff-Bow Valley is located overlapping the southern-western edge of the North-West.

[59] Doug Owram, *The Promise Eden: The Canadian expansionist movement and the idea of west, 1856-1900* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

[60] Toews, *Stolen City,* 36.

[61] As David Harvey argues, this "put the major capitalist powers on the path of globalism[…] through imperial conquest and inter-imperial rivalry that was to reach its apogee in World War I—the first global war." Harvey, *The Condition of* Postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change (John Wiley & Sons, 1992), 264.
[62] Toews, *Stolen City,* 36.
[63] Ibid..
[64] As Donald Swainson explains, the region become viewed as "a huge extractive resource, designed to provide profiteer the businessman, land for the farmer, and power for Toronto." As cited in Toews, *Stolen City*, 37.
[65] Ibid, 38.
[66] Ibid, 38-39.
[67] Ibid, 36-37.
[68] As cited in Toews, *Stolen City*, 36-37.
[69] Ibid, 34-35. Brenna Bhandar points out that such views are perhaps most famously articulated by John Locke, whose argument that the appropriation and cultivation of land was integral to the progression from a "primitive" modes of relationship to a "civilized' state relying on Indigenous dispossession. Bhandar argues that Locke's work provided the basis upon which European imperialism justified its multiple legal doctrines of terra nullius and discovery in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. See Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property*.
[70] Toews, *Stolen City, 37.*
[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Shelia McManus, *The Line Which Separates: Race Gender, and the Making of the Alberta-Montana Border* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2005).
[74] Cedric J. Robinson, *Black Marxism: The making of the Black radical tradition* (London: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 2.
[75] Racist contempt fuelling the Canadian expansionist agenda often led colonizing forces to purposefully learn little about the existing human geographies in the areas.
[76] Toews, *Stolen City,* 37-38
[77] Ibid, 41.
[78] Ibid, 42.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid, 43.
[81] Ibid, 42.
[82] For years, Wolseley's troops and their civilian allies continuously carried out raids and evictions while raping, assaulting, abducting, and lynching Métis residents of the Red River with impunity. Ibid, 44.
[83] Walter Hildebrant, Dorthy First Rider, Sarah Carter, and Treaty 7 Elders and Tribal Councils, *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty 7* (Montreal: McGill-Quebec's University Press, 1996), 25.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid, 111.
[86] Examples of conflict include the battle along the banks of Oldman River in 1870s. Ibid, 110.
[87] Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies,* 27.
[88] Hildebrant et al. *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty 7,* 117.
[89] Ibid.
[90] Ibid.

[91] Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies,* 31.
[92] For the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations, Treaty 7 was viewed as a means of addressing food shortages created through the void left behind with the destruction of the buffalo herds. See Hildebrant et al. *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty 7,* 120.
[93] As cited in Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies, 30.*
[94] Hildebrant et al. *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty 7,* 127.
[95] Snow, *These Mountains Are Our Sacred Places,* 28.
[96] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks,* 33.
[97] Ibid, 23.
[98] See Hildebrant et al. *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty 7*.
[99] Snow, *These Mountains Are Our Sacred Places,* 30-31.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies,* 28.
[102] Snow, *These Mountains Are Our Sacred Places,* 33. See also Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies,*30.
[103] Goeman, "Land is Life," 80
[104] Ibid.
[105] Nichols, "Theft Is Property!" 11.
[106] Ibid, 14
[107] Ibid, 15.
[108] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 25.
[109] Toews, *Stolen City,* 39.
[110] Ibid, 53.
[111] Ibid, 58-59.
[112] Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive,* 50.
[113] This is echoed by Toews, who explains that "capitalism [and colonialism] depend[…] on racial hierarchies that encourage some working people—usually those who are encouraged to see themselves as white—to align with capitalist in return for a share of the spoils." Toews, *Stolen City,* 18
[114] Ibid, 38.
[115] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*.
[116] Ibid, 34
[117] Ibid, 35
[118] Ibid, 151.
[119] Ibid.
[120] Following Padrón—who invokes Said—Goeman points out how the development of "'scientific' modern mapping—one of geometric, abstract girds—is a development that coincides directly with Europe's war on Indigenous people. As Goeman explains, "the 'invention of America' through the trajectory of cartographic development did not just reflect the Americas as "a purely natural object' but also defined Europe and its colonies." Commenting on the role of mapping in the conquest of the Great Basin Indians, Ned Blackhawk explains, "maps, reports, and journals ultimately carried greater influence than thousands of beaver pelts and horses ferried to market in St. Louis. By producing the knowledge from which conquest could flow, those who extended American claims in the region became agents for the most violent forms of imperialism." Similarly, the mapping of the Banff-Bow Valley by early settler explorers and trappers brought the lands and waters of the Nakoda and other nations into empire and its desire to accumulate capital. For mapping out Indigenous territories enabled colonial regimes to stake out possessive claims that were enacted on the ground by incoming colonial corporations. Goeman, *Mark My Words*, 17-18.

[121] Toews, *Stolen City,* 40.
[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid.
[124] As cited in Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies,* 125.
[125] Snow, *These Mountains Are Our Sacred Places,* 19.
[126] See Julie Cruikshank, *Do Glaciers Listen? Local Knowldege, Colonial Encounters, and Socila Imagination* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005); Andie Diane Palmer, *Maps of Experience: The Anchoring of Land to Story in Secwepemc Discourse* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005); Alexander Wilson, *The Culture of Nature: North American Landscape form Disney to the Exxon Valdez* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1991); William Cronon, *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature* (New York: Norton & Company, 1996); Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory* (New York: Vintage Books, 1996).
[127] Cruikshank, *Do Glaciers Listen?* 2005.
[128] Leslie Bella, *Parks for Profit* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1987), 5
[129] Ibid, 5
[130] Ibid, 8.
[131] Ibid.
[132] Ibid, 10.
[133] Ibid, 11.
[134] Ibid, 12
[135] Ibid.
[136] Ibid.
[137] Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies*, 51.
[138] *Ibid*.
[139] *Ibid*.
[140] Bella, *Parks for Profit,* 14.
[141] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 153.
[142] Ibid.

Chapter Three notes

[1] Margot Francis, *Creative subversions: Whiteness, indigeneity and the national imaginary*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011), 98-99.
[2] Here, I am borrowing the term "state of nature fiction" from Borrow (see Borrows, "Foreword,"). As indicated, I use this term to signal narratives and discourse that attempt to establish ideas of civilization and states emerging from primitive states previous. This are fictions not only in the sense that they are not real and, therefore, a (mis)representation of the real; they are also ficitions in the sense that they create narratives that attempt to *re*-present aspects of reality. Through this re-presentation, which is neither fully true nor fully false, discursive languages and grammars are established that determine what constitutes a particular idea and the action associate with it. Thus, fictions both constitute and are constituted by the material world.
[3] Manu Karuka, *Empires Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2019), 8.
[4] Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks,* (London: Pluto, 2008), 72.
[5] See section on "Logics of elimination" in Chapter One.
[6] Mark Rifkin, "Settler States of Feeling: National Belonging and the Erasure of Native American Presence," in *A Companion to American Literary Studies*, Caroline F. Levander and R. S. Levine, (Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 343.

[7] Ibid, 343.
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] Although speaking about the American context—which emerges as a reactionary project in both its theory and practice since the US, as a republic, emerges in reaction to both British and Indigenous conceptions of sovereignty—I argue that Karuka's notion of countersovereignty can still be largely applied to the Canadian context due to the expansionist modes of relationship this project relies on. As a constitutional monarchy, the Canadian state's conception of sovereignty may not emerge as a reaction in theory since its claim to ultimate authority is imagined as emanating from the divine authority of the Crown. However, in practice, the Canadian state's claims to the Indigenous territories it occupies are very much enacted in reaction to Indigenous nationhood as political collectivities and the expansive modes of relationship these nations tend to embody. This is particularly evident when one considers the physical and discursive strategies and tactics used by the Canadian state as it shifted its relationship with Indigenous nations from an international approach (driving by imperialistic goals and desires) to one based of assimilation and genocide. As will be discussed below, perhaps the most important piece(s) of legislation signaling this shift is the Indian Act and its subsequent amendments, which sought to transform the Canadian state's relationship with Indigenous people in ways that would shore up Project Canada. For more on Canadian conceptions of sovereignty as emanating from the Crown, see: Peter Russell, *Constitutional Odyssey* (North York: University of Toronto Press, 1993); Reginald Whitaker, *A Sovereign Idea: Essays on Canada as a Democratic Community* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992); and David E. Smith, *The Invisible Crown: The First Principles of Canadian Government* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995).
[10] Karuka, *Empires Tracks,* 8.
[11] Ibid.
[12] Bill Ashcroft, *Post-Colonial Transformation* (London: Routledge, 2001).
[13] As many scholars have pointed out, notions of wilderness are never neutral; instead, the discourses and grammars surrounding such concepts emerge from individual and collective bodies of knowledge that are entangled with particular territorial, corporeal, and political bodies. In fact, processes of spatialization more generally can be understood as operations of entangled power relations that reflect more about those materialities and political orientations of the people caught up within these entanglements than it does about the spaces themselves. See William Cronon, "The Trouble with Wilderness: Or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature," *Environmental History* 1 no. 1 (1996): 7. Cruikshank, 2005.
[14] Mark Rifkin, *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 62.
[15] For example, by invoking notions of nature and wilderness exported from European Enlightenment thought, British and Anglo-American forms of imperial domination in the eighteenth century sought to distance themselves from the violence of Spanish conquest that proceeded it. As Carol Pateman and Anuradha Gobin have argued, British parlance, visual art, maps and other discursive performances of power shifted in the eighteenth century from using the term 'conquest' to employing terms like 'settlement' and plantation' as a way of actively disavowing Britain's own brutal practices of genocide and slavery. In contrast to the barbarism and gratuitous violence of Spanish Empire, British and Anglo-American colonization began describing and naming their forms of conquest as settler colonialism, or a form that "implied the alteration of the land only through planting." Anuradha Gobin, "Constructing a Picturesque Landscape: Picturing Sugar Plantations in the Eighteent-Century British West Indies," *Hemispheres: Visual Cultures of*

the Americas 4, no 1(2011): 9. See also Carole Pateman, "The Settler Contract," in *Contract and Domination*, ed. Charels Mills and Carole Pateman (Malden, MA: Polite, 2007), 35-78.

Crucial to this discursive distancing is the particular was in which notions of nature are evoked. For example, Frank B. Wilderson draws attention to the ways in which "clearing" is only ever used as a noun within the Settler/Master/Human's grammatical structure: "*Clearing*, in the Settler/'Savage' relations, has two grammatical structures, one [as] a noun and the other as a verb… But prior to the clearing's fragile infancy, that is before its cinematic legacy as a newborn place name, it laboured not *across* the land as a noun but as a verb *on* the body of the 'Savage.'" Here, Wilderson reveals how, within Anglo discursive regimes—or what he refers to as the "Settler/Master/Human's grammatical structure"—there is an active disavowal of the violence of genocide and slavery in how colonial discourses begin to narrate the formation of places like Canada and the US. By dismissing this second use of words like clearing, British and Anglo-American regimes of empire distance themselves from other imperial projects while, simultaneously, disavowing their own brutalizing practices through the production of their own (white) civility. But crucial to this distancing is representations of nature itself—along with the colonizer's imagined relation to it. Unlike other projects of empire, British and American imperial domination is not interested in warring against those 'savages' living on newly discovered territories; they are only interested in the acquisition of these territories, which quickly becomes emptied out in the settler's mind since these savages and their ways of living will inevitably die off as time moves on. In other words, British and Anglo-American colonialism represents itself as a project of white civility only interested in improving nature through its own civilizing labour. See Frank B. Wilderson III, *Red, White and Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 207.

Here, Wilderson's work helps us to see how notions of nature—as well as a particular grammatical structure more generally—enable colonial states, such as Canada and the US, disavow and unknow the violence of genocide that is foundational to each project of empire. This includes genocide against both Indigenous people as well as Black people and other People of Color, whose physical death and epistemic exclusion is required to uphold categories of Whiteness underpinning British and Anglo-American notions of humanness. As Lethabo-King argues, "For the human to continue to evolve as an unfettered form of self-actualizing (and expanding) form of Whiteness, Black and Indigenous people must die or be transformed into lesser forms of humanity—and, in some cases, become nonhuman altogether" Tiffany Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2019), 20-21. By dismissing and disavowing such violence, these discursive regimes also dismiss and disavow the feelings of terror that are experienced by those bodies who become targeted by such violence and its breakage—including those Indigenous people living in the Banff-Bow Valley. In other words, by positioning themselves as a more civilized form of like colonialism in comparison to Spanish colonialism and its "conquistador humanism," projects of empire that sought to subsume Indigenous territories on Turtle Island within their colonial regimes of property and capitalist modes of relationship produced a particular sense of entitlement that emerged from discourses and grammars of white (Anglo) civility—despite the fact that "conquistador-settler" bodies of knowledge persist not only within British and Anglo-American colonization, but into the contemporary moment.

[16] See Brenna Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018).

[17] Kevin Bruyneel, *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous relations* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 2.

[18] Ibid.
[19] John Borrows, "Foreword," in *Entangled Territorialities: Negotiating Indigenous Lands in Australia and Canada*, ed. Françoise Dussart and Sylvie Poirier (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2017), vii.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Roy Harvey Pearce, *Sagavism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).
[22] Bruyneel, *The Third Space of Sovereignty*, 8.
[23] Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property*, 168.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).
[27] Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, xxiii
[28] As Byrd shows, distinctions between nature—which she refers to as a state of enchantment—and colonizing states of (dis)possession have long served to "first exalt the subjectivity of European nationalism and then project it into lands emptied of any subjectivity except the will of the European imperialist" (22). Drawing on Sunera Thobani's notion of enchantment here—which explains how exaltation provides ontological coherence and cohesion to the European subject and its imperial projects—Byrd argues that it is the colonizer's exalted presence within Western historiography that "inaugurates[…] the state of [dis]possession dependent on British law to interpellate the exalted subject as the white [masculine] possessing subject" (22). In other words, in addition to drawing on notions of nature as a constitutive outside/a priori from which colonial states of (dis)possession emerge as bounded entities, state of nature fictions also make and reproduce exalted subjects who buy into colonizing regimes. Yet, she also emphasizes that the transit of such regimes premised on the dispossession also necessitates the production of those deemed to be irrational and, therefore, 'primitive' and/or 'savage.' Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, 22.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Karuka, *Empires Tracks*, 174.
[31] Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, xix.
[32] In fact, such deviations have led to suggestions that the racist and gendered tropes of Indigeneity actually say more about colonizing regimes—along with the lives and relationships of those embodying their expansionist modes of relationship—than they do about Indigenous peoples. Bruyneel, *The Third Space of Sovereignty*, 8. o
[33] In fact, such discourses extend back to the work of Aristotle, who sought to justify slavery in Ancient Greek societies by arguing that those deemed to be closer to nature were naturally inferior and in need of domination. Owen Toews, *Stolen City: Racial Capitalism and the Making of Winnipeg* (Winnipeg: ARP, 2018), 33.
[34] Sherene Razack, *Dying from Improvement: Inquests and Inquiries into Indigenous Deaths in Custody*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press (2015), 6.
[35] Taken together, tropes of Indigeneity articulate state of nature fictions that represent Indigenous nations as struggling to survive in the face of an "advanced people" due to their "primitive social and political orders." Consequently, these nation negotiated treaties for the promises of civilization offered by a colonizing state who, in return, solidified its claim to Indigenous territories. Razack, *Dying from Improvement,* 4.
[36] Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, xxiv

[37] Rifkin, “Settler common sense," 325.
[38] *Ibid.*
[39] Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, xxiii
[40] Ibid, xx.
[41] Ibid, 38.
[42] Ibid, 6.
[43] Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched Of The Earth,* (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 6.
[44] Ibid, 6-7.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture,* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 55.
[47] Homi K. Bhabha, “Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817,” *Critical Inquiry* 12 no. 1 (1985): 144-165.
[48] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 55.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid. 2.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid, 60.
[53] Ibid, 61.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks,* 72.
[56] Razack, “Dying from Improvement,” 6.
[57] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture,* 62.
[58] Ibid, 64
[59] Ibid.
[60] In fact, just like colonizing regimes, colonial subjects caught up within colonizing regimes seeking to replace Indigenous nations and their modes of relationship are confronted by what Heidi Stark calls the paradox of settler colonialism: in attempting to assert their own superiority, the colonizing subject must seek to participate in the violent elimination and assimilation of Indigenous peoples whose very presence is simultaneously required to assert the formers superiority. Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, “Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land,” *Theory & Event* 19 no. 4 (2016): Project MUSE.
[61] Razack, *Dying from Improvement*, 6.
[62] Karuka, *Empires Tracks*, 174.
[63] Ibid, 173.
[64] Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), 2.
[65] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture,* 73
[66] Ibid, 88-89.
[67] Homi K. Bhabha, “DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation,” in *Nation and Narration,* ed. Homi K. Bhabha (London: Routledge, 199), 36.
[68] Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, 52.
[69] Ibid, 53.
[70] Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*.
[71] Bruyneel, *The Third Space of Sovereignty*.
[72] Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, 53.
[73] Ibid.

[74] Within Western epistemology, sight is historically privileged as the primary medium through which experience can be gained. As a result, verification of one's experience often becomes as a question of "line of sight" in that sight possesses the characteristic of connecting a subject (the witness) to the object of experience (the event). This question of "line of sight" is deeply rooted in Western epistemological assumptions that first emerge out of Cartesian philosophy and the birth of modern science. For example, in *Infancy and History*, Agamben argues that Descartes and Modern science elevate sight and sensory experience by severing the relation between experience and imagination. Specifically, through Descartes' mind-body dualism, *ego cogito*—"I think"—assumes the function of solely determining intelligence, which had been previously open to fantasy as well. This transition is signaled by the fact that the meaning attached to *cogitare*—"thinking"—slowly shifts from referring to discourses of imagination to acts of intelligence. Thus, unlike previous eras, where imagination and fantasy were understood as an intermediary between the sensible form and potential intellect, modern Western epistemology understands the thinking subject and its relation to the corporeal world—the relation between *res cognitans* and *res extensa*— as not requiring any intermediation. In fact, intelligible experience and knowledges become dominated those perceived to be directly experienced, which specifically privileges sight. Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The witness and the archive* (Homo sacer III), (New York: Zone Books, 2003), 24-25.

Following Descartes and modern science, Western epistemological frameworks have produced particular understandings of witnessing where sight is privileged as the primary medium of experience. Yet, this privileging of sight sets up a specific spatial and temporal relationship between the subject and object where the subject must have uninterrupted access to object in question. In other words, proximity and sight become crucial to stabilize truth.[74] From this perspective, a witness' testimony only gains validity if it is first established that their relationship to the event was uninterrupted. As Gaertner state: "[i]t is not so much that 'seeing is believing" within dominant Western epistemological frameworks "as much as *seeing sets up the terms for believing*" (139). Thus, the proper witness is always the (eye)witness within dominant Western epistemologies whose "line of sight" to an event is uninterrupted. David Gaertner, "'Aboriginal Principles of Witnessing' and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada," in *Arts of Engagement: Taking Aesthetic Action In and Beyond the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, ed. Dylan Robinson and Keavy Martin (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2016).

[75] Dian Million, "Felt Theory: An Indigenous Feminist Approach to Affect and History," *Wicazo Sa Review* 24 no. 2, 2009: 61.

[76] Ibid.

[77] As Byrd states, "multidirectionality is what creates the possibility for memory and resistance to forge alliances historical and cultural experiences in opposition to the competitions upon which colonialism relies." Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, 53.

[78] Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property*, 158-159.

[79] Tyler A. Shipley, *Canada in the World: Settler Capitalism and the Colonial Imagination* (Black Point: Fernwood Publishing, 2020), 53.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property*, 159.

[82] Patrick Wolfe notes that "as opposed to enslaved people, whose reproduction augmented their owner's weather, Indigenous people obstructed settlers' access to land, so their [population] increase was counterproductive." In contrast to Black peoples inclusive taxonomy, which worked according to the "one-drop" rule, Indigenous racial classifications were restrictively regulated by

blood quantum, which actively sought to eliminate those deemed "half-breeds." Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," 387-388.

[83] Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property*, 168.

[84] Rifkin, "Settler common sense," 325.

[85] This clause was first introduced through the Gradual Enfranchisement Act, which was also accompanied with a number of others sexist and patriarchal statutes, including: denying women the right to vote in band council elections until 1951, revoking band membership from women (and their children) who married Indigenous men in others bands, and more. Bonita Lawrence, "Gender, Race, and the regulation of Native Identity in Canda and the United States: An Overview," *Hypatia* 18 no. 2 (2009): 25.

[86] Lawrence, "Gender, Race, and the regulation of Native Identity," 25. Although nations like the Ĩyãħé Nakoda lived in patriarchal societies—in that, women married into their husband's extended families—women held equally important and respected positions as well as held knowledge that was considered extremely valuable. John Snow, "*These mountains are our sacred places: The story of the Stoney Indians"* (Calgary: Fifth House, 2005), xii.

[87] Commenting on the affective intensities of sexual assault within Indigenous communities, Dian Million suggests that "within the actual embodied physical violation [of rape], there is an affective disintegration" (37). For the individual experiencing harm, acts of rape not only physically affect—and break up—the body, but they also constitute an action that wreaks havoc on one's entire being causing emotional, mental, and spiritual breakage. But these affective intensities are never solely contained to the survivors body alone. Discussing sexual violence's impact on Indigenous families and nations, legal scholar Sarah Deer asks her readers: "What crime, other than murder, strikes at the hearts of its citizens more deeply than rape? Sexual violence impinges on our spiritual selves, creating emotional wounds that fester and infect larger wells of community trauma" (xxii). Here, Deer directly connects the violation of the bodily sovereignty of Indigenous people to the violation of the sovereignties of their nations. Echoing this, Dian Million suggests that "[r]ape interrupts and dissolves the ontological presence of person *and* community, their desire to be, to go on, to endure, to have integrity. Rape strikes fear in the relations that make community" (37-38). Million adds that this is particularly the case for Indigenous women, girls and queer and Two-Spirit people, whose bodies not only signify Indigenous political alterity to colonialism's heteropatriarchal orders but also invoke notions of motherhood that are directly implicated in "the reproductive powers of the nation to reproduce itself, whether through childbearing, parenting, or its spirit to endure and go on [that is] central to its sense of well-being" (38).

Yet, this gendered pattern of violence is so often silenced and made invisible by the state and settler populations. As less valuable and more violable—that is as bodies that can be broken and violated through gendered and sexual violence—Simpson argue that Indigenous women and girls essentially become "unrapeable" due to their perceived inhumanity and, therefore, highly rapeable with impunity. For her, the bodies of Indigenous women were/are to the settler eye like Indigenous lands: resources and matter to be "extracted from, used, sullied, taken from, over and over again." As such, sexual and gender violence targeting Indigenous women, girls, queer, and Two-Spirit people cannot constitute actual violence because such violence risks tacitly drawing attention to the alternative political orders represented by these people and their bodies, which further threatens an already-always fragile colonial state and its efforts to secure Indigenous lands. Even when such violence is occasionally recognized, it can only ever be recognized as a crime—for as a crime, "it appears to have no context, no structure animating it, no materiality besides legal transgression." For this reasons, Dian Million argues that sexual and gender violence ought to be understood as the "abject heart" of colonialism in that such violence plays crucial role alongside a

number of strategies and tactics enacted in the shadows and on the margins to break up Indigenous ways of life and ensure settler access to land (177). See Dian Million, *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2014); Sarah Deer, *The Beginning and End of Rape Culture: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America,* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015); Audra Simpson, "The State is a Man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the Gender of Settler Sovereignty," *Theory & Event* 19 no. 4 (2016): Project MUSE.

[88] Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies,* 28.

[89] Ibid. Within a decade of signing, the McDougalls, the NWMP, and newly-appointed Indian agents all worked together to physically confine the Ĩyãħé Nakoda to the reserve through a network of colonizing policies. For example, Methodist missionaries George McDougall and his son John set up a mission the Banff-Bow Valley area in 1873 and were motivated to "improve" the lives of the local peoples. Having tried to convince the Nakoda peoples for years to give up their subsistence land-use practices, Mason argues that John McDougall, in his role as interpreter, held a vested interest in getting the Nakoda to sign Treaty 7. Nakoda elder Archie Daniels explicates: "It is thought that McDougall voiced his own ideas, not those of the Stoney" during treaty negotiations. Furthermore, operating as a quasi-corporation contracted out by the colonial state, the McDougalls not only attempted to "civilize the Indian"—and, in the process, satiate their desire to accumulate souls for the church—but they also operated in conjunction with the state's military and developmental agenda by rendering the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other Indigenous nations as racially inferior populations devoid of any political, economic, and moral grounding. In 1874, the Canadian state sought to extend the campaign of "White terror" that it had unleashed in the Red River region westward by sending a contingent of the newly-minted militarized NWMP to places like the Banff-Bow Valley. Here, the police force was meant to meet up with and support Methodist missionaries who had arrived in the area in 1873. As agents of the state, both the Mounties and missionaries—and, later, Indian agents—were some of the first to settle in the area and often worked together to facilitate the White supremacist goals of Project Canada by pressuring and coercing the Ĩyãħé Nakoda and other nations who they deemed to be racially inferior. This included the signing of Treaty 7, which—in turn—led to the further creation and establishment of White supremacist policies meant to terrorize and break up Indigenous nations. Although Canadian frontier violence takes on multiple, unique form reflecting the distinct features and nations living in different areas, Canadian processes of colonization hold just as much of a propensity for colonial breakage and genocide as its counterpart to the south. See also, Snow, "*These mountains are our sacred places";* Walter Hildebrant, Dorthy First Rider, Sarah Carter, and Treaty 7 Elders and Tribal Councils, *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty 7* (Montreal: McGill-Quebec's University Press, 1996).

[90] Stark, "Criminal Empire."

[91] Ibid.

[92] As Tobias contends, "school attendance was of vital concern for government, for education of the Indian child was the keystone of the 'civilizing' process the reserve was supposed to perform." John L. Tobias, "Protection, Civilization, Assimilation: An Outline History of Canada's Indian Policy," in *As Long as the Sun Shines and the Water Flows: A Reader in Canadian Native Studies,* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1983), 48.

[93] Stark, "Criminal Empire."

[94] Harold Cardinal, *The Unjust Society: The Tradgey of Canada's Indians*, (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1999), 37.

[95] Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History (*Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997), 32.

[96] Ibid, 31.
[97] Karuka, *Empires Tracks*, 169.
[98] As cited in Karuka, *Empires Tracks*, 180.
[99] Ibid, 169.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid.
[102] Francis, *Creative subversions,* 100.
[103] Patricia Jansen, *Wild Things: Nature, Culture, and Tourism in Ontario, 1790-1914.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995, 105.
[104] Karuka, *Empires Tracks*, 169.
[105] As cited in Theodore Binnema & Melanie Niemi, "'Let the line be drawn now': Wilderness, conservation, and the exclusion of aboriginal people from Banff national park in Canada," *Environmental History,* 11 no. 4 (2006): 727.
[106] Alexander Morris, *The Treaties of Canada with the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, Including the Negotiations on which They were Based, and Other Information Relating thereto* (Toronto, Canada: Belfords, Clarke & Co., 1880), 303, as cited in Binnema & Neimi, "Let the line be drawn now," 726-727.
[107] Ibid, 729.
[108] Ibid.
[109] As early as 1847 a sport hunter wrote of his horror when his Cree guide began to butcher an animal before the animal had actually died. *Ibid.*
[110] Ibid, 730.
[111] Ibid, 731.
[112] Francis, *Creative subversions,* 105-106.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Ibid, 100.
[116] Bella, *Parks for Profit*, 24.
[117] Francis, *Creative subversions*, 100.
[118] Ibid.
[119] Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies*, 89.
[120] Francis, *Creative subversions,* 101.
[121] Ibid.
[122] Ibid, 102.
[123] Francis, *Creative subversions,* 96.
[124] Jansen, *Wild Things.*
[125] Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, 8.
[126] Francis, *Creative subversions,* 97.
[127] Ibid.
[128] Mason, *Spirit of the Rockies*, 78.
[129] Ibid, 96.
[130] Ibid.
[131] Francis, *Creative subversions*, 99-100.
[132] Ibid.
[133] Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies*, 100.
[134] Ibid.
[135] Ibid.

[136] As cited in bell hooks, "Eating the other: Desire and resistance," *Black Looks: Race and Representation,* (Boston: South End Press, 1992), 367.
[137] hooks, "Eating the other," 367.
[138] Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies*, 110.
[139] Ibid.
[140] Ibid.118
[141] Ibid.
[142] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 88-89.
[143] Ibid.
[144] Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies*, 93.
[145] Ibid, 123.
[146] Ibid, 125.
[147] Ibid, 122. This included powwows and sporting events as well as other ceremony and diplomatic meetings.
[148] Ibid, 121.
[149] As Kelm states, "Aboriginal people used these moments of encounter to raise awareness of their cultures, their histories, and their current concerns." As cited in Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies*, 121.
[150] Ibid.
[151] As cited in Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies*, 123.
[152] Ibid.

Chapter Four Notes

[1] As cited in Winona LaDuke, *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life* (Cambridge: South End Press, 1999), 160.
[2] Manu Karuka, *Empires Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2019).
[3] Archaeological digs in the Banff-Bow Valley show that humans have had relationships with buffalo for thousands of years. "Pledge to Restore Buffalo unites First Nations of North America," *National Geographic*, August 18, 2015: https://blog.nationalgeographic.org/2015/08/18/pledge-to-restore-wild-buffalo-unites-first-nations-of-north-america/
[4] Karuka, *Empires Tracks* 32.
[5] Focusing specifically on the US context, she argues that collusion between the colonial armies and governments claiming Indigenous territories as their own and the hide hunters seeking profit led to an indiscriminate killing of buffalo—all in an effort to profit through the destruction of Indigenous life. Tasha Hubbard, "Buffalo Genocide in Nineteenth-Century North America: "Kill, Skin, and Sell," in *Colonial Genocide in Indigenous North America,* ed. Andrew Wolford, Jeff Benvenuto, Alexander Laban Hinton (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 295. This deliberate attempt to *break up* and *break from* Indigenous modes of relationship is also echoed by Lakota members interviewed in Winnona LaDuke's work. Seeing the buffalo as a protector who took a frontline position in the war against Indigenous genocide, LaDuke suggests that "many native people view the historic buffalo slaughter as the time when the buffalo relatives, the older brothers, stood up and took the killing intended for the younger brothers, the Native peoples." Like Hubbard, LaDuke contextualizes buffalo genocide as an example of not only a colonial war on nature but, also, as a war that is intimately and deliberately connected to Indigenous peoples who share a kinship relation with the buffalo being targeted for death. For her, buffalo genocide is "a war on the psyche, a war on the soul." LaDuke, *All Our Relations*, 149.

[6] Snow explicitly cites the slaughter of buffalo in the United States as a significant cause of the disappearance of the animal from the Banff-Bow Valley. John Snow, "*These mountains are our sacred places: The story of the Stoney Indians"* (Calgary: Fifth House, 2005), 59.
[7] Karuka, *Empires Tracks,* 31.
[8] Here, one can only speculate why the Canadian state decided to reintroduce the buffalo at this point as opposed to years prior. In many ways, this decision could have been due to new knowledge and understandings about the buffalo and/or technological innovations that would enable such a project to be successful. On a more insidious note, however, perhaps the state felt that a century and a half absence was the necessary amount of time to enable the processes of enclosure and logics of containment underpinning the original colonial destruction the buffalo to congeal in ways that render the presence of buffalo no longer a threat to expansionist modes of relationship in the Valley. This and the fact that the reintroduction date also falls on the 150th birthday of Canada no doubt gives the state confidence in its ability to frame the project in nation building terms.
[9] Lisa Monforton, "Wild bison roam Banff National Park for 1st time in more than century," *CBC News*, August 14, 2015, http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/bison-buffalo-banff-national-park-1.3969106.
[10] Sarah Rieger, "Bison turn up bones of ancestors, old wallowing pots in return to Banff 140 years ter," *CBC News,* February 11 2020, https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/banff-bison-reintroduction-project-1.5458896
[11] In one instance, buffalo hooves even turned up soil to reveal the bones of one of their ancestors who had trodden the same land more than 150 years ago. Ibid.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Kacey Deamer, Bison Reintroduction to Canadian Wild after century of conservation efforts, *Live Science,* February 8, 2017. https://www.livescience.com/57812-bison-reintroduced-into-wild-in-canada.html
[14] Monforton, "Wild bison roam Banff National Park for 1st time in more than century."
[15] Ibid.
[16] The Treaty initially brought together members of the Blackfoot Nation, Blood Tribe, Siksika Nation, Piikani Nation, the Assiniboine and Gros Venter Tribes of Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of Fort Peck Indian Reservation, the Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Indian Reservation, and the Tsuu T'ina Nation. As of June 2020, the Treaty has 25 signatories. "Pledge to Restore Buffalo unites First Nations of North America."
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Monforton, "Wild bison roam Banff National Park for 1st time in more than century,"
[20] "Plains bison reintroduction."
[21] *Ibid.*
[22] See note 6 in introduction.
[23] "Plains bison reintroduction."
[24] See William Cronon, "The Trouble with Wilderness: Or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature," *Environmental History* 1 no. 1 (1996).
[25] Cronon, "The Trouble with Wilderness," 13.
[26] "Plains bison reintroduction."
[27] Mark Rifkin, *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 64.

[28] As well as the on-the-ground logistics that is open to both Indigenous and settlers. "Plains bison reintroduction."
[29] Charlotte Coté, *Spirits of our Whaling Ancestors: Revitalizing Makah & Nuu-chah-nulth Traditions,* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2010), 158.
[30] *Ibid.,* 161.
[31] Margot Francis, *Creative subversions: Whiteness, indigeneity and the national imaginary*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011), 100.
[32] The Eleanor Luxton Foundation was one of the primary groups advocating for the reintroduction of the bison. Not only is the organization connected to both the McDougall and the Luxton Families, but one of its Trustees—Locke, who is quoted at the beginning of this paper—is a direct descendant of the McDougall family. Mason, *Spirits of the Rockies*, 95.
[33] "Plains bison reintroduction."
[34] Ibid.
[35] Sarah Rieger, "Bison destroyed after wandering outside of Banff National Park," *CBC News,* August 17, 2018. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/bison-killed-banff-1.4790286
[36] "Plains bison reintroduction."
[37] Such is the case in Yellowstone National Park, where a fear that buffalo would infect cattle with brucellosis is a central driving force behind continued buffalo killings. LaDuke, *All Our Relations,* 151-152.
[38] Hubbard, "Buffalo Genocide in Nineteenth-Century North America," 293.
[39] LaDuke, *All Our Relations,* 149.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 31.
[42] Matt James, "A Carnival of Truth? Knowledge, Ignorance and the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission," *The International Journal of Transitional Justice* 6 (2012): 3.
[43] Naomi Angel, "Before Truth: The Labors of Testimony and the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission," *Culture, Theory and Critique* 53 (2012): 200
[44] Ibid. It is estimated that about 6,000 children died in IRS.
[45] David B. MacDonald, *The Sleeping Giant Awakens: Genocide, Indian Residential Schools, and the Challenge of Conciliation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019); Gina Mowatt, A brief history of 19th-20th century genocidal Indian education in British Columbia and oral history of Gitxsan resistance and resurgence" (PhD diss., University of Victoria, 2019); Tamara Starblanket, *Suffer the Little Children: genocide, indigenous nations, and the Canadian state* (Atlanta: Clarity Press, 2018). The development and implementation of this school system arose from the recognition that removing Indigenous children from their families and communities enabled the state to uproot, disrupt, and break up the transmission of Indigenous cultures, languages, and ways of life. This is exemplified by Sir John A. Macdonald's defense of IRS to the House of Commons in 1883, where he argues that:

> It has been strongly pressed on myself […] that Indian Children should be withdrawn as much as possible from the parental influence, and the only way to do that would be to put them in central training industrial schools where they will acquire the habits and modes of that of white men.

Here, Macdonald clearly articulates a colonizing desire entangled with white supremacy and heteropatriarchy to destroy and replace Indigenous modes of relationship with 'the habits and modes of white men' by separating Indigenous children from their families and communities. However, the IRS system did not only serve to facilitate Canada's white supremacist desires to break up and subjugate Indigenous nations, which were deemed to be racially and culturally

inferior; in stealing Indigenous children from their nations, IRS also served to open up Indigenous territories to the further expansion of colonizing states of (dis)possession. By confining and containing Indigenous children to the space of the residential school, IRS also functioned to break up Indigenous resistance by attacking the bodies, minds, and spirits of the next generation held in captive—all while striking at the heart of the families these children were separated from. Although he does not name it directly, when one considers Macdonald's words above alongside his expressed interest in securing Canada's claim to the continent through a colonizing regime of private property catering to capitalism (as discussed in chapter two), it becomes clear that the IRS system functioned as part of the colonizing infrastructure that sought to replace Indigenous nations and their modes of relationship with states of (dis)possession that would favor a white, male, propertied class. In other words, the breaking up of Indigenous ways of life through IRS was deemed necessary to not only subsume what remained of a supposedly savage population into the Canadian nation-state, but also to shore up colonizing regimes by further opening up Indigenous territories. Thus, when Duncan Campbell Scott famously claimed that the intent of residential schools was to "kill the Indian in the child," his genocidal sentiment cannot be separated from the expansionist modes of relationship that continue to seek out ways to access Indigenous lands and bodies for exploitation. See Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *A Knock on the Door: The Essential History of Residential Schools*, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2016), 5.

[46] Acts of resistance included practices ranging from families protecting their children from state agents to Indigenous children banning together in solidarity while at such institutions. Although this resistance to IRS and the Canadian state may not be as noticeable and intense as the ways in which colonizing regimes pressed on Indigenous nations through the IRS system, such entanglements of persistence and resistance are equally important to recognize.

[47] James, "A Carnival of Truth?" 4.

[48] As Dian Million reveals, feminist activism in the 80s—which ultimately led to the creation of "domestic abuse" as a new category of criminality—produced a new epistemological order that enabled a series of new languages and practices around trauma and healing to emerge. Tracing this shift in domestic violence law that brought forward the gendered violence that was previously left "behind closed doors," Million reveals how survivors were able to link Indigenous issues to domestic abuse activism by invoking the language of trauma to reveal the impact and effects of residential schools on individuals (88). Whereas Indigenous issues had been represented in terms of anomie in the past—which framed the poor socio-economic conditions faced by Indigenous peoples as a natural outcome of their racially and culturally inferior status—Trauma discourses granted Indigenous communities with the rhetorical tools necessary to challenge past anomic discourses by framing their present pain in intergenerational terms emerging from imposed colonizing policy (92). Furthermore, these new concepts not only gave survivors and their families a new language, "but an actual set of practices that could [a]ffect positive change" (96). As Million suggests, in addition to challenging anomic discourses, trauma as a discourse also attaches itself to practices of self-disclosure, which allowed individuals, "often for the first time, to articulate key issues in their lives and in Native communities" (93). In this sense, the activity of disclosure itself became a powerful site of triumph for Indigenous peoples who "through their own report have made many inroads towards 'healing'" (102). Much like the publicizing of domestic abuse, then, residential school survivors began to vocally disclose their lived experiences through litigation and public hearings and, by doing so, authorized discourses of trauma and healing in ways that challenged prior racist assumptions. This ultimately put pressure the Canadian federal government to officially address its role in the IRS system. Dian Million, *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2014).

[49] Glen Coulthard argues, the efforts of survivors and their families were emboldened by the heightened political climate that transpired in the wake of Indigenous opposition to the Meech Lake Accord and the confrontation between the Canadian military and Kanien'kéha:ka warriors at Oka. Glen Coulthard, "#Idle No More in historical context," in *The Winter We Danced: Voices from the Past, the Future, and the Idle No More Movement,* ed. by The Kino-nda-niimi Collective (Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2014). Matt James has also suggested that it is within this fraught context that the Canadian federal government established the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP), which included a number of specific calls for an official apology and inquiry into the IRS system. As both authors show, these often highly publicized acts of resistance against the Canadian state and its expansionist modes of relationship support and enhanced calls for substantive actions regarding the impacts of IRS for survivors. Matt James, "Narrative Robustness, Post-Apology Conduct, and Canada's 1998 and 2008 Residential Schools Apologies," in *The Palgrave Handbook of State-sponsord History after 1945,* ed. Berber Bevernage and Nico Wouters (UK: Palgrave Macmillan, [2018]), n.p.

[50] Angel, "Before Truth," 201-202.

[51] Matt James, "Narrative Robustness, Post-Apology Conduct, and Canada's 1998 and 2008 Residential Schools Apologies," in *The Palgrave Handbook of State-sponsored History after 1945,* ed. Berber Bevernage and Nico Wouters (UK: Palgrave Macmillan, [2018]), n.p.

[52] *Ibid*.

[53] "Residential Schools Settlement: Official Court Notice," Residential School Settlement, accessed March 15, 2008, http://www.residentialschoolsettlement.ca/settlement.html. Largely in response to residential school survivor activism's success in authorizing trauma discourses to access new concepts of healing, the Commission opted for a victim-centered approach that framed survivors as primary knowledge carriers; in other words, survivor disclosures constituted acts of truth telling and these acts were crucial to evoking certain concepts of healing (7). As James articulates, the TRC's "emphasis on victim voices and experiences performatively overturns the basic pedagogy of the residential schools, focused as they were on destroying indigenous truths with settler knowledge and disciplines" (21). This "quintessentially carnivalesque reversal" of knowledge assumptions—which centered former residential school students as those possessing knowledge rather than professional historians, forensic archaeologists, or other likeminded professionals—was essential to the victim-centered identity of the TRC (11). James, "A Carnival of Truth?" 7.

[54] Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin White Masks: Rejecting a colonial politics of recognition,* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 106.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Following Richard Day, Coulthard defines recognition politics as the "expansive range of recognition-based models of liberal pluralism that seek to 'reconcile' Indigenous assertions of nationhood with settler-state sovereignty via the accommodation of Indigenous identity claims in some form of renewed legal and political relationship with the Canadian state" (3). For an in-depth discussion (and critique) of a "politics of recognition," see the Introduction and first chapter in Coulthard's *Red Skin White Masks.*

[60] Ibid, 106.

[61] Alexander Panetta, "Justin Trudeau's UN Speech Outlines Canada's 'Humiliation' Of Indigenous Peoples," *Huffington Post,* September, 21, 2017

https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2017/09/21/justin-trudeaus-un-speech-outlines-canadas-humiliation-of-indigenous-peoples_a_23218217/

[62] John Borrows, "Foreword," in *Entangled Territorialities: Negotiating Indigenous Lands in Australia and Canada*, ed. Françoise Dussart and Sylvie Poirier (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2017), vii.

[63] "Residential Schools Settlement: Official Court Notice," Residential School Settlement.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid.

[66] According to Regan, Non-Indigenous people who accept the peacemaker myth continually "cast ourselves in the role of benevolent peacemakers—neutral arbiters of British law and justice, Christian messengers of the peaceable kingdom—who collaborated together in various ways to negotiate treaties and implement Indian policy intended to bestow upon Indigenous people the generous gifts of peace, order, good government, and Western education that were the hallmarks of the colonial project of civilizing 'savages.'" Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconcilition in Canada,* (Vancouver: UBC Press), 83.

[67] Jennifer Wakeham, *Taxidermic Signs: Reconstructing Aboriginality* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2008).

[68] Here, reconciliation politics and other progressive movements can be understood as often devolving into what Emilie Cameron calls a settler desire to be "good" in the face of colonial relations. In contrast to denying colonial culpability outright, settler subjects depend on what Sara Ahmed calls a "politics of declaration" in which declarations of privilege and recognition of colonial culpability function to redeem settler subjects who can, therefore, claim to be anti-racist/anti-colonial. However, as both Ahmed and Cameron insist, such declarations often do not do what they claim and, instead, risk reinforcing an individualized, depoliticized, psychologized understanding of settler colonialism and other systems of power—all in an effort transcend one's structural implications and, in doing so, to "feel better." Emilie Cameron, *Far Off Metal Rivers,* 20.

[69] Tuck, Eve and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (2012): 1-40.

[70] Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), xxiii

[71] Ibid, xxiii-xxiv

[72] Ibid, xxiv.

[73] As cited in LaDuke, *All Our Relations*, 160.

[74] Ibid.

[75] The Buffalo Treaty: A Treaty of Cooperation, Renewal, and Restoration (2014). https://luxtonfoundation.org/uploads/images/Buffalo-Treaty.pdf

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.

[79] "Pledge to Restore Buffalo unites First Nations of North America."

[80] Leanne Simpson, *As We Have Always Done* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota), 55-70; Estes, 201-246.

[81] In her work, Simpson use the story about the relationship between the Hoof Nation and the Nishnaabeg as an example of Nishnaabeg internationalism and the ways in which it extends beyond human beings to include all the living beings in Kina Gchi Nishnaabeg-ogamig. Writing

from an Oceti Sakowin perspective, Estes points to treaties with the buffalo nation as particularly significant for his nation. Simpson, 58-61. Nick Estes, *Our History Is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* (Brooklyn, NY: Verso, 2019), 203.

[82] Here, Simpson builds on the work of Glen Coulthard, who uses the notion of grounded normativity to point to "the modalities of Indigenous land-connected practices and longstanding experiential knowledge that inform and structure our ethical engagements with the world and our relationship with human and nonhuman other over time." Coulthard, *Red Skin White Masks*, 13.

[83] Ktunaxa v. British Columbia (Forests, Lands, and natural Resource Operations), 2017 SCC 54, [2017] 2 S.C.R. 386

[84] Ibid.

[85] Ibid.

[86] Nick Estes points out that two dominant discourses emerged in the twentieth century on self-determination. The first, which was perhaps most famously articulated by US President Woodrow Wilson, argued for a set of limited rights that would not fundamentally disrupt or break up colonial regimes of power globally. However, such a vison actively omitted any discussion of self-determination for Indigenous nations living on Turtle Island. The second, more radical vision was famously put forward by Communist revolutionary V.I. Lenin, who argued for the right of colonized peoples to declare independence from their colonizers. Such an understanding of self-determination was also echoed by "Third World decolonization movements" in places like Asia, Africa, and South America. Unfortunately, such a radical tradition was also largely omitted from the North American context, except among radical Indigenous, Black, Asian, Caribbean, and Chicanx liberation movements. Estes, *Our History Is the Future,* 204.

[87] "The Buffalo Treaty: A Treaty of Cooperation, Renewal, and Restoration," (2014). https://luxtonfoundation.org/uploads/images/Buffalo-Treaty.pdf

[88] As Nick Estes points out, "sovereign nations do not enter into international relations or treaties with domestic or 'internal' populations. On the contrary, the very basis of sovereignty is the power to negotiation relationship between those who are seen as different—between other sovereigns and nations." Estes adds, however, that the concepts of "sovereignty" and "nation" possess different meanings for Indigenous people than they do within colonial modes of relationship. Estes, *Our History Is the Future,* 203-204.

Epilogue Notes

[1] Manu Karuka, Christina Heatherton, and Lara Kiswani, "Anti-imperialism with Manu Karuka, Christina Heatherton, and Lara Kiswani." Red Nation (podcast), November 2019m accessed November 5, 2020. https://soundcloud.com/therednationpod/anti-imperialism-w-manu-karuka

[2] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks,* 197.

[3] Walter Benjamin, "Theses on the Philosophy of History," in *Illuminations*, ed. Hanna Arendt (New York, NY: Schocken, 1969), 253-64.

[4] Max Haiven, *Revenge Capitalism: The Ghosts of Empire, the Demons of Capital, and the Settling of Unpayable Debts* (London: Pluto Press, 2020), 56.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Manu Karuka, Christina Heatherton, and Lara Kiswani, "Anti-imperialism."

[7] Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 200.

WORKS CITED

Agamben, Giorgio. *Remnants of Auschwitz: The witness and the archive*. (Homo sacer III) New York: Zone Books, 2003.

Aikau, Hokulani K., Maile Arvin, Mishuana Goeman, and Scott Morgensen. "Indigenous Feminisms Roundtable." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies,* 36, no, 3 (2015): 84-106.

Anderson, Kim, & Rob A. Innes. *Indigenous men and masculinities: Legacies, Identities, Regeneration*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press, 2015.

Angel, Naomi. "Before Truth: The Labors of Testimony and the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission." *Culture, Theory and Critique* 53 (2012): 199-214.

Arvin, Maile, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill. "Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy." *Feminist Formations* 25, no. 1 (2013): 8-34.

Asch, Michael, John Borrows, and James Tully. *Resurgence and Reconciliation: Indigenous-Settler Relations and Earth Teachings*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2018.

Ashcroft, Bill. *Post-Colonial Transformation.* London: Routledge, 2001.

Atleo, E. Richard (Umeek). *Principles of Tsawalk: An Indigenous Approach to Global Crisis*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2011.

Barker, Adam J. "Locating Settler Colonialism." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 13, no. 3 (2012). Project MUSE.

Bastien, Betty. *Blackfoot Ways of Knowing.* Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2004.

Bella, Leslie. *Parks for Profit.* Montréal: Harvest House, 1987.

Benjamin, Walter. "Theses on the Philosophy of History." In *Illuminations*. Edited by Hannah Arendt. New York, NY: Schocken, 1969.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture.* New York: Routledge, 1994.

—. "DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation." In *Nation and Narration.* Edited by Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1992.

—. “Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817.” *Critical Inquiry* 12 no. 1 (1985): 144-165.

Binnema, Theodore (Ted) and Melanie Niemi. “'Let the line be drawn now': Wilderness, conservation, and the exclusion of aboriginal people from Banff national park in Canada.” *Environmental History,* 11 no. 4 (2006): 724-750.

Bhandar, Brenna. *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2018.

Borrows, John. *Freedom and Indigenous Constitutionalism*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2016.

—. *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Bruyneel, Kevin. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.

Butler, Judith. *Giving an Account of Oneself*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 2005.

—. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence.* New York, NY: Verso, 2004.

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

Byrd, Jodi. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Cameron, Emilie. *Far Off Metal River: Inuit Lands, Settler Stories, and the making of the Contemporary Artic.* Vancouver: UBC Press, 2015.

Camp, Jordan T. and Christina Heatherton. *Policing the Planet: Why the Policing Crisis Led to Black Lives Matter.* New York: Verson, 2016.

Cardinal, Harold. *The Unjust Society: The tragedy of Canada’s Indians*. Douglas & McIntyre, 1969.

Coté, Charlotte. *Spirits of our Whaling Ancestors: Revitalizing Makah & Nuu-chah-nulth Traditions.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2010.

Coulthard, Glen S. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

—. “#Idle No More in historical context” In *The Winter We Danced: Voices from the Past, the Future, and the Idle No More Movement.* Edited by The Kino-nda-niimi Collective. Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2014.

Cronon, William. *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. New York: Norton & Company, 1996.

—. "The Trouble with Wilderness: Or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature." *Environmental History* 1 no. 1 (1996).

Crosby, Andrew C. *Policing Indigenous Movements: Dissent and the Security State* (Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2018).

Cruikshank, Julie. *Do Glaciers Listen?: Local knowledge, colonial encounters, and social imagination*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2007.

Daschuk, James W. *Clearing the Plains: Disease, politics of starvation, and the loss of Aboriginal life.* Regina: University of Regina Press, 2013.

Deamer, Kacey. "Bison Reintroduction to Canadian Wild after century of conservation efforts." *Live Science.* February 8, 2017. https://www.livescience.com/57812-bison-reintroduced-into-wild-in-canada.html

Deer, Sarah. *The Beginning and End of Rape Culture: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.

Dennison, Jean. *Colonial Entanglements: Constituting a Twenty-First-Century Osage Nation.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Caroline Press, 2012.

Dussart, Françoise and Sylvie Poirier, *Entangled Territorialities: Negotiating Indigenous Lands in Australia and Canada*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2017.

Driskill, Qwo-li, Chris Finely, Brian Joseph Gilley, and Scott Lauria Morgensen. *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics, and Literature.* Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 2011.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. New York, NY: Verso, 1991.

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

Fanon, Fanon. *Black Skin, White Masks.* New York, NY: Grove Press, 1952.

—. *The Wretched Of The Earth.* New York, NY: Grove Press, 1963.

Federici, Silva. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the body and primitive accumulation*, Second edition. Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2014.

Francis, Margot. *Creative subversions: Whiteness, indigeneity and the national imaginary*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011.

Foucault, Michel. “On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress.” In Afterword, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, edited by Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Gaertner, David. “‘Aboriginal Principles of Witnessing’ and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.” In *Arts of Engagement: Taking Aesthetic Action In and Beyond the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, edited by Dylan Robinson and Keavy Martin, 135-55. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2016.

Gobin, Anuradha. “Constructing a Picturesque Landscape: Picturing Sugar Plantations in the Eighteenth-Century British West Indies.” *Hemispheres: Visual Cultures of the Americas* 4, no 1(2011).

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

—. “Land is Life: Unsettling Logics of Containment.” In Teves, Smith, and Raheja’s *Native Studies Key Words*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2015. 71-89.

Goodyear-Ka’ōpua, Noelani. *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School*. First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013.

Gordon, Avery. *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, 2008.

Green, Joyce. “Canaries and the Mines of Citizenship: Indian Women in Canada.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 4 (2001): 715-738.

—. *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*. Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2017.

Haiven, Max. *Revenge Capitalism: The Ghosts of Empire, the Demons of Capital, and the Settling of Unpayable Debts.* London: Pluto Press, 2020.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of* Postmodernity*: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. John Wiley & Sons, 1992.

Hildebrant, Walter, Dorthy First Rider, Sarah Carter, and Treaty 7 Elders and Tribal Councils. *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty 7.* Montreal: McGill-Quebec’s University Press, 1996.

hooks, bell. “Eating the other: Desire and resistance.” In *Black Looks: Race and Representation.* Boston: South End Press, 1992.

Hubbard, Tasha. "Buffalo Genocide in Nineteenth-Century North America: "Kill, Skin, and Sell." In *Colonial Genocide in Indigneous North America.* Edited by Wollford, Andrew, Jeff Benvenuto, and Alexander Laban Hinton. Durham: Duke University Press, 2014.

Hunt, Sarah. *Witnessing the Colonialscape: Light the Intimate Fires of Indigenous Legal Pluralism*. PhD diss., Simon Fraser Univeristy, 2014. Retrieved from: summit.sfu.ca/system/files/iritems1/14145/etd8317_SHunt.pdf

—. "Violence, Law and the Everyday Politics of Recognition." Paper presented at *Comments on Glen Coulthard's "Red Skin, White Masks:" Native American and Indigenous Studies Association*. Washington DC, June 6, 2015.

Innes, Robert Alexander and Kim Anderson. *Indigenous Men and Masculinities: Legacies, identities, regeneration.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2015.

James, Matt. "A Carnival of Truth? Knowledge, Ignorance and the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission." *The International Journal of Transitional Justice* 6 (2012): 1-25.

— "Narrative Robustness, Post-Apology Conduct, and Canada's 1998 and 2008 Residential Schools Apologies." In *The Palgrave Handbook of State-sponsord History after 1945.* Edited in Berber Bevernage and Nico Wouters. UK: Palgrave Macmillan, [2018].

Jansen, Patricia. *Wild Things: Nature, Culture, and Tourism in Ontario, 1790-1914.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.

Karuka, Manu, Christina Heatherton, and Lara Kiswani. "Anti-imperialism with Manu Karuka, Christina Heatherton, and Lara Kiswani." Red Nation (podcast). November 2019. Accessed November 5, 2020: https://soundcloud.com/therednationpod/anti-imperialism-w-manu-karuka

Karuka, Manu. *Empire's Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad.* Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2019.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. "'A Structure, Not an Event': Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity." *Lateral* 5 no. 1, (2016), http://csalateral.org/wp/issue/5-1/forum-althumanities-settler-colonialism-enduring-indigeneity-kauanui

Kimmerer, Robin Wall. *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge, and the Teachings of Plants.* Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions, 2013.

LaDuke, Winona. *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life.* Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 1999.

Larsen, Soren C. and Jay T. Johnson *Being Together in Place: Indigenous Coexistence in a More than Human World.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.

Lawrence, Bonita and Enakshi Dua, "Decolonizing Antiracism," *Social Justice* 32 no. 4: 120-143.

Lawrence, Bonita. "Gender, Race, and the regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States: An Overview." *Hypatia* 18 no. 2 (2009).

Lethabo-King, Tiffany. *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2019.

LittleBear, Leroy. "Jagged Worldviews Colliding." In *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Edited by Marie Battiste. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2000.

Lowe, Lisa. *The Intimacies of Four Continents.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015.

Mackey, Eva. *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty, Land and Settler Decolonization.* Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2016.

MacDonald, David B. *The Sleeping Giant Awakens: Genocide, Indian Residential Schools, and the Challenge of Conciliation.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019.

Macoun, Alissa and Elizabeth Strakosch, "The ethical demands of settler colonial theory," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3 no. 2 (2013): 426-433.

Macpherson, C.B. *Property: Mainstream and critical positions.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

Maracle, Lee. *Memory Serves.* Edmonton, AB: NeWest Press, 2015.

Mason, Courtney. *Spirits of the Rockies: Reasserting an Indigenous Presence in Banff National Park.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

McManus, Shelia. *The Line Which Separates: Race Gender, and the Making of the Alberta-Montana Border.* Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2005.

Michaud-Ouellet, Joëlle Alice. "On the Relationship between Vulnerability and Sovereignty in Québécois Settler Self-Determination and the Shift to a Relation Conception of the Self as Treaty Partner." PhD dissertation, University of Victoria, 2019.

Million, Dian. "Felt theory: An indigenous feminist approach to affect and history." *Wicazo Sa Review* 24, no. 2 (2009): 53-76.

—. *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2013.

Mignolo, Walter D. and Wanda Nanibush. "Thinking and Engaging with the Decolonial: A Conversation between Walter D. Mignolo and Wanda Nanibush." *Afterall: The Journal of Art, Context and Enquiry* 45 no. 1 (2018): n.p.

Monforton, Lisa. “Wild bison roam Banff National Park for 1st time in more than century.” *CBC News*, August 14, 2015, http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/bison-buffalo-banff-national-park-1.3969106

Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. ‘Writing Off Indigenous Sovereignty: The Discourse of Security and Patriarchal White Sovereignty.’ In *Sovereign Selves: Indigenous Soverignty Matters,* edited by Aileen Moreton-Robinson. Crows Nest: Allen and Unwin, 2007.

—. *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous sovereignty.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.

Morgensen, Scott L. *Spaces Between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Mowatt, Gina. A brief history of 19th-20th century genocidal Indian education in British Columbia and oral history of Gitxsan resistance and resurgence.” PhD diss., University of Victoria, 2019.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Being Singular Plural*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Nichols, Rob. “Theft Is Property! The Recursive Logic of Dispossession.” *Political Theory* 46, no. 1 (2018): 3-28.

Nixon, Rob. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Owram, Doug. *The Promise Eden: The Canadian expansionist movement and the idea of west, 1856-1900.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Palmer, Andie Diane. *Maps of Experience: The Anchoring of Land to Story in Secwepemc Discourse.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Parks Canada. “Cave and Basin National Historic Site.” Last modified October, 5, 2020. https://www.pc.gc.ca/en/lhn-nhs/ab/caveandbasin/decouvrir-discover.

Parks Canada. “Plains bison reintroduction.” Las modified June, 5, 2017. https://www.pc.gc.ca/en/pn-np/ab/banff/info/gestion-management/bison

Pateman, Carole. “The Settler Contract.” In *Contract and Domination*. Edited by Charles Mills and Carole Pateman. Malden, MA: Polite, 2007.

Pearce, Roy Harvey. *Sagavism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

“Pledge to Restore Buffalo unites First Nations of North America.” *National Geographic*. August 18, 2015. https://blog.nationalgeographic.org/2015/08/18/pledge-to-restore-wild-buffalo-unites-first-nations-of-north-america/

Prime Minister's Office. "Statement by Prime Minister on release of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission." 2015 https://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2015/12/15/statement-prime-minister-release-final-report-truth-and-reconciliation-commission. Accessed 11/24/2017.

Razack, Sherene H. "Gendered Racial Violence and Spatialized Justice: The Murder Pamela George," In *Race, Space, and the Law,* edited by Sherene H. Razack. Toronto, ON: Between the Lines Press, 2002.

—. *Dying from Improvement: Inquests and Inquiries into Indigenous Deaths in Custody*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015.

Residential School Settlement. "Residential Schools Settlement: Official Court Notice." Accessed March 15, 2008. http://www.residentialschoolsettlement.ca/settlement.html.

Rieger, Sarah. "Bison turn up bones of ancestors, old wallowing pots in return to Banff 140 years later." *CBC News.* February 11 2020, https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/banff-bison-reintroduction-project-1.5458896

Rifkin, Mark. "Settler States of Feeling: National Belonging and the Erasure of Native American Presence." In *A Companion to American Literary Studies*, edited by Caroline F. Levander and R. S. Levine, 342-355. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

—. *When Did Indians Become Straight: Kinship, the History of Sexuality, and Native Sovereignty.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

—. "Settler common sense." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3-4 (2013): 322-340. DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2013.810702.

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

Robinson, Cedric J. *Black Marxism: The making of the Black radical tradition*. London: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Rocky Mountain Outlook. "Banff Cave and Basin book offers, clarity on history of hot springs." *Rocky Mountain Outlook*. Accessed February, 15, 2018. https://www.rmotoday.com/mountain-guide/cave-and-basin-book-offers-context-clarity-on-history-of-hot-springs-1572005

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

Russell, Peter. *Constitutional Odyssey*. North York: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Sahlins, Marshall. *How "Natives" Think: About Captain Cook, for Example.* Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1995.

Saranillio, Dean Itsuji. “Why Asian settler colonialism matters: a thought piece on critiques, debates, and Indigenous difference.” *Settler Colonial Studies,* 3 no. 4, (2013): 280-294.

Schama, Simon. *Landscape and Memory.* New York: Vintage Books, 1996.

Sharma, Nadita and Cynthia Wright. “Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States.” *Social Justice* 35 no. 3, 2008: 120-138

Shipley, Tyler A. *Canada in the World: Settler Capitalism and the Colonial Imagination.* Black Point: Fernwood Publishing, 2020.

Simpson, Audra. The state is a man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the gender of settler sovereignty. *Theory & Event* 19, no. 4 (2016). Project MUSE.

—. (2014). *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. *Dancing On Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Pub, 2011.

Smith, Andrea. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and the American Indian genocide.* Cambridge: South End Press, 2005.

Smith, David E. *The Invisible Crown: The First Principles of Canadian Government*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* Second Edition. Dunedin: Zed Books, 2012.

Snelgrove, Corey, Rita K. Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel. “Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3 n. 2 (2014): 1-32.

Snow, John. *These Mountains Are Our Sacred Places: The story of the Stoney Indians*. Calgary: Fifth House, 2005.

Starblanket, Tamara. *Suffer the Little Children: genocide, indigenous nations, and the Canadian state.* Atlanta: Clarity Press, 2018.

Stark, Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik. "Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land," *Theory & Event* 19, no. 4 (2016). Project MUSE.

Stoler, Anne Laura. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkely, CA: University of California Press, 2010.

—. *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in our Time.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.

Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2007.

Tobias, John L. "Protection, Civilization, Assimilation: An Outline History of Canada's Indian Policy." In *As Long as the Sun Shines and the Water Flows: A Reader in Canadian Native Studies,* edited by John L. Tobias. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1983.

Toews, Owen. *Stolen City: Racial Capitalism and the Making of Winnipeg.* Winnipeg: ARP, 2018.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *Life in common: an essay in general anthropology*. Translated by Katherine Golsan and Lucy Golsan. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *A Knock on the Door: The Essential History of Residential Schools*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2016.

Tuck, Eve and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization is Not A Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (2012): 1-40.

Turner, Frederick Jackson. *The Frontier in American History.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997.

Veracini, Lorenzo. "Settler colonialism: career of a concept." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 41 no. 2 (2013): 1-22.

—. "Decolonizing Settler Colonialism: Kill the Settler in im and Save the Man." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 41, no. 1 (2017): 1-18.

Vermette, Katherena. *The Break*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2016.

Vimalassery, Manu, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein. "Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing." *Theory and Event* 18 no. 4 (2016): n.p.

—. "Colonial unknowing and relations of study." *Theory & Event* 20 no. 4 (2017): 1042-1054.

Wakeham, Jennifer. *Taxidermic Signs: Reconstructing Aboriginality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2008.

Waldron, Ingrid R.G. *There's something in the Water: Environmental Racism in Indigenous and Black Communities.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, 2018.

Whitaker, Reginald. *A Sovereign Idea: Essays on Canada as a Democratic Community*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992.

Wilderson III, Frank B. *Red, White and Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Wilson, Alexander. *The Culture of Nature: North American Landscape form Disney to the Exxon Valdez.* Toronto: Between the Lines, 1991.

Women's Earth Alliance & Native Youth Sexual Health Network. *Violence On the Land, Violence on Our Bodies: Building an Indigenous Response to Environmental Violence*. 2016. Accessed September 25, 2019, http://landbodydefense.org/uploads/files/VLVBReportToolkit2016.pdf

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

—. "Recuperating Binarism: a heretical introduction." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3 no. 4, 2013: 257-279.

Young, Alex Trimble. "A Response to 'On Colonial Knowing.'" *Theory & Event* 20 no. 4 (2017): 1035-1041.

Žižek, Slavoj. *The Parallax View.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.