THE COLONIAL DENIZEN:
A PROPOSAL TO MOVE BEYOND THE POLITICS OF RECOGNITION TOWARD A
POLITICS OF RESPONSIBILITIES

by

DEANNE ALINE MARIE LEBLANC

B.A., University of Toronto, 2011
M.A., University of Victoria, 2014

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

(Political Science)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Vancouver)

March 2020

The following individuals certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies for acceptance, the dissertation entitled:

The Colonial Denizen: A Proposal to Move Beyond a Politics of Recognition toward a Politics of Responsibilities

Submitted by   Deanne Leblanc   in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

the degree of   Doctor of Philosophy

in   Political Science

Examining Committee:

Barbara Arneil, Political Science
Supervisor

Jim Tully, Political Science
Supervisory Committee Member

Glen Coulthard, Political Science
Supervisory Committee Member

Dalie Giroux, Political Studies
External Examiner

Bruce Baum, Political Science
University Examiner

Coll Thrush, History
University Examiner

Abstract:

Since the twentieth century Canadian political scientists, government and society have become increasingly aware of the need to address the various effects and realities of colonialism. This has been a positive step forward for Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples alike and has led to various steps toward 'reconciliation' if not decolonization. And yet, the predominant, mainstream approaches taken or proffered by (largely non-Indigenous) scholars and government officials, in response to Indigenous peoples' calls for change, can only go so far in the move toward decolonization. This is because they are stuck within the logics of liberal democracy and recognition, based within the prevailing arguments that moving beyond contemporary colonial situations can only be achieved through either a more comprehensive extension of liberal democratic (settler) citizenship to Indigenous peoples, or through proper 'recognition' of Indigenous peoples from within a predominantly non-Indigenous (settler) perspective and societal structure. Not only are these arguments inappropriate responses to collective colonial realities, they also lead to the further entrenchment of colonial structures, relations and policies because they do not attempt the necessary self-reflexivity and openness to change that decolonization requires.

My proposal is that non-Indigenous peoples, in order that they can properly hear and respond to Indigenous peoples' calls for decolonization, move beyond these aforementioned approaches and consider themselves 'foreigners' in need of invitation onto Indigenous lands – both past and present. I suggest that as *colonial denizens* non-Indigenous Canadians take up an ethos that encourages them to re-evaluate their lives and relations with Indigenous peoples, lands and the settler state. The following provides a thought experiment centered around the *colonial denizen* through which non-Indigenous peoples are encouraged to question the sovereignty of the state, the impacts of the Canadian citizenship regime, their daily lives, and their relations to land at the same time that it encourages them to place responsibilities to others above inwardly-focused rights. I contend that such a thought experiment can open a path toward the instantiation of this *denizen* ethos (both discursively and materially), an ethos which acts as a potential and active way through which non-Indigenous peoples could appropriately and seriously meet Indigenous peoples' calls for change.

Lay Summary:

Reconciliation and decolonization have become a prominent focus within Canadian society in recent years. While this has led to some positive initiatives and outcomes toward reconciliation within the country, changes that have been invoked ultimately uphold the colonial structures and relations that they are meant to dismantle. And so, there is more that needs to be done if non-Indigenous state and society are truly interested in meaningful decolonization that properly responds to Indigenous peoples' calls for change. I argue that if non-Indigenous state and society are truly interested in responding to Indigenous peoples' calls for decolonization they need to shift how they understand their relationships to Indigenous peoples, Indigenous lands and the settler state. The following proposes one path through which non-Indigenous peoples might alter their understandings of decolonization, suggesting that they begin to consider themselves 'foreigners' who require invitation onto Indigenous lands fulfilling responsibilities to Indigenous peoples and lands in order for their presence to be justified.

Preface

This dissertation is original, unpublished, independent work by the author, Deanne Aline Marie Leblanc

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

It is not a single, isolated, individual who takes on and completes a PhD but an entire community and network of support comprised of mentors, peers, family, friends and institutions both within and beyond the academy. As such there are many acknowledgements to be made.

First of all, I would not have been able to take up or complete this PhD if it were not for the financial support of the Department of Political Science at the University of British Columbia and the Social Science and Humanities Research Council in Ottawa. This dissertation would literally not have come to fruition without this support. Thank you.

I am forever appreciative for the guidance and support of my supervisory committee – their insights and knowledge alongside their trust in me and my ideas. Thank you to Jim Tully for having, as early as my Master's degree at the University of Victoria, seen the potential in the colonial denizen - encouraging me to develop and run with the concept and for always reading my drafts with such care and consideration. Thank you also to Glen Coulthard for your own thoughtful readings of my drafts and, specifically, for challenging me to dig deeper into the concept of a regime – encouraging me to recognize its inherent limitations alongside its potential for growth and change.

I am beyond grateful to my supervisor Barbara Arneil for her abundant wealth of knowledge and wisdom as not only a supervisor but a mentor. This dissertation would not be what it is today without her and I would not have grown as much as an academic without her guidance. From our many meetings hashing out analytical threads to her diligent and insight comments and responses to various drafts, she helped me articulate, polish and improve the arguments and reasoning that formulate this dissertation. Even with her extensive commitments to the academic community, Barbara always found time to meet with me and to be the supervisor and mentor that I hope every PhD student/Candidate finds.

Thank you to my peers within the graduate program at UBC for your mutual support throughout this journey. Whether it was through conferences, the Political Theory Workshop, or Barbara's Critical Political Theory Working Group I am appreciative of your insights and support: Spencer, Corey, Nojang, Wagd, and Rose. I am also fortunate to have been able to complete this degree within a ridiculously supportive community of strong female peers at UBC and beyond. Thank you Elena, Hannah, Mandy, Kathy and Sarah. With a special shout-out to Elena and Hannah for being there for me through it all these past couple years. You two are absolute gems and exceedingly brilliant scholars with bright futures ahead.

Thank you to Josephine, Richard and Rhea for helping me navigate the ins and outs of departmental and university-wide administration as a student, an instructor and a researcher. Special thanks to Josephine for always being up for a chat and for checking in throughout the semesters. Always a bright note of my day at the department. Thank you also to the professors who, earlier in my pursuit of post-secondary education, inspired me to continue on with my studies: Linda White, Ran Hirschl, Rauana Kuokkanen, Heidi Stark. I am also grateful to Aaron Mills for supporting me in my journey from undergrad through to the Master's – for always believing in me (even when I didn't believe in myself). Thank you also to the professors at UBC

Chapter 1: Introduction - Setting the Foundations for a Paradigm Shift

Indigenous peoples have long been resisting the colonial policies and actions of non-Indigenous Canadian state and society (Smith, 2014; Harring, 1998; Cardinal, 1999). This is a fact, as are the repeated calls by various Indigenous representatives, activists, and scholars for decolonization and the re-centering of Indigenous peoples, lands and nation-hoods within political, legal and social spheres (Cardinal, 1969; Smith, 2012; Simpson, 2011; Kino-nda-niimi Collective, 2014). While non-Indigenous state and society have been responding to these calls in recent years, and making some important progress (Canada, 2016; Canada, 2019), such responses have ultimately maintained the colonial power structures that have long sought to dispossess and subordinate Indigenous peoples while they have established and maintained non-Indigenous privileges and securities that are themselves premised on the continued colonization of Indigenous life and land (Mackey, 2016). There is a need, therefore, to work beyond such contemporary approaches and to challenge the paradigms and implicit assumptions within which such responses have been put forward and, ultimately, curtailed. This is the general impetus behind my dissertation: identifying *why* there is a need to push past these recent approaches, *how* such a process might be accomplished, as well as *what* shape this process might take.

My work focuses not on the state, its role and actions within colonialism and decolonization, but on the roles and actions of non-state, non-Indigenous actors. Contemporary responses to Indigenous calls for decolonization tend to focus on the state, its colonial implications and actions. Yet the lack of meaningful engagement with and consideration of non-Indigenous actors within both colonialism and decolonization is part of the failure of past 'decolonization'-focused initiatives – although the recent report from the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission* has meaningfully *begun* to address the roles and actions of non-Indigenous society in the specific move to reconciliation.[1] The animating question of this dissertation is, therefore: what roles might non-Indigenous peoples, currently understood as

---

[1] Reconciliation and decolonization are not one and the same concept. Reconciliation, which tends to be the focus of Canadian state-led initiatives is focused on the restoration of friendly relations between parties – a goal which can be claimed to be accomplished from within colonially-animated liberal-democratic, western paradigms. Alternatively, decolonization requires substantive moves and changes that actively move beyond the structures and paradigms of colonialism and toward the re-centering of Indigenous life and land. It is decolonization, therefore, that serves as the focus of my work rather than reconciliation. This distinction is elaborated and further contextualized within chapter one.

Canadian citizens, play within the move to decolonization? My proposal is that non-Indigenous Canadians require a paradigm shift away from the contemporary western paradigms that uphold colonial power relations toward a new paradigm that I identify as the *colonial denizen* through which non-Indigenous peoples come to understand themselves as foreigners in need of invitation from Indigenous peoples in order to legitimately co-habit Indigenous lands. As I will explain further below, such a paradigm shift can relocate the territorial and local within non-Indigenous understandings and approaches to decolonization at the same time it can help introduce a specifically dialogical approach to decolonization.

I have approached this work as a non-Indigenous Canadian citizen who is focused on and interested in improving Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations so that non-Indigenous peoples can appropriately meet Indigenous peoples' calls for decolonial change. As a thirteenth-generation French-Canadian on my father's side and third-generation Irish-Canadian on my mother's side of the family I seek to situate myself as a settler scholar whose ancestors have a long history of colonial implication within the country. Situating myself in this way is not only one method through which to demonstrate respect toward the protocols of Indigenous scholars, leaders, and activists (Chilisa, 2012; Cajete, 2014; Wilson, 2009), who begin their own works and addresses by identifying themselves in relation to their ancestors and territories, but is also a way through which to align my work with the situation of oneself in relation to the post-colonial relations of the 'orient' as identified in Edward Said's work (1979). Such self-situation, therefore, demonstrates deference to Indigenous diplomacy and governance at the same time that it demonstrates a necessary challenge to western academic paradigms that claim the scholar is an objective researcher of power relations. It is also a way for the researcher to act as denizen through their work, to be accountable through approaching history and its analysis through this self-situated and so necessarily reflexive method.

I have traced my ancestry through patriarchal lines, focusing mainly on male figures who are largely public figures of widespread ancestry throughout present-day Québec and the broader French-Canadian population. Their stories and relationships have been grounded predominately through state, imperial, and elite sources and official archives although I do place these sources into dialogue with local Indigenous and non-mainstream sources where possible. Why have I chosen such a mainstream approach given the disruptive intention behind mobilizing the *colonial denizen*? Beyond the very real constraints of time, resources and linguistic barriers, this approach

actually aligns with my critical focus on state and citizenship, even when I am looking to uncover the roles and relations of non-state actors (these roles are to be uncovered vis à vis their relationships to state and citizenship – as well as Indigenous life and land). As a political theorist, therefore, the exploration of these non-state actors, these *civic* ancestors (for they are common to so many), through a critical engagement with official archival and mainstream sources, supplemented where possible with critical and non-mainstream sources, demonstrates an appropriate beginning to the historical mobilization of the *colonial denizen*. It is an internally-focused beginning, a first step that starts from within the very structures, patterns and narratives that are problematic – that have led to the contemporary realities that define today's colonial relationships and structures. It is a step, although imperfect, towards Georges Sioui's *americity* as the demythologization of Canadian socio-political discourse and the recognition of the "spirit, order, and thought" of local Indigenous societies and histories (1992, xxiii). A step through which one can begin to identify potential moments and lessons of historic relationships that might inform a contemporary instantiation of the *colonial denizen*.

Of course there are inherent limitations to this method, for it maintains focus on non-Indigenous actors wherein the intention behind the paradigm shift, the *colonial denizen*, and towards decolonization is about re-centering Indigenous lives and lands. It is, likewise, not properly understood as Sioui's *americity*. Rather it is demonstrative of some of the self-reflexive work that needs to be done to aid non-Indigenous actors in their approach to decolonization, and likewise to their support of the re-centering of Indigenous lives and lands.

Maintaining this critical, self-reflexive method, this work is approached through the discursive lens of settler colonialism. Settler colonialism is premised on the belief that there is a specific structural instantiation of colonialism wherein the colonizer looks to erase and replace original Indigenous populations with their own (Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999). Within Canada, it is generally agreed upon that this form of colonialism began during the 1860s (Greer, 2018) when British North America gained a great level of autonomy from Britain and began actively pursuing physical colonization and resource-based extractions across the continent – actions with which state and society are still occupied today. I argue throughout the dissertation, therefore, that contemporary responses to Indigenous calls to decolonize are stuck within this structure when they adhere to the western paradigms that supported settler colonialism's development and which continue to bolster its sustenance. While settler colonialism and its relationship to

contemporary, guiding paradigms forms the crux of the problem here, I also consider the roles and functions of alternative forms of colonialism that pre-dated the settler colonial turn in Canada. This is because a considerable portion of my thesis analyzes the roles of non-Indigenous peoples and their relationships with Indigenous peoples and lands within the country's historic past - research I completed in the hopes that it would help inform a contemporary paradigm shift of the *colonial denizen*. As such, I also explore trade-based colonialism, agrarian-colonialism, and religious colonialism within the follow chapters – identifying how their alternative goals and structures animated Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationship within the past – relationships from which contemporary non-Indigenous Canadians might learn from in their search for a *colonial denizen* ethos. Importantly, these chapters collectively identify how economy has always underpinned the colonial. The economic reasoning for exploration, trade and settlement always, on the political side of things, drove and continues to drive colonial interest. And it was the economy, its actors' fluctuating and changing interests, that, as will be seen within the historical chapters, led the evolution from and through trade-based colonialism well into present day settler colonialism. As the historical chapters demonstrate, capitalism (as it likewise developed from 'merchant' capital to today's modern instantiation) has – just as liberalism has – deep-seated and symbiotic ties with the establishment and continuance of colonialism. For An Antan Kapesh, an Innu activist and author from Matimekosh (Schefferville, Quebec), as well as for many other Indigenous peoples across the land, capitalism (and the structural impositions that accompany it: private property, resource extraction, etc.) have been continually used to destroy Indigenous peoples' attachment to the land (1979) so that non-Indigenous state and society can use the land to increase their own sense of security, privilege and power from within the bounds of liberalism, capitalism and settler colonialism. This relationship, between capital and the colonial, needs to be – alongside the consideration of land and property – an important focal point of the discussion in the move toward decolonization.

Importantly, this work is not situated within the approach or methodology of any one specific theorist or scholar. I do not take a strictly Foucaultian or Gadamerian approach to the study of the *colonial denizen*, 'Canadian' citizenship (belonging), and seventeenth century New France. Rather, this work is more broadly situated within critical colonial theory wherein it is more specifically guided by the works of those like Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Jim Tully, Barbara Arneil, Glen Coulthard, Audra Simpson, and Georges Sioui as I look to critically analyze and

uncover the colonial assumptions, leanings and structures of society with a view toward helping create the discursive space needed in the move toward decolonization. My mobilization and analysis of the denizen within this critical colonial space means that I am actually engaged in a critical review of citizenship throughout this dissertation. In fact, citizenship (whether it is citizenship as it is currently understood in Canada today or subject-hood/belonging as it may be understood within the historical analysis) is an important analytical thread throughout the dissertation. It is the work of the *colonial denizen* after all to re-evaluate what it means to belong, whether there is a right to belonging, on Indigenous lands. And so while the jump from the study of seventeenth century New France to the study of the evolution of anglophone-based, Canadian citizenship from 1763 to present may seem like a strange turn, it is in fact a natural analytic turn within the confines of this dissertation and a necessary turn for the continuance of the critical analysis of belonging that the *colonial denizen* entails.

      I have chosen to begin my study, the empirical contextualization of the *colonial denizen*, within seventeenth century New France for various reasons. First of all, the imperial project of seventeenth century New France represents the begins of the broader project and creation of Canada as it exists today – this is true even where New France was always a specifically-French project and more clearly and directly led to the creation of Québec and a French-Canadian society than the broader, anglicized nation-state Canada has become. New France, through various material and social mechanisms represents a starting point or prelude to Canada as it is understood today. Given that my project is, in large part, focused on uncovering Canadian subject-hood/citizenship it is appropriate, and helps provide context to contemporary understandings and functions of citizenship and its relation to colonialism, to begin uncovering relationships as they existed (or may have existed) during this earliest of colonial projects that led, or preluded, the development of Canada. Another reason I have chosen to begin my analysis in seventeenth century New France is because it represents my own ancestral beginnings, and so my own familial narrative, of being on these lands. It is a personal part of my story at the same time that it is a civic part of the broader Canadian story. Completing this work, attempting this analysis, identifying and discussing the roles of my ancestral figures within seventeenth century New France is, therefore, part of my own self-contextualization as a scholar and an attempt to abide by a *colonial denizen* ethos within my work. Finally, beginning in seventeenth century New France also provides me with an opportunity to help shed light on a founding myth – the

myth that the French were friendlier colonizers, were maybe not even colonizers, when compared to other European powers. This myth is tied up with troubling moves amongst French-Canadian populations to 'Indigenize' themselves, to claim colonizing 'metis' identities (Gaudry and Leroux, 2017), at the same time it is tied up in the very historiography of French-Canada and its mobilization towards claims for Quebecois self-determination and sovereignty (Mailhot, 2017; Michaud-Ouellet, 2019; Gaudry and Leroux, 2017; Sioui, 1992). Situated against the context of this myth, analysis of the *colonial denizen* begins, therefore, as not only a way to empirically trace and ground the denizen within the historical archive but also as a way to re-visit and re-story narratives around Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships that helps critically re-examine some of the very earliest founding myths upon which contemporary state and society have been built and continue to grow.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

The first chapter of my dissertation sets out a preliminary iteration of the *colonial denizen* as a normative-analytical tool for studying the past as well as a discursive exercise that has the potential to inform a paradigm shift toward a *colonial denizen* ethos. It is within this chapter that I address *why* the *colonial denizen* is a useful and necessary addition to contemporary rhetoric and the lexicon of colonist-focused terms (e.g. arrivant, settler, sojourner). It is also here that I begin articulating *how* a paradigm shift focused on the *colonial denizen* could look. Here I argue that through a denizen-lens, non-Indigenous peoples (past and present) should consider themselves 'foreigners' in need of invitation onto Indigenous lands. I suggest that as *colonial denizens* non-Indigenous Canadians take up an ethos that encourages them to re-evaluate their lives and relations with Indigenous peoples, Indigenous lands and the settler state. Re-evaluations which encourage non-Indigenous peoples to question the sovereignty of the state, the impacts of the Canadian citizenship regime and their daily relations at the same time that they encourage non-Indigenous peoples to place responsibilities to others above inwardly-focused rights. I contend that identifying and acting upon such an ethos can provide a way through which non-Indigenous peoples can appropriately and seriously meet Indigenous peoples' calls for change – de-centering themselves from the discourse at the same time that they help re-center Indigenous lives and lands.

While the application of this term may, at first glance, appear universal and so a-territorial, as will become clear, it is actually meant to be rooted within the territorial and local.

Yes, it is a term that can be applied to various contexts and locales, but it's instantiation in any given context is, through dialogue with local Indigenous peoples, to be specific to the relations, histories and lands within which it looks to be articulated. To identify as a *colonial denizen*, or to take up a *colonial denizen* ethos is, therefore, to recognize the need for invitation and the need to re-center Indigenous lives and lands, and to enter into dialogue with local Indigenous peoples to ask, and to also dialogically determine, what it means to be a 'denizen' within the discursive and material orientation of local Indigenous worldviews, ontologies and interests. In this way the *colonial denizen*, as I present it throughout the dissertation, is in an important way a universally-applicable term (in that it can be applied across various spaces and even times) but is also an application that is always specific, local and territorially-bound. In this way it is an appropriate avenue through which to encourage non-Indigenous peoples to re-evaluate and re-frame contemporary paradigms as it carries with it the potential to re-align and prioritize territory, responsibility and the local within the discursive and material conceptions of decolonization, and contemporary paradigms, as these are all necessary considerations and re-centerings in the move toward substantive, decolonial change. There are, therefore, two levels at which one can discuss the *colonial denizen*. It is meant to be employed as a 'universal' concept in the sense that it can be theorized at an abstract level as well as applied within various contexts. It is also intended to be specifically, materially, employed at the local and territorial level and so transformed, potentially, into something else – perhaps a 'de'colonial denizen ethos. In its specific and local application the *colonial denizen* is, therefore, a starting point in the establishment of dialogical and decolonizing relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples who find themselves living within the same locales and mutually responsible for bringing about substantive decolonial change.

Following this first substantive chapter, I move on to the first of five, roughly chronological, historical chapters based on seventeenth-century relations between the various Indigenous peoples and the French both along the St. Lawrence River and within the interior. These chapters serve two key purposes within my broader study. First of all, they enable me to explore an empirically-based iteration, rooted in historical archives, of the *colonial denizen* through investigating where initial colonists may fit in relation to the colonial denizen and broader colonial lexicon when their behaviours and relations toward Indigenous peoples, the land and the broader processes and policies of imperialism and colonization are considered. In

identifying actors in this way such chapters seek to measure how well their actions and thought correlated to a *denizen ethos*, I concede that many (if not all) colonists would not have considered themselves denizens. While this application is demonstrative of a specific, historically and territorially-rooted conception of the *colonial denizen* – what a denizen ethos may have looked like in seventeenth century encounters between the French, Innu, Wyandot, Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee, and other Indigenous peoples, such an analysis has the potential to provide contemporary interlocuters with examples, lessons and contradictions that are useful to consider when establishing a contemporary denizen ethos. And so, even if this empirical iteration of the denizen is context-bounded, the specific applications and interpretations of a *colonial denizen* found within these locales and relations can still help to inform contemporary understandings and applications of a *colonial denizen* ethos today. Secondly, this historical analysis enables me to investigate and tell an alternative narrative of citizenship, and so belonging, through a re-storying of settlement history focused on membership, invitation, colonial thought and action and the re-centering of Indigenous lives and lands. These chapters, therefore, set the stage for the last chapter of the dissertation through which I track how the (liberal democratic) Canadian citizenship regime has been built upon the subordination and dispossession of Indigenous peoples (thereby establishing a symbioses), while arguing for key changes that can be made through adopting a contemporary denizen ethos. In addition to these two core purposes, these historical chapters also allow me to situate myself within this study by exploring vignettes of my ancestors at various places throughout analysis. Being a *colonial denizen* myself requires such self-situating as a scholar with responsibility toward Indigenous peoples and the goal of decolonization; as well as in relation to my ancestors and the colonial project writ large.

The second chapter, therefore, considers the roles of some of the earliest French colonists along the river within Champlain's habitation during a time in which trade-based colonialism was the dominant structure of relations. In referencing often overlooked Innu oral tradition, this chapter challenges the well-versed narrative that the French were invited onto the shore by the Innu in 1604 to construct a habitation. In this way the chapter explores the politics and functions of invitation as it actually occurred (or did not occur) and its role within a contemporary denizen ethos. I study the roles of sojourners and early agrarian colonists considering what their actual roles and relations were at this time as well as what their roles and relations would have looked

like under a strict observance of a *colonial denizen* role. Analysis here is grounded within the hypothesis that since these early French colonists were in vulnerable positions relative to the Indigenous peoples they encountered, made alliances and enemies with, they would have naturally been more deferent toward their allies laws and customs and, therefore, would have exhibited more denizen-like behaviours. Here I use the vignette of Louis Hébert, traditionally considered the first French colonial farmer of New France and one of my first ancestors within the colony, to explore the roles of early agrarian colonists within the trade-based colony. The results of my analysis within this chapter, however, leave me to conclude that deference is not the immediate avenue through which these actors guided their behaviours. Rather deference really only comes to be present during periods of forced dependence on Indigenous peoples (which is sometimes mutual) or the realization of colonists' vulnerability amongst Indigenous peoples and within their lands.

The third chapter considers the roles of religious actors and religious colonialism during the early to mid-seventeenth century within New France. As such it considers the evolution in religious presence and action within the colony, the influence of religious colonial endeavours and actors on Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations during this period, and the connection between religion and imperialism so crucial to the 'Age of Discovery'. I explore the role of the Récollets as the first missionaries in the colony; the invasion of the island that became Montréal, and its establishment as a religious mission; and the role of three prominent religious women within the colony whose actions were integral for future French settlement in the region: Jeanne Mance, Marie de l'Incarnation and Marguerite Bourgeoys. A core argument animating this chapter is that while these religious actors were overwhelmingly colonial in their actions and intentions there are various points at which one can see (specifically in regard to the religious women of the colony) potential glimmers of responsibility-driven, denizen-like thoughts or actions. An additional and important point of analysis within this chapter is the role that religious colonialism played in the shift from trade to agrarian-based colonialism within the colony. In other words, a shift from the less permanent trade form of colonialism (naturally more inclined toward denizen-like relations due to its ephemeral colonial goals) toward the more permanent agrarian form of colonialism (naturally more inclined toward colonialists relations due to its focus on settlement). The church and its actors were critical for establishing the foundations for agrarian colonialism due to their ability to establish the conditions necessary for more permanent

settlement – a reality that further cements the relationship of religion and its actors to imperialism and colonization at this time.

The fourth chapter considers the roles of both voluntary contract labourers and *habitants* who came (in many cases on the Church's dime) to the Laurentian Valley during the early to mid-seventeenth century to settle and help cultivate the land. This chapter focuses on immigration policy (1630-1663) and agricultural policy (1632-1670) within an increasingly agrarian colony. Here I use the vignettes of my ancestors Jacques Archambault, labourer turned *habitant* of the earlier immigration policies; and Jacques Leblanc, labourer turned *habitant* of the later immigration policies to explore this period of Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations and agrarian colonialism looking to identify moments of denizen and colonialist behaviour. This chapter once against highlights contradictions in colonist behaviour – identifying conflicting moments of denizen and colonialist leanings and actions. A central argument within this chapter is that as the institutions of 'New France' developed, as the internal stability of the colony grew, its voluntary agrarian colonists were increasingly less likely to act as denizens in relation to Indigenous life and land.

While the first four historical chapters considered the roles of voluntary colonists, the fifth chapter considers the position of arrivants as the variously-situated involuntary members of a growing colony in the mid to late-seventeenth century. I explore these roles in order to enrich one's understanding of the colonial cacophony as well as to challenge the mainstream narrative of Canada as a peaceful and tolerant country devoid of slavery and forced migrations. In this capacity I explore the roles of the *filles du roi* who were sent, under varying levels of duress to help populate the colony; as well as the clearly colonized and subjected Black and Indigenous slaves who were forced into slavery within the colony. To explore the roles of *filles du roi* within the colony I use the vignette of my ancestor, Suzanne Rousselin. My exploration of these women leads me to conclude that while they were sent to the colony as sexualized dependents who in many cases had little other choice but to come (given the hierarchical and patriarchal nature of ancient regime France), the relative privileges they and their progeny experienced at the sake of Indigenous life and land (but also France's impoverished populations and even, for some *filles*, at the sake of other *filles*) positions these women more as agrarian colonists than arrivants within the broader colonial picture. Alternatively, I find it inappropriate to situate Black and Indigenous slaves from within a denizen lens. These were men and women who were themselves colonized

by French society. While their contemporary progeny might experience relative privileges of settler society, they still face significant systemic racism and discrimination. I am left to conclude that there might be avenues through which these contemporary men and women may have some common, though certainly differentiated, grounds of and responsibilities with Indigenous peoples in resistance against white privilege, and the continuing colonialism, oppression and subordination that both groups face.

The sixth chapter, the final one to explore roles and relations in 17th century New France, focuses on the roles and evolution of trade actors both along the St. Lawrence River and within the interior. As such it explores the evolution of fur trade policy and structure and this evolution's impact on actors as well as Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations. My research shows that shifting contexts had a tremendous influence on the ways through which trade-based colonialism functioned. While this form of colonialism has been identified as naturally geared toward more denizen-like relations, I found that in the presence of a growing agrarian-base along the river during mid-century, the structure of agrarian colonialism took precedence in relations and the behaviour of colonists. While the *coureurs de bois* and the *voyaguers* of the later century found themselves in more vulnerable, trade-based context within the *pays d'en haut* and interior – suggesting they should have been more inclined toward denizen behaviour – even these actors struggled (as did their early agrarian counterparts at Champlain's habitation) to act in denizen-like manners though these actors might be the closest to demonstrating a denizen role during the period under review.

The final chapter jumps forward to re-visit the development of the Canadian citizenship regime and its dependence on the incremental subordination of Indigenous peoples through analyzing key junctures in colonial policy from 1763 to 1982. Here I identify the close relationship between citizenship and settler colonialism, using the evolutions of Canadian citizenship regimes to track shifts in colonial policy and implementation considering four major junctures: the 1857 *Gradual Civilization Act*, the 1869 *Gradual Enfranchisement Act*, the 1969 *White Paper*, and finally the 1982 inclusion of section 35 within the *Constitution Act*. Using a critical colonial lens, I identify the overarching relationship of these junctures to settler colonial theory as well as their specific characteristics in relation to the given citizenship regime of the time. This chapter serves three purposes within the broader dissertation. First of all, it enables me to identify how far non-Indigenous Canadians have moved from denizen-like relations to

Indigenous peoples and lands, an historic possibility for Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations but one that has been set aside in favour of an imposed settler colonial citizenship. Secondly, it allows me to highlight the specific relationship between Canadian citizenship and settler colonialism, how this relationship has shaped Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationships, and how non-Indigenous Canadians are implicated in colonialism through their status as Canadian citizens. Finally, analysis within this last chapter bolsters the major argument of my dissertation that a paradigm shift is necessary and can be accomplished through the establishment of a contemporary *colonial denizen* ethos. An ethos that requires non-Indigenous peoples step away from contemporary western paradigms and the citizenship regime, begin to understand themselves as foreigners who need invitation from local Indigenous peoples to co-habit lands, as well as seek the renewal of relations with Indigenous peoples that eliminates the Crown as arbiter and obstacle to better relations.

Chapter 2: The Colonial Denizen - A Paradigm Shift

The publication of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's final report in 2015 appears to have fostered an environment of nascent reflexivity throughout non-Indigenous Canadian society focused on identifying and addressing the collective colonial issues of today. While many non-Indigenous Canadians are now searching in good faith for ways of re-orienting themselves toward truth and reconciliation, many find themselves stuck, alienated and uncertain of *how* to move forward. This uncertainty and alienation is due in part to the nature of contemporary state-led reconciliation efforts and the inability of current paradigms[2] to substantively challenge settler colonialism and offer its participants a method of moving beyond the logics and structures of its realities. What I am offering here, through the *colonial denizen*, is one way through which interested non-Indigenous peoples might begin discursively re-orienting themselves beyond contemporary western paradigms so that they may better situate themselves to actively, dialogically and appropriately respond to society's colonial past and present and meet Indigenous peoples' calls for decolonization.[3]

An important issue facing contemporary non-Indigenous peoples in the move forward is that the reconciliation efforts readily provided, which are largely confined to the liberal-democratic state and paradigm, look for reconciliation, as the restoration of 'friendly' relations (OED, n.d.), before and beyond decolonization, as the re-centering of Indigenous life and land (Tuck and Yang, 2012), and so are set up to fail because they are not properly focused on responding to Indigenous calls for decolonization and the substantive social and political change necessary to move beyond settler colonialism. As responses from within a liberal-democratic paradigm these efforts are caught within the paradigm's own structures and logics and so are unable to properly identify and respond to calls for decolonization. What these efforts actually

---

[2] Here and throughout this dissertation I use the term 'paradigm' to denote a set of authoritative theories and rules that have come to define a group or a society's orientation to a subject – theories and rules which impose artificial limits on what those who operate within the paradigm are able and/or willing to see. As the work of Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, has demonstrated paradigm shifts naturally occur within both fields of study and societies more broadly. I am arguing here, as will become clearer throughout, that the contemporary paradigms that guide non-Indigenous responses to Indigenous calls for decolonization (namely the liberal-democratic paradigm that serves to uphold settler colonial processes and structures) have prevented non-Indigenous peoples from being able and willing to understand Indigenous calls for decolonization and to see the real substantive change that needs to occur.

[3] Here I am distinguishing between a discursive as opposed to more material approach or intention within my work, wherein a shift through the discursive will eventually influence a shift in the material.

Barbara Arneil. *Domestic Colonies: The Turn Inward to Colony.* Oxford University Press, 2017. pp. 1-3.

end up accomplishing according to Dene Scholar, Glen Coulthard, is the extension of settler colonialism's structured dispossession and the reproduction of "the very configurations of colonist, racist, patriarch state power that Indigenous peoples' demands for recognition have historically sought to transcend" (2014, 3). This is because the very theories and components that ground the liberal-democratic paradigm (the primacy of the sovereign individual, the privileging of rights over responsibilities, etc.) support and sustain the processes and structures of settler-colonialism (capitalism, dispossession, resource extraction, etc.). And so these seemingly 'reconciliatory' moves, while they may have had positive and transformative effects for many of those who have been directly involved, do not achieve their stated ends because they are trapped within the logical reproduction of not only the liberal-democratic paradigm but also settler colonial structures and relations, which continue to threaten Indigenous and treaty rights as well as Indigenous nation-hoods and sovereignties. Yet it is these initiatives that are the state-provided guideposts with which interested non-Indigenous peoples are provided – guideposts which (if accepted) ultimately lead participants to further entrench settler colonial structures and relations as they fail to be able to recognize the realities and demands of decolonization as they actually stand from outside the mutually re-enforcing liberal-democratic and settler-colonial processes and structures.

When colonialism is defined, by scholars like Coulthard and Leanne Simpson, as a continuing form of domination over and dispossession of Indigenous peoples, specific to the logics of erasure evidenced in settler colonial states (Coulthard, 2014; Simpson, 2011), decolonization requires the resurgence and re-centering of Indigenous life and land (Simpson, 2011; Tuck and Yang, 2012) at the same time that it requires a step away from the liberal state (Coulthard, 2014) and the willingness of non-Indigenous peoples to step aside, and to be open to transformative change. The failure of the current liberal-democratic paradigm in being able to identify this, to acknowledge this, is part of what leads to settler uncertainty and alienation for those interested in acting otherwise - toward a politics of decolonization. Just as the state has become stuck within the paradigm so too have its citizens. If decolonization requires non-Indigenous peoples to respond to Indigenous peoples' calls for change, and it should, non-Indigenous society will need to challenge the long-held assumptions, privileges and worldviews (that continue to support colonial structures and processes) at a much deeper level than the contemporary liberal-democratic paradigm allows. This requires moving beyond awareness and

early-learning-stage initiatives (Environics Institute, 2016; Davis et al., 2016) and toward meaningful challenge, change and engagement.

The following, therefore, proposes the concept of the *denizen* as a new analytical tool corresponding to the historic, contemporary and future roles of non-Indigenous peoples. A status and ethos that provides greater normative direction (than for instance the term 'settler') for non-Indigenous peoples who are looking, in good faith, for ways through which they can respond to Indigenous calls for change. A status and ethos that might be able to spark a paradigm shift away from the liberal-democratic one that Canadian state and society find themselves beholden to today. Beginning from the twinned understanding of (settler) colonialism and decolonization identified with Coulthard and Simpson, wherein colonialism is further complicated by "a cacophony of contradictorily hegemonic and horizontal struggles" (Byrd, 2011, 53) between variously situated actors, I seek to articulate the colonial denizen.

It is my contention that the normative-analytical power of the colonial denizen can simultaneously allow non-Indigenous peoples to identify themselves appropriately in relation to historical realities of colonial thought and action, while creating a discursive basis upon which to more appropriately engage in dialogues with local Indigenous peoples thereby identifying further suitable actions and roles within the process of decolonization with respect to Indigenous peoples. As such, I argue that through a denizen-lens non-Indigenous peoples consider themselves 'foreigners' in need of invitation onto Indigenous lands (both past and present). I suggest that as *colonial denizens* non-Indigenous Canadians take up an ethos that encourages them to re-evaluate their lives and relations with Indigenous peoples, Indigenous lands and the settler state. Re-evaluations which encourage non-Indigenous peoples to question the sovereignty of the state, the impacts of the Canadian citizenship regime and their daily relations at the same time that they encourage settlers to place responsibilities to others above inwardly-focused rights. I contend that identifying and acting upon such an ethos provides a way through which non-Indigenous peoples can move past their uncertainty, alienation and fear and begin the discursive, re-orientating work needed to actually hear and meet Indigenous peoples' calls for material change – where non-Indigenous peoples de-center themselves from the discourse at the same time that they help re-center Indigenous lives and lands.

The following chapter will develop the rationale for using this term as well as establish the foundational articulation of the colonial denizen upon which the rest of the dissertation is

premised. As such, I will begin by situating the colonial denizen amongst the traditional terms and roles of colonists within the colonial literature (specifically arrivants, sojourners, colons and guests) arguing that the denizen offers a fresh and necessary addition to traditional roles and conceptions of non-Indigenous actors within colonialism. From here I will offer a short synopsis of the problems inherent within the inclusion/citizenship and recognition-based approaches that have dominated non-Indigenous responses to Indigenous calls for decolonization within Canada, focusing on how the turn to a denizen ethos can offer a way of stepping beyond these confined approaches. Following from this I will begin articulating the colonial denizen as against its use within Ancient Rome, Medieval England and contemporary citizenship studies literature. This will lead me into a fuller articulation of the colonial denizen – its potential as an historical-analytical tool for re-configuring narratives of settlement and belonging and as a contemporary ethos that might help encourage a contemporary paradigm shift for non-Indigenous peoples.

An Argument for the Denizen within Jodi Byrd's Cacophony

There is already a large lexicon of terms used throughout colonial-focused literature to describe the various positions of differently situated 'colonists'. It is important to contextualize the denizen amongst some of the more prominent of these terms as a way of highlighting not only the utility of the *colonial denizen* but to also present a fuller understanding of its application. As I present it here, the *colonial denizen* is not meant to replace already existing terminology (e.g. settler, sojourner, *colon*, arrivant, guest) but to add a useful and necessary term that serves both descriptive and normative functions and which works amongst and as part of these already-established roles. As such, the following presents a short summation of the colonial cacophony-as-lexicon and the way in which the *colonial denizen* fits into and adds to the literature and understandings of colonial roles and relations.

First of all, I will be using the term 'colonist' throughout to refer to *anyone* who comes to a given colony from away. (Almost) everyone who participates (historically and today) at some level in the practice of leaving for a colony or settler colonial state is a part of this cacophony and is implicated in some way within the colonial project as 'colonist'. Both voluntary and involuntary as well as permanent and temporary members of the colony (or settler colonial state), therefore, become implicated within the structure and processes of the colonial project – in some cases simultaneously occupying the position of dominator and dominated (Arneil, 2017). Such a broad application of the term 'colonist' is supported today in the works of Indigenous and

racialized scholars like Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua who, in challenging anti-racial studies to decolonize, recognize that the application of the term 'colonist' is not just confined to Caucasian (and one might add cis-gendered and heteronormative) men and women but is applied to nearly all those who 'come from away' who (while they might experience domination themselves) benefit in some way from the colonial project (2005). Noteworthy here is implied voluntary nature of 'coming from away'. As will be seen within the following parsing of the lexicon, not all colonists are equally implicated within the colonial project and so not all equally benefit from it. Importantly, some individuals who have been forced to migrate to a given colony, slaves for instance, as explored within chapter 6, may not be appropriately identifiable as denizens at all because they too are colonized and so beyond the bounds of the identity of 'colonist' - even where their contemporary progeny may now enjoy some level of colonial privilege and so be identifiable as 'colonist' and so also as denizens somewhere along a broad and interwoven spectrum. This is to say that while the application of the 'denizen' term is meant to be fluid and its given instantiation context-specific, it too has limits. Alongside this, the application of the denizen to any given context or 'colonist'-identified individual, society or group fluctuates alongside this scale of complicity and privilege as do the potential discursive constraints, leanings and material instantiations of a denizen ethos within present realities – even where such constraints, leanings and material instantiations must ultimately be determined through dialogue with local Indigenous peoples.

It is through the various alternative terms (settler, sojourner, etc.) that one identifies and analyzes the diversity along this spectrum within the colonist body. These differences speak predominately, though not exclusively, to differences between one's position as voluntary or involuntary, permanent or temporary colonist within the broader colonial project. For instance, the 'settler' term is suggestive of a voluntary and permanent colonist actor. Within the literature of settler colonial studies (Wolfe, 1999; Veracini, 2010) through which the term has been brought to the forefront of recent discussion "settlers are *founders* of political orders [who]…carry their sovereignty with them" (Veracini, 2010, 3). Settlers are men and women who ultimately seek to establish themselves as Indigenous to foreign lands - a process that is never complete and which is dependent on the continued erasure of Indigenous lives. As such it is a term applicable to the specific settler colonial turn, rather than the precursory economic forms of colonization and empire. While there is an implicit voluntary dimension to the 'settler' term,

suggesting that settlers are those who willingly come to the colony to conscientiously participate within the settler colonial project such a term might apply more broadly to alternatively-situated actors who come to take on such a role – like in the case of indentured servants who decide to remain in the colony as free men following their servitude.

In juxtaposition to the 'settler' is the 'arrivant' – a term initially identified in the work of Carribean poet Kamau Brathwaite and borrowed by Jodi Byrd for her analysis of the colonial cacophony. This term refers to "those people forced into the Americas through the violence of European and Anglo-American colonialism and imperialism around the globe" (Byrd, 2011, xix). While the term is principally used to identify the role of slaves and indentured servants as 'colonists' within the literature, it could also be extended to apply to women like the *filles du roi*, who in many cases, it can be argued, were forced to come to New France to settle and help populate the French-Canadian colonies. This term is used to identify involuntary colonists who experience(d) subordinate roles of domination within the colonial project and yet who are still implicated as colonists, and may be seen to benefit in some ways from the colonization, dispossession and erasure of Indigenous peoples. Such 'colonists' can be either permanent or temporary actors within a given colony. While slaves were indentured for life, thereby suggesting that theirs' is a place of permanence, indentured servants were 'enslaved' for short periods of time and in some cases returned to their homeland upon completion of their contracts.

As chapter 6 will demonstrate, some forced migrants like the *fille du roi* ended up experiencing such relative colonial privileges that they are clearly identifiable as colonists and so potential denizen-like figures. Whereas others are clearly colonized from the outset and so, like Black and Indigenous slaves forced into servitude by the French along the banks of the St. Lawrence, not colonist actors. This is true even where, for instance, the progeny of Black slaves within contemporary Canada may now experience relative privilege, while simultaneously being subjected to various forms of racism and subordination, and so may have a potential role or line of responsibilities as denizen today that would look different from the progeny of voluntary migrants who do not share these contemporary realities and histories.

The denizen serves as an analytic tool through which to identify and analyze the ways that the positions of differently situated colonists, their various relations to Indigenous peoples and the lands, affect(ed) not only their actions but also their willingness and ability to act as denizens - as those who recognize(d) their foreignness to Indigenous lands and act(ed),

respectfully to Indigenous peoples, nations and societies, in kind. As such, it also demonstrates the importance of context both in the past and the present and how this can inform the employment of the denizen term as an ethos today – in other words, the fact that looking to act as a colonial denizen will mean something different to a given individual based on various factors (e.g. how they came to reside on Indigenous lands, their own relation to the colonial state and its structures, and the specific interests and governance structures of local Indigenous peoples with which a given individual looks to dialogically present themselves as 'denizen'). In this way, the denizen is applicable across the already existing lexicon as a further guide to surveying the actual actions and roles of colonists as well as the potential roles of denizens. In addition, it provides a normative lens through which to examine potential moments and models of denizen-like behaviour that can help inform the contemporary paradigm shift, as *denizen ethos*, needed to re-new relations and to substantively and appropriately meet Indigenous calls for de-colonial change.

Importantly, there are other terms within the colonial lexicon that are of further use in filling out the colonial denizen: namely the terms, sojourner, *colon*, guest, and treaty partner. The terms sojourner and *colon* mark yet another important internal difference within the colonist body, highlighting differences specific to socio-economic status. Sojourners were colonists who stayed within the colony for a brief period of time and in many cases occupied roles of considerable power and socio-economic standing (Veracini, 2010, 6). These would be the European explorers, the colonial officials and even certain echelons of the military who would take (seemingly voluntary) temporary residence within the colonies to progress their careers and aspirations as willing colonists of foreign lands. While some of these men eventually took permanent residence within the colonies as 'settlers', this term is generally applied to men of considerable wealth and political standing who voluntarily embarked for temporary sojourns within the colonies. These were men who were interested in directly contributing to the colonial project in whatever form (economic, agrarian, settler) colonization embodied at the time. Today one might identify diplomats, visiting Heads of State, and even foreign property owners as sojourners within settler colonial states like Canada. My application of the term here will not be confined to those of a certain socio-economic bracket but will also include temporary contract workers (in both the fur trade and labour along the river) who returned back to France following their contracts with trade companies and seigneurs respectively.

As an alternative to the more traditional use of sojourner, the French term, *colon* was specifically used to identify 'average' (seemingly voluntary) colonists who were neither at the top echelons of colonial society nor those who were colonized but who (similarly to the 'settler' within settler colonialism) would "slaughter, expel from their own lands, or exploit as a labour force" the Indigenous peoples of the lands they sought to make their own (Young, 2016, 19). In this way the term *colon* offers a helpful directive within the broader 'settler' application in that it forces a distinction between 'average' colonists of lower socioeconomic standing and power and the official and wealthy men who were establishing and activating the major policies of colonialism and imperialism. These terms, therefore, offer further articulation and specification within the study of the colonial cacophony and the *colonial denizen*.

The 'denizen' is most closely related to the concept of 'guest'. Contemporary land acknowledgements that draw to light the colonial privilege of living and working on territories that are not one's own typically lead Indigenous peoples (who are not on their own land) and non-Indigenous peoples to identify themselves as 'uninvited guests' on Indigenous lands. Identifying oneself in this way suggests that the person in question recognizes they have not been invited onto the Indigenous lands they find themselves on and yet who, unlike an 'invader', want to establish positive and anti-colonial relationships with the peoples on whose lands they find themselves. Identifying oneself as a 'guest' in this way, while it could be seen as an imposition in and of itself (through forcing the role of the host), is generally identified as establishing the grounds for positive engagement between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

One of the first colonial applications of this term was made by the Secwepemc (Shushwap), Sylix (Okanagan), and Nlaka;pamux (Couteau) peoples of the pacific west coast in reference to non-Indigenous peoples. As recent work by Jim Tully highlights, these nations (as evidenced through their oration at the 1910 *Sir Wilfrid Laurier Memorial*) identified the French-Canadian fur traders who came, visited, and lived within their territories prior to 1858 as 'good guests'. Guests who respectfully interacted with these nations and demonstrated deference to their laws and customs. Alternatively, within the same memorial, these nations identified those colonists who came into their territories after 1858 (largely Gold Rush opportunists) as 'bad guests' or settlers who sought to impose their own laws and customs on the Indigenous nations (Tully, 2018, 639-42). Tully's analysis of these nations' historic and continuing application of the 'good guest' term (2018), brings to light important ways through which non-Indigenous

peoples might act in better, anti-colonial relations with the Indigenous peoples on whose lands they find themselves. In this way, similarly to my intention with the *colonial denizen*, the 'guest' becomes not only part of the descriptive colonial lexicon but also introduces a normative element – a way through which non-Indigenous peoples might come to think and act otherwise. Taking direction from the *Memorial*, Tully argues that acting as a 'good guest' means that those who find themselves as foreigners on Indigenous lands respect their hosts' laws and customs, and do not interfere with nor seek to dismantle tribal organizations; do not force their conceptions and worldviews on their hosts; do not try to steal or appropriate; do not go 'completely native', but instead share useful knowledge and technologies with their hosts through entering gift-reciprocity relationships (2018).

The 'denizen' takes on a similar role as both descriptor, normative ideal and ethos within the colonial lexicon – encouraging those interested, non-Indigenous peoples, to take up respectful, meaningful dialogical relationships with the Indigenous peoples on whose lands they find themselves. Yet where the 'guest' by very nature of its definition suggests ephemeral status, further supported by the transient roles of original 'good guests' of the fur trade (circa. 1910 *Memorial*), the denizen has the capacity to refer to indefinite presence on Indigenous lands. Given the reality of contemporary global situations and the reasoning that (due to their roles in colonization) non-Indigenous peoples will likely have important roles to play in decolonization, one need to approach decolonization from the understanding that non-Indigenous peoples are indefinite 'colonists' who, where invitations are deemed appropriate and are extended by Indigenous peoples, might be 'here to stay' and yet are people who (regardless of their indefinite status) should begin to act otherwise toward realizing a de-colonial society. As such, there is a need to substantively engage with the (potential) permanence of the non-Indigenous body within the colonial cacophony. The 'denizen', therefore, offers a way to re-conceptualize not only descriptive but also normative analysis of non-Indigenous roles in colonialism and decolonization around this more indefinite and possibly permanent prospect.

The 'denizen', as I am presenting it here, also helps avoid the troubling dichotomy that the application of the 'guest' risks – wherein colonists tend to be identified as being either good or bad. By specifically placing the denizen as one possible role and ethos within the colonial cacophony (as amongst and part of the various roles explored: arrivant, sojourner, settler) its application strives to avoid essentialization. As will become clearer within the historical

chapters, the colonial denizen is not to be found in near-perfect form within a specific actor, but is used as a tool to delineate the different and often conflictual leanings of early colonists who acted in both respectful and disrespectful ways to their Indigenous allies. As such, the denizen is both a normative ideal to strive toward – an ethos to be articulated for the modern world – at the same time that it is an analytical tool through which to identify and analyze the various thoughts and actions of all colonists within the historic and contemporary world who find themselves benefiting from the (settler)colonial project though they may experience domination and subordination themselves. The denizen does not apply to *all* who find themselves as foreigners on Indigenous lands. For instance, the Black and Indigenous slaves found throughout the French colony along the banks of the St. Lawrence are not identifiable as slaves since they were colonized by the colonizers themselves. How exactly the denizen does or does not apply to a host of other involuntary actors (refugees, undocumented migrants and labourers) warrants further exploration and consideration. Its application here is merely meant to get the ball rolling, to get those who find themselves somewhere along the contemporary colonist spectrum thinking through their colonial ties and engaging with local Indigenous peoples, establishing dialogues and being open to the discursive and material changes they can contribute to that accurately situate them within the colonial and decolonial and through which they might help invoke a decolonized future.

While this analysis has provided a clearer picture of both the colonial denizen itself, and where it fits within the broader colonial lexicon, analysis here would be incomplete without a brief discussion of the term's relationship to the 'treaty partner'. The treaty partner is a role that gained prominence following the *Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples'* 1996 report – having since been taken up by various scholars (for instance, see: Asch, 2014; Borrows, 2010; Mills, 2016). It is a role that is deeply tied to concepts of mutual recognition, co-existence and Indigenous self-governance as presented within the same report (RCAP, 1996) – concepts which I will re-visit within the latter part of this chapter. Certainly, there are similarities that can also be drawn between the colonial denizen and treaty partner in terms of their descriptive and normative orientations for non-Indigenous peoples and their relations to Indigenous peoples and lands. For instance, just as with the treaty partner mutual recognition between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples composes an substantial component of a denizen ethos. And for the colonial denizen, treaties themselves (as I will also explore at greater length below) constitute significant

sites of potential invitation for non-Indigenous peoples onto Indigenous lands. Yet, unlike with the treaty partner, the denizen cannot assume they are here to stay. Instead they must be open to the possibility of refusal – that an invitation will not be extended. This means that while the treaty partner is encouraged to take invitation for granted (through invoking the concept of treaty as already established and central to the role, the invitation has already been assumed) the denizen cannot do so and is, in fact, focused on establishing dialogical relationships with local Indigenous peoples not already premised on such potentially colonizing assumptions. There is a liminality and vulnerability, that I will explore at greater length below, that is necessary in the move toward decolonization that is not immediately fostered within the role of 'treaty partner'. This needs to be taken up in a serious and conscientious way through a denizen ethos. Furthermore, given the co-optation of treaty by government through the modern treaty agreements (with their imbalanced power), as well as mainstream understandings of treaty throughout Canadian society, there is perhaps a broader practical element to moving away from the treaty partner role and toward the less weighted colonial denizen.

Overall, it is my contention that the colonial denizen provides a fresh avenue through which to step back from long-held, colonizing paradigms. Importantly, it offers an avenue through which to escape what has been identified as the self-reproducing logic of settler colonialism as it is upheld through contemporary western paradigms. Within the settler colonial literature, colonial thought and action are identified as a meta-structure from which it is difficult if not impossible to escape (Veracini, 2010) as it will always exist and re-enforce its foundations. Herein non-Indigenous peoples are only ever complicit within the structure because there is no foreseeable escape and Indigenous peoples are forced into one of two roles: those who are co-opted or those who resist (Snelgrove et al., 2014). Employing the concept of the colonial denizen, approaching it as an ethos, enables interlocuters to see that while there may be structural aspects to contemporary colonial thought and action it is more than a structure and it is something that can be transcended. Given the colonial denizen's ability to challenge the contemporary liberal-democratic paradigm, it might just be able to foster a new responsibility-focused paradigm that can help interested parties in transcending the structural limitations of the settler colonial turn and encouraging non-Indigenous peoples to enter into respectful and appropriate dialogical relationships with local Indigenous peoples.

On Framing the Issue in Terms of (Liberal-Democratic) Citizenship and Recognition

From the 1857 *Gradual Civilization Act* to the 1969 *White Paper* and beyond, Canada's colonial documents have always been focused on recognizing the 'Indigenous other' in such a way that they can eventually be subsumed into a superimposed yet vulnerable settler citizenship regime (Tobias, 1983). Even prior to Confederation, and the search for Canadian-specific citizenship, the government was establishing 'Indian' status as a means of identifying and controlling Indigenous populations so that they could eventually be 'civilized' and effectively erased through their incorporation into settler society (*Gradual Civilization Act*, 1857). As Audra Simpson argues, citizenship is a central technique (power) of statecraft. It is through the granting (or withholding) of citizenship that the "state's power is made real and personal…[it is the tool through which the state develops] the structural and legal preconditions for intimacy, forms of sociability, belonging and affection" (2014, 18). Time and again, the Canadian settler state has tried to use this power to silence the threat Indigenous populations pose, through their very existence, to the legitimacy of the state and Canadian society. And continually Indigenous populations have refused to be silenced, erased and subsumed through incorporation into the broader settler project.

One of the more prominent examples of this citizenship-based imposition within recent history centers around the 1969 federal *White Paper* which attempted to force the Canadian liberal-democratic citizenship regime upon Indigenous peoples through eliminating 'Indian' status. While the goal of 'Indian' status, since it was first created in the *Gradual Civilization Act* (1857), has always been the eventual incorporation and erasure of Indigenous peoples, this 1969 policy was an attempt to expedite a process Indigenous peoples have on mass continually refused (Kainai Board of Education, 2005; Molloy, 1983). The wholesale rejection of the 1969 *White Paper* by Indigenous representatives (Indian Association of Alberta, 1970; Union of BC Indian Chiefs, 1970; Cardinal, 1999), as well as the continuing suspicion and critique of contemporary recognition-based approaches (Coulthard, 2014; Simpson, 2014; Corntassel, 2012), should clearly demonstrate to non-Indigenous peoples that the way forward is not one based on state techniques of western citizenship, status and liberal-based recognition politics. This is not what Indigenous peoples have been advocating and demanding. Decolonization requires a step away from such techniques and state logics toward something else, something that has not necessarily thus far been imagined. And yet, so many contemporary non-Indigenous responses to Indigenous

calls to decolonize are tethered to citizenship and recognition-based approaches of the liberal-democratic paradigm.

These are the two popular approaches (citizenship and recognition) taken by non-Indigenous scholars in response to calls for decolonization. Both are ultimately based within a liberal worldview. The first focuses on making the citizenship regime more inclusive of Indigenous peoples and is based on the assumption that the state is a legitimate sovereign power wherein Indigenous peoples want to and will benefit from further inclusion within state structures and processes. The second focuses on equalizing the discursive field of the public sphere through a politics of recognition that ultimately upholds the relations of power it attempts to disband. While these approaches differ in important ways they both end up circumscribing the discussion as well as possible solutions to colonization within the structures and logics of the colonial thought and action they are meant to address. They are, therefore, problematic approaches to decolonization as they serve to uphold and reinforce settler privilege and security at the continued expense of Indigenous life and land.

Take for instance Alan Cairns' *Citizens Plus*, a well-received scholarly work by one of the leading scholars on Canadian politics at the time it was published at the turn of the twenty-first century.[4] Taking a citizenship-based approach, Cairns argues that Indigenous peoples within Canada should be considered 'citizens plus' – individuals who hold the usual rights and duties of a liberal-democratic Canadian citizenship but whom hold additional rights in recognition of their special status within the Canadian community. A special status they hold by way of their position as self-governing nations prior to European contact. In arguing that the Canadian reality is one of interdependence, between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, Cairns contends that Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians will be best served by an approach that enables them to share a common link. Identifying other possible solutions like nation-to-nation relationships as inappropriate, Cairns states that a common link – to be found within a common, though differentiated citizenship – is a "necessary support for the empathy that would make us feel responsible for each other" (2011, 182-3), and that it is the denial of full citizenship inclusion that is largely to blame for Status Indians' "immiseration" (2011, 182-3).

---

[4] Cairns' book was shortlisted for the 2011 Donner Prize as well as the Harold Adams Innis Prize. This speaks to how seriously this work was taken within Canadian policy debates and scholarship.

Such citizenship-centered approaches (such as Kymlicka, 1996; Macklem, 2001; Russell, 2004) assume the liberal-democratic Canadian state is politically and ethically neutral and legitimate, and provide little to no space to identify, explore or question that state's legitimacy as a sovereignty entity. Here colonial thought and action are seen as realities of the past for which Canadians may see a residue of today but from which non-Indigenous peoples can distance themselves *if* they move to fully incorporate Indigenous peoples into the public sphere through citizenship extension. Such approaches fail to recognize not only that (in many cases) Indigenous peoples have continually refused these extensions, but that it is the citizenship regime itself that continues to be used as a tool of assimilation (Alfred and Corntassel, 2005), a regime that assumes and bolsters the presumed legitimacy of the settler state and which is, therefore, inconsistent as a starting point toward the goal of decolonization.

While liberal-based recognition approaches tend to focus broadly on civil society, with a critical eye toward state institutions, they too fall into similar traps. For instance, Charles Taylor's highly-acclaimed essay "The Politics of Recognition" responds to liberal democracy's push for difference-blind equal rights recognition by arguing that recognition cannot be blindly implemented as such an approach not only misunderstands the (Hegelian-based) dialogical nature of identity formation. It will also result in the misrecognition of others, leading them to suffer 'real damage [and] real distortion" (Taylor, 1994, 25). For Taylor due recognition (the ability to positively self-identify and have this self-identity recognized by broader society) is not just a courtesy owed to people but a vital human need (1994). In calling on interlocutors to embrace a Gadamerian fusion of horizons, to come into dialogue as open and self-reflexive individuals, Taylor suggests that recognition of the other is an inherent rather than instrumental good that requires mutual respect from all participants.

Where such recognition-based approaches might appear more amenable to de-colonial goals, works like Taylor's still uphold the colonial hegemony of the settler state. For instance, Taylor maintains an 'us' and 'them' within his theory wherein it becomes clear that the "text is speaking of an Anglo-American, so-called Canadian 'us', who are being attributed the power of recognizing or not recognizing 'them'" (Bannerji, 2000, 135). Through implicitly upholding power relations, thereby forcing the other to translate their voice and identity within the reasonable bounds of dominant society, this approach ultimately upholds the colonial relations and assumptions that need to be critically evaluated and changed. One sees this recognition-

based approach within Canadian politics and society today, through politics of accommodation, recognition, and reconciliation that have been implemented with the colonial aims of continuing to dispossess and subordinate Indigenous peoples (Coulthard, 2014). Where moves to recognition are really just attempts to "materialize the fantasy of certainty and stability for settlers, always encompassing Indigenous nations into the 'jurisdictional imaginary' of the settler nation" (Mackey, 2016, 60). Just as with citizenship-based approaches, therefore, recognition-based methods also uphold the colonial even when they claim to move beyond it toward a de-colonial politics and society.

There is a need to move beyond both citizenship and recognition-based methods which ultimately re-assert and solidify colonial control while claiming to move beyond the colonialism they are supposed to surmount. There needs to be a place where Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples can enter into dialogue wherein the colonial hegemony is not upheld and the boundaries of the discourse are not pre-inscribed – wherein interlocuters will actually be able to hear and respond to one another through mutual respect and acknowledgment.

Instead of beginning with either a politics of citizenship or a politics of recognition, therefore, discussions should begin instead with the principle of non-Indigenous peoples as *denizens* (foreigners who need to be invited) within Indigenous peoples' territory, both past and present. To re-conceive of non-Indigenous peoples as denizen and to act within a denizen ethos, will aid not only in recognizing the roles non-Indigenous people have played within colonial thought and action (past and present) but also in allowing for much greater possibilities to imagine the move toward decolonization. And so, what I am calling for, as a non-Indigenous scholar, is a move away from the politics of recognition and rights as citizens toward a politics of responsibility as denizens. Within such a politics, non-Indigenous peoples are encouraged to re-evaluate their local relationships to Indigenous lives and lands, their relationships to the state and broader state systems, at the same time they are encouraged to look to establish local, discursive relationships with Indigenous peoples premised on dialogically determining what such a 'denizen' role and/or ethos looks like within the logics of local Indigenous governance, law and ethics. The *colonial denizen* as I present it here is, after all, a jumping-off-point, through which interested non-Indigenous peoples can more appropriately, discursively, situate themselves in order determine, through dialogue with local Indigenous peoples, what material, as well as further discursive work, can be accomplished to help bring about decolonization.

Situating the Colonial Denizen Against its Political Origins and Contemporary Use

There are multiple definitions of the 'denizen', ranging from an inhabitant of a specified space to a person admitted residence in a foreign country (OED, n.d.). While the former tends to be used within the natural sciences as a non-politicized term, the latter is derived from historical practices of inclusion within politically specified areas. A colonial articulation of the denizen finds its grounding within the term's political application. This is partially to do with the term's 'natural' science application being hindered by its implicit naturalization (as de-politicization) of subjects, which troublingly aligns such an application with settler colonial moves to erase Indigenous populations as political peoples and Indigenize colonists in their place. Alignment with its political use is also due to the overwhelmingly political nature of re-orienting non-Indigenous peoples toward substantive decolonization with Indigenous peoples, and the ability of a political articulation to help illuminate vital aspects of such a paradigm shift that helps re-center Indigenous sovereignties and nationhoods.

The term itself is derived from the Latin root words: *de intus*, meaning 'from within', and *aneus*, meaning 'foreign', therefore, meaning "foreigner from within" (Berry, 1944, 491). Broadly, this term has been used as a political identity marker – a status bestowed upon an individual who is a foreigner within a political territory, who has been allowed to inhabit this area given that they pledge allegiance as well as fulfill certain obligations to the preeminent political power of the territory. Traditionally, this was a status that conferred upon the foreigner a curtailed membership based upon the fulfilment of a set of responsibilities under the political power to which they sought standing.

The historic and contemporary use of the denizen, however, is tied up in the practice and study of colonization, empire and citizenship – the very things that state and society need to address and move past when the goal is decolonization. In Ancient Rome, for instance, the process of *civitas sine suffragio*, which is closely associated with the medieval practice of denization (Berry, 1944), was an imperial tool through which the Romans commodified their civil law to incorporate and colonize conquered peoples. They would extend partial citizenship to conquered colonies on the condition that certain conditions (namely conscription to the Roman military) were met each year (Yeo, 1959). In the early days of the Empire this helped strengthen Roman power throughout conquered lands (MacKendrick, 1952). So why am I interested in

using this term for decolonial ends? And perhaps more importantly, how can it be salvaged for such ends?

First and foremost, the core of the definition, beyond its specific application within the Ancient and later Medieval worlds, holds considerable potential in encouraging a decolonial paradigm shift. The core of the definition identifies an important relationship of belonging, dependence and responsibility that appears to be wanting within the contemporary western political lexicon. It situates those who are foreign to a given area as requiring not only recognition of their foreignness but also invitation, by those who are of the area, to co-exist with those who are sovereign/responsible to the lands upon which the foreigners seek to rest/live. It places such 'invited foreigners' within a vulnerable position as those who are not 'native' to the area and who do not, necessarily, get to experience full access to membership (through whichever system of relations and belonging exist within a given locale). In other words, if non-Indigenous peoples within settler-colonial states began to understand themselves and their civic ancestors as potential 'denizens' (as based on the core definition) they would understand that they need to be invited to co-habit Indigenous territories; that their position on such territories would require a recognition of Indigenous law and governance structures as legitimate and primary; that *they* would be the populations requiring invitation and by extension recognition; and that such invitation and recognition would require the continual fulfilment of responsibilities under local Indigenous and governance structures. Taking the concept from its bare-bones definition, therefore, and re-formatting it from within a (de)colonial lens, demonstrates the denizen's potential to re-situate Indigenous life and land through recognizing Indigenous populations' sovereignties and settler peoples' vulnerabilities as non-Indigenous peoples.

Taking up the denizen concept in this way could be a huge leap toward a paradigm shift, a way through which to properly acknowledge Indigenous peoples' pre-existing and continuing governance structures and legal systems. One could make the argument that the original European colonists should have recognized themselves as foreigners requiring invitation onto Indigenous lands through Indigenous governance and legal structures wherein, upon invitation, the European presence was as denizens and not imperial powers. As I explore within chapter two, the Euro-Canadian narrative of original encounters between the French and Innu, for instance, appears to demonstrate such invitation-through-treaty (Pollack, 2012) even though Indigenous records as well as the progression of history have shown that high-level European

intentions (even so early on) were ultimately imperially-driven and problematic (Dickason, 2001; Vincent, 2002). This does not discount the potential of the denizen concept and its use as a guide to re-evaluate the vast history of Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations. If anything it only amplifies the term's potential to act as a tool to re-visit and re-story histories of contact and relations given the term's ability to highlight both descriptive and normative realities as well as tensions throughout the history of Indigenous-colonist relations.

Despite the term's colonial entanglement, there may still be key aspects of the term's historic use in the ancient and medieval worlds, as well as within its contemporary analysis in citizenship studies, that can offer some potential insights as to how one might further conceive of the colonial denizen (even where its application has been under paradigms that need to be escaped). As an example, the Roman process of *civitas sine suffragio* demonstrates belonging is not just a trajectory from foreigner to member. It was not just individuals of conquered colonies that could become partial 'citizens' of Rome. As a means of population control the Roman government increasingly encouraged Roman citizens to take up residence (and so to give up their full citizenship rights) within the colonies (MacKendrick, 1955). This helps challenge conceptions around teleology and membership practices. In turn, this helps in acknowledging and complicating the various intersectional identities individuals may have in relation to things like race, gender, and land within Byrd's colonial cacophony, therefore, enabling academics, activists and interlocuters to grapple with the complexity of life, relations and belongings as they actually exist.

The denizen's early use within the Ancient and Medieval worlds also demonstrates that the term's origins are not confined to state-centric logics. Neither Ancient Rome nor Medieval England were composed as nation-states. This supports the introduction of the term into contemporary use as a fresh concept, unburdened by the baggage of the nation-state and its associated terms of belonging. Consciously turning away from state-centric terms can enable greater paradigm shifting amongst non-Indigenous populations. Such non-state-centric application of the denizen is even available within the contemporary citizenship literature. Focusing on the effects of neoliberalism and privatization, the work of Clifford Shearing and Jennifer Wood, for instance, applies the term to identify and explain the multiplicity of obligations people share across various governance sites (beyond the state) that are difficult to categorize by the public/private divide (2003). Not only do Shearing and Wood apply the

denizen in a contemporary non-state-centric manner, but their application of the denizen also opens up space for the term to carry a desirable and even exclusive status within society – for instance being a denizen of a gated community which holds exclusivity and distinction for the individual. Such a positive connotation is noteworthy given traditional connotations of the status as being 'less-than' and undesirable. This positive connotation can serve to inspire ways to balance unsettling, hope and belonging when taking up a denizen ethos.

Finally, Mick Smith's application of the denizen within his 2005 article "Citizens, Denizens and the *Res Publica*"(2005) demonstrates the productive and creative capacities inherent within the term itself. Quite apart from the more traditional citizenship-based applications (Hammar, 1990; Standing, 2011; Turner, 2016), Smith looks to articulate a re-formulated citizenship ethos that is more in line with environmental ethics. According to Smith, modern citizenship (and the *res publica* it helps sustain) establishes an ethos that excludes non-human life. This exclusion prohibits the inclusion of appropriate, and for Smith, necessary, environmental ethics within contemporary western governance practices and citizenship regimes. This in turn threatens both the human and non-human worlds. For Smith, the denizen offers a positive way through which to establish a different *res publica* – one that incorporates both the human and non-human world in mutually sustainable ways. According to Smith, if humans are to re-situate themselves as denizens to the natural world they need to recognize themselves as occupying a more ambiguous place (in relation to the non-human world) than they currently do when they consider themselves citizens from within a western paradigm. As denizens they would be in relations not of "rule-bound equality imposed by an external authority…but on an understanding and recognition of the importance of context and difference" (Smith, 2005, 19). For Smith, therefore, a denizen ethos enables societies to restructure themselves in ways that force them to question anthropocentric concepts of life, politics and the world and to re-image political orders more inclusive of the non-human world, their dependence on this world and environmental ethics. Smith's application of the denizen appears particularly compelling when applying the term to a colonial context. He takes stock of the term's productive capacities, its ability to help people to think otherwise and to re-evaluate their relations to people and land - such re-evaluations that are needed within a decolonial application of the denizen.

While the historic uses and contemporary applications of the term are troublingly colonial and citizenship-oriented, such applications still offer valuable guiding points in the move to

articulating a colonial denizen. Such applications demonstrate the utility of the term not being beholden to state-centric origins and applications, it's capacity to engage with belonging as a non-teleological, as well as its productive capacity to encourage people to re-imagine their relations to life and land beyond confining state-centric paradigms of liberal citizenship and recognition.

Articulating the Colonial Denizen: Re-Aligning Responsibilities, Lands and People

Deciphering exactly what non-Indigenous roles within decolonization could materially look like requires that non-Indigenous state and society first undergo a paradigm shift – away from the current liberal-democratic paradigm that continues to uphold settler colonial processes and structures. This paradigm shift is a guide for non-Indigenous state and society to be able to engage Indigenous calls for decolonization on their own merits, outside of the confining approaches of the current paradigm. What I am proposing within this dissertation is a theory that could animate such a shift: the theory of the colonial denizen. What I am specifically presenting here, however, are only the first two components of this shift: the theory and the discursive exercise that leads to the more substantive discursive, material, and specifically local, instantiation of an ethos and its resultant broader, societal, paradigm shift.

While I have already begun fleshing out the theory of the colonial denizen above, within this final section I will elaborate upon my intentions with its use as both an historic-analytical tool and a contemporary discursive exercise. It is important to note here that what is being presented is not a full articulation of the colonial denizen, of exactly *how* it's application would alter the real material politics of the heavily entrenched western nation-state, its colonial logics and the international realm. What I am providing here are the theoretical foundations of the concept of a colonial denizen, its use as a discursive tool for non-Indigenous peoples interested in decolonization, upon which contemporary local action as well as necessary (materially-focused) future research and action could be based. As such, the following begins to set the stage for the colonial denizen's use as both a tool of historic analysis of the colonial past as well as a contemporary discursive ethos focused on un-settling and re-visioning shared presents and futures in the goal toward decolonization.

As an Historic-Analytic Tool

While there is no evidence to suggest original settlers considered themselves as denizens, application of this colonial role within the analysis of historic encounters and relations has the

potential to not only deepen historical analysis but to also inform contemporary understandings of how non-Indigenous peoples might take up a denizen ethos. As a method for deepening historical analysis the application of the colonial denizen is more in line with a status or role – though one could simultaneously employ the term historically as an ethos – as a way of measuring how colonists' actions aligned or misaligned with an understanding of themselves as foreigners who required invitation onto Indigenous lands. When placed as a potential role within the colonial lexicon identified earlier, the colonial denizen can enrich identification and understandings around differentially situated actors within the colonial project and their actions - therein identifying newer avenues of analysis that are both descriptive and normative in nature. Further research is required here to identify and analyze the early contact period, the multifaceted roles of early settlers and the ways in which they may have acted as either more precarious, dependent denizens or else as land and power-driven colonists. Such an analysis has the potential to not only deepen contemporary understandings of how a denizen ethos could be taken up today but also helps in charting how colonist positions vis à vis Indigenous life and land have evolved over time. The following five chapters seek to do just this, thereby deepening contemporary articulations and understandings around a colonial-denizen ethos.

Such an historical application of the term presents avenues through which to challenge foundational colonial paradigms that were used to justify the colonization of Indigenous life and land – like the colonial paradigm animated by the theory of *terra nullius*. These are paradigms that might not hold the same traction today as they once did, but which still influence understandings of broader settlement narratives and which continue to inform contemporary thought and action in less obvious and direct ways. Along this same line of thought, an historical application of the term also provides openings through which to re-orient the Canadian settlement narrative of discovery. A re-orientation through which Indigenous peoples' historically-grounded and continuing sovereignty and governance are acknowledged and supported at the same time that original and contemporary colonists are re-situated as foreigners in need of invitation. Under such an application of the term, non-Indigenous peoples become foreigners in need of denizenation rather than colonists of an empty land who were (possibly) granted the rights of co-habitation through Indigenous customs of invitation or else who were to permanently remain foreigners who would likely return home. Such re-orientation of the settlement narrative not only has implications for understandings of history, but also has

repercussions for current settler understandings of belonging and place. Such contemporary repercussions will require a re-evaluation of concepts like settlement, treaty, property, citizenship and the state. While this historic application is important for re-evaluating contact narratives, belonging and relations of shared pasts, such an historical application can in turn lead to clearer articulations for a substantive application of a contemporary denizen ethos both discursively and ultimately materially.

As a Contemporary Discursive Exercise

As a discursive exercise, the theory of the colonial denizen animates a thought experiment focused on confronting and challenging the various assumptions present within contemporary (and, as identified above, even historic) paradigms that work to support the establishment and continuing vitality of colonial processes and structures. For instance, it can be used to explore and challenge the Lockean-liberal theory that not only supported the concept of *terra nullius*, and which helped justify early European colonization, but that has also grounded modern understandings of the sovereign individual endowed with reason and the isolating theory of individual rights that animate the contemporary liberal-democratic paradigm. Through the exploration and challenge of such theories and their broader paradigms, the colonial denizen can help in providing the language and discursive expansion necessary for non-Indigenous peoples to recognize the limits of current paradigms, to hear and begin to more accurately understand the calls and demands of people who are situated outside of these very paradigms, and to be open to the more substantive discursive and material shifts necessary to meet with local Indigenous peoples so that together they can imagine and bring into being realities that are otherwise. In this way, the contemporary discursive exercise of the colonial denizen is meant to be a guide, a jumping-off-point, for interested non-Indigenous peoples to more humbly and appropriately meet in dialogue with local Indigenous peoples to begin discussing what specific, localized instantiations of what decolonizing non-Indigenous roles might look like. As such, the contemporary discursive exercise is both a broad-based, abstracted, principle that can help bring about a larger societal paradigm shift as well as an available practice that can help mobilize localized, dialogical engagement toward necessary material, as well as further discursive, change.

As such, it is important to provide a brief an overview of the colonial denizen theory before delving into the broader discursive exercise. The theory of the colonial denizen suggests

that if non-Indigenous peoples can understand themselves (both historically and today) as foreigners in need of invitation by Indigenous peoples, for their presence on Indigenous lands to be legitimate, than Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples might be able to collectively move toward a properly grounded material decolonization that exists beyond the confines of the contemporary liberal-democratic paradigm and its bolstering of settler colonialism. This theory is not based directly in Indigenous thought or critical political theory but on the understanding that if the Europeans that originally colonized the Indigenous peoples of North America had properly understood themselves as foreigners to Indigenous lands and societies, their place (and the place of their civic progeny) – upon invitation - would have been as denizens of a foreign land. And if this were the case then non-Indigenous peoples would have been living in better relation with Indigenous peoples and would have not instantiated colonizing relationships. In this way the theory of the colonial denizen is structured on a discursive re-visiting of settlement history that asks what the past, present and future would look like if non-Indigenous peoples recognized that they had to be invited onto Indigenous lands. Here recognition of oneself as foreigner to Indigenous lands requires the recognition of and the acceptance that an invitation might not be extended and that further discussion might need to occur as to what this means. While the recognition of oneself as colonial denizen, where such invitation has been extended, requires the privileging of responsibilities over rights, acknowledgement of and deference toward Indigenous legal systems, as well as the sustenance of mutual co-existence and respect in relations with Indigenous peoples and lands. The following will engage the concepts of Indigenous life and land, treaty and invitation through the use of the colonial denizen theory in order to demonstrate how one might begin exploring the proposed contemporary discursive exercise that can lead to a new ethos and paradigm shift.

Since decolonization requires the re-centering of Indigenous life and land, the ethos and paradigm shift that non-Indigenous society needs has to encourage this re-centering. This re-centering can begin through discursive practice, through encouraging the provincialization (i.e. recognition of the non-universal character) of western thought and institutions and the re-evaluation of origin and settlement stories in ways that not only open space for Indigenous voice and vision but open such spaces in ways that encourage non-Indigenous peoples to actively step back from the center of their colonially-derived narratives and institutions.

While there are a number of decolonizing education initiatives in place within Canada today, they tend not to push participants far enough. A recent article by Lynne Davis et al. identified and assessed more than 200 initiatives taken to change non-Indigenous Canadians' understandings of Indigenous peoples, colonialism and settler colonialism as they have informed and continue to exist within contemporary Canadian society (2016). The authors found that while many of these initiatives are positive (early learning stage) developments in the move toward decolonization, there is a huge gap between such early stage initiatives and the later stages that are needed to "actually confront settler positionalities and privilege" (Davis et al., 2016, 14). They argued that while these programs demonstrated positive development, by not forcing their participants to confront positionalities and privileges they risked becoming a move to settler innocence for non-Indigenous peoples who achieve "redemption through the act of listening" (Davis et al., 11). I would contend that a large part of this gap has to do with the pervasive nature of contemporary western paradigms that foreclose certain lines of inquiry and privilege the centering of 'settler certainty' above and beyond Indigenous interests. Not only can the colonial denizen theory challenge non-Indigenous peoples to de-center themselves from the (de)colonial discourse it can also encourage them to broaden their horizons – to challenge their personal and societal assumptions and to be open to dialogue and change. These are all necessary aspects of a substantive move toward decolonization – they are all necessary moves in bridging the gap between initial, early learning initiatives and more tangible de-colonial change.

Taking up a denizen ethos also needs to privilege the identification of land and treaties as important aspects in the discourse around decolonization. For instance, state-centered citizenship approaches take the land largely for granted, similarly to how they take the nation-state's legitimacy for granted. As a number of Indigenous scholars and activists argue Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples cannot move forward toward any type of reconciliation or decolonization without talking about land. As an Anishnaabekwe from Mississauga territory, Leanne Simpson argues:

> Land is an important conversation for Indigenous peoples and Canada to have because land is at the root of our conflicts. Far from asking settler Canadians to pack up and leave, it is critical that we think about how we can better share land. That's a conversation we're not having (2016).

Just as one sees with settler positionality and privilege, land remains largely absent from any substantive reception. And yet with Mick Smith's employment of term, one can see how using a

denizen ethos can be instrumental in encouraging non-Indigenous peoples to re-evaluate their relationships with land. Smith's work offers people a way through which they might not only re-center discourses of decolonization around land but also in such a way that they can re-evaluate their direct relationships to the land. Given that Indigenous worldviews, governance structures and legal systems are based on vulnerable, formative and responsibility-driven relationships to both the human and non-human world, wherein which 'land' is included (Chilisa, 2012; Wilson, 2009; Little Bear, 2000), the denizen provides two important avenues to encourage paradigm shifts in the move to decolonize: re-centering of land within the discourse surrounding decolonization as well as a foundation from which to re-evaluate more direct relationships to the land in such a way that non-Indigenous peoples are encouraged to recognize and practice more holistically-based relations to land and the non-human world that align with local Indigenous governance structures and processes. These two avenues are intrinsically pursued when the intended territorial nature of the denizen, its invocation at the local level, is employed through the establishment of meaningful dialogue between local Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples as premised on the position of non-Indigenous peoples as potential colonial denizens.

The paradigm shift the *colonial denizen* seeks to encourage is, therefore, not merely focused on relations between people but also, and importantly, on relationship to land. As Joëlle Alice Michaud-Ouellet argues in her work on vulnerability, sovereignty and treaty amongst the Québécois settler population, moving forward in right, decolonizing relationships with Indigenous peoples is not just about improving direct relations with Indigenous peoples but also about shifting non-Indigenous relationships to land – "relating to the land with respect and humility" (2019, 2). Non-Indigenous state and society have a tendency to conceive of land, and relationship to land in terms of the legal, material, and capital – it is an entity that provides privilege and power, or status, to the beholder(s). Indigenous conceptualizations of land, however, are far different and tend to identify land as an interconnected part of a much broader system of life within which peoples are situated as stewards (Michaud-Ouellet, 2019, 20). A *colonial denizen* ethos, therefore, requires not only the re-situation of land within the discourse on decolonization but a shift, and openness, to reconsidering the ways through which relationship to land is currently circumscribed within contemporary structures (capitalism, state, property, etc.) and to, as Michaud-Ouellet suggests, reflect on how non-Indigenous peoples might transform their own relationship to land, belonging and self-determination.

Treaty also becomes an important part of this discursive process. This is because treaty, whether formally or informally established, is easily identifiable as a possible form of invitation. Yet, treaty must be approached cautiously from within a colonial denizen ethos due to the settler states' continuing ability to:

> discursively transform…treaties from relationships to land cession contracts…[as a way to] disguise the illegitimacy of their [settler states'] settlement, which ha[s] been rendered unlawful [since] the moment they violated the treaty relationships and commitments that authorized their presence across Indigenous lands (Stark, 2016).

As recent work by Heidi Stark highlights, the treaty process in Canada has transformed over the years to better follow the "eliminatory logic of settler colonialism…reconstruct[ing] treaties away from Indigenous visions of living relationships toward a contractual event" (2016). Grappling with treaty from a colonial denizen ethos, therefore, necessitates the acknowledgement of this colonization of treaty with a view toward successfully understanding, engaging and acting from Indigenous-based understandings of treaties as living relationships and potential sites of invitation.

Treaties as living relationships have been an important aspect of many Indigenous governance systems, worldviews and legal structures since time immemorial. As living relationships they are premised on the concepts of respect, responsibility and renewal amongst participants (Stark, 2010; Williams Jr., 1997). And so to understand treaty from such a lens requires that interlocuters enter into treaty on the sustained basis of mutual respect, mutual responsibility toward each other as well as on the understanding that their living relationship will need to be consistently tended to and maintained throughout its course. It is treaties that establish living relationships and so set the ground for recognition between peoples and therefore exist as potential sites of Indigenous invitation to non-Indigenous foreigners to visit/exist/co-habit Indigenous territories. For instance, it has been argued that early ceremony-based treaties between the Innu and the French during the early seventeenth century established such a relationship wherein the French were permitted to co-exist (to what extent is disputed) on Innu territory in exchange for their military and economic aid (Pollack, 2012).

As Heidi Stark points out, a well-rounded understanding of treaties is deeper than even this, it requires the recognition that (if such treaties act as sites of invitation) they also act as a site of (some sort of) induction into the already existing webs of treaties-as-relations that a given Indigenous peoples have with other Indigenous peoples as well as the non-human world (Stark,

2012). This in turn places upon the invited foreigners-turned-denizens responsibilities not only to uphold the conditions of the given treaty-as-invitation but the broader web of treaties-as-relationships that their treaty partners already hold. In grappling with treaty, the fostering of a colonial denizen ethos today, therefore, requires understanding treaty as a living relationship that could act as a site of (partial) invitation onto Indigenous lands as well as into Indigenous legal and political orders. An invitation that is only available through the continual fulfilment of obligations as outlined and re-visited between treaty members, wherein treaties are more than documents between Indigenous peoples and the Crown but necessarily include non-Indigenous inhabitants of a given treaty area as members. As such, a re-visiting of treaties as living relationships not only identifies and re-centers Indigenous nationhood and governance but acts as a natural site (give the role of responsibilities, relations and potential invitation) to situate non-Indigenous peoples as foreigners and potential colonial denizens.

It is important that treaties, or treaty-like relationships, to the extent they are deemed desirable, be approached from outside the contemporary liberal-democratic paradigm. When treaties and the associated contemporary concepts like mutual recognition are approached from within this colonially-supportive paradigm, they are transmuted into alternative creatures that do not uphold the primacy of Indigenous worldviews, life and land but settler security and certainty – the colonial privileges of those who benefit from the current paradigms. From here Indigenous interests are only conceded to so far as they do not fundamentally disrupt the security and certainty of settler colonial state and society. Approaching treaty from a colonial denizen ethos, however, encourages the re-politicization of treaty as a potential site of invitation and mutual recognition that, according to David Scott, have long been de-politicized through the imperializing lens of culture where treaty and its interpretation are reduced to a difference in culture rather than politics (2013). The colonial denizen is meant to encourage non-Indigenous society from this comfort zone, from the place where it de-politicizes Indigenous life, land and treaties so that it can maintain its privilege and security.

Where treaty through liberal-democracy seeks to make room for Indigenous difference through a sort of devolution of some governance powers to recognized bands, where it frames the discourse of co-existence as an issue of living together across cultural differences, treaty through the colonial denizen seeks to shift power relations and re-politicize issues of treaty and mutual recognition. Where the 'treaty partner' of the liberal-democratic paradigm takes

invitation for granted, the colonial denizen does not. Where the 'treaty partner' makes room for Indigenous difference within liberal-democracy, the colonial denizen asks what would it look like if (s)he had to accommodate to Indigenous legal systems and political paradigms. Where the 'treaty partner' maintains their colonial certainty and security, the colonial denizen risks losing them. In embracing vulnerability, in looking to re-center Indigenous life and land, this discursive work looks to re-politicize issues around colonialism, co-existence and mutual recognition within non-Indigenous society away from the confining liberal-democratic paradigm so that real structural and material change has a chance to develop through a renewed discourse between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples wherein non-Indigenous peoples are better able to identify and understand Indigenous paradigms and calls for change.

Having said all of this, however, it is important to provide room for invitation and relations beyond such specific treaty-focused conceptualizations. As will become clear in the re-orientation of the contact narrative not all places throughout Canada where non-Indigenous peoples currently reside are marked by treaty. And many if not all of those areas that are marked by treaty have been identified as thinly-veiled land grabs – some of these without any substantive invitation or discussion. Discursive exercises focused on the colonial denizen, therefore, need to be cognizant of how vastly different contact histories across the continent have occurred and been upheld and to be flexible in application to such differences. Even in areas of treaty – as vast and multifaceted as treaties and treaty relations are – space and relation have eclipsed these important, living relations and (potential) invitations. One of the strengths of the colonial denizen is that it is adaptable to these various contexts and to re-imaginings of treaty-like relationships in areas where treaties do not currently exist.

In connection to treaties, treaty-like relations, and invitation one of the concept's most intriguing contributions might be its potential to challenge western notions around rights and responsibilities. Within a liberal democratic state, there is a tendency to place greater emphasis on the *rights* of membership (as citizenship) rather than the duties. This is in part due to modern understandings of citizenship and politics wherein the sovereign individual is vested with inalienable rights and freedoms prior to political association (Insin et al, 1999). Under such an understanding of citizenship, the sovereign individual has the right to decide whether or not they wish to actively participate within the public sphere – they have the right to relinquish or ignore some, if not all, of their political duties. In fact, it has been argued that under neo-liberal

influences citizens have increasingly become focused on consuming their rights as isolated, passive members of society, therefore, increasingly ignoring the active duties liberal-democratic citizenship entails (Turner, 2016). This modern privileging of rights clearly pre-dates the neo-liberal turn as it is also present within earlier citizenship literature. For instance, T.H. Marshall's exploration of the evolution of modern citizenship, a formative text for the field, bolsters this tendency in charting the development of citizenship as an evolution in the granting of civil, political and social rights (Marshall, 1950). If one approaches their position relative to others and the land as denizen, however, *responsibilities* take centre stage and rights become precarious privileges dependent on the fulfilling of responsibilities. Not only does such a re-orientation hold enormous decolonizing potential in and of itself, it also better aligns with many Indigenous ontologies and understandings around relationships to the human and non-human world (Chilisa, 2012; Wilson, 2009; Little Bear, 2000; Stark, 2012). Such alignment with Indigenous ontologies helps to re-center Indigenous peoples, understandings and lands within the discourse. At the same time that it offers interested non-Indigenous peoples the language and knowledge to begin transforming their own discursive understandings around settler colonialism, decolonization and their place(s) therein.

While this is a potentially radical re-orientation, I am not suggesting here that the Canadian state necessarily be abolished. Rather, what I am suggesting is that taking up a denizen ethos today entails re-visiting our conceptions around belonging and membership and the relationships we have to the public sphere, rights and duties at the local, national and even global levels. It is through such a re-focusing that non-Indigenous peoples can be encouraged to challenge their privilege and positionality, the legitimacy of the state, the logic of function of capitalism, their notions around property and their colonial implications as well as to re-center the discourse of decolonization around Indigenous peoples and lands. Hopefully, this leads to an avoidance of moves to innocence and the reification of colonial thought and action that occurs when non-Indigenous peoples do not open themselves up to substantive change. As decolonization requires a taking up of responsibility in an effort to move forward (Irlbacher-Fox, 2014; Simpson, 2011; Wallace, 2013; Regan, 2010), such a re-assessment of rights, responsibilities and privileges would be appropriate.

Ultimately, this discursive work will need to develop differently in different contexts. Not only were these lands colonized at different times and in different ways; but the Indigenous

peoples whose lands these are, the Indigenous peoples who have continually fought against colonization, are vastly different peoples, even though, within certain geographical concentrations, they may share a common language or culture. This is why, although the colonial denizen may help in bringing about a larger 'nation'-wide (perhaps even global) paradigm shift, it is focused around mobilizing local interaction wherein localized dialogues between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples are discovered, or re-visited in light of a new approach on behalf of non-Indigenous peoples – an approach meant to lend greater room for substantive, discursive change premised on the re-centering of local Indigenous land and life. Informed by Tully's public philosophy (2008), thinking through a colonial denizen ethos is to realize all of these things and to, in dialogue with local Indigenous peoples, ultimately act, locally, in kind. Act locally and yet see local connections to national and international structures, institutions, thought and action. Acting on a denizen ethos in this way will mean something different for me living where I grew up, on the traditional lands of the Anishinabek Mississauga (Toronto), an area 'granted' through a controversial land surrender agreement (Indian Claims Commission, 2003; Smith, 1981; Freeman, 2010). then it will for me living on the unceeded territory of the Musquem peoples (Vancouver) as a graduate student. And yet the combination of these two realities will for me mean something altogether different in terms of my thoughts and actions in relation to the state, the province(s), Indigenous peoples, the land, and the non-human world.

What I am offering here is a potential first step for non-Indigenous peoples, who are themselves interested in decolonization, to discursively re-orient themselves to better understand and actively take up more appropriate roles, as co-determined with local Indigenous peoples, in the move toward decolonization with Indigenous peoples. The colonial denizen, as presented here, has the ability to provide such colonists with the tools to accomplish this by establishing a new descriptive and normatively focused concept for the colonial cacophony that helps contemporary colonists to situate themselves (and their civic ancestors) as foreigners in need of invitation onto Indigenous lands (past and present). While this is a discursive exercise that, at least initially, helps symbolically re-center Indigenous life and land, such a discursive re-orientation has the potential to lead to substantive material changes that appropriately re-center Indigenous life and land in ways that are unavailable under the contemporary liberal-democratic paradigm and its traditional approaches of citizenship and recognition.

In applying the denizen concept to both the colonial and de-colonial, I am arguing that there is no extinguishment clause on the need for invitation. There is a need to consider what invitation should have looked like at the various points of initial contact across the land as well as ask what it looks like to either re-visit and take-up initial invitations and agreements or else to ask for an invitation (if that is appropriate) and negotiate an agreement to share the land in areas where non-Indigenous peoples were never invited. Taking up a denizen ethos requires that non-Indigenous peoples do not assume their privileges to live on Indigenous lands because there are colonial property regimes that have been founded through violence and dispossession, which have enabled contemporary and past generations of non-Indigenous peoples to live here for centuries. Rather a denizen ethos requires that non-Indigenous peoples challenge such regimes, recognize them as colonial mechanisms and re-visit the need for invitation, responsibilities and mutual co-existence. It is only when non-Indigenous peoples can actively engage with such a paradigm shift (as presented with the colonial denizen), that they will be in a position to meet with Indigenous peoples to more accurately hear their calls for decolonization and so be open to the substantive material change that decolonization demands.

Applying the Historical-Analytical Colonial Denizen: Seventeenth Century Encounters

Within the following five chapters I critically re-visit narratives of encounter between French colonists and Indigenous peoples in the St. Lawrence Valley and interior during the seventeenth century as a way of applying the colonial denizen as historical-analytical tool. It is my contention that such analysis will not only enable a re-visiting and re-orientation of mainstream 'settlement' narratives but also provide insights as to how to further develop a contemporary colonial denizen ethos. I have chosen to focus on encounters along the St. Lawrence and interior because these are the areas first inhabited by Europeans within what would become Canada. As such, early encounters of these areas are constitutive of the beginnings of mainstream Canadian settlement and citizenship narratives. Initial French settlement, within areas currently constituting parts of Québec, established the grounds upon which British settlement would flourish and through which the Canadian state would eventually be established. Early settlements along the river (Tadoussac, Québec City, Montréal, Trois-Rivières), therefore, represent key spots from which to explore the roles of early settlers in establishing and maintaining a colonial project that would contribute to the creation of Canada as a Dominion of the British Commonwealth.

I focus on the seventeenth century because this period roughly corresponds to the first tumultuous century during which France actively sought to establish a prosperous position in the fur trade, as well as a colonist presence in North America, through their early alliances with the Wyandot (Huron), Algonquin and Innu (Montagnais) nations of the continent. This period, therefore, encompasses the introduction of a variety of differently situated individuals and groups, changing – although always economically-grounded - colonial objectives, and a plethora of unique initial encounters between Indigenous and colonist people. It is my intention that this analysis of the early encounter period serves two key purposes within my broader study. First of all, it enables me to explore an empirically-based iteration, rooted in historical archives, of the *denizen* through investigating the cacophony of colonist roles in tandem with how well such actors fit into a denizen role or ethos. As such, I will explore various colonists roles (such as arrivant, settler and guest) through a denizen-focused lens wherein I attempt to tease out various ways through which such differently situated colonists (who could simultaneously occupy dual roles as, for instance, arrivant and guest) acted in relation to the colonial project, a denizen 'ideal', and Indigenous peoples and land.

I will approach this investigation of colonist thought and action through a broader analysis of western and (where available) Indigenous materials focused on earlier interactions within the east, placing thoughts and actions within this cacophony through which I attempt to explore and further elucidate denizen-like behaviours amongst early colonists. Such an investigation can contribute to a fuller articulation of the denizen vis à vis colonial thought and action as it is empirically manifested in the past. Such an analysis allows contemporary non-Indigenous people to reflect upon these historical narratives in light of the colonial thought and action today and begin to articulate the possibilities of a normatively-informed, denizen praxis for contemporary society.

Such an historical-empirical analysis will demonstrate that the French 'colonist' of the seventeenth century is not a monolithic singularity, but rather a complex alignment of differently situated actors, implicated within a grander colonial project at various points and through fluctuating relations of power within the colonizing body as well as outside of it. Actors who at various points and in various ways acted as colonists and denizens. In approaching this study through this particular lens I explore the historically-situated, empirical 'denizen' so as to begin challenging the two-dimensional nature of the country's settlement stories and their characters.

This brings me to a second intention of the historical analysis – to investigate and tell an alternative narrative of citizenship through a re-storying of settlement history focused on membership, invitation and colonial thought and action. Ultimately, this will complicate the master narrative of Canadian citizenship, as a universal, multicultural, largely uncontested membership within a peaceful and legitimately-settled western state (see Mackey, 2002), by exploring how the French (and post-1763 the British) went from foreigners who lived outside of Indigenous territories and societies; to invited denizens and intruders of these same territories and societies (whether intentionally or not); to citizens of their own now imposed 'sovereign' settler colonial state. In addition to situating the historical denizen, therefore, this analysis complicates and challenges narratives of the inevitability of colonial structures and relations. Understanding the narratives of (potential) denizenship that evolved into citizenship opens up a new conceptual avenue for decolonizing current relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and political and societal structures.

Thirdly, this historical analysis enables me to situate myself within the study of settler/Indigenous relations as a non-Indigenous scholar in the same way that Edward Said speaks of the situated scholar in relation to the post-colonial relations of the 'orient' (1979). Being a colonial denizen myself, requires situating myself as a scholar with a responsibility towards Indigenous peoples and the goal of decolonization (Cannon, 2013; Nicoll, 2004); as well as in relation to my ancestors and their roles in the colonial project of New France. Identifying myself in relation to my ancestors is to be respectful of the protocols of many Indigenous scholars and activists who begin with their own community identification and self in relation to ancestors and territory. Self-situation is key to the ontologies and diplomatic procedures of many Indigenous nations today (Chilisa, 2012; Cajete, 2014; Wilson, 2009). As such, it embraces both a post-colonial need to challenge western paradigms around the scholar being objective and able to study outside of existing power relations (as Said argues) and is consistent with Indigenous protocols in identifying oneself in relation to one's ancestors and relations.

Thus, as a thirteenth generation French-Canadian I have ancestors who settled on the shores of the St. Lawrence in Champlain's habitation as far back as 1617. And so throughout the next five chapters I use my own ancestors – their roles within the colonial project and their relations to colonial powers and Indigenous people – as case studies for identifying early colonists in New France. Not only do such cases empirically ground this analysis, they force me

to situate myself within this research and on the land as well as more broadly within both historical and contemporary citizenship regimes. Thus, I can begin my own discursive work as a colonial denizen in my own methodological approach to research, consistent with a post-colonial focus on situated knowledge and take up my responsibility to Indigenous peoples and land – a responsibility grounded within the stories of my ancestors as well as my own contemporary position vis à vis colonial structures, thought and action. These interconnected processes and responsibilities, broadly understood, are important components in the move to decolonize as they require non-Indigenous peoples (at an individual and collective level) to understand privileges and positions in relation to contemporary structures and processes of colonial thought and action.

With this in mind the next five chapters present the reader with a re-telling of the original Indigenous-French encounter period. A narrative which seeks to challenge western conceptions around citizenship and settlement through exploring the various roles played by a multiplicity of actors during seventeenth century encounters along the St. Lawrence and into the interior. A narrative that explores the choices taken by initial colonists, potential denizens, and in certain cases un-invited intruders, through which I look to uncover some of the earliest seeds sowed for the competing paths of respect and assimilation. The following is a narrative that conveys the complex nature of actors and relationships within the colonial project. A narrative which looks to elicit a fuller and more nuanced articulation of the historical-empirical colonial denizen so that it might help articulate a contemporary, normatively informed colonial denizen praxis. A narrative through which I seek to demonstrate a practice of self-situation as well as record the beginning of my own journey of taking up responsibility through understanding the roles of my ancestors in the colonial project and the implications this has upon my own self-situation and actions today.

Chapter 3: Searching for the Colonial Denizen in the Early Trade Colony of 'New France' (1600-29)

While contemporary Canada is widely understood to be a settler colonial state, built on and fostered through the logics and structure of settler colonialism, its origins actually derive from imperialism[5] and trade colonialism[6] which are themselves built on a different (though not necessarily antithetical) logics and structures. Settler colonialism did not really come into being until the 1860s when the, by then, British colony gained a significant level of independence from Britain and the freedom to pursue specific settler colonial goals and interests. It is within the early days of French trade colonialism, however, where my application of and search for the colonial denizen begins: amongst the Innu, Anishinaabe, and French people along the St. Lawrence River in the early seventeenth century. The fur-trade-based colonialism established during these early years, has been linked to more generalized practices of trade colonialism that date back to early Greek and Roman commerce practices of establishing temporary trading posts that colonists would travel to for a period of time to trade before returning home (Arneil, 2017). This was a temporary and so less invasive form of colonialism focused on economic profit and the spread of an Empire's reach across, though not necessarily to physical occupation of, continents. Here, imperialism, the building of an empire through symbolic, economic and spatial claims, was aided by the functions and procedures of trade colonialism as a material and symbolic means of spreading empire.

For the purposes of the following historical analysis, it is important to distinguish this commerce-based colonialism from the agrarian-based colonialism that came to dominate colonial practices and which ultimately fed into settler colonialism. In comparison, agrarian-based colonialism (originating with the Greek *apoikia*) is a colonialism based on permanent, independent and self-sustaining agrarian settlement by colonists within an area that is a far distance from their home city or country (Arneil, 2017). As such, this is a permanent and more invasive form of colonialism focused on dispossession. And so there are important differences between these two key forms of colonialism: between goals (trade and dispossession) and

---

[5] Here and throughout the dissertation 'imperialism' refers to the expansion of Empire through the extension of claims over Indigenous territories, even where (in most cases) such territories were not physically settled (colonized).

[6] Here and throughout the dissertation 'colonialism' refers to the ideology of colonizing areas wherein 'colonization' refers to the physical act of colonizing an area.

between presence (temporary and permanent) and the resulting roles (sojourner and settler), processes and structures that result. While European forms of colonization have always tended to have elements of both trade and agrarian colonialism, trade-based settlements often preceded but were usually then superseded by agrarian-based settlement, processes and structures (Arneil, 2017).

It is my contention that due to the less invasive nature of trade colonialism, its logics and structure, as well as the small and vulnerable population of French colonists that participated in the early trade colony within the St. Lawrence Valley one is more likely to find denizen-like behaviours amongst the early trade-colonist population. To test this hypothesis, the following considers the very early days of colonial New France with its focus on the fur trade. It identifies and explores a set of actors from colonial officials like Champlain, to temporary fur trade workers and relations and even those few colonists, such as my ancestor Louis Hébert, who came to the shores of the river to establish themselves as more permanent agrarian colonists.

A Quick Note on the European Context of Colonial Relations and its Implications for the Denizen

The typical story non-Indigenous Canadians tell themselves about initial encounters between Europeans and Indigenous peoples along the Atlantic coast speaks of fish, furs, and a friendly interest in trade between European and Indigenous peoples. Mainstream narratives suggest that the founding of French trade settlements (like Tadoussac and Québec) along the St. Lawrence River were acceptable to, and may have even been encouraged, by Indigenous peoples like the Innu. The picture is, generally, pretty rosy – aligning with later articulations of Canada as a 'peaceful' and 'tolerant' country (Mackey, 2002). Such a picture suggests that one would find denizens amongst the earliest of colonists who came to the shores of the St. Lawrence – individuals who understood their foreignness to the lands; acknowledged Indigenous peoples' self-determination, their legal, and governance systems; acted deferentially in-kind; and only came to establish themselves on Indigenous territories following invitation and the continual fulfilment of responsibilities based on this invitation and its broader agreement.

In analyzing these early interactions between Europeans and Indigenous peoples within North America, however, one also needs to be cognizant of the broader inter-European developments occurring at the time. By the seventeenth century, the Age of (European) Discovery - an era through which European kingdoms sought to expand their empire and influence beyond Europe under the guise of Christian responsibility - was well under way (Green

and Dickason, 1989). Europeans were quick to justify their imperial objectives by claiming that the Americas were *res nullius*, legally vacant lands, since the Indigenous peoples European explorers encountered led largely nomadic or semi-nomadic lifestyles and so could be conveniently dismissed as legal inhabitants under European legal thought (Dickason, 2001). Yet Europeans found that the Indigenous peoples they encountered, who had vast intra and inter-national legal and governance systems, like the Wyandot Jacques Cartier encountered along the St. Lawrence River in the sixteenth century (Sioui, 1992), could not be so easily dismissed. This led the French to use the legal doctrine of consent, originating in Roman law, as a means to establish themselves within North America. The French, therefore, first looked to establish relationships with Indigenous peoples, from whom they got consent to co-habit Indigenous lands. Once this consent was garnered the French then sought to have such an invitation recognized in Europe as justification for French settlement (Dickason, 2001) and hence a sort of sovereignty over these lands as against the interests of other European powers. This was the 'sovereignty' of imperialism wherein monarchs laid claim to lands they had not necessarily physically colonized (Greer, 2018). Where the French may appear to have acted as colonial denizens (looking for and gaining invitation before establishing trade settlements), therefore, they did so with imperial intentions that, at least in part, counter such denizen-like actions.

This broader colonial policy suggests that the French could never be proper or 'perfect' colonial denizens because, even from the beginning, they were using whatever invitation they obtained from Indigenous hosts, and hence their *de facto* role as guests or denizens, to claim a sovereignty that sought to displace any possibility for the international recognition of Indigenous governance systems that, as denizens, the French should have recognized and accepted as legitimate. Instead, the French (as with other Europeans) tended to come to Indigenous territories believing that their societal structures and intellectual traditions were superior (Doxtator, 2001; Sioui, 1992). Therefore, while one might be able to identify moments, thoughts and actions through which French colonists exhibited denizen-like behaviours such instantiations exist within a pre-inscribed colonial project as determined through the European Age of Exploration and its rationale. This is something to keep in mind when re-visiting these narratives of encounter, (potential) invitation and responsibility.

Questioning Invitation onto Innu Territories at Uepishtikuiau (Québec)

It is a common misconception of the grand Canadian narrative that the St. Lawrence Valley was uninhabited by Indigenous peoples by the early seventeenth century. Innu and Wyandot activists and scholars, like Georges Sioui (1992) and An Antan Kapesh (1976), whose nations claim areas within the valley as their ancestral territories, have pointed out that this has been a purposeful misconception (from the seventeenth century through to the contemporary period) to bolster governmental claims to the valley. Claims that form an important part of the historiographic myth of French settlement used to cement Québécois identity and claims for self-determination (Gaudry and Leroux, 2007; Michaud-Ouellet, 2019). While the Wyandot, whom Jacques Cartier had met earlier in the valley, had 'disappeared' (Moogk, 2000; Trigger, 1985; Gilmour and Turgeon, 2000; Parmenter, 2014), there were still numerous semi-nomadic Innu and Anishinaabe groups living throughout the valley who had established connections with and forms of governance over the lands (Brown and Wilson, 2004; Witgen, 2012). Importantly, the Wyandot had not disappeared but had, due to the devastation of epidemics carried to them by the French in the sixteenth century, largely moved westward for a time to live amongst their Huron allies (Sioui, 1992). These lands were, therefore, not *terra nullius* (empty lands) waiting to be claimed by France – as they are popularly depicted within the Canadian narrative. Rather they were lands ancestral to a given and clearly identifiable people still in existence today, not the mythologized 'St. Lawrence Iroquois' of the contemporary mainstream narrative (Sioui, 1992) mobilized to ease the settler colonial erase to replace mechanism. There were lands still occupied and governed by various Indigenous groups who had the ability and perhaps even the responsibility[7] (in certain cases) to force Europeans off the land.

Early Euro-Canadian accounts and interpretations of initial Innu-French encounters suggest that the Innu happily invited the French onto their lands to establish trading posts at Totouskak (Tadoussac) and Uepishtikuiau (Québec) in 1603 and 1608, respectively. Such

---

[7] Here I refer to traditional concepts around governance structured on responsibility to the land, the animate and in-animate world, and treaties conducted with animal-beings.

While she is specifically referring to Anishinabek conceptions of responsibility and governance, Heidi Kiiwepinesiik Stark identifies how governance functions as the act of taking seriously one's responsibility to the land, animal-beings, etc. and how Anishinabek-settler treaty relations are premised on earlier Anishinabek treaties to the land and animal-beings that require both Anishinabek and settlers to meet the continuing obligations they hold to these earlier treaties. A similar function of responsibility in terms of Innu governance over land is also mentioned in Brown and Wilson's chapter on the northern Algonquin.

Heidi Kiiwepinesiik Stark. "Respect, Responsibility, and Renewal: The Foundations of Anishinaabe Treaty Making with the United States and Canada." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal.* 34.2 (2010). 145-164.

interpretations are largely based on the writings of Samuel de Champlain whose recordings, John Pollack notes, one should be wary to take at face value since the explorer (and others involved in the printing of his works for European audiences) easily could have misunderstood, mistranslated and could have even fabricated the stories recorded to make Indigenous peoples appear as willing commerce partners and potential religious converts for France and the Roman Catholic Church (2012). Yet even where such works are taken cautiously, Euro-Canadian versions of these initial relations suggest that interactions (specifically in 1603) are representative of a positive agreement initiated by the Innu to have the band of French explorers and traders establish a trading post on Innu territory on the understanding that the French, in turn, provided military support to the Innu in their battles against the Haudenosaunee. While the specific details and understandings of this agreement differ, this is the basic framework to which they all adhere.[8]

Such interpretations of Innu-French encounters suggest that the foundations for colonial denizen thought and action were present for the earliest of French colonists. Grave du Pont and Champlain, it appears, were invited to an already established ceremony of the Innu, Anishinabek and Etchmin. Through mutually reciprocated speeches, performances and words an alliance for defense and commerce was established between parties that enabled the French to settle (at least temporary) trading posts amongst their new-found allies (Pollack, 2012). From such a vantage point all the necessary components for the denizen are present: the French secured an invitation before establishing themselves along the shore, they established such invitation by largely deferring to Indigenous governance customs and law (Pollack, 2012), they then actively looked to fulfil their obligations within the treaty/invitation by aiding the Innu in their efforts against the Haudenosaunee (Heidenreich, 2001).

Oral traditions of the Innu, collected by anthropologist Sylvie Vincent, however, relay a different story. Within these oral traditions the Innu were not quite so inviting as Euro-Canadian accounts depict. The Innu were rather hesitant and suspicious of the French and their interests. In

---

[8] For instance Bruce Trigger identifies this 1603 agreement as one through which the Innu and their neighbours agreed to permit the French the right to explore the interior territories and form trading relations throughout these territories; Olive Patricia Dickason argues that this agreement establishes an original and lasting transatlantic agreement between the Innu, Anishinabe and French based on trade and friendship, wherein the French are allowed to establish themselves on Innu territory but hold no title-like claim to this territory; and Alain Beaulieu argues the agreement established an alliance that was beneficial to both sides, which allowed the French to populate the country to the benefit of trade and military support for both parties.
Pollack. pp. 85-86.

some accounts it is even stated that from the very beginning the Innu actually opposed French presence on their lands through force, though the French were ultimately able to come ashore. This highlights the tension, as identified by Amélie-Anne Mailhot, between the two versions of history (mainstream and Indigenous/subordinated) apparent within the works of Indigenous scholars like An Antan Kapesh and becoming increasingly apparent throughout critical scholarship focused on the history of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations in Canada (2017).

According to these accounts it was the French who asked for land to settle – specifically the land of Uepishtikuiau (Québec City). The Innu refused their initial request, only finally agreeing to grant the French permission to inhabit this specific area after the French took it upon themselves to sow some wheat there, let it grow, and ask again for the land on the promise that they would grow more food at the site and share this food with the Innu. Here an invitation to inhabit a very specific site was hesitantly granted to the French (through force) on the condition that the French provide economic aid to the Innu (Vincent, 2002). These Innu narratives of initial encounter do not align with Euro-Canadian accounts. They suggests that the French were pushy and demanding and ultimately used settlement-based (agrarian) tactics to encourage, if not force, an invitation onto Innu lands. While Euro-Canadian accounts suggest that the French upheld their responsibilities to the Innu by joining them in raids against the Haudenosaunee, the Innu accounts suggest that the responsibilities were not military-based but economic and were, as such, poorly met if they were met at all (Vincent, 2002). The Innu accounts, therefore, intimate that while the French recognized their foreignness to some degree, and became *de facto* colonial denizens in their inhabitation of Uepishtikuiau, their actions were not indicative of denizen-like behaviour – they forced their invitation and, it seems, failed to meet their responsibilities.

What would a 'good' denizen-like trading relationship look like here? First of all, the French would not have forced an invitation. This would have meant that they either should have returned to France and let go of their American aspirations or else spent more time establishing relations of mutual trust and respect with the Innu, Anishinaabe and Etchemin in the hopes that some sort of invitation would be more naturally extended. Secondly, it would have required clear deference to Innu law and custom whose lands they were on. This would mean that the French needed to spend time learning from the Innu about their ways and making an effort to communicate to the Innu and abide by their legal and governance systems. This could include world-building efforts – efforts to share and create new avenues of communicability,

understanding and ways of being between parties. Thirdly, it would mean that the French needed to appreciate the limitations of their invitation and the responsibilities this invitation/agreement/alliance placed on them as allies and inhabitants of a specific site on Innu lands. Finally, it would require that the French re-visit their relationship with the Innu periodically, as conditions arose, in recognition that it was the French who were foreigners who needed to be recognized by the rightful and self-determining stewards of the land upon whom their presence was dependent. Where Innu tradition places the French as failing to properly meet the first condition of a more mutually-desired invitation, the following seeks to identify how well the variously situated French actors at the site faired in meeting the other conditions for a good 'denizen-like' trading relationship as I have identified here.

Fragile Alliances: Charting the Maintenance of Early French-Innu Trade-Based Relations

During these early days the small French population on Wyandot and Innu territories was largely composed of sojourners: men who came for temporary (contracted) visits based at the established trading posts (Tadoussac, Port-Royale, Québec). These French sojourners would have been composed of colonial elites like Grave du Pont as well as colonial officials of lesser rank like Samuel Champlain, and unnamed (though seemingly voluntary) labourers employed by the fur trading company to establish trading relations with local peoples and accumulate furs to take back to France for the company's profit (Biggar, 1901; Wrong, 1928; Trudel, 1968). Unfortunately, very little is known about the unnamed early company employees within the first two decades of French trading settlement along the river, and so little can be said about their roles. It can be said, however, that their transient presence helped strengthen the colonial project. But it is difficult to say if these men were voluntary or in-voluntary servants, criminals, or willing participants within the trade. Work by W.J. Eccles suggests that some of the men who came in 1608 may have been criminals exiled to the colony (1969). Until more is known about these men, it is difficult to say much more surrounding their roles as denizens and colonists within the French colonial project. For now the following will focus on largely voluntary (elite) sojourners within the early days of the colony, leaving discussion of involuntary colonists for chapter five.

According to Innu tradition, it appears that these more elite and official French sojourners began as acceptable inhabitants of the patch of land they had been hesitantly offered at Uepishtikuiau. The Innu talk of how the French established a small sustenance garden on the

site, which they surrounded with a wooden fence (Vincent, 2002). French efforts remained small and focused on survival at this point, although, it is interesting to note that even while this site was meant to be a trading post, mechanisms of more permanent and agrarian settlement were being used to establish French presence. Given that such mechanisms would have been necessary for survival, however, and without evidence of the use of agrarian labour to lay claim to the territory at this point, it appears that this might not have been the case. And yet, within the Innu oral tradition, it seems that agrarian labour was eventually used to widen the boundaries of the French habitation. When the Innu were not on their lands at the shore, when they had gone further into the interior, it is argued that the French widened their fences to increase their agricultural output – claiming that they needed more land to grow their wheat (Vincent, 2002).

This does not bode well for identifying early colonial actors at Québec as potential denizens in relation to the Innu whose lands they were inhabiting. Not only did the French force an invitation onto the site but, according to Innu tradition, they cunningly sought to expand the boundaries of the site upon which they had been permitted to establish themselves, which in turn pushed the Innu further and further off their own territory. This is not denizen-like behaviour – this is agrarian colonial behaviour. This is behaviour that is more aligned with colonial objectives of land acquisition, dispossession and profit than with denizen-like objectives of mutual respect, responsibility and deference. The French at what became known as Québec forced their invitation and then did not adhere to the reluctant territorial limitations of their agreement with the Innu.

This is not to say that all interactions between the French and the Innu were decidedly and always bad. In June of 1609, the French (Champlain and two volunteers from the habitation) are said to have accompanied 60 Innu and Wyandot warriors into a successful raid on a band of Haudenosaunee at the Richelieu River (Heidenreich, 2001). While military aid might not have been part of the original invitation/agreement, this sort of aid suggests potential denizen-like action and consideration on behalf of the French colonists – though it could also suggest interference and meddling in affairs they could have and maybe should have stayed out of. While one needs to approach colonial documents with caution, the *Jesuit Relations* do make mention of these early colonists repeatedly protecting the Innu and other allies from the Haudenosaunee by sheltering them within the French habitation (Thwaites, Vol. V, 1633). If true, this would be a good denizen-like act based on mutual respect and responsibility. Such positive behaviour may

be further supported by the events of 1624, when a short-lived peace treaty between the Innu, Wyandot, Haudenosaunee and the French (Biggar, 1901) was established and the habitation became a site for an annual summer trade fair that would have benefited both the French and their Indigenous allies through commercial profit and endeavours.

And yet, by the 1610s, the French habitation itself was a forcibly imposing structure: built for defense it was "surrounded by a wall in the form of a square, with two small turrets at the angles" which were added for increased security (Sagard, 1968). It was not a welcoming place – built in European style on Indigenous lands, it functioned, however tacitly, as a demonstration of French strength and even sovereignty, an imposition of French governance on Indigenous lands. While relations with the Innu had always been rocky, as the years drew on the Innu grew less and less trustful of the French. Not only had the French pushed past Innu barriers to make a treaty with the Wyandot in 1615, placing the later as the preferred middlemen of the French-Indigenous fur trade, but as the price of trade goods began rising in 1614 (due to the enforcement of a trading monopoly in France) the Innu became quite disgruntled with the French. Innu resentment, importantly, was reportedly limited by the "clandestine traders who continued to offer the Montagnais [Innu] goods at cheaper prices" (Trigger, 1971). But even with this tempering there were moments of extreme violence seen between the French and Innu at Québec.

According to Euro-Canadian accounts, one such instance involves a French locksmith, an Innu man named Cherououny and murder. In either late spring of 1617 or late summer of 1616,[9] Cherououny, who appears to have frequented the habitation, was poorly treated by the locksmith. In retaliation Cherououny later attacked this man and his companion in the woods outside the habitation, killing both men and tying their bodies down with stones to dispose of them in the river (Champlain & Grant, 1907). The bodies washed ashore in 1619 (Biggar, 1901). This resulted in the inhabitants at Québec temporarily refusing to let the Innu into their habitation and requesting retribution in the murder. In response, the Innu initially steered clear of the settlement, finally coming to the habitation to inform the French that as a collective they had had no knowledge of the murder and had not consented to it. They offered reparations, gifts, as befitted their customs. But the French demanded that the perpetrators be delivered to Québec. While the

---

[9] Accounts differ here between Sagard and Champlain's recordings, which is understandable given that the bodies were found years after the fact.

Innu reportedly found this strange and were not happy with the demand, they eventually agreed. Interestingly, when the perpetrator was being delivered there was a big show of arms and security by the French at the habitation. As Champlain's records suggest, there was considerable mistrust on both sides.

> Every Frenchman stood to arms, keeping a good watch with his weapon in hand, with sentinels posted everywhere necessary for fear of an attempt of the savages outside because of this suspicion that it was intended actually to do justice on the culprit who had put himself so freely at our mercy…The whole was very well contrived, arranged and executed, to make them feel the enormity of that offence, and to be afraid in future…(Champlain & Grant, 1907, 190)

Here the French made a big show of intimidating and telling the Innu that the perpetrator should be killed as retribution and again, according to Champlain, the Innu representatives stated that they had not been a part of the murder and had only kept it a secret because they did not want the relationship to suffer. They wanted and expected a pardon. Eventually, it is described in the European records, that Checououny laid his own life on the line telling the French they should kill him. The French deliberated, knowing they were weak in numbers (as Champlain admits: outnumbered even at this public meeting), they also realized that killing him would lead to perpetual mistrust and possible warfare which would impede (if not destroy) France's position in the fur trade. And so the colonial officials granted Checououny his life asking that the Innu leave hostages for the French colonists' security. The Innu agreed, and left two children who were taught by Father Le Caron (Champlain & Grant, 1907).

Acting as colonial denizens here would have meant that the French recognized the authority of the Innu, Innu laws and customs around justice, the requirement of the French colonists to show deference to these laws and customs (rather than trying to intimidate the Innu), therefore, agreeing to a solution more in line with the reparations culture of their allies. While the ultimate agreement appears to have aligned more so with an Innu conception of justice as reparation (the Innu children given to the French) this solution was only arrived at following great displays of French intimidation and the understanding by the French that they could not impose their own form of justice less they risk their entire colonial trade project and presence along the St. Lawrence. Of course there is also the issue that the Innu apparently knowingly withheld the murders from the French which is demonstrative of bad ally behaviour. But it still stands that the French, as forcibly-invited denizens, were foreigners on Innu land who needed to

recognize and abide by local law and custom. This is something that the French may have somewhat done, through coming to a compromise with the Innu that was marginally more in line with Innu customs, only when they recognized they *had* to act this way. In the absence of corresponding Innu oral tradition, it is difficult to come to any firmer arguments or conclusions here. Regardless, this encounter (as recorded by Euro-Canadians) demonstrates an interesting instance through which one sees early colonists actively grappling with their position on Innu territory – wanting to be colonist-proper, wanting to impose their will, their 'superior' laws and customs on their Indigenous hosts, but ultimately realizing they are too vulnerable to do so and so acting more in line with a denizen ethos.

Ultimately, this solution left both the French sojourners and Innu unhappy. For the French, proper justice had not been served and for the Innu this 'solution' was a display of French weakness because a proper reparation had not been offered. It appears that French-Innu relations were never the same.[10] According the Champlain, by 1624 the Innu were openly boasting about the possibility of killing all the French at Québec and looking for other Europeans with which to trade furs for more reasonably priced European goods (Trigger, 1971). The Innu-French alliance, therefore, was fraught with these tense moments of violence and continued to be tense given the monopoly on trade trying to be imposed from afar and the resultant rise of trade goods. Sojourner-Innu relations at the French habitation, therefore, appear to always have been marked by a growing level of caution and distrust as the French had forced their way onto Innu lands, increasingly seeking to expand their territory and power. It seems that the French continued to be tolerated by the Innu due to the prestige that Champlain and the other fur trade workers had received in helping the Innu, Wyandot and Anishinaabe in reducing the Haudenosaunee threat – a threat reduction that lasted until 1634 (Trigger, 1971). While relations with the Innu were marked with tension and mistrust, records suggest that the French may have enjoyed more favourable and deferential relationships with the Wyandot with whom they seem to have had a clearer and stronger commercial relationship. The following, therefore, briefly

---

[10] In 1624-5, Sagard notes a Wyandot response to the death of two other Frenchmen. He says that while the representatives had been at the ceremony of forgiveness (during which the French symbolically threw a sword into the river) the Wyandot were unmoved and solemn but upon returning to their village they mocked the French joking that "henceforth for killing a Frenchman one could get off at the cost of a dozen beaver-skins."
Sagard. *Long Journey into Huron Country.* p. 86.
There are also reports of Louis Hébert's servant, Choppard, as well as a man named Dumoulin being killed by Innu. The killing of Choppard reportedly led to Champlain receiving three Indigenous children from the Innu.
James Douglas. *Old France in the New World.* Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Co., 1905. p. 181.

explores the early relationship between the French and Wyandot within the fur trade focusing on the exchange of young boys and men as demonstrative of more denizen-like behaviour.

Tending to the Living Relationship as Mutual Responsibility: Wyandot-French Exchange

It appears that the French were more deferential toward the Wyandot (at Huronia) following their formal alliance in 1615. While the Wyandot and the French were already allies, through earlier ceremonies and treaties with the Innu and Anishinaabe, they established a more direct and mutually satisfactory trade relationship when Champlain brought two Récollet friars to stay with the Wyandot in 1615 (Moogk, 2002). It seems that the French had more respect for their Wyandot allies, largely recognizing the Wyandot role as middlemen (conduits between the fur-trapping nations to the west and the French) and refraining themselves from barrier pushing until the dispersal of the Wyandot at Haudenosaunee hands in 1650.

It is important to note here that the economy, specifically the fur trade, was one of the main methods by which the French sought to establish themselves amongst Indigenous peoples for the further exploration and 'discovery' of their lands. While religion was used as the official justification for this European exploration (Green and Dickason, 1989), and the real goal was 'discovery' (as against other European sovereigns) for empire building, the fur trade was a means by which to satisfy both. As such, the trade functioned as a major component in French colonial policy toward Indigenous peoples. Trade was already a vital component of inter-national life for Indigenous peoples, and it took many forms,[11] but required the establishment of relations between strangers (in many cases fictive kinship relations) to establish familiarity and connection prior to the exchange of goods and people (Miller, 2015; Witgen, 2012). Early on, the French learned to use the rhetoric of fictive kinship to support and strengthen these alliances that centered around trade and war (Doxtator, 2001). These interactions led to the formation of treaty relationships and agreements that largely followed Indigenous governance practices and diplomatic protocols.

In different ways, both the Wyandot and French were looking to gain from their relationship to each other. While the French wanted to use this relationship to eventually enable their further exploration of the continent, and hence strengthen their discovery claims, the Wyandot sought to benefit from their middlemen status in the fur trade. As middlemen the

---

[11] As will be explored within chapter five, Indigenous trade diplomacy included not only the trade of furs for goods, but the trade of people and slaves.

Wyandot could amass European goods that could then be used in ceremony or easily traded with interior hunting groups for furs they did not have to trap (Delâge, 1981; LeBlant, 1972; Trigger, 1985). Relative to the interior nations, their role was less labour intensive and potentially more profitable as they oversaw the flow of goods. Both groups, therefore, were looking out for their own interests in strengthening their relationship through trade and even military-based bonds of alliance, although one might identify the French interest as inherently more troubling and ultimately deleterious to maintaining good relations.

Beyond these troubling intentions, however, it appears that during these early years the French were more interested in tending to their relationship with the Wyandot than they were with the Innu. Perhaps one of the strongest examples of this was the mutual exchange of young men between the French and Wyandot. As early as 1610 the French and Wyandot (and even the Anishinaabe) began exchanging boys as a means of strengthening their relationship. These boys would live with their allies for a period of time, learning the language and culture of their hosts. French boys like Étienne Brûlé, gained a greater sense of the land and eventually reported back to their people what they had seen and learned. Thus began the integral role of the French-Indigenous interpreters and trade agents (Wrong, 1928; Heidenreich, 2001). These boys functioned as diplomats between nations, helping to further communication and understanding between allies as well as trust and hence strengthening bonds of alliance. Peaceful and equal exchanges like these demonstrated a recognition of mutual obligations that were necessary to sustain the life and well-being of community between nations. Following Indigenous diplomacy protocols, these sorts of ritual exchanges "made fur trade exchange possible by creating a social nexus that facilitated the peaceful transfer of goods and peoples between different social groups, across jointly occupied territory" (Witgen, 2012). So while the French certainly gained specific information that helped them in their colonial mission, specifically the knowledge those like Brûlé acquired about the geography of the *pays d'en haut* and later the interior, such exchanges also demonstrated a deference to Indigenous diplomatic protocols and an understanding of the French colonists' need for and vulnerability amongst those like the Wyandot and Anishinaabe.

While this analysis of French-Wyandot relations is brief, it is suggestive of more denizen-like behaviour with the Wyandot than with the Innu. In line with the call to explore treaty relations in chapter one, this mutual exchange of boys suggests that the French understood (or at least could be interpreted as understanding) the need to re-visit treaty and to tend to the

relationship. The exchange of boys and with this the exchange of language, culture, and worldview was a step toward strengthening the relations between the two parties – a way to continually re-visit the original trading agreement and relationship. While French intentions were less than pure, such interactions are demonstrative of denizen-leanings especially when combined with the sojourners' general observance of Wyandot territories and respect for their physical boundaries to more direct engagement with the trade.

Settlement Attempts: The Increasing Tendency Toward Agrarian Practice and Permanence

While the early colonial mission for France was focused on the establishment of trading posts and more temporary and efficient presence, as early as 1617 there were attempts at more agrarian and permanent colonial settlement. The first permanent colonist of Québec is considered to be my ancestor, Louis Hébert, who uprooted his family (wife, Marie Rollet, and three children) from Paris to take up a fief in what became the Upper Town of Old Québec (Champlain & Grant, 1907; Fischer, 2008). Hébert was a Parisian apothecary who lived on rue Sainte-Honoré in the première-arrondissement (Choquette, 1997), and was the son of Nicholas Hébert who had been the apothecary to Catherine de Medici in the sixteenth century (Biggar, 1901). Cousin by marriage to Jean de Biencourt de Poutrinecourt and friend of Pierre Sieur de Mons and Samuel Champlain (Fischer, 2008), Hébert had accompanied Poutrinecourt and Champlain on various voyages to the New World such as to Acadia wherein he acted as the crew's surgeon (Choquette, 1997) to help establish Port-Royal in 1605 (Fischer, 2008). It appears, therefore, that he held a sustained interest in the colonial project of New France and came from some wealth. As such he is identifiable as an early voluntary and elite colonist of New France.

Before analyzing the more intricate actions and implications of the Hébert family within the broader French colonial project, I think it's important to ruminate on how a denizen-like settler actor might have functioned during this early period in relation to Indigenous peoples and lands. As mentioned in chapter one, you will not find a perfect colonial denizen, but you might be able to find denizen leanings. Such leanings would demonstrate relations between such agrarian colonists and Indigenous peoples based on mutual respect and trust – this would require forms of direct engagement and communication beyond official/Crown mediators. Such leanings would also demonstrate colonist deference to the Indigenous peoples whose lands they were inhabiting – for instance, a deference to Innu law, governance and customs. One would also

expect to find minimal cultivation of territory (cultivation based on subsistence), the sharing of goods and services, as well as respect for the land itself and treatment for it along local-based worldviews and customs. Given such vulnerable positions of early agrarian colonists (the lack of structural support from France and knowledge of the land) one would suspect that such early colonists were more inclined than their later followers toward such denizen-leanings. The following will analyze the various records of Hébert's actions along the St. Lawrence in light of these enumerated denizen-leanings.

In 1616, Champlain was able to convince Hébert to settle at Québec by offering him a contract that Champlain had wrangled from the *Compagnie des Marchands* (Company of Merchants). Through this contract the company offered to support Hébert and his family for two years on a sizeable plot of land, providing him with two hundred Crowns a year for the first three years of their settlement. Happy with the offer, Hébert sold his property and assets in France and set off for the port of Honfleur as a voluntary colonist headed for the valley. Upon his arrival at the port, however, the company shareholders had changed their minds. Hébert would only receive half of the original land agreed to, would only be given 100 Crowns for the first three years and was obliged (alongside his wife; children; and servant, Henri Choppard), to serve the company during this first three years. He was strictly forbidden to engage with the fur trade, which introduces an impediment to the direct relations a denizen-leaning settler would require for more positive and mutually respectful relations with the Innu. He also had to continually offer his services as an apothecary to the company without payment, and had to sell whatever produce he was able to grow to the company at the current price of produce in France rather than at a price suitable to the conditions of the trading colony. Having sold off his assets, Hébert was compelled to accept this new offer. While he had intended to come to Québec as a self-determining colonist, Hébert ended coming to the colony as a servant of the company, allowed to clear 'his' land, build 'his' house, and settle only when the chief factor at the habitation did not require his services (Biggar, 1901; Fischer, 2008). At this juncture, Hébert came to occupy an interesting position within the early colonial cacophony – willing colonist who came to be dominated by the trading company at the same time (as will be demonstrated) that he helped contribute to the success of the French colonial project, eventually profiting from such exploits himself. In other words, Hébert was both oppressed and oppressor during these early years of the French settlement.

For Champlain and the few Récollet missionaries at the colony there was considerable interest in encouraging the settlement of French colonists within the valley. The rationale of Champlain's exploratory efforts and the missionaries' religious labour suggested that civilization and religious conversion, which those like Champlain thought would strengthen bonds of alliance enough to enable further exploration (Moogk, 2000), would best be completed amongst French subjects from whom Indigenous peoples could learn French language and culture. In other words, assimilation would best occur when Indigenous peoples were surrounded by French colonists. For many of the Protestant company shareholders, however, settlement placed too heavy a burden on their profit margins. Many of the shareholders were merchants from western France at this point, who were really only interested in the economic gains they could make from the trading of furs (Eccles, 1969). This opposition to agrarian settlement within the company likely led to the poor treatment of Hébert and his family along the river. As recorded by Sagard, it was not only the shareholders that treated Hébert poorly but also the factors at Québec who went even further in their cruel treatment of the family looking to "discourage others from following in their footsteps, unless indeed they came as slaves" (Sagard, qt. Biggar, 1901). While there were numerous other mitigating factors discouraging settlement (Trudel, 1968; Greer, 1997) at this time the treatment of the Hébert family likely played a role in discouraging other French subjects from embarking for permanent settlement in the colony.

While Hébert was contracted to work for the company, only being provided his spare time to build a house and cultivate the land, recent archeology excavations of this property suggest that the family's original dwelling was actually built quite quickly. By 1618, it appears that Hébert had not only constructed this first dwelling but had already done well to establish a healthy farm – this was important as their contract with the company required that following their first two years the family would have to rely on their own resources for food as well as all other needs (Simoneau, 2009). At this point such cultivation could be interpreted as subsistence and therefore still aligning with colonial denizen-leanings. By the 28th of February 1626, this land was established as a noble landholding: the fief of Sault-au-Matelot (Simoneau, 2009). This suggests that, independent of what Hébert's socio-economic standing had been on arrival, by the mid 1620s he was certainly a Sieur – a noble living within the French trading colony. While it appears he came from some affluence in France, one might consider that his actions within the colony – his perseverance in settlement even when he received such poor treatment by the

trading company - ultimately provided him and his family great privilege. This was a privilege experienced through and premised on the colonial project. In 1621 his daughter, another one of my ancestors, Guillemette, married Guillaume Couillard, a carpenter employed by the company. They took over half of the fief. When Louis passed away in 1627, due to a bad fall, the last half of the fief was divided in two and so a quarter of the original fief went to Marie Rollet, his widow, and her new husband, Guillaume Huboust, the last quarter to his son, Guillaume Hébert, and his wife, Hélène Desportes (also my ancestors). Regardless of his original position at Québec, therefore, Louis Hébert and his family became wealthy and noble colonists (in the eyes of the French) upon Innu territories. This evolution from company service to noble land-holder demonstrates a step away from denizen-leanings toward colonial profit and privilege.

By the late 1620s such profit and privilege was clearly demonstrated in the grandeur of the Hébert-Couillard property. The fief was well developed at this point and contained "not only the houses and secondary buildings of Couillard and Guillaume Huboust, but also a brewhouse with outbuildings, a mill and an associated dwelling, a barn, a stable, and several pathways and tracks" (Simoneau, 2009). The extended family – as the first of 'New France' – had done quite well for themselves despite active discouragement by the trading company. This is further suggestive of a step (or multiple steps) away from denizen-leanings. It does not appear that under so grand and comfortable a development of these lands that the Hébert-Couillard family was cultivating the land for mere subsistence but profit and wealth through the use of Innu territory. Furthermore, one imagines that this plot of land they were cultivating, which was on the upper terrain of Québec, was likely not territory originally 'granted' by the Innu in 1608. Beyond such heavy cultivation of this land, which itself could function as a breach of invitation, one is left wondering what the Innu thought of the family's presence and endeavours at this spot of their traditional territory and how mutually respected and comfortable they felt with the colonists' presence here.

Importantly, from a colonial standpoint, Hébert's perseverance and success in clearing his fief and growing enough food to feed his family and others at the habitation (Fischer, 2008; Eccles, 1969) was important for the survival of the trading colony in its early years. Not only did Hébert's success bring a much needed sense of stability and order to the habitation, it also demonstrated that the dream of a self-supporting French population was possible along the shores of the St. Lawrence (Fischer, 2008). In fact, there is evidence to show that a small handful

of families did in fact come to settle at Québec following Hébert's example. For instance, Martin Abraham dit L'Écossais (the Scotsman), another of my ancestors, was a fisherman that Champlain personally helped finance to settle at Québec sometime before the conquest of 1629. He also settled in the upper territory with his wife, Marguerite Langlois, on the land referred to today as the Plains of Abraham where they began a large family (Fischer, 2008). And so, despite any possible denizen-leanings, Hébert's actions directly contributed to the early success of the French colonial project.

Hébert and Martin were colonists in a very traditional sense – pioneers of French-Canadian society within the St. Lawrence Valley. They were some of the very first agrarian colonists to be 'given' property by the Crown (through a trading company) upon lands that were considered by the French Crown free for the taking. The idea that a society could happen upon a foreign land and impose its own property structures for settlement (it was feudal-like fiefs given to Hébert and Martin) of their own people is emblematic colonial practice – even if such lands had been extended to the French in invitation. In accepting such fiefs, these two men became an important part of a broader process of colonization. As recipients of such property, these men contributed to what became an important colonial fixture – the rendition of Indigenous territories into European property increasingly accomplished at the price of Indigenous dispossession. At such an early stage this did not necessarily translate into Hébert and Martin acting as malevolent colonists, the settlement of these families appears to have been at least tolerated by Indigenous allies and neighbours. But this early use of the seigneurial system certainly did set the stage for later colonial thought and action that would use property as a tool of domination and subversion. And my ancestors, Hébert and Martin, were some of the first actors to willingly make this colonial path possible.

Excavations of the Hébert-Couillard fief suggest that the family ate a varied diet (domesticated and hunted animals) and likely traded with Indigenous allies, for there were objects like glass beads found throughout the excavated dwellings (Simoneau, 2009). This suggests that the Hébert-Couillard family broke the law regarding their contracts, as well as the law later, which stipulated they were not allowed to enter trade with Indigenous peoples. This suggests that the family set some foundations for potential denizen-leanings - foundations for direct interactions with Innu and other Indigenous allies. Unfortunately, little is known of their direct dealing with Indigenous peoples and how productive or destructive such relations might

have been. Although if such trade relations were mainly premised on fair and mutually-supportive exchanges of goods, however clandestine, one might consider such relations positive and possibly even supportive of denizen-leanings. Without further evidence here, however, little more can be said.

Reportedly, Hébert was a deeply religious man who was keenly interested in helping civilize and missionize the Indigenous peoples within the valley (Choquette, 1997; Wrong, 1928).[12] Such convictions would align with the official colony policy of France within the valley. While claims are difficult to substantiate, it has also been suggested that Hébert was quite friendly with local Indigenous peoples: providing them his apothecary services and even opening his home to them (Fischer, 2008). Importantly, it was the Indian corn and peas that his family grew that were used by the French to trade for furs during annual summer markets at Québec (Sagard, 1968). If any stock is to be taken from Sagard's writings and the *Jesuit Relations*, Indigenous visitors to the habitation and the Récollet and Jesuit seminaries nearby were frequent (Thwaites, 1633; Sagard, 1968). Given the reported frequency of interactions, the evidence found suggesting illicit trading occurred at the fief, and Hébert's interest in aiding religious conversion one can at least suggest there was a premise for direct contact between a colonist like Hébert and the Innu and other Indigenous allies. While it appears such interaction, if premised on religious conversion, was problematic, there is still the possibility that some of these relations, specifically trade-based ones, were positive for both parties. Unfortunately, as previous stated, without further credible resources it is difficult to say. Intriguingly, Father Le Jeune wrote that Madame Hébert stated "the savages had helped them [the Hébert family] to live during the greater part of the time" of English occupation (Thwaites, 1633; Sagard, 1968), which suggests a relationship of (possibly mutual) dependence and trust. And so, even if Louis did not have much of a direct relationship with the Innu and others during his time at Québec, it appears that after his death, during occupation, his family did have and needed that direct relationship to sustain themselves until the French returned.

Unfortunately, information of these very early colonial families is difficult to ascertain. There are no first-hand accounts of their experiences like there are for the missionaries and

---

[12] According to Wrong: "Like many founders of New France he [Hébert] was inspired by religious fervour and on his death-bed praised God most of all that his chief purpose in crossing the sea had been fulfilled since he had seen savages converted to the faith."

educated men like Champlain. Instead there are only brief mentions of them through the annals of European history as recorded by political and religious elites. It is, however, quite clear that at least men like Hébert came, voluntarily and with colonial intentions – knowledgeable that their presence and actions within the trading colony were helping the French achieve their colonial and imperial aims. At the very least, one can argue that Hébert was quite aware and interested in the colonial project helping found Port-Royale alongside his reported interest in 'helping' to Christianize the Indigenous peoples of the continent. The intentions and complicities of the wives and children, though they importantly helped populate the colony, are even harder to determine. When Champlain brought his wife to settle for four years (1620-24) at Québec, it is said that she "tried to instruct the Indian women and especially their children" (Wrong, 1928). Perhaps she encouraged the small handful of other colonist women to accompany her on such a mission – it may never be known. But such instruction, if its aim was assimilatory, as history suggests it likely was, would suggest a step away from denizen-like behaviour.

These first families came to the shores of the St. Lawrence with very little structure or support from France. Unlike later colonists who would land along the shores and be incorporated into an increasingly structured colonial society, these first few colonists came with a relatively blank slate. Certainly their agency was shaped by the past actions of explorers, traders, the French Crown and the company that had allowed their settlement, there was still a good deal of agency, of freedom in their approach to Indigenous-French relations relative to later French arrivals. These colonists came with, perhaps the least security of any voluntary colonists that would follow. There was little to no French Crown policy or support. With their small numbers they were dependent on the good will of the trading company for provisions, which only came by ship once a year in the late Spring, if they came at all (Trudel, 1968), and their Indigenous hosts and neighbours. The implications of their vulnerable position suggests that they would have every incentive to act as colonial denizens, foreigners who understood the fragility of their presence on Indigenous lands and who needed to act in kind toward the Innu.

But even under these circumstances, these early colonists sought to re-develop European structures upon Innu territory, likely participating in the challenge to the laws and customs of the Innu during moments of unrest like those identified above. It appears, therefore, that these early colonists occupied a complex space wherein they wavered back and forth between damaging colonial and more deferent denizen-like behaviour – leaning more toward problematic colonial

roles given the implications of their presence and the overwhelming leanings of their actions and intentions. While it was likely the case that individual agrarian colonists and their Indigenous allies got along best during periods of hardship (harsh winters and English occupation), their position as colonists seem to dominate their roles and influences within the French colonial project.

Summary

It cannot be denied or overlooked that the French came to the shores of the Atlantic with colonial and imperial intentions: the pursuit of commercial profit and the discovery of 'new' lands to be claimed in the name of their sovereign. Such 'discovery' was part of a European reality, a vying for power and empire between Crowns. Due to this imperial context, while one might find denizen-like behaviours amongst French colonists, it appears that French thought and action with Indigenous peoples was always pre-inscribed within the damaging rhetoric of colonial and imperial thought. This chapter has searched for any potential iterations of denizen-like behaviour amongst the original colonists of France's trading settlements along the St. Lawrence River. It began from the premise that the actual vulnerability of these first French colonists and the nature of trade-based colonialism one might lead to one more easily finding denizen-like behaviour here than amongst later colonists within what became New France. Two primary groups were identified as actors here: early colonial sojourners (employed by the trading company) and early agrarian colonists (the handful of individuals who came to settle at trading posts during commerce-based colonial policy).

What has been found is a tangled web of relations and actions that ultimately point to more aggressive colonial leanings than denizen-like behaviours and yet, which are not devoid of these latter behaviours. While the official and elite sojourners forced their invitation onto Innu territories; slowly encroached further onto Innu territories; built imposing structures; and resisted abidance to Innu law and custom in cases of inter-cultural conflict, they also provided protection to their Innu allies, as well as military aid against Innu enemies; and helped host annual trading fairs and peace treaties. When these sojourners sought more direct trading relations with the Wyandot, their behaviour appears to have improved as it seems they respected imposed boundaries to more direct trade engagement and better upheld and deepened trade relations through the mutual exchange of young men. Yes, these sojourners were overwhelmingly dominating colonial actors who failed to meet a number of crucial principles of denizen

behaviour (like deference to local customs and laws, a mutually agreeable and unforced invitation) but there are still important actions one can point to as potential denizen-like behaviours. And even where these sojourners did not meet denizen behaviour principles, reviewing their troubling behaviour from a denizen-lens serves to challenge one's readings of their actions with a view to understanding and identifying avenues toward better, more denizen-like, actions that can inform one's understanding of the past, present and future.

The same can be said of the exploration of my ancestor, Hébert, and his actions as an early agrarian colonist. The review of what records are available of his life in the colony suggest he acted in potentially destructive ways – living beyond subsistence on lands that were likely not actually formally granted to the French, his reported interest in the religious conversion of Indigenous peoples, and his very presence and progress leading to the future success of agrarian based colonial endeavours. And yet, there is at least the suggestion within these records that he may also have acted in more denizen-like ways – he very likely traded directly with Indigenous peoples, which increases the possibility that he had, if not overly friendly, then at least mutually respectful relations with those Indigenous peoples with whom he traded. He also indirectly contributed to trade relations through supplying corn to official traders and so helping to sustain and develop positive trading relationships between the French and Indigenous allies more broadly. And, as records suggest, during times of hardship – like when his family was stranded during English occupation – they relied on their Indigenous allies and neighbours for survival which is indicative of positive relations since those like the Innu likely would have not considered themselves beholden to the French following the Kirke brother's conquest.

I expected to find quite deferential colonial denizens during these year years. Instead I found that, even when their numbers were so low, and they were so vulnerable amongst stronger and more numerous Indigenous hosts and neighbours, these original colonists struggled with their identity as colonial denizens. They wanted to be more – to be powerful colonists benefitting from the colonial project, spreading the righteous word of God or benefiting from the trade of furs or the glory of 'discovery'. While colonial denizens need to demonstrate deference to the laws and rules of those whose lands they have been invited onto, even at this early stage the French colonists were pushing up against their role as denizens and looking to impose their self-ascribed 'superiority'; where and when they could. Interestingly, it appears that when the French (were forced to) recognized their vulnerability and their need for mutual aid they were more

likely to act as denizens. This likely rings true for a contemporary denizen ethos. The more one can find common interests across difference, the more likely that Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples are going to have good relations. There is a need to find mutual interests and mutual vulnerability – this doesn't require a shared citizenship, as Alan Cairns suggests (2001), such shared understandings can exist across difference.

People will always carry self-interest. As demonstrated here, both Indigenous and colonists did during this early period. The Innu and later Wyandot were interested in maintaining alliances for economic and military profits while the French were interested in maintaining these alliances for further exploration and 'discovery'. Today, however, there needs to be a shift, specifically, in colonist self-interest. It is certainly time as western, colonial structures are not even benefiting the majority of non-Indigenous peoples anymore – though they certainly maintain non-Indigenous privilege throughout state and society. With the rise of the Occupy Movement, the stronghold that neo-liberal policies of austerity and economics continue to have upon society and state, the concentration of wealth amongst the one-percent – what is even being protected anymore? Perhaps one should identify the early 21st century as a moment of rupture through which to re-align priorities, as well as mutual and self-interests in a way that benefits a greater share of people within a de-colonial society, in a way that recognizes the self-determination and inherent rights of Indigenous peoples, the inherent responsibilities of being a denizen upon Indigenous lands, and the need to establish and maintain good relations.

As such there is a need to re-position the narrative that is told about 'Canada' around this concept of invitation – around the actual (forced) invitation between the French and Innu, around the other instances of (potential, forced, real) invitation throughout the rest of these lands. Re-positioning the narrative around this invitation, around the *need* for such invitation, has considerable de-colonizing power in and of itself as it helps provincialize the European intellectual tradition around discovery and sovereignty at the same time that it opens up a very real space through which to meaningfully identify the inherent rights and responsibilities of Indigenous self-determination and stewardship to the land.

The struggle to do these things – to find mutual interests across real difference, to re-position the stories that are told around invitation - is real. It is a struggle that needs to be taken up at both the individual and societal level. I have begun to take it up here through the exploration of early trade-based colonial history. I have begun to take up the responsibility of

exploring the roles my ancestors played in such a history through exploring the actions of my ancestor Louis Hébert. Identifying my ancestor as the first agrarian colonist to take up land as property within the colony, to consider his reported religious leanings and interests within New France has been unsettling. It has forced me to recognize the complicity of my ancestor within the broader colonial project – at such an early and integral state. He helped set the stage of the use of property as a colonial tool within a largely trade-based colony. He supported the colonial project. And while there are many generations between myself and Louis, I am still connected to this complicity in addition to being complicit within contemporary structures of property and colonialism as I sit writing this chapter in my rented apartment on unceded Coast Salish territory. This is something I need to sit with and consider was I move forward looking to articulate a contemporary denizen ethos and a way of orienting myself in the move to decolonize state and society.

The following chapter departs from this focus on early trade-based colonialism and the early agrarian colonists efforts therein, to focus on the early religious actors and religious-based imperialism and colonization within the colony. Where I have identified that the conversion of Indigenous peoples to the Catholic faith was merely a justification for colonial presence on Indigenous lands and the actual goal of 'discovery' for empire building, such religious based actors and colonialism still played important roles in the development of the colony. Amongst the most important influences of the religious presence was the aid religious actors and institutions played in the move from trade-based to agrarian-based colony. Chapter three once again uses the lens of colonial denizen to approach such religious colonialism and their actors.

Chapter 4: Religious Colonialism in the Laurentian Valley (1623-63): Denizen Contradictions

The previous chapter focused on trade colonialism and its sojourner and early agrarian colonist actors of the French colony along the St. Lawrence River. This next chapter seeks to tackle a different type of colonialism and set of actors from the end of this same period up until the mid-seventeenth century (when the French Crown took control of administration over the colony) by focusing on the functions of religious colonialism (as conversion and missionization) and the roles of religious actors within the Laurentian Valley. Whereas trade-based colonialism is focused on economy and temporary settlement, theoretically holding a greater positive proclivity towards more mutually beneficial relationships; and agrarian colonialism is focused on dispossession, labour and more permanent settlement; religious colonialism is focused on psychological assimilation and the 'civilization' of Indigenous populations. All three forms of colonialism were used to aid the imperial and colonial interests of the French Crown and its subjects throughout its first century in North America. While all three types of colonialism are identifiable today, this religious-based form has been one of the more recognizable forms within contemporary Canadian discourse following the 2006 Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement and the consequential establishment of and report from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

Religious actors, specifically those of the Roman Catholic Church, have been implicated within the Canadian colonial project through various means and contexts since the fifteenth century. The religious colonialism in which these actors participated is a psychological and discursive colonialism mobilized to aid broader imperial and colonial aims. These actors' work within missionization projects helped colonial aims in that it led to the assimilation of Indigenous peoples as well as the strengthening of colonial society in its move toward greater permanence and colonial endeavours. It is through these mechanisms that church members were directly involved in early colonization efforts within seventeenth century New France. Church influence and involvement, however, extended beyond the specific function of missionization efforts. It was the papal bulls, released by the church in the fifteenth century, through which all European imperial endeavours were originally established and justified. Through establishing a legal convention whereby European sovereigns could 'discover' new territories in the name of God, as against other sovereign counterparts and irrespective of Indigenous occupants, these papal bulls

provided the legal and moral basis upon which European nations claimed sovereignty over Indigenous peoples and lands. The church and its actors, therefore, had a widespread influence over global imperial projects at the same time that they were active and more direct members within the processes and structure of religious colonialism – focused as it was on the conversion of non-Christian peoples to the Christian faith.

The papal bulls actually became the foundation upon which the entirety of the North American continent was eventually established as two separate settler colonial states. While these papal bulls were used merely as convention through which to overwrite the sovereignties of non-Christian peoples with the imperial claims of European monarchs throughout the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. By 1823, this convention became the 'doctrine of discovery' as codified in American law through the United States' Supreme Court ruling in in *Johnson v. McIntosh* (Crosby et al., 2016). It has since been used to support major court cases that uphold settler state sovereignty over Indigenous land rights within both the United States and Canada.[13] In recent years the Six Nations Confederacy (the Haudenosaunee) has been requesting that the Vatican revoke the doctrine and, hence, its codification into law (Barnsley, 2016; Brown, 2013). To date it has not been officially revoked. This demonstrates that the church, beyond its role within religious colonization (as conversion), has played an integral role in providing the continuing moral and legal foundation for colonialism within the country. While the following chapter focuses on the roles of church actors and religious colonialism during seventeenth century New France, it also opens space for this broader discussion of the 'Doctrine of Discovery' – a discussion that extends beyond a given form of colonialism as it permeates the entirety of the Canadian colonial project and needs to be taken up and challenged if non-Indigenous peoples are serious about decolonization.

While the basis of religious colonialism does not lend itself well to any denizen-like instantiations, the following chapter still uses a denizen-lens to explore a few key roles of variously situated religious actors during this period along the river. As such, it is hoped that even where such religious actors may be found overwhelmingly colonizing in behaviour such an

---

[13] See for instance: *R v Sparrow*, [1990] 1 S.C.R. 10975 (upholds Crown sovereignty as uncontested and absolute); *R v Van de Peet*, [1996] 2 S.C.R. 507 (defines reconciliation as requiring the reconciliation of previous Indigenous occupation of the land with Crown sovereignty); *City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York*, 544 U.S. 197 (2005) (affirms U.S. government's sovereignty over lands even when they've been 'sold back' to Indigenous nations).

exercise will still be useful in challenging long-held assumptions and narratives of the early encounter period. This exploration will also help in identifying the influence of religious actors and actions in the move from a trade based colonialism to one increasingly focused on agrarian colonialism within the French colony and hence the move further away from denizen-like behaviours amongst colonists. As such, this chapter will begin with an exploration of the roles played by the Récollets in the early colony – an exploration of religious foundations and actions during the colony's earliest and more vulnerable days wherein one expects to find more denizen-like actors. Analysis will shift focus to the founding of Ville-Marie (present day Montréal) as a Catholic mission following the French return to the Laurentian Valley after English conquest. Discussion here will focus on the European settlement of Ville-Marie as the site of a boundary between Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee territories, and will investigate religious and trade-based relationships between colonists and Indigenous peoples within the area. Focus here will be given to questions surrounding invitation and settlement intentions as they concern both religious and more agrarian-based colonist actors. This chapter will end with an investigation of the roles played by three official religious women within the colony: Marie de l'Incarnation, Jeanne Mance and Marguerite Bougeoys focusing on their relations with local Indigenous peoples as well as their important role as founders of an increasingly self-sufficient French colony along the St. Lawrence River.

The Récollets: Early Religious Actors and their Vulnerable Missions

The following considers, somewhat briefly, the role of one of the first religious orders within the French colony: the Franciscan order of the Récollet. This was a religious order that was pledged to poverty (Thwaites, V. IV, 1634) which sent a small handful of brothers to the nascent trade-based colony as early as 1615 to 'improve' Indigenous-colonist relations through religious teachings and conversions. While such intentions, the conversion and assimilation of Indigenous peoples, is inherently colonial, similarly to the study of the first sojourner and early agrarian colonists from chapter two, one still expects to find religious colonists who were more conscious of their foreignness and vulnerability (as compared to later colonists) and so somewhat more inclined to act in a denizen-like manner. What has been found amongst these early actors is rather much more colonial leanings and the foundations for further assimilatory practices that helped support the gradual move from a trade-based colony to one that was increasingly settled and agrarian.

Before launching into a specific discussion of the Récollet roles and influences within the early French colony, it is important to identify and understand the context in which they came to the Laurentian Valley. While French charters for exploration and the establishment of trading posts and monopolies cited the religious (specifically Catholic) conversion of Indigenous peoples as the main aim and justification for exploration and settlement, during early colonial days there was little interest and effort in establishing French missionaries along the river or amongst Indigenous allies. While there had been small-scale attempts to establish secular and Jesuits missionaries within Acadia from 1610 to 1613, these missions were short-lived failures (Codignoa, 2001).[14] In large part, this was due to the fact that religious civilization was not the real prerogative of French exploration and settlement within the continent (Eccles, 1969; Biggar, 1901; Codignoa, 2001). For those few who *were* interested in religious civilization, there were mitigating factors in establishing such religious presence. The most prominent of factors was the inter-religious nature of French fur trade interests and the burgeoning civil war between Catholic and Protestants (Huguenots) back in France (Biggar, 1901; Codignoa, 2001). It is, therefore, impressive that Champlain was able to garner the support of the company to establish four Récollet missionaries (Moogk, 2000; Wrong; 1928) in 1614 given that many of the shareholders who had to agree to this support were protestants and supporting a Catholic order was likely seen as an unwelcome burden (Thwaites, V. IV, 1634).

Champlain and other like-minded sojourner type colonists were interested in such religious settlements because they thought they would strengthen local relationships with their Indigenous allies. Even with the strength achieved through fulfilling military and trade obligations to their allies, the French at Québec (with the exception of interpreters and trade agents like Brûlé) were not being taken by their allies to explore to the north and west of their habitation. Further exploration and the resultant 'discoveries' this would make available were a prime motivation of high-level French sojourner presence as such acts would help expand imperial claims over the continent. Religion was thought to be the answer to encouraging closer ties, and hence greater discovery, since it was believed in France at this time that one's faith determined their loyalty (Moogk, 2000). The four Récollet missionaries were, therefore, brought

---

[14] The earliest missionary effort was established in 1610 at Port-Royal when Jessé LaFléché, a secular priest, settled at Port Royal explicitly for the conversion of the local Mi'kmaq people.
A shortly-lived Jesuit mission was also established in Acadia between 1611-13.

to the colony so that they could help strengthen cultural ties between the French and their Indigenous allies in the hopes that this would help re-vitalize the colonial process of exploration and 'discovery'. The religious presence therefore was preceded and entwined with such imperialist intentions – something important to keep in mind when investigating the roles and actions of these early religious actors.

Joseph Le Caron, a Récollet, was the first missionary to visit the Wyandot people. His presence amongst the Wyandot was identified as an important component toward fostering a more direct and strengthened relationship between the Wyandot and French people (Moogk, 2002). Le Caron lived with the Wyandot during the winter of 1615-16. During this time Champlain (who had accompanied Le Caron) visited neighbouring nations to further promote trade and alliance, while Le Caron began learning the Wyandot language and attempted to missionize his hosts. In certain respects, therefore, Le Caron's presence and actions were supportive and indicative of trade-based colonial relations and, therefore, more denizen-like behaviour. He was there, in part, to support commerce relationships. He took the time to learn the Wyandot language and customs – suggesting a greater equality that goes hand-in-hand with the basis of trade colonialism which is itself based on a greater sense of interdependence between trading parties. Yet, Le Caron was still interested in missionization. He came to Wyandot territory with the aim of converting his hosts to the Catholic religion – grounding his relations within such a goal disrupts one's understanding of his seemingly more denizen-like, deferential, interactions.

Le Caron's early presence amongst and understandings of the Wyandot would play an important role in future missionization efforts for the French colony. Upon returning to Québec the following spring, Le Caron claimed that it would be impossible to convert Indigenous peoples to Christianity without first civilizing them. This would be the prevailing rationale supporting further missionary efforts by not only the Récollets but also the Jesuits following them – the idea that Indigenous peoples had to be assimilated into European cultures before their 'souls could be saved'. At this early stage it was determined by the Récollets that the best way to civilize Indigenous hosts and allies would be to make them settled agriculturalists amongst French settlers from whom they could learn French language and culture (Sagard, 1632; Heidenreich, 2001). Early on, therefore, there was an important connection fostered between religious and agrarian colonialism – supported by the idea that the logics and structure of one

(agrarian) would support the establishment of the other (religious), therefore, simultaneously strengthening the French colonial project. Le Caron's hypothesis led to the establishment of a seminary along the St. Charles River two miles from the Québec habitation (Wrong, 1928) as well as concerted efforts to establish Récollet-led missions in Wyandot territory.[15]

Such thought and behaviour is undoubtedly colonial – focused on transforming Indigenous peoples into 'civilized' Christians. Even at so early a stage, missionaries (believing they were doing the good work of God) came to the French colony with the specific intention of changing Indigenous peoples through spreading the Roman Catholic Scripture. The very rationale behind their arrival suggests that these missionaries understood themselves and their order as at least spiritually superior to Indigenous peoples. Coming onto Indigenous territories with the intention of assimilating self-determined peoples into a foreign faith suggests a refusal of any sort of denizen status. Missionaries likely did not understand themselves as humbled foreigners invited onto Indigenous lands, but rather superior religious representatives sent to change their allies' behaviours as well as legal, social and religious structures. While the missionaries likely did this out of a genuine belief in the power and goodness of Christianity,[16] such thought and action was destructive and disrespectful of Indigenous peoples' lives, lands and roles as allies.

If one considers the writings of Gabriel Sagard (the only first-hand account available from the Récollet missionaries in New France) it becomes clear that there is a need to dig beyond the surface of recorded encounters. For instance, in Sagard's account of his 1623 visit and mission establishment amongst the Wyandot, he recorded his interactions with his hosts in a way that suggests he understood some basic social customs of the Wyandot . He wrote:

> I also went out very often…and visited them in their lodges and households. They liked this very much and were better friends with me on that account seeing that I dealt with them in a kind and affable spirit; otherwise they would not have regarded me with a fabourable eye, and would have thought me proud and scornful…(Sagard, 1632)

This demonstrates that Sagard understood some basic Wyandot customs and followed suit, whether or not he might have done this anyway, by visiting his hosts so as to show respect and

---

[15] Main records of these missionization attempts are found within Brother Garbiel Sagard's writings surrounding his experiences with establishing such missions.

[16] See for instance the writings of Gabriel Sagard and the Jesuit Missionaries who routinely praise their work as virtuous in light of their duty to God.

interest in their relationship. He goes on to state that had he not acted in this way he would not have been able to gain enough influence over them (Sagard, 1632) that, it is implied, would be necessary for their religious conversion and 'civilization'. And so, while such potential denizen-like deference might be suggested within the recordings of these religious colonial actors, even during these vulnerable early missionary years, such deference did not necessarily originate from an honest and respectful place. As one sees with Sagard, deference was used to gain influence so that the colonial mission could be successfully administered since it was necessary to curry trust amongst the targeted Indigenous populations.

While it might, therefore, be tempting to write-off missionaries as colonists *par excellence*, whose goals of Christianization trump whatever other actions and relations they had, their roles were still more complicated than one might assume. There were also moments within Sagard's writings where one sees him grappling with his position as a guest and with his understanding of the Wyandot. He wrote, for instance, of a need to act deferentially toward the Wyandot although he still recognized a need to instil fear amongst them in order to encourage their conversion (Sagard, 1632). This suggests that at a certain level he was able to identify his vulnerability amongst the Wyandot - since he realized he could not just come into their society invoking fear and lording power over them without also establishing some amicable relations with them. And yet, he was still focused on and was supportive of invoking power over the Wyandot through encouraging fear amongst them as a method of persuading them to take up Christianity. At other times, Sagard recognized the Wyandots' humanity, at times arguing they were even more patient, kind and pious than Frenchmen, yet describing their language as poor and defective (Sagard, 1632). Where he wrote of recognizing the importance of following Wyandot customs, specifically the importance of accepting invitations to feasts and finishing one's entire meal so as not the offend one's hosts (Sagard, 1632), he also admitted that he and his brothers refused feasts as much as possible so as not to have to reciprocate such a gift (Sagard, 1632). While the brothers were reportedly often visited by their hosts at the seminary that the Wyandot had helped them erect, they also made a number of efforts to construct the building so as the discourage familiar behaviour amongst the Wyandot and themselves. For instance, Sagard reported, "around our little dwelling we made a little garden, fenced off by stakes so as to prevent free access by the small children of the savages, who for the most part seek only to do mischief" (Sagard, 1632, 80-1). Such an action, the fencing of their garden on Wyandot lands

demonstrates a disrespect for their hosts' customs. While the order was forbidden to own property (Thwaites, V.IV, 1634), such an act is curiously demonstrative of a sense of property. The fact that the brothers constructed this fence exemplifies the force of colonial ideas at the same time that it demonstrates an imposition of western custom within Indigenous territory. All of these competing actions and thoughts, while suggestive of a clash of cultures, also intimates that even Sagard (and likely his missionary brothers) struggled with their role amongst Indigenous peoples as should-be-denizens who ultimately sought to be colonists and rightful-inhabitants of lands they likely saw as rightfully God's and hence rightfully theirs for the taking.

The Récollet missions[17] of the early French colony were ultimately doomed since the brothers were pledged to poverty and since the interest in missionization within the trading company was so low – the latter of which is a phenomenon that would plague the religious colonial project throughout the French era (Codignola, 2001). By the mid 1620s it was clear that the Récollet's efforts for missionization were not successful (Heidenreich, 2001). Recognizing the limitations of their poor resources (Wrong, 1928), the Récollets sought cooperation with the Jesuits - asking for them to send missionaries at the Jesuits' own expense (Thwaites, V. IV, 1634). Having abundant resources, the Jesuits used them to quickly send men to clear lands and establish buildings to begin their missionary work within the colony (Wrong, 1928). While the Jesuits went on to play an integral role in religious colonization in New France, they would not do so until the French returned to the Laurentian Valley in the 1630s.

One could argue that the Récollets could never have been successful religious colonialists within New France given their pledge to poverty and the importance of property (and so wealth) within colonization. Property is, after all, central to processes of colonization. The concept of property, whether it is through the establishment and imposition of the Doctrine of Discovery or the actual possession and occupation of land, has always been an integral aspect of the colonial project (Arneil, 1996) - even under trade-based contexts. While the Récollets might have fallen into implicit conceptions of property in their dealings with the Wyandot, ultimately the order's prohibition of property ownership led to their ineffectiveness within the colony. Beyond this, it is questionable just how well the order could have done even if they had secured funding to

---

[17] By 1624 the Récollets had established missions at Tadoussac, Québec, Trois-Rivières, Carhogouha in Wyandot country, one mission among the Nipissings, and one at Acadia on the St. John's River.
 The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Volume IV. Note 21 from page 171.

continue their efforts. The pledge to poverty suggests that at a foundational level the order's beliefs were counter-intuitive and hence counter-productive to the logics of the agrarian and settler-based colonialism that increasingly took shape and dominance within later colonial years.

Even given such caveats and the vulnerability of such an order so early within the French colonial project, these religious actors struggled to accept their should-be-roles as denizens on Innu and Wyandot territories. This, at least in part, mirrors the early sojourner, trade-based actors explored in chapter two. Actors who may have shown some deference to their Indigenous allies in certain contexts, but whom nevertheless consistently sought to push past the limitations and vulnerabilities of their foreign-status and questionable invitations onto Indigenous territories. Situated from within religious colonialism, the roles of actors like LeCaron and Sagard are unquestionable tied into damaging processes, actions and structures of the broader imperial and colonial project leading the way for future, destructive religious and agrarian colonialisms when the French returned to the Valley in 1632.

La Folle Enterprise: Religious and Agrarian Colonists in the 'Founding' of Ville-Marie

The following focuses on the 'founding' of Ville-Marie (Montréal) in the 1640s by a more economically sufficient religious order than the Récollets: the *Société de Notre-Dame de Montréal*. It considers the context in which French religious and agrarian actors established themselves on the island as well as the results of their un-invited settlement. Important for study here is not only the 'real' results of this invasion of the island but also its implications for the instantiation of a denizen-like ethos - both of which are addressed below. Analysis moves from settlement without invitation into an exploration of the implications of establishing a settlement specifically for missionization purposes, which again denotes an important step away from a denizen-like ethos since such intentions (as previously identified) are inherently colonial and assimilative. Such analysis leads me to conclude that the establishment of Ville-Marie in 1642, by religious and agrarian colonists alike, demonstrates a growing trend away from the limited denizen-like behaviour identified in chapter two, toward increasingly more assimilative and damaging colonist behaviour. This is in part due to this shift from a trade-based colonialism to an increasingly agrarian-based colonialism – a shift that these later, more self-sufficient, religious actors helped bring about in their establishment of social welfare programs. The security that such programs provided helped to foster the settlement of French people and the assimilation of Indigenous allies along the St. Lawrence. Discussion of this self-sufficiency will be left to the

following and last section of this chapter, which focuses on the actions of the leading religious women of the colony.

When the French returned to the Laurentian Valley in 1632 it was with a pre-dominantly Catholic presence.[18] The return to the colony, therefore, marks a second period of religious activity in New France that was specifically Catholic and more active than before, wherein actors were composed of not only clerical men but also nuns and *dévote* laymen and women. The colony saw the return of the Jesuits but not the Récollets (Codignola, 2001; Moogk, 2000), at the same time that it saw the introduction of a number of female religious orders and leaders (Trudel, 1973; Noel, 2013; Simpson, 1997).[19] During this period, French settlements along the river were being re-established as not strictly commercial but also religious sites for the conversion of Indigenous allies. Members of the clergy (specifically the Jesuits) were moving further inland to establish missions amongst allies. The French return in 1632, therefore, marks an important turning point from earlier relations that placed much greater emphasis on economic alliances – when the religious justifications written within trading company charters were largely ignored (Eccles, 1966; Biggar, 1901; Codignola, 2001).[20] Although the role and importance of economic and military concerns did not dwindle during this period, there was a renewed vigor for religious conversion as a method of assimilation that would ultimately enable the French further discovery rights throughout the continent. Importantly the 'success' of these religious endeavours was due to religious and private funding as the trading company and the French Crown remained largely disinterested in any such projects themselves.

While all the previous major French settlements along the river (Tadoussac, Québec, Trois-Rivières) had initially been established as fortified commercial sites, only later receiving institutions like churches, hospitals, and schools; as a mission-settlement, Ville-Marie (Montréal) had all three types of institutions from the outset (Eccles, 1990). It was thought that developing a

---

[18] A Catholic-only stipulation was actually part of the charter for the Company of New France in 1627. Due to the siege of Québec, however, this stipulation was only substantively acted upon when France returned to the colony. H.P. Biggar. *The Early Trading Companies of New France: A Contribution to the History of Commerce and Discovery in North America.* Ed. George Wrong. St. Clair Shores: Scholarly Press Inc., 1901. p. 136.

[19] Examples include the Canonesses of St. Augustine of the Mercy of Jesus, who established the *hôtel-dieu* (hospital) of Québec in 1637; the Ursuline nuns who established a monastery and school at Québec in 1639; and the *Congrégation de Notre-Dame de Montréal* who established a school and almshouse on the island in 1658.

[20] As explored within chapter two, from the outset, French charters for exploration identified the religious civilization of Indigenous populations as the main intention behind exploratory voyages to the New World. However, such justifications and their mandates were largely ignored until the 1630s, as the main intention behind these journeys was to find an alternative route to the Orient and its riches.

settlement with so many amenities would further encourage Indigenous allies to permanently establish themselves on the island, thereby making their assimilation to French culture and the Catholic religion that much easier. Given that the island sat at the junction of both the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Rivers, two integral routes for communication, travel, and trade, it was also thought that settlement here would appear highly accessible and favourable to Indigenous peoples (Eccles, 1990). And so the site was established by the French as both a mission for Indigenous peoples and a settlement for French colonial subjects. This is suggestive of the close connection established between religious and agrarian based colonialism – following from Le Caron's suggestion that the assimilation of Indigenous peoples would more readily occur amongst settled French populations. Unlike previous settlements along the river, therefore, Montréal was explicitly established as a site of assimilation – something that tends to be conveniently glossed over within the grand narrative of its founding.[21] Its origins as a settled-mission indicate that the settlement and the relations therein (between the *dévotes*, the agrarian colonists and Indigenous neighbours and allies) were already pre-inscribed within a clearly demarcated colonial project specific to the site. As such, Montréal's ideological foundations are potentially the most damaging of the denizen-ally relationship than any of the previous French settlements along the river.

Settling Montréal: Invasion of the Divide

In 1642 the island now considered Montréal, was 'granted' by the French Crown as a seigneury to the *dévote* group, the *Société de Notre-Dame de Montréal* (Greer, 1997; Codignola, 2001). In the seeming absence of inhabitants, the French understood they held a right to claim

---

[21] For instance, mainstream news coverage as well as the Prime Minister's official statement concerning the 375th anniversary of Montréal's founding in 2017 makes no mention of how the city was founded as a religious-settlement whose goals were primarily focused on the conversion of Indigenous hosts and neighbours. In fact, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau actually referred to Ville-Marie as a 'fur trade settlement' rather than a mission-settlement in his official statement released for the anniversary. Montréal only later became an important spot for the fur trade later on in the 17th century. Although, importantly, some mainstream coverage does speak to the recognition of a history of mistreatment of Indigenous peoples within the Montréal area, as well as the recognition that Montréal was founded and continues to exist upon unceded Haudenosaunee territory, its religious origins need to be brought forward and recognized.

Government of Canada. *Statement by the Prime Minister of Canada on Montreal's 375th Anniversary*. *Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada*. N.p., 17 May 2017. Web. 17 Mar. 2018. https://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2017/05/17/statement-prime-minister-canada-montreals-375th-anniversary; Benjamin Shingler. "Montreal honours its founders, stresses diversity at 375th anniversary celebration." *CBCNews*. 17 May 2017. Web. 17 Mar. 2018. http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/montreal-375-birthday-coderre-1.4119164; Morgan Lowrie. "Festivities galore as Montreal celebrates its 375th birthday." 17 May 2017. Web. 17 Mar. 2018. https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2017/05/17/trudeau-other-dignitaries-gather-in-montreal-to-celebrate-citys-375th-birthday.html

the territory as their own through the imposition of a feudal property regime. This is the sort of logic fostered by the Doctrine of Discovery as established through Rome's papal bulls in the fifteenth century – used to establish earlier settlements along the river – it is indicative of an imperial or colonial mindset, which identifies Indigenous lands as discoverable by 'superior' or more improved European powers. While there appears to have been no formal ceremony or agreement for the French to establish themselves on the island, it has been suggested that as early as 1611 some Anishinaabe allies encouraged a French presence here as it would make the fur trade route that much safer for them – as the French could help protect them against the Haudenosaunee (Trudel, 1968).

If one digs deeper, however, French habitation of the island is fraught with tension. When the French had first ventured to the island in the sixteenth century it was clearly inhabited by Indigenous peoples, at least some of which were the Wyandot who later moved to Huronia following European-carried epidemics that threatened their populations (Sioui, 1992). These Indigenous peoples referred to the site as Hochelaga (Douglas, 1906). In the absence of the Wyandot during the early seventeenth century, the French identified the site as being vacant – no longer anyone's land and so free to be taken up and claimed by France. But they were wrong. As the works of Haudenosaunee scholars like Taiaiaike Alfred and Audra Simpson argue the island is actually a traditional boundary between the northern part of Haudenosaunee territory and Anishinaabe territory. Alfred even identifies the Haudenosaunee name given to the island 'Hochelaga' as meaning 'island where the people divide' (1995). For the Haudenosaunee and Wyandot their physical absence from their territory, the divide, when the French arrived in the seventeenth century does not equate to a vacancy that the French could take advantage of to claim the lands as their own. And so, even if Anishinaabe allies were supportive of French settlement on the island, which is questionable when relying on Euro-Canadian accounts, given the island's site as a boundary between Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee territories both groups would have to have had agreed to invite the French onto the island for French presence to be legitimate. Without such invitation early colonists of the settlement were invaders and so had no real grounding upon which to situate themselves as denizens since invitation is a pre-condition for denizen-ship proper.

While the first year on the island was relatively free of strife, when the Haudenosaunee discovered the French on the site in the summer of 1643 the violent skirmishes between the

French and the Haudenosanee that were to threaten French presence on the island for the greater part of the seventeenth century began (Simpson, 2014). While the Anishinaabe may have tolerated French presence here the Haudenosaunee were decidedly against French presence. They saw the French as intruders on their territory – more than mere intruders the French were in league with the Anishinaabe and Wyandot, the Haudenosaunee's enemies. It is no wonder that the Haudenosaunee consistently attacked the French who had settled on the Haudenosaunee's own territory for several decades following 1643 – the Haudenosaunee were, at least in part, looking to defend a claim to their own land. According to Wyandot scholar Georges Sioui, they were also looking to get rid of the French due to the epidemics French presence had brought, and continued to bring, that en masse were threatening Haudenosaunee populations (Sioui, 1992).

The recordings of François Dollier de Casson, a Sulpician Priest who settled on the island, published in 1871, document a number of violent skirmishes and events between the French and Haudenosaunee during these years (Casson, 1871). These recordings point to the fact that it was not only religious colonists and officials who were actively involved in the invasion of Hochelaga, it was also the French agrarian colonists who, in helping to defend their settlement against the Haudenosaunee, were actively participating within such invasion efforts. It is important to keep in mind that while the Haudenosaunee were attacking these settlements, specifically targeting Ville-Marie, the French were also actively engaged in attacking Haudenosaunee villages with the Anishinaabe and Wyandot. For the Haudenosaunee, as will be contextualized within the intra-continental slave trade in chapter 6, these raids were a means of replenishing Haudenosaunee populations that had been, and continued to be, threatened by European epidemics (Sioui, 1992). For the French re-population was not an end goal of their own retaliatory raids against Haudenosaunee villages.

Casson's recordings note that a number of my early ancestors, who helped invade the island and settle Ville-Marie, like Jacques Achambault, Jean Gervais and Urbain Tessier dit Lavigne, were among the many agrarian colonists who helped fight off the Haudenosaunee who attacked the French on the island (1871). Jacques lost a son, Denis, during an attack in 1652 (Drouin Institute, 1965). And Urbain himself was captured as a prisoner of a Haudenosaunee raid and released in 1660 (Casson, 1871). Such stories have been used throughout the Euro-Canadian settlement narrative to paint a very specific picture of French-Haudenosaunee relations wherein the French are depicted as humble heroes of a legitimate and burgeoning French society. While

the Haudenosaunee are identified as the wild and violent war-like people (bent themselves toward imperial aims) who constantly attacked a relatively weak and meek French population. Such a picture is inaccurate. The French were invading and claiming Haudenosaunee territory as their own. They were not invited. And it was not just the religious officials who were actively invading Haudenosaunee territory. Agrarian colonists on the island like Jacques, Jean and Urbain, were more than tacitly supporting French occupation of the island through their presence, they were also actively helping to fight off those people whose territory they were settling – stealing.

Even with the Anishinaabe, Wyandot and Innu with whom the French were allies, relations on the island were tested and plagued with tension. As de Casson's recordings suggest there were moments of unrest between the French and the Wyandot in particular during the first two decades of French settlement on the island.[22] Given that the Wyandot counted territories within the vicinity of the island as their own ancestral lands (Sioui, 1992), their alliance and views of French habitation there must have been complicated following 1642. A notable example of tense relations between the French and Wyandot is recorded by Casson who wrote about the Wyandot looking to betray the French on the island in 1646-7, currying favour with the Haudenosaunee who were attacking the settlement (Casson, 1871). While the priest did not go into much detail, this recording still suggests that even the French colonists' allies were not fully supportive of their presence on the island. Whether the Wyandot were motivated here through self-interest or anger is not the primary element in identifying such an event as indicative of tense relations – ones which might further discredit French presence on the island. And yet, it is also important to note that in many cases at Ville-Marie relations between the French and Wyandot were positive, lending themselves to mutual dependence and good relations. Casson identifies times during which the Wyandot sought refuge with the French on the island, and other times when they fought alongside the French, against the Haudenosaunee, in and around the settlement (1871). While it appears, therefore, that the French were in bad relation with the Haudenosaunee – specifically were refusing their roles as should-be-denizens with the Haudenosaunee since they 'settled' the island without invitation – in establishing themselves on

---

[22] While de Casson was not living in the settlement during the 1640s and 50s, it is understood that the recordings of such earlier events (which are plentiful within his writings on Montréal) would have been collected through a rich oral history of the French settlers at the site, if not also from the writings of the few literate members of French society along the river.

the island the French were (at least at times) acting as good allies to their Anishinaabe and Wyandot allies through helping fend off the Haudenosaunee and preventing their access to the major trade routes of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Rivers.

And yet, the settlement of Ville-Marie, above and beyond its religious colonial purposes, fundamentally neglects the requirements of a denizen ethos. The French did not clearly acquire an invitation from any of the territory's rightful stewards. They in fact actively fought against the Haudenosaunee whose lands they were (at least partially) on. While it appears that their presence was at least generally condoned by their allies: the Anishinaabe, Innu and Wyandot, even their support of the French on the island was tested and more broadly contestable. And so the basic foundation for any sort of denizen-like relationship was missing during the early years of French settlement at Hochelaga, even if (at times) French presence was beneficial to their Anishinaabe and Wyandot allies with whom they fostered more positive and even sometimes denizen-like relations.

Mission Efforts

As mentioned, the French established Ville-Marie, without invitation, explicitly for the purposes of Christianizing Indigenous peoples. While many Indigenous allies were warry of establishing themselves around the island in part due to the consistent skirmishes between the French and Haudenosaunee, a number of Wyandot, Nispissing and Anishinaabe people did come to establish themselves at French missions here. According to scholars like Georges Sioui, for the Wyandot settlement around the island in the mid-seventeenth century was a return home following the dispersal of Huronia (1992). The proliferation of religious colonialism on the island points to yet another means through which the French colonists at Ville-Marie found themselves further and further away from any instantiation of a denizen-like ethos. Their actions and support of the mission enabled the implementation of missionization efforts focused on colonizing Indigenous peoples. While it would be easy, from within Euro-Canadian accounts, to leave the discussion here it is important that one once again visits Indigenous-based narratives and experiences around these events and processes to begin uncovering how Indigenous peoples who established themselves at these missions might have understood their own roles and interactions within the broader colonial project and relations. Such insights lend further complexity to one's understanding of the actual function of religious colonialism within the colony.

Where those who established themselves within these missions generally practiced a syncretic Christianity (Havard, 2001), and were subjected to religious teachings and imposed cultural practices and standards of the missionaries, as a group they retained a great deal of autonomy from colonial officials. There was, therefore, a limit on the colonial power that could be exercised by the French over these populations, due in large part to colonists' appreciation of their own vulnerable position along the river and the *de facto* autonomy of the mission members. Many of the Indigenous peoples who found themselves living in the missions often established, amongst themselves, their own political ties and alliances independent of the French. These Indigenous peoples would become important military allies to the French in the late half of the seventeenth century as tensions with the Haudenosaunee League peaked (Havard, 2001). The Wyandot in fact had considerable strength in commercial alliances at these missions – a strength that built upon their traditional roles within the Laurentian Valley as conductors of a vast network of trade that predated European arrival (Sioui, 1992). And so the Indigenous peoples who participated within the missionization efforts at Ville-Marie were not the heavily subjected and colonized individuals one might initially paint them to be from a Euro-Canadian perspective but rather still largely independent and even enterprising individuals who were maintaining large levels of autonomy and even benefiting from their positions within the missions.

While the French had baptized 78 (largely Anishinaabe) at Ville-Marie by 1643, they also came to realize that until they mitigated the threat posed by the Haudenosaunee on the island (who sought to eliminate colonists from their traditional territory) other Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples would be reluctant to settle and assimilate on the island – indeed this is exactly what the Haudensaunee sought to achieve (Eccles, 1987). Given this intention and the sustained violent relations with the Haudenosaunee on the island, it is at first glance surprising that by the 1660s members of the Haudenosaunee League joined French missions near the island. Take for instance, the large number of Mohawk members who settled within the Jesuit-led mission of Kentaké (*La Prairie*) just south of Montréal in the 1660s. Why would members of a nation of the Haudenosaunee League come to establish themselves in a Catholic mission that had been imposed on their own traditional territories?

Religion was an important motivation. It became a major cleavage amongst the League nations who had taken in Christianized Wyandot people following their dispersal at Haudenosaunee hands in 1650 (Alfred, 1995). Given that the great law of peace, by which the

League lived, required the achievement of consensus in decision making, introducing Catholic religion as an exterior cleavage proved burdensome and led to stalemates and additional strain on factional divisions already present amongst nations. And so for some Haudenosaunee, coming to establish themselves in missions near their Hochelaga was one way through which to avoid these tensions and cleavages. A move to these missions, during their early days at least, was also a move to find temperance (Simpson, 2014) given the availability of alcohol in the southern reaches of Haudenosaunee territory and the violence, social disruption and cultural disintegration it was purported to induce (Alfred, 1995). More than this, the move by those like the Mohawk to the mission at Kentaké, was a move to extend or reclaim the League's territory (Simpson, 2014). At the same time, it was a calculated move specifically for the Mohawk who came, since they could position themselves at the island (the central site of the French fur trade during these years) to become "intermediates in the lucrative Albany-Montréal trade route…to generate a profit out of their individual political immunity and special legal status as Mohawk people in the colonial balance of power" (Alfred, 1995, 44). And so, while the French understood these missions as vital to the success of their assimilation project, and hence broader project of 'discovery', in practice, these missions also afforded Indigenous individuals and nations who used these missions (for the purposes of political and social tools) a means of survival as well as political and territorial development and even territorial reclamation. This brings into relief avenues by which to question the actual function of French missionization efforts on the island and to highlight the resiliency and actions of Indigenous allies and neighbours. The fact that the Indigenous peoples of the missions retained so much autonomy and authority, however, does not un-do or override the assimilative intentions behind the establishment of these missions. These projects, therefore, still maintained the religious and agrarian colonists as colonists who were edging further and further away from denizen roles.

It was not only through physical missionization efforts that the French sought to encourage the assimilation of their Indigenous allies. The French Crown also introduced a policy that any Indigenous individuals who "professed the Catholic faith would be recognized as *naturals français* ('French Nations') without the need for *lettres de declaration ni de naturalité* (affidavits or citizenship papers)" (Trudel, 1968). In other words, at this juncture, French Crown policy attempted to induce assimilation through the provision of French subject-hood via religious affiliation. It was thought that such a status, which the French colonists of New France

retrained, would encourage and ease assimilation and loyalty, thereby strengthening alliances. It was only through strengthened alliances, after all, that the French might get to explore further into the interior and be able to claim 'discovery' over more of the continent. This is a further instantiation of a move away from denizen-like thought and behaviour as it depicts an official policy which identifies French culture and subject-hood as preferable and desirable to Indigenous peoples. It demonstrates an attempt to impose French society onto Indigenous peoples and lands and is, therefore, demonstrative of increasingly aggressive colonizing endeavours.

Throughout the seventeenth century the miscegenation of French men and Indigenous women was also encouraged by the French Crown. It was thought that such a policy could kill three birds with a single stone. It was considered an avenue through which to increase a 'French' population, and hence expand and cement the Empire along the St. Lawrence when there was little interest in actively encouraging French subjects to emigrate to the colony. It was a way by which to strengthen alliances with Indigenous allies. And it was believed that such intermarriage was a good avenue through which to assimilate Indigenous women and their communities (Belmessous, 2005) into French civilization and so an avenue through which to encourage Indigenous subject-hood under the French Crown. Intermarriage by these standards was not about *métissage*, therefore, but the Frenchinization of Indigenous peoples (Gaudry and Leroux, 2017). Both of these later results it was thought would aid further imperial expansion and discovery goals. This supports the view that during the seventeenth century official French policy was not racially prejudice toward Indigenous peoples. As Peter Moogk's work suggests, even French colonists during this century were certainly

> culturally self-centered, but they did not see themselves as racially superior. They accepted the Amerindians' humanity. The presence of Mediterranean people, with black hair, brown eyes, and dark skin, in France's population meant the traits of native Indians were regarded as normal by the French (Moogk, 2002).

And so in theory the policies encouraging miscegenation were acceptable to French agrarian and religious colonists and desirable for the French project of 'discovery'. By the eighteenth century, however, this policy was replaced by one that forbade intermarriage since it was feared that more often than not French men who married Indigenous women were the ones being assimilated and developing many of the vices (such as idleness) the French associated within their Indigenous allies (Moogk, 2002). While the policy's success along the river was questionable (Trudel, 1968; Gaudry and Leroux, 2017), by the eighteenth century French men involved in the fur trade were

consistently practicing miscegenation within the interior (Prodruchny, 2006; Barman, 2014). The reversal of policy, therefore, was likely based on the practice of inter-marriage within the fur trade during the late seventeenth century and the mistrust of certain fur trade actors by the French Crown although it did initially play at least a discursive role within religious colonial endeavours.

The missionization efforts at Ville-Marie and these assimilative policies focused on subject-hood and marriage indicate an important aspect in the shift from a trade-based colony to an agrarian colony – a shift that religious actors were important in helping to bring forth. As the French began gaining greater traction and security along the river, colonial policies became increasingly assimilative. Imposing such policies suggests that the French Crown, its religious emissaries and even average agrarian colonists were stepping further and further away from their proper roles as denizens to Indigenous allies and their lands, by looking to elevate themselves in their relations with Indigenous peoples whose lands they were taking over.

***

The unsanctioned establishment of Ville-Marie, as a settled-mission, represented the new-found zeal with which the French returned to the Laurentian Valley. It is also demonstrative of the increasing distance from which French colonists could be associated with the colonial denizen. In the gradual shift from trade-based colonialism to agrarian colonialism, colonial actors became increasingly destructive and focused on assimilation and settlement at the expense of more friendly and interdependent relations. While evidence demonstrates that in actuality the number of those involved in these evangelization efforts, both within the colony and at home, was small (Codignola, 2001)[23] these men and women were integral to the establishment and survival of an increasingly self-sufficient French society within the Laurentian Valley.

Devoted Women: The Role of Religious Women in Establishing a New French Society

Religious and *dévotes* women, such as Jeanne Mance; Marie de l'Incarnation; and Marguerite Bourgeoys, alongside their largely female benefactors, like Madame de la Peltrie; the Duchesse d'Aiguillon; and Madame de Bullion (Simpson, 1997) played vital roles in the establishment of French society and the recruitment of colonists at both Québec and Montréal

---

[23] In fact, "only 190-193 male and 26 female members of clergy, at all levels (including lay brothers and the converse [lay] sisters) voluntarily went or were forcibly sent to North American between 1610 and 1658." Codignola. p. 184.

during the mid-seventeenth century.[24] Their prominence and influence was not always fully supported by the male-dominated Roman Catholic Church, and yet these women were able to actively help establish New France as a more self-sufficient and increasingly agrarian colony. Their roles within the larger Euro-Canadian settlement narrative have since been preserved and cherished within French-Canadian history (Noel, 2013). While the male order of the Jesuits played an important role in mission work during this period, these religious women who stayed along the river were the ones establishing hospitals, almshouses, and educational institutions for French colonists and Indigenous allies – the institutions which helped secure French presence and society within the colony and which enabled the shift from trade-based to agrarian-based colony.

In part, the presence of these women within the French colony was due to the Counter-Reformation which was itself a response to the critique and challenge that faced the Roman Catholic Church following the Protestant Reformation. During the Counter-Reformation women were vying for more prominent roles within the Church – specifically looking for ways to participate within the missions that the clergy were establishing within the colonies (Rapley, 1993). But "patriarchal Europe had never been entirely comfortable with the religious communities of women it harboured…[and so] insisted on *clausura*, the strict confinement of religious women within the cloisters of their convent" (Greer, 1997, 72). This imposed cloister presented an obstacle for women who wanted to do mission work because such work to create hospitals and almshouses as well as missionary work amongst Indigenous peoples required an un-cloistered or at least less cloistered lifestyle. Teaching within educational institutions in the colonies, therefore, became one way to fulfil women's desires to participate within missionization without too heavily challenging "the sacrosanctity of the clausura" (Rapley. 1993, 73). It was in this spirit that the Ursuline nuns, "the feminine teaching congregation *par excellence* of seventeenth-century France (Rapley, 1993), were first established at Québec in 1639 under the guidance of Marie de l'Incarnation (Noel, 2013). As the "exercise of charity towards the poor had always been a feminine prerogative" (Rapley, 1993, 77) within the French Roman Catholic tradition, other congregations that established hospitals and almshouses were

---

[24] As financial donors, Madame de la Peltrie helped establish the Ursulines at Québec; the Duchesse d'Aiguillon (the niece of Cardinal Richelieu) helped establish the hospital nuns at Québec; and Madame de Bullion (widow of the late Treasurer of France) was one of the largest benefactors of the *Société de Notre-Dame de Montréal*, which was the society that originally founded Ville-Marie as a religious settlement in 1642.

quick to follow if not precede teaching-based establishments along the river. The women who helped establish these institutions tended to come from bourgeoisie backgrounds (Noel, 2013), playing the roles of colonists and/or denizen in differing degrees upon Indigenous lands.

In order to explore the roles these women played in the colonization of New France, the following will first consider the role and actions of Marie de l'Incarnation at Québec, who though she actively helped assimilate young Indigenous girls to Catholicism and French culture, demonstrated, to some extent, denizen-like behaviour through her multilingual and diplomatic services. It will then consider the role and actions of Jeanne Mance at Ville-Marie, who though also predominantly aggressively colonialist in her work also could be seen to demonstrate denizen-like behaviour to the extent she provided healthcare to Indigenous peoples (thus taking seriously the responsibility for mutual care and reciprocity between those who come to land and those who 'host' them). And finally, will consider the role and actions of Marguerite Bourgeouys at Ville-Marie whose schools helped strengthen the colonial and assimilative presence at Ville-Marie but who also may be seen to have questioned her role as religious colonist amongst Indigenous peoples on Indigenous lands.

Marie de l'Incarnation: Educator and Diplomat of Québec

In 1639 Marie de l'Incarnation helped establish the Ursuline nuns at Québec. While the Company of St. Ursula was a cloistered congregation, the nuns at Québec ultimately modified, though still kept many of, the constraints of their order's cloistered lifestyle. While their primary intention was to instruct young girls in the ways of the Catholic tradition and French culture, they ended up instructing both males and females in the parlour of their small convent at Québec (Trudel, 1999; l'Incarnation & Marshall, 1967). Such interaction with men would not have been permitted under a more strict adherence to the *claustura*, a loose application was important for the maintenance of diplomacy at Québec. Importantly, the ultimate purpose of this education within the colony was to assimilate Indigenous girls for marriage with French men or else their re-introduction into their communities where they were to spread the word of God and French civilization (Marhsall, 1967; Noel, 2013). The Ursuline nuns were thus colonialists who it appears strayed far from their proper roles as denizens – looking to impose foreign culture, ways and religion onto Indigenous peoples and failing to show deference to the culture, ways and religions of the peoples whose lands they were on.

Marie de l'Incarnation was somebody who was somewhat of an exception to this picture. She learned various Indigenous languages and provided instruction in Algonquin, Innu, Wyandot as well as the French language (Noel, 2013). The endeavour to provide a multilingual service may show some deference to Indigenous allies, though the learning of these languages was ultimately used to broaden the reach of assimilation through education. While, according the Marie's letters, the nuns were never left wanting for young girls to instruct (l'Incarnation &Marshall, 1867), she also makes clear that she (and other nuns in her order) did not use force or entreaties, should the girls wish to leave because they found the lessons were causing them pain – of course the plan was still that these girls might be 'won over' to civilization if they were left alone. As Marie de l'Incarnation wrote in a 1668 letter to her son, many Indigenous girls:

> are here only as birds of passage and remain with us only until they are sad, a thing the savages' nature cannot suffer; the moment they become sad, their parents take them away lest they die. We leave them free at this point, for we are more likely to win them over in this way than by keeping them by force or entreaties (Marie qt. l'Incarnation & Marshall, 1967, 336).

The quote suggests that these nuns were not permitted to use force to encourage the assimilation of young Indigenous girls and that they ultimately had to hope that such girls would be more likely to assimilate if force was not used to keep them housed with the nuns. And so while someone like Marie de l'Incarnation may appear to have demonstrated considerable deference in providing instruction through multiple Indigenous languages, and in 'letting young Indigenous girls go' when they were not happy under her tutelage, her intentions (and those of here order) were overwhelmingly and damagingly colonially-focused. She may be a more denizen-like religious actor than those who followed her, but her aims and desires were still clearly focused on the colonial assimilation of Indigenous peoples.

Women like Marie de l'Incarnation also played important diplomatic roles within the colony. Not only did she instruct and provide charity to both men and women within her parlour, she and the nuns in her order provided refuge to Indigenous allies during times of violent warfare with the Haudenosaunee nations (Noel, 2013; l'Incarnation & Marshall, 1967). Furthermore, they helped fulfill important diplomatic ceremonies with neighbours and allies. Marie de l'Incarnation writes of entertaining important Indigenous dignitaries "who order their visits as do persons of rank in France" at their parlour in a 1641 letter to the Superior of the Visitation of Tours (Marhsall, 1967). Given the statement that these Indigenous officials "ordered" feasts for

the visits there is an implication here that the Marie de l'Incarnation recognized the important of feasting as a practice of diplomacy with Indigenous allies that was similar to rituals of feasting with French officials back home. Whether or not she recognized that these feasts were part of a very specific custom of pre-existing Indigenous diplomacy or a way through which to impose French ways of food-based socialization is ultimately unclear. Nevertheless, such actions are suggestive of attempted diplomatic relations between the nuns at Québec and their Indigenous allies and neighbours. Such diplomatic roles even extended to the Haudenosaunee. Acting in consultation with the governor, during the 1650s, the Ursuline nuns would keep young Haudenosaunee girls at the convent following attempted peace treaties or raids (wherein these girls had been captured) since the exchange of children and kin could be an important matter of diplomacy for Indigenous nations in negotiating peace or cease-fires (Noel, 2013). The Ursuline nuns were, therefore, an important component of the colonial project within New France. They aided the colonizing mission through their services as educators and diplomats, thereby also helping to support the permanence of the colony at Québec. But they also sought to assimilate Indigenous girls into the Roman Catholic religion and French culture thereby ultimately seeking to assimilate Indigenous populations into the French empire.

Jeanne Mance and Ville-Marie's Survival

Jeanne Mance, a devout nurse, was not only integral to the original settlement of Ville-Marie but also key to its survival during the 1640s, 50s and early 60s. While she was a member of the *dévote* group, the *Société de Notre-Dame de Montréal*, she did not belong to a convent or other religious order. She was, rather, a deeply religious woman who had taken no vows but who wanted to support the religious mission of Ville-Marie. Even before embarking from France, Mance was so committed to the project that she actively sought to increase the society's membership and funds. On the heels of her induction, as the first female member of the *Société*, she convinced the members of the society to write a prospectus of their project which she sent to Madame de Bullion and a number of other wealthy Parisians. This prospectus was so well-received that donations more than doubled and the company expanded from eight to thirty-eight members (Noel, 2013). At this time, another women integral to the project of Ville-Marie, Mme de Bullion, became one of its biggest benefactors and even provided the society with 22,000 livres to fund the establishment of a hospital within the religious settlement. As there was no specific order in mind to establish the hospital, she asked Mance to take on the task and so

Jeanne Mance travelled to help establish Ville-Marie and its hospital in 1642 (Choquette, 1992; Noel, 2013).

Mance was not only the hospital director within Ville-Marie, she was also the financial manager (or treasurer) and principal fundraiser of the mission (Casson, 1871; Noel, 2013). Through medical care and financial planning she was integral to the settlement's survival, travelling back and forth between the colony and France to secure greater funds, recruits and supplies for Ville-Marie (Noel, 2013). While Mance was not directly involved in the re-education or assimilation of Indigenous neighbours and allies, it is important to recognize that she sought to enable this re-education and assimilation through actions that looked to enable the funds, security and colonist presence necessary for these colonial endeavours. While the settlement was sparsely populated during the period within which the majority of her work occurred - due to the continual war-like violence between the French and their allies against the Haudenosaunee - by the time settlement increased in numbers, the character of Ville-Marie had turned from its religious beginnings – through the work of those like Mance who had enabled the settlement to last long enough for this to occur – to an increasingly settled site that functioned as an inter-societal hub of trade and diplomacy. And so, Mance's work was important in helping the settlement of Ville-Marie not only shift into a more agrarian-based colony but also to last long enough to survive (however illegitimately) to see this more agrarian-based colony.

As an un-cloistered, *devote*, Mance had considerable freedom in her interactions with both Indigenous and French peoples but she faced resistance from some sects of society who favoured the patriarchal nature of European society. Like other religious women at various settlements along the river, however, she was able to establish sufficient favour with enough political elites to withstand such resistance (Noel, 2013). Not only did Mance help found a French settlement whose purpose was to assimilate the Indigenous peoples of the Laurentian Valley, she also paved the way for future missionization projects at Montréal and beyond. She was a powerful women in a patriarchal society, who challenged gender norms, but simultaneously deployed her religious zeal to formulate destructive foundations for colonial relations between Indigenous and French peoples. While she treated Indigenous patients at her hospital on the island, where she likely considered her efforts to have a positive effect on Indigenous neighbours and allies, her intentions and her legacy were ultimately colonial in nature suggesting she falls closer to aggressive colonizer than colonial denizen.

Marguerite Bourgeoys and Religious Schooling at Ville-Marie

Marguerite Bourgeoys came to Ville-Marie in 1653 with the recruitment of 'one hundred men' in order to ostensibly 'save' the island for the French from what was seen by the colonizers as Haudenosaunee aggression (Simpson, 1997, Rapley, 1993). Bourgeoys came through the "agency of the *Congrégration de Notre-Dame de Troyes*" (Rapley, 1993, 101) and founded the *Congrégation de Notre-Dame de Montréal* (Simpson, 1997). This was a ground-breaking congregation for New France because it was un-cloistered (Rapley, 1993), unlike the Ursuline nuns at Québec discussed above who had a modified *clausura*. Like Jeanne Mance, Bourgeoys experienced significant backlash from elite clergy who wished to maintain strict cloistered life particularly for religious women. Powerful men within the Catholic Church were not comfortable with autonomous women,[25] who in many cases were financially independent thanks largely to female benefactors (Noel, 2013). One the other hand, the French Crown favoured un-cloistered congregations over the Ursuline nuns because they were more flexible and suitable to the demands of travelling to Indigenous settlements, and teaching – often done because of religious support – free of charge (Rapley, 1993). Bourgeoys and her sisters thus established a school in 1658, and taught French and Indigenous children free of charge (Simpson, 1997; Rapley, 1993); caring for the young boarders at their household; offering help, encouragement and advice to the colonists who came to them in need while managing to support themselves and their own needs so that these services (education, alms, etc.) could be rendered to the Indigenous and non-Indigenous public free of charge (Greer, 1997; Simpson, 1997). While Mance helped establish and lead the settlement, and oversaw the administration of the hospital, it was Bourgeouys and her congregation that provided the public and colonial services that had been wanting during the 1640s. For the rest of the seventeenth century, Mance's hospital sisters and Bourgeouys' congregation worked closely together to provide services to French and Indigenous peoples alike (Simpson, 1997).

From the outset Bourgeoys and her order were eagerly welcomed by the French inhabitants of Ville-Marie and the surrounding areas. The *habitants* recognized the need for such mobile, un-cloistered nuns – teachers – who could travel freely and live amongst the regular

---

[25] There was considerable struggle for Bourgeoys' order to remain un-cloistered within New France, specifically following the arrival of Bishop Laval in 1659. Even the more formal cloister of the Ursuline nuns at Quebec was threatened with his arrival. For further information, please see: Leslie Choquette. "Ces Amazones du Grand Dieu": Women and Mission in Seventeenth-Century Canada." *French Historical Studies*. 17.3. (1992). 627-55.

population (Rapley, 1993). It is quite likely that my ancestors' children, the children of Jacques Archambault and Urbain Tessier di Lavigne, were taught by Bourgeouys' order at Ville-Marie. While the settlement and the colony more generally were places of great violence during these years (due to warfare between the French, their allies and the Haudenosaunee) the presence and actions of the congregation during these years still afforded great privileges to the French colonists on the island and within the surrounding areas. The services they rendered including free education, health care, poverty assistance, and greatly improved the lives of the peasant-class within the colony. This was especially true of women who would not have had access to education in France (Noel, 2013). The hospital broadly benefited all colonists that, like the sister institution at Québec, had a ninety-two percent survival rate by 1681 (Noel, 2013). These sorts of services and institutions were integral to a growing colonist independence from not only France but their Indigenous allies. It was this sort of religiously-based support that induced the French population to shift from a vulnerable position as denizens and invaders on Indigenous lands to increasingly become a more permanent, self-sufficient and growing agrarian colony.

The nuns served not just the colonist population. As has been argued, these religious orders were coming to the St. Lawrence with the specific intention of assimilating Indigenous allies to the Roman Catholic religion (Noel, 2013). As early as 1683, Intendant Muelles identified Bourgeoys congregation, the *Congrégation de Notre-Dame de Montréal*, as the most successful order in New France at assimilating Indigenous peoples to Christianity. By 1763, the congregation was the largest community of nuns within the French colony (Choquette, 1992). While Bourgeouys and Mance, seemingly in good faith, offered health care services to Indigenous neighbours and allies as well as colonists, and their educational services were voluntary, thereby abiding by the sort of mutual respect and goodwill one would expect to find within a denizen ethos, they also helped established at least one basis for the assimilative policy through education that ultimately resulted in the residential school system – an intergenerational trauma still being felt today.

Intriguingly, there was a letter from 1658, written by Louis Tronson (a Sulpician Priest), as cited by Etienne Michel Faillon (nineteenth century Catholic historian), that suggests that Marie Bourgeoys had to be reassured concerning her mission efforts to 'civilize' young Indigenous children within the colony at some point (Faillon, 1853). Unfortunately, the letter, as appears to have been lost to time. The existence of such a letter, however, if it were found, would

be quite at odds with what is known about a religious woman like Borgeoys and of the colonial mentality of the time. Perhaps Bourgeoys' experience missionizing in the French colony for over a decade had instilled within her such doubts that she began to question her role as a colonist even as her congregation went on to be one of the most successful assimilationist institutions during the French regime.[26] Without physical evidence of the letter and further context behind it, it is difficult to offer much more beyond conjecture. Whether or not Bourgeoys began to fundamentally question her role, potential evidence of such doubt within the project would be demonstrative of the complexity of these women and their roles and their implications within the French colonial project. It would suggest that while these women predominantly acted as colonist there were glimmers of them seeking to take up or at least grapple with responsibility as a denizen, quite possibly questioning and resisting the pull to impose one's own ways while living on the territory of the people one seeks to assimilate.

<center>***</center>

These devoted women played a crucial role in the development of the French colony from trade-based to agrarian-based colonialism. Their ability to work in less or un-cloistered orders was an important aspect of their contributions here. They provided colonial society with a huge amount of support through not only helping to secure a more stable, healthy and educated agrarian colonist population but also through challenging European patriarchal genders roles. While their goals in coming to the Laurentian Valley were, as with all the other religious actors explored in this chapter, aggressively and damagingly colonial, one can also see moments or brief shimmers of more denizen-like behaviour or awareness – in the rendering of equal health services provided by Mance and the multilingual and diplomatic services provided by de l'Incarnation. Analyzing and understanding the roles and actions of these women, while only briefly begun here, helps one in determining not only the complexity of these mid-seventeenth century female religious actors but also the ways through which their actions helped pave the way for increasingly destructive, agrarian-based colonist actions and policies.

---

[26] Yet even when discussing the supposed success of conversions one must keep in mind the tendency for 'native syncretism' – that many Indigenous peoples who were seen to have converted to Catholicism still held the beliefs of their own people and merged the two into a hybrid worldview.
Havard. pp. 35-7.; Noel. p. 65.

Summary

 This chapter has focused on identifying early instantiations of religious colonialism and its actors in early to mid-seventeenth century New France. It has considered how the actions of these colonists aligned and/or misaligned with a denizen ethos from the more vulnerable positions of early Récollets missionaries, to the mission colonists of Ville-Marie, and the devoted religious women of the colony whose actions helped sustain and secure and increasingly agrarian colonial based presence on Indigenous lands. What has been found is an overwhelming tendency for these religious and agrarian colonist actors to behave in increasingly aggressive and assimilative ways although, as has been shown there remain glimmers of denizen-leanings, and suggestions of doubt surrounding more aggressive and assimilative-based behaviour toward Indigenous peoples. Above and beyond these more specific action-based analyses, this chapter has also identified and explored how important religious actors were in the move from trade-based to agrarian-based colonialism within the French colony – specifically here the devoted religious women who established the hospitals, public education and almshouses that were important for supporting a more secure and permanent settler colony. And finally, this chapter has shed light on an important narrative readily silenced in the grander narrative of Euro-Canadian settlement: the 'founding' of Montréal as a mission to assimilate Indigenous peoples into French culture and the Catholic religion.

 What can the contemporary reader take away from all of this? In terms of the broader narrative of settlement, this chapter suggests that taking up a denizen ethos will require grappling with contexts in which no invitation was extended to Europeans to settle a site that has long since been settled by Euro-Canadians. For contemporary inhabitants of Montréal, any negotiation with the Haudenosaunee and/or the Anishinaabek nations needs to recognize this settlement-without-invitation, this contested history and claim to the island and what this might mean for Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations moving forward within the city and surrounding area – what an invitation might look like today, if deemed appropriate, and what obligations it might carry and to whom. Interestingly, there is some recent movement toward recognizing the city of Montréal as having been founded upon the unceded territory of the Wyandot, Haudenosaunee and even Anishinaabek nations.[27] This is a positive step forward, though it needs to go hand-in-

---

[27] For example, through their websites both McGill and Concordia universities recognize that they are located on unceded Indigenous territories.

hand with recognizing the intentions behind this settlement and their religious and assimilative nature. Beyond the specific nature of grappling with what this means for contemporary city dwellers to live on stolen land, there is a broader question surrounding Doctrine of Discovery that needs to be addressed within Euro-Canadian society and between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. There is a need to recognize the historic use of this doctrine to attempt to legally and morally justify colonization and its continuing use to sustain the settler colonial state and society against the perceived threat of Indigenous self-determination and stewardship over the lands currently claimed by Canada.

This chapter has also been about signalling the importance in the connection between religious and agrarian colonialism. This connection is especially important for contemporary readers to recognize in the wake of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's *Final Report* and recommendations regarding the structure, effects and legacy of the destructive residential school system. To understand this connection between the assimilative-focused religious mission and the agrarian-based colony of the seventeenth century is to be open to identifying and accepting a continuing connection between these two types of colonialism into the present day and so during the residential school system – since it is agrarian colonialism that lead into the settler colonialism that took formal root in the 1860s. As such, this chapter has helped demonstrate how religious and agrarian colonialism are intertwined as part of a larger project of colonization that has led to the establishment and sustenance of the Canadian settler state, settler privilege and implication.

Finally, the exploration here (as within the other historical chapters) has been about re-visiting historic narratives through a denizen-specific lens, looking to identify and tease apart how today's settler-colonial predecessors acted as both colonists and even denizens. It is about moving away from the Euro-Canadian narrative where possible to explore Indigenous-based records and narratives of these same moments, therefore, challenging mainstream narratives and

---

"Traditional Territories." *McGill University*. 17 Mar. 2018, https://www.mcgill.ca/edu4all/other-equity-resources/traditional-territories; "Territorial acknowledgement." *Concordia University*. 17 Mar. 2018, https://www.concordia.ca/about/indigenous/territorial-acknowledgement.html.
While there is no official pronouncement of the city's website the mayor did recognize the character of the land during the 10th anniversary of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples celebration in September of 2017.
See: "Reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples – Montreal celebrates the 10th anniversary of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." *Newswire*. 13 Sept 2017. https://www.newswire.ca/news-releases/reconciliation-with-indigenous-peoples---montreal-celebrates-the-10th-anniversary-of-the-united-nations-declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples-644215653.html;

developing more nuanced understandings of shared histories and relations. Re-visiting historic relations in this way, while such a project remains incomplete here, demonstrates for contemporary actors seeking a denizen ethos both ways through which to act and not to act in relation to Indigenous life and land at the same time that it helps in challenging long-held assumptions regarding settlement, legitimacy, and settler privilege.

The next chapter moves from a focus on religious-based colonialism and its actors toward a focus on agrarian-based colonialism and its actors in both the religious re-structuring period (1630-60) and the French Crown administration period (1660s onward). It was, after all, the social support structures provided through religious actors and orders during the early to mid-seventeenth century that helped provide a more secure foundation for more permanent settlement of colonists and so a turn to an increasingly agrarian-based colony. As with this chapter, analysis within the following chapter will focus on re-visiting major Euro-Canadian narratives of specific agrarian-based colonial actors and their roles within the broader settlement project. Focus will be given to trade-based labour immigrants who were encouraged to settle the colony during the religious re-structuring period and other male immigrants who came to the colony following direct French Crown administration of the colony becoming *habitants* and patriarchs of large families – roles that were encouraged through French Crown policies throughout the century.

Chapter 5: Settler and Sojourner Colonists from the French Return to the Valley to the Late-Seventeenth Century: Stepping Away from Denizen-like Behaviour (1630-1700)

Through the creation of social welfare-type services and the further construction of settlements along the St. Lawrence River, Christian-based religious groups of the early to mid - seventeenth century set the foundations for an increasingly developed and stable agrarian colonial presence within the Laurentian Valley from the 1630s onward. Whereas the previous chapter focused on the various implications of church actors and religious colonialism within New France, this chapter focuses on agrarian colonialism and its actors within the 1630s, 40s and 50s, before the French Crown took direct control of the colony; as well as the decades following direct French Crown control in the 1660s. Built upon trends identified within the previous chapters, a key hypothesis within this chapter is that as French agrarian colonists became increasingly self-sufficient within their settlements they stepped further and further away from denizen-like behaviours and an appreciation of their foreignness on Indigenous lands. Due to this, one expects to find more denizen-like leanings amongst the early, pre-direct French Crown administration colonists of Ville-Marie, like Jacques Archambault, than they would with later colonists, like Jacques Leblanc, who came following direct French Crown control and increased security and self-determination within the colony.

This increased sense of security and move away from denizen-like behaviour goes hand in hand with the move from trade colonialism to agrarian colonialism. As identified in chapter two, trade-based colonies are more so focused on temporary settlements and short-term profits, leading to a greater sense of vulnerability on the part of colonists as well as a greater tendency for Indigenous-colonist relations to be more equitably developed and sustained regarding mutual interests and mutual (though differing) strengths within trading relations. While trade colonialism was not established in a pure form along the St. Lawrence River during the seventeenth century (there were after all very early colonists who came to settle like Louis Hébert), once religious actors stepped in and began establishing structures to sustain and improve Euro-Canadian life (public education, health care, etc.) conditions for and interest in more permanent settlement arose. As will be shown, this led to a colony and colonists more interested in greater permanence and agrarian settlement. Colonists who increasingly had the structures and security in place to step further and further away from the more vulnerable positions of their predecessors and the more deferential relations required for successful trade-based relations, as

they moved toward increasingly aggressive actions and policies aimed at Indigenous dispossession and assimilation.

The following chapter, therefore, analyzes the positions of variously situated average (non-elite) agrarian and sojourner colonist actors during the religious re-structuring period and beyond. Herein I look to identify the moments through which one sees these actors either exhibiting more aggressive or more deferential colonial behaviour. As such, the chapter begins with an exploration of the immigration policies of the early to mid-seventeenth century that sought to encouraged a skilled labour population along the river. Here focus will be given to the roles of those who took labour contracts and returned home (sojourners) as well as those labourers who ended up staying after their contracts to settle the land. The roles of those labourers who stayed and became agrarian colonists[28] will be explored through an analysis of the Archambault family, my ancestors, in the settlement of Ville-Marie and their roles as agrarian colonists and labourers therein. Focus will be given here to their contributions in establishing a French colonial society on invaded lands and their manual labour, specifically through the cultivation of land and construction of stone-works, that helped re-enforce a budding social security and permanence on stolen land. From here I will focus on the post-1663 colony, the roles of the *habitants* therein and their place as agrarian colonists under a re-structured seigneurial system. I will use my ancestor, Jacques Leblanc, the first Leblanc of my family to arrive in North America, and his role as a *habitant* to focus on the implications of agricultural policies and farm-based-colonists within the broader colonial project considering their actions as colonialist and/or denizen-like. While the promotion of progenation and the establishment of a specifically French population within the colony were part and parcel of re-structured French Crown policy in 1663, analysis of such population-focused and family planning-policies, and with these the largely involuntary presence of the *filles du roi*, will be left for the following chapter and its discussion of the role of arrivants during seventeenth century New France.

Contract Work and Sojourner Colonists: Mid-Century Immigration Policy

---

[28] Here I include both farming and craftsmen practices within the agrarian colonist umbrella. These men who came to settle following labour contracts within settlements like Ville-Marie were engaging in both types of practice. Both types of practice follow the general logics of agrarian colonialism, focused as they are on the improvement of lands and their settlement through labour.

The following briefly explores the roles of temporary contract workers along the river during the mid-seventeenth century. As such the policies that encouraged their immigration and what little is known of their actions as sojourners are explored through a denizen-lens. With renewed French control in 1632, policies for increased immigration of French subjects came to somewhat greater fruition for the colony than they previously had – given the influx of funding and activity from religious organizations and individual actors. Even so, it was difficult to encourage French subjects to embark for New France. There were still few economic prospects due to mercantilist policies that continued to economically limit the colony to a glorified factory for the fur trade; the Haudenosaunee threat was fairly well-known in France and functioned as a deterrent; and the system of property inheritance within France was favourable to the settlement of future generations on their parents' property, therefore, presenting an incentive to stay in Europe (Trudel, 1968; Greer, 1997). Due to these discouraging factors, the seventeenth century saw a number of policy attempts to lure colonists to the banks of the St. Lawrence. Initially this immigration policy focused on attracting craftsmen to the colony as voluntary contract workers who were encouraged to stay and settle once their contracts were completed. This policy was, therefore, a means of not only increasing immigration but of specifically attracting a skilled labour force that could help build, defend and make the colony more self-sufficient. As such, this policy stated that all artisans, which the contemporary trading company agreed to transport to the colony, who practiced their trade within the colony for six years (after their initial contracts), could return to France and would be recognized as a master craftsmen permitted their own shop in Paris or within another French city (Charbonneau et al. 1993). Given the difficulty of attaining the rank of master craftsman in France (Trudel, 1968), it was thought that such relatively open access to the position would be popular.

And yet immigration numbers were still low following France's return to the Laurentian Valley. This was in no small part due to the fact that benefactors were hesitant to fund the passage of *any* immigrants because of the risks involved in voyaging across the Atlantic Ocean (namely shipwreck and illness) and because the benefactors would not be compensated for any such losses. Importantly, certain religious benefactors were quite active in funding immigrants, as contract workers, for their seigneuries. For instance, with the help of her benefactors, Jeanne Mance recruited the 'one hundred men' who helped 'save' Ville-Marie from near extinction in

1653 (Simpson, 1997; Noel, 2013), and the Sulpician order that established itself on the island in 1657, and later took over control of Ville-Marie in 1663 (Trudel, 1973), went on to play an active role in recruiting immigrants like Jacques Leblanc to the colony as well as a handful of marriageable women (Charbonneau et al., 1993).

Until 1655, it was standard for contracts made between benefactors and contract workers to include a clause whereby the employer agreed to pay for the worker's return to France after his contract was completed. This privilege progressively dwindled as employers increasingly placed the burden of return passage onto the recruits themselves (Charbonneau et al., 1993). This suggests that many of the men who (at least initially) came over to the colony saw their stay as a temporary labour sojourn – a conception bolstered until 1655 given the availability of contractual guarantees for return passage. Even when return passage was not guaranteed there were few incentives to settle in the colony given the striking gender imbalance presented and the fact that most recruits came over as single men. This disincentive was the case at least until 1663 when the first group of *filles du roi* was sent over to the colony for the express purposes of marriage and settlement. It is estimated that of all the contract workers who came to the colony during the seventeenth century, more than two-thirds returned to France after their contracts were finished (Choquette, 1997).

This means that more than half of these contract workers who came to the colony came as temporary dwellers: sojourners. Most came because their prospects in France were poor, they were mobile and temporary work in New France, for a period of three years, offered a steady salary, lodging and food (Greer, 1997). They could come to the colony for a cost of 30 livres that was not paid up front, save some money, and return to their home country to settle (Charbonneau et al., 1993). Their work along the river, meanwhile, helped establish the colony. These workers cleared the land for their employers, tiled the soil for framing, unloaded ships and helped in the construction of buildings and other settlement structures – all things that went toward not only affirming a French presence within the Laurentian Valley but toward building Indigenous territory into property and enabling the French to call it their own. It would appear, therefore, that their presence and actions on Indigenous lands were ultimately destructive since these men helped in the move from trade to agrarian-based colonialism suggesting that their roles strayed from and supported broader moves away from denizen-like behaviours regarding deference to

Indigenous stewardship, self-determination and the recognition of colonists' foreignness to Indigenous lands.

As temporary dwellers these men should have seen themselves as guests on Indigenous territories, though their actions as constructors of colonial institutions are suggestive of more aggressive colonial actions than good guest/denizen behaviours. Whether these men stayed or left after their contracts, they contributed to the development of colonial institutions and self-sufficiency, they enabled the French Crown to strengthen its claims to territory along the river, and they helped set a path for future settlement of the land. Whereas one might not see those who left after their contracts as pioneers or colonists in the way that one might see those who came and stayed as agrarian colonists, they were still important to the grander scheme of French colonization in North America. While most of them did not stay long enough to take advantage of the opportunity to take up a trade, let alone become a master of one (Trudel, 1968), or to take up land as a *habitant* they were still able to take advantage of early settlement policies – although it is uncertain whether they were any better off returning the France. They were sojourners, for whom little of their interactions with Indigenous peoples or even colonial officials is known and so it is difficult to say too much more about any possible, more denizen-like instantiations amongst these men. Although one could hypothesize they accrued more privileges than they fulfilled responsibilities to their neighbours and allies, during their short stay as labourers who helped establish the French colony. Further exploration of their roles and interactions is warranted before anything more concrete can be said about these ephemeral actors.

The Archambault Family: Agrarian Colonist Workers, Water Wells and the Cultivation of Land at Ville-Marie

Even while so many contract workers returned to France a good number of them stayed to become agrarian colonists. Within the colony these men became members of the working class, *habitants*, and *voyageurs* within the fur trade. In some cases they even became master craftsmen. They gained much by coming to New France. While they began as contract workers (in many cases to religious employers) many eventually took up land and enjoyed (at least relative) prosperity in a colony they helped settle through their labour. The following focuses on those contract workers who stayed within the colony and became agrarian colonists along the St. Lawrence River. This focus is operationalized through the analysis of Jacques Archambault, my ancestor, and his family (with whom I am connected through various lineages) and their early roles as craftsmen, labourers and progenators within the early days of a more focused settlement

policy within the colony. Here I consider how their roles and actions aligned with more agrarian colonial behaviour and/or colonial denizen behaviours.

One Frenchman who appears to have taken advantage of early emigration policy for permanent settlement in New France was Jacques Archambault – my tenth great-grandfather seven times over. Jacques was born around 1604 in the hamlet of L'Ardillière at what is now Dompierre-sur-Mer near the port of La Rochelle. He married Françoise Toureau, who was roughly the same age, on January 24, 1629 in France ('Françoise Toureau', PHRD). They had seven children in France before coming to the colony with six of them in 1646.[29] They were one of the few already established families to come to New France. While the recruitment of families was initially encouraged during the early decades of the seventeenth century, by 1647 it was deemed too costly given the risks of crossing and the fact that children represented financial burdens rather than productive labourers (Charbonneau et al., 1993). It is suspected that the Archambaults arrived at Québec with the director of the new Comunauté des Habitants, Pierre Legardeur de Repentigny in August or September of 1646. Given that Repentigny was present at Jacques' eldest daughter's first wedding to Michel Chauvin and that Jacques is cited on the notarized parish records as Repentigny's worker it is believed that Jacques came to the colony as a domestic worker for Repentigny (marriage certificate, 19 July 1647, Drouin Collection).

It was not long after his short stint working for Repentigny that Jacques took up fiefs first at Cap Rouge by Québec and later in 1651, under Governor Maisonneuve, at Place d'Armes in Montréal (land concession, 18 sept. 1651, Baby Collection). One sees with Archambault what would become a regular progression for many male immigrants – they would come to the colony as contract labourers, save enough money to become a *habitant*, marry if they had not come over with a family, and perhaps even become a self-employed craftsman (Greer, 1996). Whether this improved the fortunes and prospects for Jacques and his family, from what they had been in France, is uncertain as little is known about the Archambaults until they appeared in records of the colony in the 1640s. By the 1650s, however, they were *habitants* at Place d'Armes in the mission settlement of Ville-Marie – and so by the 1650s Archambault and his family had become agrarian colonists of New France.

---

[29] Louise the youngest had passed away in France before their emigration to the New World.

In 1658 Maisonneuve commissioned Jacques to build the first water well in the colony.[30] This led to a bit of a career for Jacques as a well-builder – in 1659 he was commissioned to build a well for Father Gabriel (contract, 8 June 1659, fonds des greffes de notaires du Québec), in 1660 he was commissioned to dig another well for Jacques Le Ber (contract, 7 May 1660, fonds des greffes de notaires du Québec), and in 1664 he was commissioned by Sieur Claude Robutel de Saint-André to build yet another well (contract, 16 Nov. 1664, fonds des greffes de notaires du Québec). While he may not have officially been noted as a 'master' craftsman for this work, during these later years of his life (he would have been in his late fifties or early sixties) it appears he was an active self-employed craftsman of the Montréal area. The remains of the first well he built at Place d'Armes, within the fort, exist for viewing within the Pointe-à-Callière Museum in Montréal. Outside of the museum there is a public water fountain that commemorates Archambault's well. While the fountain exists as merely a quick water break for the thirsty pedestrian today, the original well would have been an important source of fresh water for the early inhabitants of the Montréal area during Jacques' time.

The completion of the well represents an important moment in French colonization as a steady supply of water is critical to both permanent human settlements as well as to the cultivation of the land to support their existence. Even today, the well stands as an accomplishment important enough to warrant a commemorative plaque set beside the water fountain. Archambault was one of the many early agrarian colonists who took advantage of the policies set down for settlement in New France. His daughters went on to marry prominent members of the Montréal community (all brought over by Maisonneuve or the Sulpicians) and have large families, like Marie (senior) who married Urbain Tessier di Lavigne, a sawyer craftsman and Jacques' direct neighbour and Ville-Marie; Marie (junior) who married Gilles Lauson, a master coppersmith; and Anne who married Jean Gervais, a master baker (Trudel, 1973). Considered one of the pioneering families of New France the Archambaults not only took advantage of early colonial policies, they quickly progenated and contributed through farming as

---

[30] The commemorative water fountain beside the Pointe-à-Callière Museum, near the contemporary Place-d'Armes in Montreal contains a plaque dedicated to Jacques Archambault recognizing him as the craftsman who built the first water well at Montreal.
The plaque reads: "Près d'ici << sur la Place d'Armes du Fort >> Jacques Archambault (1604-1658) ancètre unique des Archambaults d'Amérique cruesa en 1658 le premier puits d l'île de Montreal à la demande du gouverneur M. de Maisonneuve." (Near here (on the fort of Place d'Armes) Jacques Archambault (1604-1658) single ancestor of the Archambaults of America [referring to the fact that he was the only Archambault to come from France] created in 1658 the first well on the Island of Montreal as asked for by the Governor M. de Maisonneuve.)

habitants and through craftsman-ship at Montréal towards creating a French colony on traditional, unceded, Indigenous territory.

As labourers and craftsmen these families played an important role in the agrarian colonization of what is now Montréal, Québec. They enjoyed a great degree of comfort and self-sufficiency relative to earlier inhabitants of the colony. Not only did they have access to social services (through religiously-funded hospitals, schools and almshouses), meaning they were less dependent on their Indigenous allies and neighbours than earlier colonists. They also helped clear land that was turned into French property, they built stone works upon these same lands, they took up agriculture, they settled, they progenated – all things that helped to strengthen France's colonial and imperials aims and claims. It appears that they were proto-typical agrarian colonists – pioneers of a colonial society that increasingly sought to possess and claim Indigenous territories as their own. While there may have been small ways through which they acted in more deferential manners toward Indigenous peoples and lands, there is no evidence available of such otherwise-focused actions.

Habitants: Rural Agrarian Settler-Colonists, the Seigneurial System and Land Cultivation

No analysis of seventeenth century New France would be complete without an exploration of the role of *habitants* and their actions as agrarian colonists and/or colonial denizens within the colony. The following focuses on the 1663 French Crown policies that supported land cultivation by the *habitants*, how this helped shape the actions of those like my ancestor Jacques Leblanc during the mid to late-seventeenth century, and what their implications within the broader French colonial project would have been.

Prior to 1663 the seigneurial system was poorly managed (Harris, 1966). Most of the lands along the river had been held by a few powerful families who had been granted enormous seigneuries but who had either failed to develop or else had done a poor job of improving these properties.[31] This occurred even when seigneurial deeds clearly stated that it was the seigneur's duty to settle his lot with *habitants* that would in turn help to develop the land, for even at such an early time the goal of the system was "land settlement…intended to attract as many

---

[31] The exception here were religiously held seigneuries that had been productive and important in the early development of the colony (constituting roughly ten percent of total seigneurial holdings). Even these seigneuries were not ideal since they held an uncertain future due to their reliance on the interests and fortunes of private individuals and orders.
Trudel. p. 250.

participants as possible in order to achieve it" (Trudel, 1973, 247). And so even before 1663, there was an increased focus specifically within French Crown policy on a more agrarian colonial presence within the Laurentian Valley. The mismanagement of this system did not profit colonial settlement and security and so in 1663 the Crown took most of these seigneuries back, while some large seigneuries that had actually been developed (like Montréal and Cap-de-la-Madeleine) were left to their seigneurs (Trudel, 1968).

Following direct French Crown control, new seigneurial land grants were kept small. Seigneurs were granted smaller plots on the condition that they grant sections of their land "without charge, to any bona fide settler who applied" (Eccles, 1988, 136). The intention behind this system was to increase and expand the claim over land through cultivation. It was understood that expanding the number of seigneuries would mean that more people would be responsible for agrarian settlement. In the eyes of the French Crown, if more people were responsible for settling, more area would be physically settled, and the colony's strength would increase (Trudel, 1968). And so one sees that as the French Crown took direct control of the colony the French colonial project shifted even further away from trade-based colonialism into an increasingly land-focused agrarian colonialism. With the seeming availability of land (that was not necessarily for the French to take), in combination with the potential for a man to enter the fur trade to amass enough capital to buy a seigneury, there were avenues for social mobility in New France that simply were not present within the old world (Eccles, 1988) which would have attracted interested French subjects.

My ancestor, Jacques Leblanc was one such subject. He came to New France in 1666, at roughly 22 years of age, as a domestic worker for the Sulpicians (Tanguay, 1957) who had taken ownership of Montréal following French Crown control in 1663 (Trudel, 1968). Born in Normandy around 1637, records indicate that by 1659 Leblanc was working as a mason in France (Trudel, 1983) before his emigration to the Laurentian Valley. He married Suzanne Rousselin on June 6, 1666 (marriage certificate, 6 June 1666, Drouin collection), which is surprising given that contracts at this time – which lasted three to five years – usually denied the worker the right to marry for the duration of his contract (Charbonneau et al., 1993). This suggests that either the records, which are few and far between, are inaccurate or else Jacques and Suzanne present an exception. Some records suggest that by 1667 Jacques was granted a fief in Montréal but fled with Suzanne and their first son, Julien, to Charlesbourg at Québec because

he was accused to stealing bread from a Jacques Bria. It is difficult to confirm this as no official documents are available of their settlement until Charlesbourg. On April 8 of 1668 Jacques Leblanc signed a rental agreement with Claude Charron for a fief on Charron's seigneury at Bourg-Royale at Charlesbourg, Québec (concession, 8 April 1668, fonds des greffes de notaires du Québec). It was here that the couple remained, establishing and maintaining a farm until their death.

Habitants in New France experienced a freedom that was not provided to their counterparts back in France. Unlike traditional feudalism the seigneur was not provided any military power in New France, his *foi et hommage* (declaration of fealty and tribute to the French Crown) became a formality, a seigneur like Charron had no position as a higher justice of a censitaire (*habitant*) like Leblanc, and he could not bind his censitaires to him or his fief – habitants were free to move from one seigneur to another (Trudel, 1968). This meant that the seigneur had significantly less power and privilege in the French colony than in France during the ancient regime. The seigneur, therefore, had many responsibilities for settling the land and providing common tools to his *habitants* while he had few privileges (Trudel, 1968). In effect, the seigneur "owned a bundle of specific and limited rights over productive activity within that [his seigneurial] territory" (Trudel, 1968, 40). Since the seigneur was not recognized in New France as a conveyor of justice, unlike with traditional feudalism, the seigneur of New France had little real control over his censitaires (Harris, 1966). This all meant, as I will expand upon briefly below, that *habitants* experienced great privilege and freedom relative to their counterparts in France – a freedom and privilege they enjoyed through the agrarian colonial structure being imposed on Indigenous lands and so at the expense of Indigenous lives and lands.

Upon the granting of a *contract de concession* (cessation contract) a *habitant* had the right to take up the land which had been granted to him, had access to the communal flour mill, had the right to sell or pass along his rented fief as he saw fit and for as long as he obliged his contract by residing on the land, clearing the land where necessary, paying his dues to the seigneur as well as any additional taxes that were demanded of him (Trudel, 1968). The ownership – the surface ownership – of land along the St. Lawrence was divided between a seigneur (Charron) and habitant (Leblanc) (Greer, 1997). Unlike the feudal system of the Old World, the *habitant* was quite independent of his landlord in New France. They had many legal rights and autonomy against their seigneur. They had royal courts in the three major settlements,

the intendant, and the Conseil Supérieur to which they could appeal for matters of justice. And royal officials frequently by-passed seigneurs to deal directly with *habitants* (Harris, 1966). While the socio-economic gap between seigneurs and censitaires was large in France, in Canada few seigneurs were better off than their censitaires. Where the ancient regime's hierarchical class system was tightly bound up with the feudal system, there was little economic foundation for a hierarchical class system within the New World. Furthermore, the "old world distinctions were blunted when seigneur and habitant worked side by side on the land" (Harris, 1966, 5). While France had a submissive peasantry, Canada had an increasingly independent and self-reliant group of habitants who, with the aid of the intendant, fought against the oppressive aspects of Old World feudalism (Harris, 1966). And so this peasant class experienced much greater freedom and privileges due to their roles within the French colonial project than they would have experienced back in France – paving the way for future colonist freedoms and privileges to be attained at the further expense of Indigenous lives and lands.

Unfortunately little is known of my ancestor Jacques Leblanc in terms of his land holding practices and upward mobility since there is a scarcity of records available on his life within the archives. I can only provide conjecture based on a broader analysis of records as to his relative privileges and implications as an agrarian colonist within the French colonial project. It would seem here that given the specific instantiation of feudalism present within the French colony he and his family largely gained a level of freedom and security due to his contributions to and actions within the agrarian colonial structure established in 1663. This would paint Leblanc as much more entrenched within agrarian colonial rather than colonial denizen role – especially relative to earlier colonial actors. And yet, one's understanding of these agrarian colonists becomes more complex when one dives into the limitations of the seigneurial system and the insufficient agricultural support that stood in the way of more bountiful and expansive agrarian settlement.

Even after the re-structing of 1663, vast areas of land along the river were poorly developed. Isolated at the river, plots of land did not extend very far back and so the frontier was very near at hand and untouched. This meant that the river traveller was given a false impression of a never-ending village, which was in reality a quite weakly population expanse of territory. This was especially so given the relative difficulties faced by seigneurs to settle enough families on their lands (thirty to forty) to make their seigneuries profitable. Given seigneurs' relatively

weak authority to increase the speed at which colonists came to rent their land, they usually did little to try and in many cases were absent from their own land (Harris, 1966). Furthermore, this system discouraged the development of village life (given the structuring of land rents) and hence greater security for colonists at the same time that it discouraged French colonists from settling further into the interior, which would have strengthened France's colonial and imperial claims. This discouragement was partially due to the seigneurial system itself and partially to do with French Crown policy. The Ottawa Valley could have, for instance, been settled quickly by the French had the state not forbade it in support of its seigneurial system along the river and the fear that colonists would become traders instead of farmers if permitted so far into the interior (Trudel, 1968).

In a sense, the seigneurial system kept the French *habitants* from becoming more aggressive and land-greedy colonists than their southern neighbours who mercilessly, though slowly, expanded their settlements westward (Eccles, 1988). Yet it appears this system *unwittingly* encouraged colonists into such a role. As the colony did little along the river to push for further settlement –having had enough trouble settling the territory they already claimed along the river - one could identify the limitations of the seigneurial system as a way through which to identify a self-constructed limitation on the further expansion of these agrarian colonists. And yet, many of these seigneuries quite likely were already pushing up against or had far exceeded the boundaries of original agreement and invitation. Jacques Leblanc's fief at Bourg-Royale, north east of the original habitation Champlain set up on Innu territories at Québec, was likely *not* a part of the original forced invitation to co-habit Inuu territory along the river. And so while the presence of my ancestor at Bourg-Royale was already of questionable legitimacy – settling on lands that were not included in original invitation, though colonist presence may have been tacitly accepted on the site at this point – and his actions were clearly agrarian colonial in nature, the limitations of the seigneurial system and the French Crown policy supporting it helped in limiting further agrarian colonial expansion by someone like him at this point.

Independent of the argument that these agrarian colonists may have been somewhat confined on the territories that the French Crown had already questionably claimed, these were colonists who were still actively helping to create a New France along the shores of the St. Lawrence, on contested and even stolen land. A society that resembled the culture, laws and

traditions of their homeland. Such actions demonstrate a lack of deference to Indigenous society, law and governance and colonists' proper place as foreigners on Indigenous lands. In the words of Marcel Trudel, during this time

> the immigrant came, not to try his luck in the wilderness, but to become part of a previously organized society that took care of his immediate needs, a society that he, in his turn, maintained by his contribution (Trudel, 1968, 181).

And French *habitants* did this in self-interest, looking to improve their own lives at the expense of others. This was not only at the expense of the Indigenous nations whose lands they claimed for France but also of their kinsmen back in the old world. For many of the welfare privileges established within the colony were enjoyed by colonists at the expense of an overtaxed peasantry back in France (Eccles, 1988).

Even when the geographical confines of the seigneurial system restricted the French from the further expansion of French land claims on Indigenous territories, in many cases their actions as farmers bolstered their roles as destructive colonists. It is believed that roughly seventy-five percent of French colonists who took up land along the river had no previous agricultural experience. Due to immigration policies, most were originally domestic workers or military recruits (Trudel, 1968). The agricultural inexperience of these colonists was so bad that in 1664 the French Crown mandated that all domestic workers would have to work for a least three years before being granted land for agricultural improvement and settlement. It was believed that during these first three years the colonist would gain the experience he would need to be able to deal with the environmental conditions of the valley. At the time of taking up land he would then be granted tools, seed, clothing a food to support him (and likely his wife) for a year (Eccles, 1988). This policy did not really deal with the crux of the problem, however, that *habitants* were still amateur farmers after their three-year-contract.

Since most *habitants* knew little to nothing about agriculture they exhausted the bountiful soil provided them, their livestock – poorly cared for – degenerated, and they made small returns on their crops. *Habitants*, seigneurs and the state alike did nothing to improve their seed grain, or to preserve the quality of the land and livestock. No one was made to fertilize their land and so the soil nutrients became exhausted by the repeated planting of singular crops like wheat. Furthermore, habitants were known to throw manure into the river (Trudel, 1968). Because of their inexperience and a lack of any formative agricultural policy from France, *habitants* were

essentially destroying the lands they had been invited to inhabit. One could imagine that neighbouring Indigenous allies who recognized this would not have been very happy with these colonists. While there is evidence that *habitants* adopted some local Indigenous practices in their agricultural pursuits (such as growing some native crops like corn and pumpkin, or sowing seeds in indoor hotbeds before the season began) (Eccles, 1969; Trudel, 1968), their interactions with the land as farmers depict a largely troubling colonial interaction. The fact that there was no policy supporting the development of good agricultural practices lends further credence to the idea that the seigneurial system was merely a system for occupying the land to improve colonial strength, rather than a system meant to encourage good relations with and settlement amongst Indigenous allies and lands.

What would have made these agrarian colonists more denizen-like at this juncture? Given the nature of the agrarian colonist position – focused as it is upon land possession and improvement - one will not find a pure instantiation of the denizen. Yet there may be leanings toward this more denizen-like existence as initially explored through the role of Louis Hébert in chapter two. A more denizen-leaning agrarian colonist during this time, therefore, would have sought invitation and proper relations with the Indigenous peoples whose land he was on (even where the French Crown may not have done this) or else left such lands. He would heave looked to enter into his own relations of mutual respect and dependence with local Indigenous peoples whose lands he was on and not impose French property structures and law but abide by local Indigenous structures and law – though certainly there would be room for him to incorporate his own French knowledge and systems of cultivation, etc. and to share such knowledge in mutual exchange with his Indigenous allies and neighbours. And certainly, as a more denizen-leaning agrarian colonist he would have been confined to whatever lands he had been invited onto for co-habitation as well as the continual fulfillment of whatever obligations resulted from this invitation/agreement.

This is not what one finds amongst the agrarian colonists of the mid to late-seventeenth century Laurentian Valley. While such actors were confined to a specified area along the river that they had settled – however tacitly or questionable such settlement was established – they were also clearly settling this area through the imposition of French legal and property structures. They were confined to settling this area, not because they acknowledged boundaries of original invitation (where they had them), but because of the abundance of the lands already claimed and

because French Crown policy prohibited further expansion of fear that French subjects would desert the colonial project and take up a more rugged (and perhaps denizen or guest-like) life amongst interior Indigenous nations. Where *habitants* in some ways learned from and borrowed the practices of their Indigenous allies and neighbours, as inexperienced farmers, they also destroyed the quality of the land, livestock and the river system. This suggests they were not in good relation with the lands they had taken, if not the been invited onto. And so these men and women who found themselves as *habitants* in the mid to late century were aggressive agrarian colonists by way of their practices on the land, the presence on questionably claimed Indigenous territories, the impact that such practices would have had upon their relation to their Indigenous hosts, even where they were confined to these lands and so prevented in certain respects from being 'worse' agrarian colonists. This position was the product of not only the individual *habitants*, but the society of *habitants*, colonial officials and French Crown policy.

Summary

This critical narrative supports the hypothesis that as the French colonial settlements grew in strength and security, French Crown policy and individual and collective colonist behaviour became increasingly aggressive and agrarian based. As policy and behaviour shifted from trade-based to agrarian-based colonialism one sees further steps away from what was already a poorly embodied denizen role or ethos amongst the earliest of French colonists within the Laurentian Valley (as demonstrated in chapter two). While this might appear disheartening for the formulation and application of a denizen ethos within contemporary society, if they could not accomplish such a thing in the past how are settler colonists going to accomplish it today, this analysis still helpful and illuminating in regarding to the contemporary move to decolonization.

First of all, these agrarian colonists were likely not terribly interested in fostering better, more deferential and denizen-like relations with Indigenous peoples - a contemporary denizen ethos would be taken up consciously and with purpose leading to foundations for better success. But beyond this there are still a number of useful insights to be distilled from the above analysis. Foremost, of course, is identifying the trend away from instantiations of denizen-like behaviour in the move to an agrarian-based colony. But here there is also the importance of challenging the romanticized Euro-Canadian narrative that surrounds settlement and the 'kindly' seigneurs and *habitants* by complicating and problematizing their roles through a denizen-lens – pointing out

the ways through which these actors could have aligned with a more denizen-like presence on Indigenous lands and yet did not, how they instead acted in agrarian colonial ways. Such a re-visiting of the narratives surrounding European settlement provide an avenue through which to question these taken-for-granted roles, to set the foundations for the re-centering of Indigenous peoples, places and narratives during this era, and to identify the *de facto* though ignored and silenced roles of French colonists as colonial denizens on Indigenous lands.

This analysis also encourages contemporary settler colonists to question the roles of familial and civic ancestors in the settlement of the country and in one's own sense of belonging and connection. As Archambault's descendant I have been unsettled. My upbringing as a Canadian citizen has taught me to be inherently proud of being able to identify a connection so distant that cements my place therein, because such a connection has historically been used to produce claims of being more connected to the land than those colonists who have arrived more recently. And being able to claim some sort of stronger connection to the land, because of having ancestors who have been on it for four hundred years, it is claimed by some creates greater security and a more valid presence on that land. My analysis of denizenship, however, helps to show that such claims are not only false, but damaging in the move toward decolonization. Just because my ancestors have been on stolen land for over four hundred years does not make them more validly present than more recent colonists – if anything it further implicates them, and myself, within the colonial project as active perpetrators in the dispossession, subordination and attempted erasure of Indigenous peoples.

Claims which do not recognize the validity of this later statement miss the fact that Indigenous peoples who have lived on these lands for thousands of years continue to have an inherent right, and set of responsibilities as stewards, to the territories upon which these land claims are being made. Indeed, the main point of my analysis suggests that the presence of one's ancestors was *only* possible through invitation. And while some ancestors may have been invited onto such lands, and established themselves there, ultimately even they failed to uphold the conditions of their status as denizens. Those like Archambault were certainly never invited onto the lands, and thus may be described as intruders. As a descendants (whether familial or civic) of these original colonists, one has a specific obligation to re-visit and interrogate these original relationship with Indigenous peoples. The exploration of these ancestors in the establishment of Montréal, and New France generally, thus enables one to illuminate the various ways through

which they am connected to a long history of colonial thought and action, invitation, intrusion and treaty.

Where these last three chapters have charted the development of sojourner and agrarian colonist behaviour and French Crown policy from the colony's earliest and most vulnerable days as a largely trade-based colony into an increasingly self-assured agrarian-based colony, the following two chapters take on different foci. The first considers the roles of arrivants within New France during the mid to late seventeenth century, namely the *filles du roi* and African and Indigenous slaves whose presence were both important for the development and sustenance of a French colony along the river. As arrivants, involuntary colonists and the colonized, these roles and implications within French Crown policy and the broader colonial project will be considerably more complex when analyzed through this same denizen-lens applied within these early chapters. And yet will provide the nuance necessary in demonstrating and determining *how* a contemporary denizen ethos applies across the cacophony. The sixth (and last historical) chapter delves into mid to late-seventeenth century actors of the fur trade namely the *voyageurs* and *coureurs de bois* whose roles and actions – both legal and illegal – helped establish and sustain French relations and presence through the interior that was necessary to strengthen and maintain the French colony until its fall to England in 1763. Important for analysis here will be identifying the tendency to romanticize such trade-based actors and so align them with more denizen-like roles, to untangle their roles in relation to both trade and the broader colonial project, a denizen ethos and Indigenous peoples and lands.

Chapter 6: Involuntary Denizens and Colonists amongst the *filles du roi*, Slaves and Slave Trading Participants of 17th Century New France (1650-1709)

The colonial actors discussed in previous chapters were largely identified as voluntary colonists who had the recognized agency to decide and who chose to embark for a life within the colony of New France. Yet not all colonists came to New France voluntarily. Some were enslaved and literally forced to the colony and others had little other choice but to accept their embarkation. While this demonstrates that such involuntary actors were, as with Indigenous peoples, also subjugated and in certain cases colonized peoples themselves, even those who did not willing arrive in the colony still became actors within the colonial cacophony – in some situations benefiting from their positions relative to the colonization of Indigenous land and life. These actors, therefore, became embedded within the colonial project. Due to this, these same individuals, and their offspring are not free from responsibilities that result from the development of colonialism and the move toward decolonialization. The entanglements and the resulting responsibilities that they hold, however, are that much trickier to navigate and are differently oriented than those of more voluntary colonists. In order to have a fuller articulation of the *denizen* and a contemporary denizen ethos, it is, therefore, necessary to complicate the colonial narrative through an exploration of involuntary actors who came to the shores of the St. Lawrence to become, however unwillingly, part of a broader colonial project. Throughout I will use the term *arrivant*, popularized by Jodi Byrd in her analysis of the colonial cacophony, to identify involuntary actors amongst the broader web of roles and relations therein. While Byrd uses this term to specifically identify racialized slaves brought to North America through the trans-Atlantic slave trade (2011), my own employment of the term will be broader and encompass sexualized, white, and Indigenous peoples as involuntary members of the French colony.

As early as 1542, France experimented with forced colonial migration to the shores of the St. Lawrence when the king allowed Jean-François de La Roque de Roberval to take roughly fifty convicts to establish a settlement at Stadacona - present day Québec (Sanchez, 2018). This endeavour was a failure, due to mounting tensions between colonial officials and the Laurentian Haudenosaunee (Moogk, 2000; Parmenter, 2014; Trigger, 1971), and such clearly forced embarkation for the colony was not part of colonial policy again until the Crown took direct administrative control of the colony in 1663. In the late seventeenth century and well into the

eighteenth century involuntary embarkment for the colony occupied a new role within colonial policy. The first decade of Crown control saw the introduction of the *filles du roi* program wherein women were sent, with varying degrees of willingness, to become mothers of a burgeoning French colony (Noel, 1998). This period also saw the extension of the already formed trans-Atlantic and intra-continental slave trade to the shores of the St. Lawrence, where Black and Indigenous slaves were acquired by colonists against their will for lives of subservient labour – a practice that continued well into the eighteenth century (Cooper, 2007; Trudel, 2013). In the early to mid-seventeenth century, even insurgent young noble men (*fils de famile*), alongside salt smugglers and other petty criminals, were sent to the colony from 1721 until 1749 (Paul, 2008; LAC, 2016).

In an attempt to deepen the discussion of the denizen as both historic role and contemporary ethos, the following takes stock of three of these broadly-defined groups: the *filles du roi* and Black and Indigenous slaves. This chapter explores the influence of varying degrees of involuntary settlement on colonial/denizen actors within the St. Lawrence colony as well as the broader French, intracontinental and trans-Atlantic slave trade. I have chosen these three groups because they represent three quite differently situated groups of involuntary actors whose presence in the French colony began within the timeframe of my analysis – the seventeenth century. Where the *filles du roi* were women raised in a patriarchal society, sent as sexual dependents under varying degrees of their own willingness to the colony, the colour of their skin and the relative social positions they enjoyed ensured that they experienced many colonial privileges once settled within New France. Alternatively, Black slaves were previously colonized and enslaved within their own lands, racialized by the colour of their skin and clearly forced as chattel into life within the colony. Indigenous slaves, still, present a further layer of complexity as men and women captured in accord with their own inter-national laws and customs and enslaved within their own continent by the French.

Within the following chapter voluntary and involuntary embarkment and settlement are not taken as a binary so much as alternative ends along a scale upon which variously situated actors sat in regard to their own context, willingness, and privileges enjoyed based on their positionalities within the colony. It is my intention that such an exploration will enrich understandings of the multifaceted narratives surrounding Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationships and the inter-national world of the seventeenth century at the same time that it will

lead to clearer articulations of the mutability of a contemporary denizen ethos for those non-Indigenous peoples who find themselves on 'Canadian' soil today. As such, I first consider the *filles du roi* as colonists of varying willingness from within a broader analysis of the *filles du roi* program, with its aims of establishing a specifically *French* colonial society within North America. From there I explore France's slavery policies, its involvement in the trans-Atlantic as well as intra-continental slave trade and the roles of both Black and Indigenous peoples who were enslaved therein.

Les Filles du Roi – Unwitting Mothers of an Empire?

The *filles du roi* were women who were encouraged, if not forced, to embark from France to help strengthen its colony along the St. Lawrence River in the late seventeenth century. Since so little is known of the individual histories of the *filles du roi*, it is difficult to say with certainty to what extent the trip to New France was their own decision or the result of having been "strong-armed by guardians or government officials" (Noel, 1998, 14). The following, therefore, takes stock of the policies that led to their arrival and the policies that guided their lives both within France (leading up to embarkation) as well as within the colonies – policies which made these women mothers of a French empire overseas. Here I also, briefly, explore the life of one of my many *filles du roi* ancestors, Suzanne Rousselin, as a way to not only contextualize this study but also as a way to self-situate as a scholar and non-Indigenous woman within this work. I am left to conclude that even where these women were likely largely coerced to settle and help populate what became French Canada, they experienced such relative (although differentiated) colonial privileges and so deeply contributed to the development of the colonial project that they, and their progeny, became increasingly more identifiable as agrarian and colonists rather than arrivants.

As early as 1634, and without state intervention, various noblemen, merchants and religious institutions like the *Societié de Montréal* recruited young women from France to become wives and mothers within the colony (Charbonneau et al., 1993; Simpson, 1997; Trudel, 1968). Given that such endeavours were not centrally organized and were dependent on individual interest and funding, these efforts did little to increase the proportion of marriageable French women within the colony. Until the 1660s this was not identified as a big problem for colonial officials since the fur trade had encouraged the development of a colony that did not require settled families (Baillargeon, 2014), but instead a mobile, sparse, and largely male

population. With the shift in French interests toward more aggressive imperial interests and protections in the 1660s, France focused on strengthening its settled colony. Recognizing that this would require establishing a "strong population with ties to the land" (Runyan, 2010, 34), in 1663 France began its state-led policy of sending roughly 150 young marriageable women to the St. Lawrence each year (Eccles, 1988). This policy lasted for ten years (Landry, 1992b; Charbonneau et al., 1993), until it appeared that the colony could support its own growth. Within these ten years, more than 700 women were sent to the colony to marry and establish large families. While these women only represent roughly eight percent of all immigrants who settled within the colony during the French regime (Landry, 1992a), they still account for nearly half of all the women who came to the St. Lawrence during this time (Noel, 2013). It is suspected that these women are responsible for two-thirds of the gene-pool within the current French-speaking Québécois population (Landry, 1992b). This policy, therefore, was of critical and lasting importance to the strength of a French colonial society in the seventeenth century and beyond.

These women were sent to New France at the Crown's expense and on the understanding that once they found a match for marriage they would be provided a small dowry from the king. This is presumably the logic upon which their name, *les filles du roi* or the King's Daughters, is based – since it was the Crown (in place of the father) who provided their dowry.[32] It has been difficult to determine the exact number of *filles du roi* who were sent to New France as there is no evidence that an official register was established (even as this was a state-sponsored program) nor has any formal definition been found through official documentation of who was to be considered a member of the program (Landry, 1992b). Work completed at the Université de Montréal, through the *programme de recherché en démographie historique (PRDH)*, has helped in identifying many of the women who came to New France as part of this policy and has, therefore, provided contemporary readers with a more nuanced understanding of the lives of these women.[33]

---

[32] Marguerite Bourgeoys is identified as having coined the term *filles du roi* within her writings when she used the term to describe these young women who were sent to the colony for marriage and progenation between 1663 and 1673.
Found in Landry.1992b. p. 19.
[33] Today *less filles du roi* are identified as "all marriageable immigrant women, single, or widowed, who arrived in Canada between the years 1663 and 1673 and who are identified by archival sources." Landry as quoted in Charbonneau et al. p. 38.

Given the apparently piece-meal nature of official documentation, it is not terribly surprising that the form and quantity of French Crown support actually varied for these women on a case-by-case basis - largely differentiated along lines of social class. As research has shown, the *filles du roi* were composed of women from the lowest as well as from amongst the higher ranks of French society. Women of higher social standing tended to fair better with their funding under the program – likely due to their family's court connections. Generally speaking, however, the funding for these women was composed of three parts: their transportation, 100 pounds provided to the French West India Company for each women sent to the colony; the dowry, which contrary to popular belief was not an automatic gift for all; 34 and a trousseaux, which was composed of important items that "gave each young women the basic tools to establish herself in the colony with at least a minimal level of personal independence" (Runyan, 2010, 26). Such funding, as I will explore further below, may have provided an alluring reason for many of these women, who were otherwise financial worse off, to embark for the colony.

While many of the women in the program came from poverty or uncertain prospects within France, contrary to a once popular myth, these women were not prostitutes (Lanctôt,1964). Given that the focus of the program was to provide healthy young women to support population growth within the colony, Colbert established a screening process meant to prohibit the recruitment of prostitutes (and other vagrant women) who, beyond their immoral behaviour within a strictly Catholic society, would likely have carried venereal diseases that may have made them infertile. As such, women who were recruited for the program had to provide a birth certificate, an affidavit from their priest confirming they were free to marry, and character witness statements signed by their priest or a judge to qualify for the program. The moral character and chastity of these women was so important to officials that if these women were later found to be 'debauched' or ill-behaved along the journey they were sent back to France at the Crown's expense (Runyan, 2010). These women were, therefore, not prostitutes but largely virginal women of good moral character. While the rigour of the screening process suggests a commitment and willingness of behalf of these women to depart for the colony - as I will explore at greater length below – one should consider the constraints these women faced within the patriarchal context of the time and the relative subordination of women to guardians and

---

34 Common girls were lucky to receive a 50 pound dowry, while wealthier girls might receive something closer to 100 pounds but not all girls actually appear to have received a monetary dowry.

government officials. Given such considerations, applications to the program may not have been a choice for these women but the choice of a guardian or official these women felt unable to challenge.

Most of the *filles du roi* were from Paris and Normany where recruitment was focused due to proximity of the major ports of entry. While the precise socioeconomic background of these women is difficult to ascertain, since so few declared their father's profession (Runyan, 2010), Gustav Lanctôt's 1964 work divided the girls into three rough categories: *les demoiselles* (women of the upper class), orphans from charity hospitals, and the daughters of farmers and lesser tradesmen who were from both rural and urban locales. The following briefly considers the position of these women in seventeenth century France broadly before considering each of these groups in turn, focusing on the contexts these differently situated women may have found themselves in within France and the potential motivations for embarking for the colony that would have resulted from such contexts.

For all the *filles du roi*, and the women of France more broadly, the patriarchal nature of French society was a serious and important constraint on their lives. These were gendered and classed individuals. Marriage was *essential* to a woman's social standing, despite her socio-economic position, in seventeenth century French society (Runyan, 2010). The only respectable option beyond marriage was for a woman to join a religious order (Crowley, 1997). For a woman during this period in France, marriage required the payment of a dowry from her father to the groom. Women were, therefore, very much dependent on their fathers to support their prospective marriages and, hence, social standing and quality of life. It is not terribly surprising than, that nearly fifty-seven percent of the *filles du roi* had lost their fathers before embarking to New France, compared to only thirty-seven percent who had lost a father but remained in rural areas near Paris during the same period. This suggests that being orphaned by one's father, in particular, had a strong influence (stronger than having lost a mother) on a woman's likelihood in emigrating to the colony (Runyan, 2010). Participation within the *filles du roi* program afforded a woman a dowry and social standing that she may have otherwise lost, or never have had, in France.

Women of the upper class were brought over during the later years of the program (1667-1673) in an effort to "bind seigneurs and officers to the colony" (Choquette, 1997, 273). Officers of the *Carignan Salières*, for instance, who had come as temporary defenders (sojourners) of the

colony in 1665, were enticed to settle following their service through land grants and gratuities as well as the provision of marriageable women (Charbonneau et al., 1993; Trudel, 1968). The marriageable women destined for these men likely came from the *petite robe* (new nobles) rather than the *grande robe* (well established, intergenerational nobles) of France. This was the smallest sub-group of *filles du roi* sent, registering at approximately 80 women (Noel, 1998). There are three major circumstances that could have led to a woman of such standing leaving France for a life in the colony. They may have lost a father and so have had no dowry with which to marry – though they kept their rank. Their family could have recently lost their fortune which would have also resulted in a loss of dowry. Or, they may have been younger daughters of a large family with too many daughters to properly support and so, also have had a dowry in jeopardy (Runyan, 2010; Noel, 1998). There were many reasons for upper class women to be sent to New France. All of these reasons circulated around the absence or poor nature of a dowry and their marriage prospects within a heavily patriarchal French society. As will be demonstrated, this patriarchal constraint is a trend one sees throughout all three socio-economic groups of the *filles du roi*.

At roughly one third of the total population, the second largest sub-group of the *filles du roi* came from charity hospitals in France, most prominent among recruitment sites being the *Saplêtière* – a branch of the *Hôpital-Général* in Paris. The *Hôpital-Général* subscribed to the belief that "labour was the ultimate weapon against vice and idleness" (Runyan, 2010, 49). Emboldened by an Edict of 1656, premised on ridding the Parisian streets of its vagrant populations, the charity hospital and its associated wings, like the *Saplêtière*, were institutions of imprisonment from which residents, forced into menial labour, were not free to come and go as they pleased. The *Saplêtière* was the woman's division of the broader hospital wherein one found respectable poor women, women with mental illnesses, the old and infirm as well as orphans from various social classes. While the women found here were taught reading, writing and catechism (Runyan, 2010), they were also malnourished (Lanctôt,1964) and forced to live in squalor with crowded and lice-infested beds. Whereas there were various means through which a woman could be forced into the *Saplêtière*, a court order, a transfer from another wing, a *lettre de cachet*, the most common method through which a women entered the institution was through a *billet de bureau* that she asked for from the *superieure* of the institution. On the presentation of a baptismal certificate and an affidavit from her priest that confirmed her poverty, a woman was permitted access to a houseroom and bed. Life must have been dismal on the streets of Paris to

encourage women to imprison themselves within the *Saplêtière*. Given how few resources these women would have had to leave the institution, travel to the colony as a prospective bride could have very well been an attractive option (Runyan, 2010), if not a royal order they had little other option than to accept (Landry, 1992a; Charbonneau, 1993). As orphans and residents of the *Saplêtière*, these women would have had no real marriage prospects in France since they had no father from which to receive a dowry – life in the colony, therefore, likely afforded them the only prospects for marriage, and so a life of relative comforts, that they would have received.

The final and largest sub-group of the *filles du roi* were the daughters of farmers and lesser tradesmen, a group which can be further sub-divided into two categories: those raised in urban locales (usually port cities) who were the daughters of minor artisans, labourers and servants; and rural girls who had been raised on farms in the French country-side. Amongst these so-called commoners, dowry and marriage concerns would have also been of utmost importance for their lives and motivations for heading to New France. Similar concerns that plagued upper class women would have affected these commoners as well: the loss of a father and the size of and financial constraints placed on a large family. Furthermore, finding a mate of similar age and status was very important at this time in France, marrying someone outside of these parameters led to social ostracization, yet the prospects in many small parish towns were slim. This would have made New France an attractive option for many of these women and their families. While girls from urban locales were readily accepted, the ones from rural locales, while generally poor in manners, were the most desirable candidates for the program since, having been raised on farms, they were well-suited to a rough pioneer life within the colony (Runyan, 2010).

For all the *filles du roi*, therefore, marriage and so socio-economic prospects within a patriarchal society, would have been driving factors toward their participation within the program. For some women, like those of the *Saplêtière*, this program offered a freedom, and a chance for socio-economic betterment, that would have never been available to them in France. For others, it may have seemed like a larger sacrifice. Given the patriarchal nature of French society, the heavy supervision of women by their own families, and the important role that marriage played in a French woman's life it is impossible to know how much agency any given *filles du roi* exhibited in her participation within the program and to what extent she was forced by a father, brother, or government official to embark for New France as a sexualized dependent.

Regardless of their voluntary or involuntary status as prospective colonial wives, once these women set foot in New France they experienced great privileges and comforts relative to their counterparts back in France. One such woman was my ancestor Suzanne Rousselin who came to the colony in 1665 at the age of 21 having been born in Britany around 1644. As a confirmed *filles du roi*[35] she married Jacques Leblanc in Montréal in 1666 (Landry, 2013). Given that little to nothing is known of her life before New France, like many participants of the program, it is impossible to ascertain whether she was an orphan sent from a charity hospital like the *Saplêtière* or a commoner sent by her family.[36] In 1665 she would have arrived with roughly a hundred other women in Québec city; the majority would have stayed in Québec, while others would have accompanied her to Montréal and a few others would have gone to Trois-Rivières. While these women were under constant supervision during their journey and then again when housed with local religious women within the colony as they awaited their proposals, their freedom to choose amongst suitors and the relative comfort they enjoyed in the colony would have been noteworthy – a privilege afforded through their position in the colony.

In Montréal women were housed under the dual care of Jeanne Mance and Marguerite Bourgeoys (Choquette, 1997) initially at a house along the Rue Saint-Paul and then, after 1668, at the Maison Saint-Gabriel. Bourgeoys followed beliefs similar to those held at the *Saplêtière*, that these women under her care required labour to prevent their idleness and, specific to the colonial program, prepare them for their lives as wives and mothers (Runyan, 2010). The *filles du roi* under her care, therefore, learnt not only their catechisms but how to tend animals as well as cook and sew for a household. They ate an abundant, though not varied, diet that would have far surpassed what orphans from charity hospitals had previously known. Given that women were a clear minority within the colony, that their fathers were not present, and that the single men of the colony had been told, via a 1670 edict from Colbert, that they needed to marry or else risk forfeiting their recently earned hunting rights and privileges, the power to choose a spouse rested in the hands of these women rather than the men who courted them (Runyan, 2010). While arranged marriages were abundant amongst the upper and rural middle classes of France, they were virtually unheard of in New France. Whereas the majority of women married within six

---

[35] Cite PDHR

[36] *Le Saplêtière*'s registers did not survive the French Revolution (1789-99) and so it is difficult to say with any certainty which of these women came from the institution.
Choquette. p. 236.

months of their arrival, roughly thirteen percent broke their first engagement, if not several more, before actually marrying one of the male colonists (Noel, 1998; Charbonneau et al., 1993; Runyan, 2010). While these women were confined by the patriarchal nature of seventeenth century French society, they did enjoy relative freedoms in a choice of spouse and the relative comforts of an agricultural colonial setting. This relative freedom and comfort was a *colonial* privilege. Once a woman married, however, she was understood to reside under her husband's sovereign control. He had the "power to chastise [a] disobedient wi[fe] with moderate physical force" (Noel, 1998, 19). These women, therefore, were only free to choose amongst their chains – still a relative privilege, but one that did not afford them any substantive freedom within the colony over their counterparts back in France.

Due to the rough conditions of pioneer life in New France, gender lines were sometimes blurred between partners. This led these women to experience married life in somewhat different fashions than they might have back in France. Generally speaking, the settlement of newlyweds was subsidized by the woman's dowry (if she had one) and, usually, the amount the man had saved while working. In addition to a dowry, a couple destined for rural life was provided "a few farm animals, and perhaps eight months' worth of supplies and staples such as wheat, peas and lard" (Noel, 2013, 80). These gifts were meant to support a young couple like Jacques and Suzanne in their early years of settlement on a fief. Jacques and Suzanne were given a concession of land that may have already cleared and seeded for them at Bourg-Royale (Eccles,1988; concession, 8 April 1668, fonds des greffes de notaires du Québec). Had it not been cleared and seeded, they would have been faced with the difficult work of clearing and transforming the land into a farm. In cases where colonists had to complete this hard work, gender roles were blurred as women helped clear and settle the land until the farm and family were well established and she went back to the gender-specific acts of child-rearing and food preparation. Women who found themselves in rural settings, the wives of artisans and shopkeepers helped with businesses as well; making sales and keeping accounts. Such acts were among the many gender-blurring tasks wives would complete to help their families in New France (Baillargeon, 2012). As a general custom, when the men were away, or a husband had passed, wives usually took on male roles like these – leading family affairs and business. Such actions, however, were not seen as matters of power and privilege but "work and worry" (Noel, 1998, 19). While these women were still subservient to their husbands by way of the French civil

law, their actually positions within matrimony spoke to a certain level of formally un-acknowledged importance (and even power) in the establishment and maintenance of a shared life.

The demand on these women's bodies, as mothers of a French colonial society, however, was immediate and extensive. Jacques and Suzanne would have been encouraged to begin a family quickly after being married. The Crown gave a yearly pension of 300 livres to families of 10 children and a 400 livres pension for families of 12 children or more (Goulson, 1970) as an incentive for rapid population growth.[37] They had their first son, Julien, less than a year after their marriage in March of 1667 (Tanguay, 1957). Women of means, within the middle and upper classes of the colony, were encouraged to hire wet-nurses, from amongst the commoners of the colony, so that they could avoid the infertility associated with breast-feeding (Runyan, 2010). Such a practice introduces a further layer of complexity within the analysis here as women of lower socio-economic status were likely pressured into positions as wet-nurses given their own meagre means relative to the women they worked for within the colony. This would have been a subservience present within the *filles du roi* body itself. In fact, beyond wet-nurses, many households employed a single, usually female, domestic worker to help the wife and her daughters with household chores. Women of the upper-class hired an entire staff to relieve them of the set of their domestic duties. Many common colonial women found themselves subject to such service at some point in their lives (Baillargeon, 2012). And so, it is clear that some *filles du roi* experienced considerably more benefit and freedom in New France due to their socio-economic standing than others of lesser standing would have, though they were all subject to the physically demanding and sexualized task of producing as many children as possible until one was physical incapable (Greer, 1997).

The pressure of procreation was not limited to this first female generation, the generations that followed were also subjected to demanding social policies geared toward marriage and the establishment of families within the colony. By the time Jacques and Suzanne were well-settled at Charlebourg, beginning around 1687, with their children reaching marriageable age, they would have been eagerly seeking nuptial arrangements. It was Crown policy that if children were not married by a certain age, 20 years for the boys and 16 years for

---

[37] They fell just short of gaining the yearly pension of 300 livres, having had their ninth and final child (my ancestor) Charles in 1688.

the girls, the parents would be fined in six-month intervals until their of-age-child married (Goulson, 1970). And as already identified, once married these daughters would have been expected to, more or less immediately, produce children. And so there were a number of Crown policies – composed of both carrots and sticks – to encourage natural population growth within the colony. It was adherence to this system of carrots and sticks that further wove Jacques, Suzanne and their children into the colonial narrative, establishing them as agrarian colonists whose presence and actions (as demonstrated in chapter four) helped propel French settlement and governance systems along the St. Lawrence. It was these same policies that treated women's bodies, the *filles du roi* and the bodies of their daughters and grand-daughters, as birthing machines. In this sense these women and their female offspring, despite their relative colonial privileges, can be identified as sexual dependents whose bodies were continually used to establish a settled French society along the shores of the St. Lawrence.

Given the various degrees by which the *filles du roi* were compelled to come to New France and their subordinate position as women within seventeenth-century French society, the question of what denizenship would have looked like for them is difficult to ascertain. It is also difficult to determine how these women interacted with Indigenous peoples since French colonial society was so patriarchal and thus few records of female thought and action exist during this period. Due to this, determining what a female colonist as denizen would have looked like at this point in history depended on where an individual *filles du roi* found herself within the colony and how much time and agency she could afford for anything beyond survival within the patriarchy she found herself ruled by. Many would have found themselves married to *habitants* (Runyan, 2010) and so the stipulations identified in chapter 4 as to what made agrarian colonists more denizen-like would also be applicable to the *filles du roi* as they married farmers and settled into their new homes (purposefully seeking invitation and good relations with local Indigenous peoples, adherence to local Indigenous laws and customs, fulfilment of obligations to local Indigenous peoples, sustenance-living within the boundaries ascribed under agreements). Given the patriarchal nature of French society at the time, the devotion across genders of French society to the Catholic mission (Runyan, 2010), it is uncertain at what level, if at any level, a woman would be permitted to fulfil such actions or even encourage her husband to do so.

Generally speaking, the *filles du roi* were unwitting mothers of a French empire. These were women whose agency was seriously constrained by the limitations placed on them by a

hierarchical and patriarchal French society. These were women whose social and economic prospects were directly tethered to their marriage prospects, women who generally found themselves without a father and so without a dowry to secure a suitable marriage in France. One will never be able to determine the extent to which an individual *filles du roi* chose to come to New France or was forced to come by guardians or officials. Even in the case that an individual 'chose' to register for the program, her 'choice' was based upon the realities she faced given her own subservient position within French society. And so one ought to question, even here, how much the choice was really her own. While these women and their female progeny did experience considerable privileges relative to their counterparts back in France (lived longer, chose their spouse, offered free education, etc.), their bodies were still used for the purposes of strengthening the colony's population. They were still considered the property of their husbands. These women, therefore, existed between the realities of their subordination positions within a male-dominated society and the colonial privileges and comforts that these positions afforded them.

The French and the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade: Black Slaves in New France

Black slaves are a second group of people who much more clearly did not arrive voluntarily in New France, but as arrivants and are thus part of the cacophony of people in the colonial project along the St. Lawrence. I have divided the study of Black and Indigenous slaves within this paper since the experiences, contexts, as well as the French moral and legal justifications and relations of slavery between the two groups are quite different and so require their own focused study. In this sub-section I deal with the legal position of slavery in France, the country's participation in and justification of the trans-Atlantic slave trade and the roles of Black slaves in New France during the late seventeenth, and into the early eighteenth, centuries. In the following section I will deal with the intra-continental slave trade of North America, France's involvement and struggle to justify participation within this latter trade as well as the roles of Indigenous slaves within the colony. Collectively these two studies are part and parcel of the broader analysis of involuntary settlement within New France and the effects of such forced settlement on the roles, actions and responsibilities of such actors and their progeny into the present day.

France had a complicated history with slavery throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The kingdom both stated to forbid slavery domestically while clearly condoning the

same practice within its colonies internationally. Even while the kingdom declared to forbid slavery domestically, the reality is that France was never completely free from slavery. While the kingdom confirmed, in both the fourteenth and early eighteenth centuries (Rushforth, 2013), a centuries-long 'free soil' principle whose origins date back the medieval city-state of Toulouse (Peabody, 2011), it still always condoned slaving practices in certain areas of the kingdom. For instance, France had a long history of enslaving Turks and Muslims as galley slaves (Weiss, 2011) and even domestic slaves in some port cities (Rushfoth, 2013). While the 'free soil' principle might have been a celebrated myth by the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, while it led to the emancipation of certain individuals (Weiss, 2011), it was never a uniform and cogent guarantee for those who found themselves enslaved on French territory. Yet it's existence still created moral and legal difficulties for France's participation within the trans-Atlantic slave economy and its slave-holding subjects (Palmer, 2016).

In fact all of the major European nations struggled to justify their participation within the trans-Atlantic slave economy during the sixteenth and through to the end of the eighteenth centuries. This was due to the increasingly popular view, of the pre-Enlightenment and Enlightenment period, that slavery was not a natural condition for humans. European and French justifications of the slave trade during this time, therefore, sought alternative justifications. Many justifications were based on a separation of the concepts of enslavement and slavery. While it was increasingly accepted that no one was naturally a slave, the law of nations determined that through acts of just war enemies who would otherwise have died could be legitimately enslaved. Since these captive individuals would otherwise have been killed, but were spared due to their captors' benevolence, it was deemed lawful that they could then become slaves to those for whom they owed their lives. Once one was lawfully enslaved in this way, they, alongside their progeny, were enslaved (at least for the most part) in perpetuity. And so slavery, by these means, was considered by many at the time to be free of questions of morality and ethics because the burden of morality and justice rested with enslavement in the context of a 'just-war'. This logic was used to support France's slave trade in the West Indies where the French often identified the Black individuals who entered the colonial slave trade as previously enslaved from amongst their own nations. Needless to say, France approached its position in the trans-Atlantic slave trade through a legal pluralist patchwork of ordinances, morals, and practices that were rarely unified in ethics or execution but which enabled France and her subjects to benefit greatly from the slave

economy. It was acceptable, therefore, that France upheld its already questionable executed 'free soil' principle domestically, while condoning slavery in its colonies.

The first modern slavery laws that France established were the *Code Noir* and the *Letters Patent*, which were both introduced by Colbert in 1685 (Chatman, 2000). The *Code Noir* was established to regulate the lives of slaves within the colonies of the West Indies, as such, it "recognized slavery in the colonies as 'necessary and authorized'" (Chatman, 2000, 145) for the kingdom's colonial and imperial interests. It identified slaves as the property of French colonist-owners. Under the code, slaves were prohibited from owning property, making contracts, holding public office, taking part in a trial, marrying without the consent of their masters, engaging in trade, assembling freely, and carrying firearms (Chatman, 2000). Not only did the *Code Noir* formally authorize slavery specifically within the French colonies, it also heavily regulated and sought to denigrate the lives of Black slaves for individual and collective colonial profit. As part of France's careful distinction between slavery and enslavement, the *Code Noire* never identified who could be and under what conditions someone could be enslaved (Rushforth, 2013), therefore, maintaining a moral and legal distance from issues and rules of enslavement. It was through the *Code Noir* that France formally condoned the holding of slaves within it colonies while being able to sustain the myth that its (domestic) kingdom was a slave-free society.

While the French colonies of the West Indies were specifically established as slave-colonies, New France was not - having been originally established as an economic outpost for the fur trade. While there is a record of one Black slave (baptised Olivier Le Jeune) having been brought to the colony by the Kirke brothers during English occupation (1629-33) and sold to my ancestor, Guillaume Couillard, upon the return of French control (Cooper, 2007; Trudel, 2013), French-Canadian interest in the trans-Atlantic slave trade did not begin until the late seventeenth century. It was in the 1680s, in view of the successful slave trade the colonists received word of in the West Indies and New England, that the higher echelons of New France began making calls for France to start sending Black slaves to improve the labour and economic condition of the colony. While France agreed to permit such trade from the West Indies in 1688, 1701 and 1721, a shipment of slaves never arrived on the shores of the St. Lawrence. This was due in part to wars in Europe that distracted the Crown's attentions as well as the fact that colonists were told they had to foot the bill for both the shipment and sale of any such slaves – this was a massive

expense to undertake. Those Black slaves that did make it to shores of New France were largely taken in from New England (Trudel, 2013).

While slaveholding was practiced in New France as early as the late seventeenth century, there was no formally recognized regulation of it until the early eighteenth century. France did have the 1685 *Code Noir* that regulated slave holding within the West Indies, and later in Louisiana (Trudel, 2013), but this code was never made law within Canada, although "New France's slaveholders applied the [code] when they thought it was necessary" (Cooper, 2007, 75). Given the increase in slaves along the St. Lawrence that accompanied the turn of the century, by 1709 Intendant Raudot felt it was necessary to confirm the servile statuses of both enslaved Africans and Indigenous peoples within the colony. As such, the 1709 ordinance identified that any colonist who bought a Black or Indigenous slave "owned them outright" (Trudel, 2013, 36). In effect, this ordinance made all slaves held in New France chattel under colonial law. Not only a response to a rise in the slave population this ordinance was also a response to the increasing numbers of slaves running away from their owners and claiming to be free people. In some cases, colonists themselves were reportedly encouraging slaves to escape (Cooper, 2007). The frequency of such claims and the roles of colonists therein was likely encouraged through the legal and moral uncertainty of the status of slavery within New France as well as France specifically, given not only the lack of formal legal regulation within the colony up to this point but also the mythologized 'free soil' principle of the kingdom itself. In fact the frequency of runaways claiming to have been freed by their owners grew so much in the early eighteenth century that by 1736, Intendant Hocquart issued an ordinance within the colony that regulated manumission. This ordinance required that slaves be freed through formal and notarized agreements in order to be considered legally free (Cooper, 2007). While these local ordinances were laws for the colony, they were never formally recognized laws of the French Crown, and so their application did not apply beyond the borders of the colony within the Laurentian Valley. The ordinance of 1709, however, did formally legalized slavery within New France.

While Indigenous slaves were more numerous within New France, work completed by Marcel Trudel suggests that there were at least 1443 Black slaves in New France from the late seventeenth century into the late eighteenth century following British conquest (2013). While there were upwards of 2700 Indigenous slaves (Trudel, 2013), at 1443 individuals there was still

a considerable population of Blacks slaves within New France. Colonists bought Black slaves from Abenaki and sometimes even Haudenosaunee who had captured them from the English in the thirteen colonies, while other French colonists went down to the thirteen colonies to buy Black slaves from the English directly. Many of these slaves were brought back to settlements along the river to work as domestic slaves and farm hands and some were forced to work in the fur trade alongside their owners (Cooper, 2007). Slaves usually lived in the same houses as their owners; ate the same food as their owners; were baptized by their owners and in some cases had their owners, or their owners close relatives, as godparents – even receiving their owners' family name in certain cases. This was a system of slave-holding that ascribed to the patriarchal nature of French society during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Cooper, 2007).

Legal records suggest that the slave population was fairly well-integrated into French colonial society along the St. Lawrence River. There was never a massive slave-led revolt in New France – unlike in other French colonies like Haiti – there were only ever individual and small-scale acts of resistance and violence (Trudel, 2013). Why exactly this was so is uncertain, it could have pertained to a heightened ability of French owners in the colony to keep their slaves from assembling than the French colonists in other colonies. It might also have had something to do with the jurisdiction grey-zones around slavery in New France, even following Raudot and Hocquart's ordinances, and the informal nature of the *Code Noir*'s application within the colony. Unlike slaves within the West Indies, slaves in New France could appeal to the Conseil supérieur, could act as witnesses, and were even sometimes involved in lawsuits. There are actually a few cases of slaves bringing lawsuits against their masters and winning. Had they been strictly and formally subjected to the *Code Noir* these relative legal freedoms would not have been possible (Moogk, 2000). Such access to legal avenues may have played a role in deterring larger acts of resistance and violence amongst New France's slave population.

But the work by Afua Cooper, on the hanging of the Black slave Angélique in 1734, demonstrates that one needs to be careful in making broad statements about the integration of slaves and 'good' slaving practices. She argues that there is actually little evidence to suggest that slaves were better treated in New France than the West Indies or New England and that owners were fully able to "brutalize their slaves" (2006, 82-3). She argues that the legal access and rights enslaved peoples experienced actually suggests that the French did not perceive them as a large threat (Cooper, 2007) – an argument bolstered by the fact that Black slaves came from

distant territories with little hope of returning home and inciting some sort of raid or direct war (Trudel, 2013). Just because there may not have been a massive slave-led resistance against the institution, does not mean that there was not a culture of resistance amongst slaves throughout the colony. Through her work, Cooper highlights that Black slaves in particular

> took steps to wreak revenge of their owners. They ran away, talked back, broke tools, were disobedient, threatened their owners, organized slave uprisings [even if not successful], and in two cases allegedly set major fires that devastated colonial towns (2007, 81).

Slaves were not passive subjects of French property. Black slaves were individuals who had been colonized within their own territories and forced into the trans-Atlantic slave economy against their own will, shipped to North America and taken up as chattel – eventually finding themselves held by French colonists along the St. Lawrence River. They actively resisted this position and their place as slaves on foreign Indigenous lands. Whether slaves may have been slightly better off in New France (relative to other French and British colonies) remains highly speculative. The central fact that they were considered the property of their owners, subject to their owners' whims, remains the central feature of most slaves' lives.

Black slaves of this period, and their progeny, found themselves clearly subordinated by the broader European system of colonization dominating the western world in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. As such, I consider their positions to be beyond an analysis of the denizen – beyond attempting to situate them as denizens since they were themselves so heavily colonized and subordinated. Given commonalities in subordination and colonization, and in consideration of very important differences both historically and today, however, one can imagine there are ways through which Black slaves and Indigenous peoples have a joint connection to the resistance of white supremacy and privilege as expressed historically through imperialism, slavery and settler colonialism even when their experiences differ in relation to the territory upon which they now both live. There is a potential for joint resistance here, this potential, in combination with the responsibility held by those now living on territory that was Indigenous land, might be one avenue through which contemporarily-situated actors whose ancestors were slaves might begin to determine their own colonial-denizen ethos.

The French and the Intra-Continental Slave Trade: Indigenous Slaves in New France

In this final section of the chapter, I consider French participation within the intra-continental slave trade focusing on how the French got involved in the trade, how they struggled

to justify their involvement, and how their involvement ultimately led to the enslavement of Indigenous peoples along the St. Lawrence River. As part of this analysis I identify the way through which early participation of non-Indigenous peoples within the intra-continental slave trade can be indicative of narrowly-defined and inconsistently-situated denizen-like practice, as well as how colonial interests led non-Indigenous peoples to gradually co-opt the trade for the interests of its urban and agrarian colonists along the river. Ultimately, this final section seeks to further complicate, or rather enrich, not only the analysis of the slave trade within French colonial practice in New France but also the cacophony of involuntary actors one finds within the colony.

Slavery was an important institution for the Indigenous nations of the *pays d'en haut* and interior before the French arrived (Bowker Lee, 2012). It was only with the fall of Huronia in 1650, however, that the French became integrated into this already existing slave trade. While the French had alliances with the Algonquin, Innu and Wyandot during the first half of the seventeenth century, they only received a few slaves from these allies as these nations' regional war culture did not place as high a value on the trading of slaves as symbolic gifts of friendship like many of the other nations within the *pays d'en haut* and interior (Rushforth, 2013). It was only when the French started pushing westward that they began interacting with other Indigenous nations (like the Odawa, Sioux, Ojibwa, Illinois) who placed much greater weight on this practice. During the last half of the seventeenth century, therefore, French merchants, traders, and *coureurs de bois* (Ethridge, 2012) would be presented slaves as customary gifts (usually alongside other gifts like food) as a sign of friendship and alliance before beginning a trading ceremony with their new allies (Bowker Lee, 2012; Trudel, 2013).

While French bureaucrats may have been hesitant to accept Indigenous slaves as gifts from their new allies, as early as the 1660s, western traders began accepting them. Slaves served the dual purpose of strengthening alliances and securing additional labourers within the fur trade (Rushforth, 2013). While slavery in any form is not acceptable, in the historical context of the day the acceptance of slaves as gifts in alliance-making within the fur trade was consistent with Indigenous peoples pre-contact laws and customs. In this way such early participation within the slave trade would have been identified as a practice that was deferential to Indigenous allies and so in-line with a sort of narrowly-contrived denizen-like action. For the acceptance of such slaves, was, in relation to the Indigenous nation with which a trader was dealing, a demonstration

of denizen-like deference. And yet, the acceptance of slaves as slaves does not align with a denizen ethos as it is demonstrative of violent and unethical behaviour that subordinates and colonizes other Indigenous peoples and nations.

Although French interaction with the intra-continental slave trade was originally demonstrative of a limited deference to Indigenous allies, it was not long before French interaction and influence began to shift the scale and structure of the trade as well as war and diplomacy within the *pays d'en haut*. Initially, slaves that were given to traders as gifts within the frontier remained at French posts or as accompaniment during trades. By the late 1680s, however, one finds Indigenous slaves (traded or sold to French traders and merchants) coming into the colony along the river. By the end of the century Indigenous slaves show up almost every year within historical records in the St. Lawrence Valley (Trudel, 2013). These Indigenous slaves, usually from far off nations that their allies had raided as enemies, were meant to fill a long-cited labour shortage within the colony (Eccles, 1988; Greer, 1997; Trudel, 2013). While the colonists had originally wanted to fill this labour shortage with Black slaves, slaves from the West Indies, as previously explored, were hard for the colonists of New France to acquire. Since Indigenous slaves were cheaper and easier to acquire than Black slaves (Rushforth, 2013; Trudel, 2013) they were eagerly accepted by colonists along the river.

The justification of Indigenous slavery along the river, however, presented an issue for the French. The just-war theory that was used to validate participation within the trans-Atlantic slave economy could not be easily applied within the intra-continental slave economy. As explored in the previous section, the just-war theory was premised on the important distinction between enslavement and slavery and claimed that others could be justifiably enslaved when they had been conquered by another in a just-war between the two parties. Understanding that the Black slaves the French acquired in the West Indies had previously been enslaved by their own nations, the French not only justified the enslavement from which they distanced themselves but also their acquisition of already enslaved-slaves. For this justification to work, therefore, the French had to recognize African nations as sovereign. But the entire French colonial project within New France at this time required the gradual subordination of Indigenous sovereignty to French sovereignty (through the increasing instantiation of vassal-like relations) since the primary focus of the kingdom's imperial endeavour was the expansion of its territorial claims. To have identified Indigenous nations as sovereign under just-war theory would have legitimized

the holding of Indigenous slaves by French colonists along the river, but it would have also branded the French settlements there "as [potential] violations of the law of nations" (Rushforth, 2013, 113). At least initially, therefore, the question of moral and legal justification for Indigenous slavery was avoided by officials in the colony and back in France, which left the practice to be condoned from a moral and legal grey-point within New France.

The French Crown refused to ever formally sanction slavery in New France due to fears around officially justifying the holding of Indigenous slaves within the colony. This was likely due to concerns about the just-war theory's implications as well as a fear that Indigenous allies and foes might violently resist such an action by the Crown, thereby ruining the relationships that were so necessary for the French to claim control of the St. Lawrence Valley, *pays d'en haut* and interior as against other European nations (Trudel, 2013; Rushforth, 2013). Yet the Crown was equally disinterested in outlawing the practice of holding Indigenous slaves in New France since it appeased its subjects along the river. Given the previously mentioned spike in the slave population in New France during the early eighteenth century, however, as well as the number of slaves claiming their freedom, local colonial officials clearly felt compelled to pass some sort of regulation that served to confirm the status of Indigenous slaves. This was what led to Intendant Raudot's 1709 ordinance. This ordinance formalized, only within the boundaries of the settled colony, the legal status of Indigenous slaves as chattel (like their Black counterparts) by stating that these Indigenous peoples could be bought and sold as slaves through enforceable contracts (Cooper, 2007; Rushforth, 2013; Trudel, 2013). Since it was merely a local ordinance its reach did not legally extend beyond the settlements of New France. This justification, however, basically legitimized Indigenous slavery through the use of the just-war theory by separating enslavement from slavery, thereby introducing a great discrepancy between territorially-based colonial intentions and their logics and slave-holding desires and their logics. A disparity that was ignored by local officials and condoned by the French Crown for the remainder of New France's days.

In fact, the officials of New France had become so cavalier about their position and authority within the intra-continental slave trade that in 1687, Governor Denonville tricked approximately fifty Haudenosaunee warriors into enslavement. Having first convinced these warriors they were meeting with French officials to negotiate a peace agreement, Denonville instead captured them and sent them to France to work in the galleys (Rushforth, 2013). Not only

was this a bombastic infringement of their own justification for involvement in slavery, given the trickery involved, but the Haudenosaunee and even the allies of the French were outraged. Allies were dishonoured by the French's inability to follow Indigenous trade customs and afraid of their own potential to be enslaved by such means at the hands of the French. The Haudenosaunee sought vengeance and killed twice as many French colonists in the next decade than they had through raids in the previous eighty years of French settlement along the St. Lawrence (Rushforth, 2013). While such an event appears to have been exceptional, it still speaks to troubling and careless actions taken by local colonial officials that defied the already inconsistent logic presented for participation within the intra-continental slave trade. While the negative outcome of this experiment in enslavement stopped any similar actions within the future, it is indicative of a very chaotic and haphazard approach to slavery and the slave trade more broadly.

All of these various actions and justifications led to a relatively high Indigenous slave population in New France. Work completed by Marcel Trudel, suggests that there were roughly 2700 Indigenous slaves held by French colonists along the river from the late seventeenth century into the late eighteenth century (2013). Many were held as domestic slaves by the merchant class in Montréal. Given the fact that these Indigenous peoples were largely acquired through the fur trade and that Montréal was the colonial hub of the trade following the mid-seventeenth century, the dominance of slaves held by merchants within this city is not surprising. Not only would those who were involved within the fur trade (merchants, traders and the bourgeois) have had easier access to Indigenous slaves, given the nature of their business, they would have been more likely to settle at Montréal. Within urban locales these slaves tended to take over domestic work, freeing the women of the house from their daily chores – a freedom which was a sign of wealth and privilege. While the majority of slaves were found in urban conditions, there is documented evidence that a good number lived in a rural setting where they worked farms alongside their owner's families. While those of a rural locale might have helped to fill the oft-cited labour shortage, it appears that by and large slaves in New France – given their pre-dominantly urban situation and ownership were rather a 'form of public extravagance' indicative of the opulence and prestige of their owners (Trudel, 2013).

Indigenous slaves within New France found themselves originally captured by their nations enemies within the interior or the *pays d'en haut*, and gifted, traded or sold to the Frenchmen whose slaves they became both at French posts as well as along the river. These were

clearly colonized and subordinated men, women and children who were forced into chattel slavery by the European allies of their enemies – forced into lives of subservience, although some might have been returned to their nations in certain circumstances, and so freed, in order to establish a new alliance or halt an ongoing war. Such an occurrence was rare due to the nature of 'private' ownership of slaves once they reached the shores of the St. Lawrence, and the unwillingness of officials to ask private owners to return their slaves, though it was a possibility and a development for some Indigenous slaves within New France (Rushforth, 2013). While I have not come across literature which specifically identifies Indigenous slaves as resistant to colonial authority, as was demonstrated for their Black counterparts through Afua Cooper's work, it is reasonable to suggest that such individuals would have taken up methods and moments of resistance against their slavery at French hands. Here, as with the Black slaves explored in the previous section, Indigenous slaves of this period are beyond situation as denizens due to their heavy colonization and subordination at the hands of non-Indigenous colonists in New France.

While this analysis sheds light on the place of Indigenous slaves in New France, it also offers further insights as to the colonial positions of French colonists as both slave holders and slavery condoners during this period. The holding of Indigenous slaves in New France (even irrespective of the devastating effects this had on the populations of their allies) speaks to a clearly definable moment of French colonial action within New France. As the owners of Indigenous (and Black) slaves, the colonists of New France were embodying positions of greedy, ruthless, and unethical colonialists focused on reducing others lives' to labour, subservience and violence for their own colonial privilege and gain – sometimes doing this within the other's very own territory. Some Haudenosaunee, for instance, were among Indigenous slaves in New France (Rushforth, 2013) – slaves on lands to which their nations hold claim to title (Simpson, 2014). Participation with this practice, as well as the condoning of such a practice, places French colonists of this period as troublingly complicit within continental as well as trans-Atlantic colonial structures and systems that lasted well into the eighteenth and even nineteenth centuries. Such practices are clear embodiments of the increasingly troubling colonial, racist and violent rhetoric that increasingly dominated European thought and action throughout the following centuries through which Europeans sought to degrade, destroy and eventually erase Indigenous life for their own imperial and colonial interests.

Summary

The roles and complicities of arrivants is highly contextualized and complex. The *filles du roi*, for instance, were by and large forced to come to New France to help populate the colony though this compulsion varied amongst this population in degree both at the point of departure and arrival. While many of these women experienced colonial privileges due to their race and position relative to others in colonial society, and where these women appear to have fulfilled their role with little resistance, they were subordinate to colonial men within a hierarchical and patriarchal society. Where some may have willingly come to the colony as sexual dependents, it is difficult to say – given the predominance of the patriarchy and the fact that a woman's social standing was dependent on marriage at the time – how willing any one of these women was in coming to New France. Certainly they all experienced many colonial privileges. As discussed many were even able to deny marriage proposals where they would not have held that same right in France. Furthermore, as discussed in chapter 4, these women and their husbands tended to enjoy securities funded through the overtaxed peasantry in France (Eccles, 1988). They were able to secure what privileges they gained for their own female and male progeny at the expense of Indigenous peoples and their territory. And their actions as mothers helped directly strengthen the colonial project, thereby, directly implicating them within the broader colonial project. Thus, while these women were forced to the colony as sexual dependents, for many of these women, the privileges they gained in such a role appear place them closer to agrarian colonists than either arrivants or colonial-denizens.

Alternatively, the role of African Canadian slaves in the colony of New France (while also complex) afforded them no real colonial privileges given their extreme oppression and subordination as slaves. While their work, which was forced labour, may have directly and indirectly helped to build the larger colonial project, these original slaves and their progeny were enslaved for decades as arrivants and experienced systemic racism and discrimination by colonists and colonial institutions. The descendants of these same slaves today still experience racism and state based discrimination and violence rooted in these historical practices (Maynard, 2017) although they may now experience relative colonial privileges over Indigenous lands and people. While slaves, as arrivants have no colonial complicity since they were forcibly moved to New France, the same is not necessarily true of their contemporary progeny. In mutual though possibly differentiated resistance against the white privilege and colonial structures that have

subordinated Indigenous peoples and slaves, there may be common grounds of and responsibilities to support each other in resistance against continued colonialism, oppression and subordination.

Beyond the roles of differently situated arrivants, this chapter has also explored the role of Indigenous slavery in Indigenous-colonist relations during the seventeenth century – an important analysis given the large proportion of Indigenous slaves within the colony and the influence of the salve trade on colonial relations. As such, I have been led to conclude that early non-Indigenous interaction with the already well-established intra-continental slave trade is demonstrative of early deference to Indigenous laws and customs of interior nations – though, given the immoral nature of slavery, such acts were never proper representations of denizen-like ways of being. Even still, such deference was short-lived and it was not long until the French co-opted the intra-continental trade in a bid to increase their own colonial privileges. Such co-optation is an extreme embodiment of colonial subordination. It may be demonstrative of an important moment in the history of colonization within Canada, a point at which the colonists of New France clearly committed to their roles as colonists and away from roles as denizens in relation to Indigenous life and land.

Involuntary settlement not only complicates one's understanding of the colonial denizen, historically and today, but also the broader and mainstream stories non-Indigenous peoples have been telling themselves about Canada for decades. It is not easy to discuss slavery and forced migrations, but it is integral that society begins to do so – these are important parts of a broader story that have been silenced for too long. The fact that Black and Indigenous peoples were forced into slavery by French colonists or that the French women, who were so important for the strength of the colony, may have had little other options but to emigrate to the colony as wives and mothers, have important roles to play in the move forward. They are important facts because they help illuminate a fuller, broader and more complex picture of the actors involved in the colonization of North America – of the colonial cacophony that animated the various and multifaceted relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. They illuminate long silenced histories and lives that need to be acknowledged and grappled with, histories and lives whose connections to colonialism and subordination even today need to be highlighted before decolonization can occur.

Analysis in this chapter can also serve a role in shaping articulations of a denizen ethos today. In focusing on involuntary colonists, this chapter has sought to challenge assumptions surrounding the roles of colonists as voluntary and willing subjects. This has helped shed light on not only the differing degrees of complicity amongst differently situated actors within the colonial project broadly, but also the fact that, given one's own position in society (their own potential positions of subordination, forced migration, etc.) they may have a different set of responsibilities in the move to articulating a denizen ethos than more voluntary and free colonists today. Consider for instance the positions of those whose ancestors were Black slaves in New France – the potential responsibility they hold through a solidarity they might find with Indigenous peoples to resist continuing (though differentiated) colonial violence and subordination of their communities. This chapter has highlighted the very real need to peel back the layers of the colonial cacophony, to differentiate the positionalities of variously situated actors, and to question what the impact of one's place within the vast web of colonial relations means for their own articulation of a denizen ethos today.

The following chapter steps back into the realm of willing colonists for one final snap-shot of seventeenth century New France. In this final chapter on New France I explore the roles of colonists as traders within the fur trade, exploring the evolution of the trade throughout the seventeenth century and the simultaneous shifts in colonists roles therein. This chapter takes stock of the broader, imperial, goals of French involvement in the fur trade as well as colonial roles and relations along the river but also within the interior. While several more chapters could be written on the various and multifaceted roles and relations of seventeenth century New France, I hope that with this final chapter a respectable and formative analysis will be presented from which contemporary non-Indigenous Canadians can begin to substantively grapple with their own roles and relations, taking up their responsibilities as they move forward through a denizen ethos to meet Indigenous peoples and their calls for change.

Chapter 7: Colonial Actors from the Purview of the Fur Trade – Denizens, Sojourners and Guests

Previous chapters have considered voluntary and in-voluntarily colonial actors along the St. Lawrence River during the seventeenth century, focusing on their relationships with Indigenous peoples, lands and colonial administration as a means of un-covering their roles as potential denizens and colonists of the continent and its peoples. This chapter, the last to focus on relations in seventeenth century New France, extends the scope of study more explicitly beyond the colony at the river (though it also includes study along the river) in its exploration of the roles of fur trading actors – many of which were found within the interior. The seventeenth century was a period of great change within the fur trade and hence trade-based colonialism. As such, this chapter explores the changing roles of French fur trading actors during this century from the trade's earlier days in the 1610s, when average, agrarian colonists were explicitly barred from participating in trade; to its function as a free market, when all men were allowed to participate within the trade with few regulations; up until the end of the century, when the involvement of French men within the trade was heavily administrated by local officials.

The following analysis places these variously situated actors as colonists, denizens, sojourners and guests alike depending on the role and the context in which they participated within the trade. For instance, I argue that early colonists (1610-1647) who defied the regulations of early trading companies (Biggar, 1901) by participating in the trade may be positioned, as seen in chapter two with my ancestor Louis Hébert, as more denizen-like actors. It was these early colonists who likely recognized the need to form more direct and respectful connections to the Indigenous peoples whose lands they inhabited and who disobeyed their own laws to do so. Alternatively, one might consider later trading actors as both sojourners and guests within the interior. These were men who, by and large, took temporary contracts to work within the interior and who would have needed to establish relations with Indigenous peoples as *guests* of their societies and lands in order to facilitate trade.[38] I use the term guest in this later context and not denizen because it is the guest that confers more temporary conditions,[39] whereas the denizen is

---

[38] The obvious exception here would be the men who gave up colonial life and established new societies with their Indigenous wives - societies that would lead to the creation of the Métis Nation.

[39] See chapter one, page seven, for further elaboration on the differences and similarities of the guest and denizen roles as premised on the work of Jim Tully.

meant to convey greater permanence in relation and responsibilities – as most trade actors would have been sojourners (temporary colonists) within the interior the guest role seems more appropriate an application.[40] I contend that beyond this major difference, the orientations of these two roles, denizen and guest, would be similar (deference, invitation, etc.) though goals and means (due to variances in temporality) would be different. The following takes stock of these specific roles, placing them within the broader colonial cacophony as I seek to explore and articulate the roles of fur trading actors during the seventeenth century.

Given the nature of trade-based colonialism (as identified in chapter 2, naturally more inclined towards denizen-like behaviour); later fur trading practices; and the place of French trading actors within the interior, where they would have been outnumbered and vulnerable, there is an argument to be made that fur trading actors within the latter half of the century would have themselves been naturally-inclined to more guest-like behaviours than other late-century actors along the river. Not only was the industry these actors were participating within dependent on alliances and friendly relations with Indigenous peoples, but the environment in which these men found themselves would have once again been foreign – they would have needed Indigenous guides, support and knowledge in order to survive within the interior. In light of major conclusions within earlier chapters, specifically the conclusion that colonists were more likely to act like denizens in contexts of their own dependence on Indigenous peoples, especially in trade colonial situations, or else in contexts of needed mutual support with Indigenous peoples, this vulnerability suggests a natural inclination towards more respectful, deferent, and hence denizen or guest-like relations between non-Indigenous trading actors and their Indigenous allies. This chapter tests this hypothesis through the analysis of later fur trading actors and trade policies.

Overall, this chapter functions as a book-end to my analysis of French colonial actors within seventeenth century New France. Through this chapter I explore the roles of actors within the very industry that supported the establishment and strength of the French colony at the same

---

Jim Tully. "On Resurgence *and* Transformative Reconciliation." *Plants, People and Places: the Roles of Ethnobotany and Ethnoecology in Indigenous Peoples' Land Rights in Canada and* Beyond. Ed. Nancy Turner and Pamela Spalding. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2018.

[40] Here it is important to highlight that while these actors can generally be identified as sojourners/guests within the interior, in the broader scheme of the colonial project they were not sojourners as they came back to the colony along the river. Usually, these men stayed within New France and did not leave the colony/colonial project to return to France.

time that I extend my broader analysis of seventeenth century colonial actors beyond the confines of the settled colony within the St. Lawrence Valley. As the 1650 dispersal of the Wyandot at Huronia is marked as a catalyst for France's westward expansion in the fur trade it is a highly visible post against which to observe shifts in fur trade policy, contexts and behaviours. The following, therefore, takes a chronological approach beginning with an analysis of policy and trade actors prior to the Fall of Huronia (1650) and the evolution of trade policy and actors following this fall.

Evolution of the Fur Trade and its Early Actors

Prior to the dispersal of Wyandot at Huronia, one sees two major structures present for the French fur trade economy: monopoly and free-trade. Under the monopoly structure a single trading company was given exclusive rights to and control over the fur trade economy within New France. During some of the earliest years of settlement within the colony this led to companies prohibiting all colonists, not specifically employed for the trade, from participating in any form of direct trade with Indigenous peoples. Under the free-trade structure no company was given a full monopoly on the trade and, at least by the late 1640s, any and all colonists were permitted if not encouraged to participate in direct trade with Indigenous peoples. The following section focuses on the monopoly structure and the roles of average colonial actors therein. It briefly introduces the free trade period so that its function as a stepping stone to the post-1650 trade structure can be explored in the following section.

Prior to the late 1640s, the main actors within the fur trade were the Indigenous trappers of the *pays d'en haut* and interior; the Indigenous middlemen, who collected these furs and supplied them to the French; and the company agents who went into the frontier to collect these furs from the middlemen (Dechêne, 1992; Hart, 2002). While this constituted the formal trade, as early as the 1610s (Simoneau, 2009), [41] "colonists could easily obtain furs from no farther away than their front doors…[by trading] with resident or visiting Indians" (Dechêne, 1992, 90). The nature of seigneurial settlement along the river enabled such ease of access to trading as the frontier was always close at hand, just beyond one's doorstep (Harris, 1968). Such claims suggest that interactions between common colonists and Indigenous allies were regular and perhaps even daily occurrences. Average colonists skirted around the laws of the colony to

---

[41] As identified in chapter two, there is evidence to suggest that as early as 1617, early settlers like my ancestor Louis Hébert and his family, were (illegally) trading with Indigenous peoples at their front doors.

participate (at however small a scale) within the fur trade. Likely, in many cases, this helped foster some positive and normalized relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples at the settlements – possibly even being indicative of denizen-like behaviour.

If one considers, as explored in chapter 2, the role of my ancestor Louis Hébert, during the early seventeenth century there is evidence to suggest such denizen-like behaviour through trade may well have existed between early colonists and the Innu and Anishinaabe of the Québec area. Recent excavations of Hébert's fief suggest that such clandestine trade occurred since objects that would have been traded by Indigenous peoples at the time, like glass beads, were found throughout the excavated area (Simoneau, 2009). While little is concretely known about Hébert's direct dealings with Indigenous peoples, and whether these interactions were positive or negative, productive or destructive, this certainly suggests that as early as the 1610s avenues were present and taken for colonists to trade directly with Indigenous peoples. As long as such trade-based relations were founded on fair and mutually-respectful exchanges, they could be considered denizen-like – focused on alliance-building, mutual support and perhaps even deference to Indigenous customs of trade. In the case of Hébert there is further evidence to suggest that such relations occurred and were at least somewhat positive and productive between both parties. According to records made by early officials, Hébert was friendly with local Indigenous peoples. He reportedly provided them apothecary services and even opened his home to them (Fischer, 2008).

A colonist participating (illegally) within the fur trade during this time, therefore, could be seen as leaning toward a more denizen-like existence within the colony. Certainly, his presence on the land was of questionable justification, whether the land he found himself upon was acquired through forced invitation or not, tolerated by allies, or aggressively unaccepted by those like the Haudenosaunee, there was a great complexity of relationship and orientation as colonists and denizens for these actors. However, in defying colonial policy premised on the separation of Indigenous peoples and average colonists, such actors can be seen to have understood the importance of trade for local Indigenous peoples, their customs and laws, they can be seen to have also understood the importance of friendly relations and possibly even deference to local trading customs and laws. While their presence may have been of questionable validity, their trade-based behaviours would have at least provided the grounds for more denizen-like behaviours and relations with local Indigenous allies along the river.

By 1647 restrictions around trading were more formally relaxed, in an attempt to increase turnover and curtail the smuggling of furs, average colonists were officially authorized to participate within the fur trade as middlemen themselves (Dechêne, 1992). This led to a decades-long era of free-trade. Given a lack of regulation and the somewhat chaotic nature of the free-trade period it is difficult to account for the actors of this era and their specific behaviours. Certainly, it would seem motives and behaviours varied. One would imagine actors that fell more in line with those like Hébert, who it appears established and sustained mutually favourable trade relations with local Indigenous peoples, as well as those who would have been looking for economic gain at the potential cost of mutually favourable trade relations with Indigenous peoples. Given the nature of colonist involvement during the free-trade period, the focus afforded to economy and profit, one expects that more of these later actors would have entered the trade in the interest of their own economic gain and so have been more likely to fall from denizen-like and toward more colonially-aligned behaviours.

And so one sees that there were avenues through which some of the early common actors of the fur trade could participate illegally against company policies (Dechêne, 1992). Such men and women who did so would have been working on a small-scale and likely in the interests of their own sustenance (rather than profit) and could be seen to have been adopting more denizen-like behaviours in their trading relations with local and visiting Indigenous peoples. As the trade structure shifted, however, from outright company monopoly to free-trade, one sees the potential for greater colonial-leanings of common actors whose interests, given the open trade, would have become increasingly profit-driven. Not only were these latter actors more inclined to be profit-driven but, as will be seen in the following section, their role in opening the west to French 'occupation' was clearly colonially-driven, placing latter actors as highly-colonially-implicated actors within the interior following 1650. The following section considers the shift to the post 1650s era and its impact on the trade actors therein.

The 1650 Dispersal of Huronia: An Opportunity for Expansion and Accumulation in a Free-Trade Economy

This section considers the impact of the dispersal of Huronia on both French fur free-trade policy and trade actors from 1650 to 1680 and how their actions and roles aligned with colonial and guest/denizen behaviours and orientations within the *pays d'en haut* and interior. Analysis leads me to conclude that during this time, while the context of the interior required

common traders to exhibit more guest-like behaviours, the interactions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (both along the river and within the interior) were circumscribed by French colonial interests and aims of overarching French colonial policies.

By 1650, the Haudenosaunee League had successfully eliminated or dispersed of the Wyandot who, along with the French, had previously prevented the Haudenosaunee from exploiting the fur-rich lands of the north-west interior.[42] Following the dispersal of Huronia, therefore, the League and the French held competing claims to the lands south and west of the Ottawa River as well as around the shores of Lakes Erie and Huron. The Haudenosaunee understood that they had conquered these lands from the Wyandot, Petuns and Neutrals (Eccles, 1988), while the French understood that they maintained some claim to these same lands based on alliances they held with nations - both anterior and contemporary (Parmenter, 2014). Given the Wyandots' former primacy in the fur trade, as middlemen between interior hunting nations and the French, their dispersal upset the trading networks that the French colony had come to depend on for its prosperity and continuance. The dispersal of Huronia, therefore, also left a desperate French colony grappling to survive in the face of economic hardship while remaining faced with consistently aggressive attacks by the League.

In fact, during the 1650s, the Haudenosaunee "pushed New France to the brink of extermination" (Parmenter, 2014, 111). Colonial officials became so concerned for their safety at the hands of League attacks that they sought transnational alliances with their Imperial neighbours to the South – to no avail (Parmenter, 2014). This state of insecurity remained a reality in the colony until the Crown introduced the first military troops in 1665 – sent over specifically with the intention of putting a stop to League attacks (Verney, 1991; Lozier, 2015; Charbonneau et al., 1993; Parmenter, 2014). An important component in the salvaging of the French fur trade during this decade was their alliance with the Odawa (Ottawa)[43] who initially

---

[42] Haudenosaunee motives were not solely based on enhancing their economies within these lands, such attacks on Huronia were also about adopting Wyandot peoples (a significant number of which were believed to be descendants from the Laurentain Haudenosaunee and therefore distant kin) into their nations, thereby helping to recover from significant populations losses.
Jon Parmenter. *The Edge of the Woods: Iroquoia, 1534-1701*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 2014. p. 81.
[43] During this time the term 'Odawa' actually became a generic term of French use for referring to various Indigenous nations that came from the west to trade with the French at the St. Lawrence. In addition to the Odawa-proper, the term was likely used to refer to the Nipissings, Saulteurs, and Potawatomis.
Richard White. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. pp. 105-6.

took over the middleman role of the former Wyandot. This alliance and the French free-trade structure enabled the French further and more direct access to the *pays d'en haut* and interior (Trudel, 1968) despite Haudenonsaunne efforts to take over these same territories. In choosing to ally with the Odawa at this juncture, the French cemented their relationship with the Haudenosaunee as one based on enmity as this new alliance attempted to exclude the League and their access to the interior. In response, throughout much of the last half of the century, the Haudenosaunee "increasingly sought to detach the western tribes from their alliances with the French" (Goldstein, 1969, 107) and to divert the furs to the English along the Hudson. These relations and tensions animated French-Haudenosaunee relations for much of the remainder of the seventeenth century and influenced the roles and actions of both parties within the fur trade (Leitner, 2015; Goldsten, 1969).

In contrast to their relationship with the Wyandot, however, the French increasingly pushed past Odawa territory in order to explore the interior, increase the volume in trade, and establish permanent trading posts as far west as the Mississippi Valley (Nassaney, 2008; Trigger, 1985). In expanding westward the French established direct trading relations with the hunting nations that had been providing furs to the Wyandot and Odawa (Eccles, 1988). This policy of expansion meant that by the 1680s the Odawa were largely bypassed as middlemen (Trigger, 1985) and French traders were regular and plentiful characters within the North American fur trade. As with the Innu before, French disregard for the barriers that their allies erected paints them in a negative light. And yet the work of Richard White suggests that at least by the 1660s, the Odawa were actively looking to encourage other nations to share the burden of middlemen status - at least as it applied to the annual trade fairs at the French settlements. This was likely because, as the Haudenosaunee threat grew, travelling down to Montréal became an increasingly perilous journey that the Odawa did not wish to take on their own (White, 1991). And so there is reason to question the status of the French as bad allies to the Odawa at this point, since it appears the Odawa may have encouraged the French to form alliances with select allied nations situated further inland.

The expansion of the labour pool under a free-trade structure (1647) had an important effect on the nature of the trade at this time. Having more Frenchmen available for the trade meant that, once Huronia was dispersed, France had the manpower necessary for venturing into the interior (beyond Odawa barriers) to make new alliances. It also meant that the French could

begin relying more on themselves to increase the volume of the trade. Participants helped discover new routes into the interior that cut down on transportation time, thereby helping to increase the volume of furs and profit, at the same time that they helped establish some of the first French trading posts within the *pays d'en haut* and interior (Trigger, 1985). The efforts of these early traders, therefore, helped the French in establishing a presence in the interior at the same time that they helped bypass the Odawa as middlemen. As such, the actions of common French fur traders of the 1650s, 60s and 70s likely aligned with both colonizing as well as guest-like behaviours. Their vulnerable position at the trading posts and while traversing the interior would have encouraged guest-like behaviour, likely leading to displays of deference, generosity and gift-giving. Yet, their function for the colony more broadly was to erase the position of Indigenous middlemen from the trade and extend the impression of French sovereignty throughout the continent. In this way these men were heavily colonial actors. While many may have individually acted as guests in relation to Indigenous peoples and allies of the interior, it is important to note, that not all were driven to act as respectful guests – some were driven by a hunger for profit that propelled them to act instead as greedy colonialists (White, 1991).

Importantly, formal French colonial dealings with other interior tribes suggests that once the French pushed past the Odawa they seem to have acted as guests – at least at the level of official policy. The French were aware they had no real sovereignty in the west. By the time they had begun to venture into the interior for trade, it was clearly demonstrated that their safe passage was dependent on the goodwill of the nations whose territories they passed through. The French only established trading posts in the *pays d'en haut* and interior where and when there was either no claim by an Indigenous group to the area or where and when they had the express permission of local Indigenous nations (Eccles, 1988). Due to their sparse numbers and reliance on interior nations to navigate and survive harsh winters, the men of the fur trade were dependent on good relations with their Indigenous hosts and neighbours within the frontier and so became 'forced' guests – a situation similar to that seen in chapter 2 with the first families living at Québec in the early seventeenth century.

As W.J. Eccles argues, interior Indigenous nations that allowed the French to establish trading posts likely saw the lands upon which these posts were established as their own. He suggests that the French occupants of these posts were considered tenants. The French were allowed passage to these posts in order to maintain good relations and upon the understanding of

continued trade of furs for European goods (1988). Michael Witgen also argues that while the French looked to "expand their empire by discovering Native nations", the reality of interior trade interactions and trading post establishment did not diminish Indigenous autonomy and political power but actually could enhance them (2012, 107). The yearly presents that were given to Indigenous peoples at the posts could be seen as a form of rent to the host nations for the use of the land, as well as a fee for travel through the territories of their allied and host nations (Eccles, 1988). In this way one might think of the French as renters – leasing trading post lands from Indigenous landlords/stewards – their payment being the exchange and gifting of European goods and the continuance of good relations. Such a conceptualization works well with the role of denizen/guest – the French, however begrudgingly, recognized their foreignness and need to be invited to co-habit these areas and embrace the responsibilities (i.e. gift giving and maintenance of good relations) that their invitation and continued presence was dependent upon. It was due to such recognition and apparent deference that the French, unlike their southern neighbours, generally enjoyed good relations with their allied nations within the interior (Nassaney, 2008).

Yet where alliances were upheld and the French were seen to be good guests and allies there were other factors at play that suggest their actions were not as purely intended as they may first appear. Perhaps the most important factor here concerns the French manipulation of fictive kinship relations (Doxtator, 2001) and the imperially-inclined interests of colonial elites in establishing and leading a wide-ranging alliance amongst as many of the interior nations as possible. As a matter of policy, French officials generally relied on the metaphor of the family to establish and maintain good alliances with the nations of the *pays d'en Haut* and interior. Beginning with the fall of Huronia and expansion into the *pays d'en Haut*, it was the intention of elites to establish a 'vast alliance' amongst the rival villages they interacted with within the frontier – an alliance that they believed would bring stability to the fur trade (Weyhing, 2013). The relationship between a father and his children, important to both the French Crown and Indigenous nations, though held to very different standards and understandings, was used to foster fictive kinship relations and alliances. French officials would refer to the French Crown as the 'Great Chief' or 'Father' of his children (constituting both the French settlers and Indigenous allies). This satisfied the French king who understood that such establishment of fictive kinship relations naturally extended his rule as *pater* over his subjects (which came to include Indigenous

allied nations). For the French Crown, such actions were seen as imperfect extensions (although by no means affirmations) of French sovereignty (Havard, 2013).

As many colonial officials understood, this simultaneously satisfied Indigenous allies whose understandings of the paternal relationship were constructed quite differently. For the nations with which such colonial officials allied, children were not subordinate to their father. Rather, and most importantly, "an Indian father was expected to give generously to meet his children's needs, protect them from danger, and avenge any injuries inflicted upon them" (Weyhing, 2013, 37). And so colonial officials established good relations by sustaining illusions between the French Crown and Indigenous nations – demonstrating to their hosts and allies that the king was a viable paternal character (through the gifting of regular presents) while also suggesting to the king that French notions of paternal authority were being established and upheld within the colony and frontier (Weyhing, 2013). This duplicity suggests that, while the French appeared to be deferential guests to their Indigenous hosts and allies within the interior, the broader strategy and the underlying intentions behind their actions were less than pure. Such actions were animated by imperial intentions that are themselves demonstrative of colonial mentality and behaviour. And so, at the elite policy level, actors in the fur trade might have appeared to have been largely deferential guests to the Indigenous nations they allied with in the frontier. Their actions, however, were mediated by a level of duplicity and the colonial intentions of French Crown policy to expand and strengthen sovereign claims throughout North America (Rushforth, 2013).[44]

This official level influences not only the broader analysis and understanding of the fur trade during this time, but also the roles of more common trading actors who were operating within the context established by officials and their policies. Where the vulnerability of fur traders within the interior required more guest-like relations with interior tribes, the very impetus for trade expansion was the extension of French land claims throughout the continent. The grounding of all interactions and relations within the interior was, therefore, for the French, inherently imperial. While some of the more common fur trade actors may have been more guest-like in their relations with interior nations, this foundation cannot be overlooked. Indeed,

---

[44] As explored in chapter five, French intentions for this vast alliance were repeatedly thwarted by those like the Odawa who purposely traded the French the slaves of their enemies as a barrier to treaty negotiations with those like the Sioux.

the orientations and behaviours of French fur trade actors within the interior were multifaceted and demonstrative of both colonial and guest-like behaviours.

The Shift to Colonial Regulation and Late Century Fur-Traders of the Colonial Frontier

This last section focuses on the gradual shift from free-trade to regulated fur trade economy during the late seventeenth century. An important component of this shift was the failure of initiatives like the annual trade fairs to keep trade based along the river as a means of retaining a labour force and diversifying the colony's economy. This failure was due to various factors including the consistent threat posed by Haudenosaunee raids within the *pays d'en haut* and at Montréal, as well as the behaviour of colonists within the fairs – both of which discouraged Indigenous peoples from attending. The actions of French colonists participating within these trade-based relations at Montréal were increasingly more avaricious - shaped as they were by a growing sense of security and autonomy under agrarian colonial circumstances specific to these settlements. While the free trade structure still lasted until the 1680s, it was ultimately an unstable system for the colony's continued success. This realization led to an attempt to place greater restraints on an economy that became an increasingly visible veil for the imperial interests of the French Crown. As will be seen, the actors found during this later period of greater control over the trade, actors (like the *coureur de bois* and the *voyageurs*) that came to dominate mainstream narratives of the Canadian fur trade story, were quite diverse in background and orientation. Focus throughout this last section will remain on policy and its influence over the behaviours and roles of common actors within the interior.

Once the French Crown took direct control of the colony in 1663, plans for its economy changed. Colbert, who simultaneously acted as First Minister and Minister of Finance for France in the 1660s, wanted to diversify the economic development of the colony. Encouraging diversification required controlling the fur trade so that it did not continue to eclipse the colonial economy. Ironically, the measures Colbert put in place to control the fur trade ultimately led to its over expansion (Leitner, 2015). He granted the control over the trade to the new Company of the Occident and continued to allow colonists full freedom to trade with their Indigenous allies, hosts, and neighbours on the condition that they sell all beaver and moose hides to the company at a fixed price. These measures, in combination with the peace brought to the colony by the *Carignan Salières* in the late 1660s (Eccles, 1990) led to a rush of colonists into the western frontier (Dechêne, 1992). These were favourable conditions through which common colonists

could enter the fur trade, though this led to unruly conditions, illicit trading (Dechêne, 1992), and the growing fear that supply would soon outgrow demand. Furthermore, the draw of the fur trade only served to place further strain on an already paltry labour-force along the river (Eccles, 1990). While such conditions might have been immediately favourable for common colonists, they ultimately served to threaten the French Crown's stability within the continent at the same time that they threatened Colbert's plans for a more diversified economy.

In response, Colbert ordered that public markets be established at Montréal as a means of encouraging trade within the settlement so that the male population would be less likely to desert the colony for trading in the interior. Here exchange "took place in an openly political forum" (White, 1991, 105) and attracted many Indigenous nations like the Nippisings, Huron-Petuns, Saulters, Odawas and occasionally the Potawatomis (Greer, 1997) whose interest in the annual fairs was not strictly commercial but largely militarily-based. These annual markets, however, were not without their problems. Frenchmen were quite willing to and adept at manipulating Indigenous cultural forms for their own ends. The common French participants had a tendency of looking to extort their allies during these markets: demanding large quantities of beaver pelts (rather than customary gifts of moose hides and wampum), and providing small and ultimately demeaning gifts in return. The Potawatomis in particular found that they had been treated so poorly at one point that they retaliated by pillaging the French and ultimately refusing to return (White, 1991). And so there is evidence of common French colonists acting as bad allies (and hosts of these markets) when they sought to pursue their own economic profit at the sake of maintaining friendly relations with and showing deference to their trading partners. As profit incentives and greater self-sufficiency came to animate the trade and life along the river, therefore, it appears colonists were increasingly less likely to act as denizens and more likely to act as avaricious colonialists.

While these markets were held for a number of years, by 1680, when the Haudenosaunee once again presented a credible threat to the French project, these fairs came to an end (Eccles, 1969). Despite such efforts, the draw of the fur trade remained strong for French-colonial men. This meant that available labour pools of common male colonists were drained into the trade at the same time that trade-elites, "seeking their own advantages in an expanding world of merchant capitalism," not only complicated and challenged France's mercantile edicts and military power within the interior (Weyhing, 2013, 38) but forced France to spread itself ever

thinner throughout the continent when they used the trade, (at least in part) for their own personal aggrandizement, to lay claim to territories within the mid-west (Eccles, 1990). In 1676 a royal ordinance sought to put an end to free trade by expressly prohibiting "all persons of whatever quality and state, from going to trade pelts in the villages of the savages and in the depth of the woods" (*Royal Ordinance*, 1676 cited in Goulson, 1970). Yet this directive too, had little influence in dissuading those who were, as of 1676, illegal traders – those who came to be known as *coureurs de bois*. As a 1679 letter from Intendant du Chesneau to Colbert states, even after this ordinance, merchants were supplying the illegal traders, and colonists were sheltering them as well as failing to inform local judges of their presence. Support for the *coureurs de bois*, at this point, was so strong amongst French colonists at the river that the illegal traders no longer bothered to hide themselves from officials (*Letter to M. Colbert* cite in Goulson, 1970). These men became outlaws whose roles and actions were largely condoned by French colonial society.

Finally, in 1681, Colbert had to admit defeat, that he could not confine colonists strictly to the river. Instead he looked to reduce the number of colonists who were allowed to venture into the frontier by introducing a licensing system for the trade (Eccles, 1990). Under this new system only 25 permits were issued annually to trading elites who, with a license, were "entitled to ship one cargo out West" (Dechêne, 1992, 93). Not only did the number of local merchants drop considerably under this system, it also saw the establishment of the *voyageur* – the legal traders, recognized by the Crown and local merchants (Royot, 2007). The *voyageurs* became known as a professional group. The clerks and officers (those within leadership positions within these groups) were amassed largely from the small bourgeois class: a number of smaller merchants, and the sons of officers and rich merchants. The lower echelons were increasingly composed of the peasant French. *Voyageurs*, generally, were often recruited by kin and had regional-colonial concentrations (most notably Trois-Rivières). As part of this legal system of trade, one also sees the rise of fur-trade *engagés*, drawn mainly from the urban peasant class, who tended to fill shorter work terms than their *voyageur* companions (Dechêne, 1992). Even when a royal ordinance was established granting amnesty to all *coureurs de bois* who returned to the colony with haste in 1681, many continued to trade and live illegally. It was this dual system, the legal trade by the *voyageurs* and *engagés*, and the illegal trade of the *coureurs de bois* that characterized the fur trade well into the eighteenth century. As will be further explored below, both legal and illegal traders acted as colonists and guests within the interior. Intriguingly, by the

end of the seventeenth century, French officials recognized the utility of not only their legal but also their illegal traders who were encouraged to trade within the Mississippi Valley and foster alliances there as a method of blocking the English from New Mexico (Eccles, 1969). This is indicative of the assertion that the fur trade became an increasingly thin veil for the imperial claims of France against other European powers to the vast continent of the New World.

The overarching interest of French Crown policy in North America, as explored in chapter 2, was never the fur trade but discovery and conquest (Green & Dickason, 1989; Dickason, 2001). The fur trade was an important component for French access to the interior, for its discovery and conquest, an access that grew after 1650. Yet by the mid to late seventeenth century the fur trade was becoming a burden, a drain on the French Crown's finances. With the declining market for beaver pelts, the increase in supply following policies that opened the trade to all common colonists, and even following the licensing system, France was spending more on maintaining the trade than it was getting in returns from the furs the trade supplied (Weyhing, 2013; Eccles, 1987). Even so, French policy kept the trade going – in large part because it helped the French sustain alliances with Indigenous nations that were integral for maintaining French presence and authority throughout North America as against other imperial powers. Government elites were worried that if the French Crown stepped back from the trade, and hence these alliances, their Indigenous allies would make new alliances with the Dutch and the British, which would weaken French claims to the New World. At the official level of Crown policy, therefore, the trade was maintained for military and imperial purposes. For local colonists, the trade was maintained because it was an important source of economic support. For the merchants of New France, it was a potential profitable business; for the common inhabitants, it was a means of sustenance if not a method through which to improve one's socio-economic status (Eccles, 1987). For Indigenous allies the trade was a way to accumulate European goods[45] and to secure military support against warring nations. For the *coureurs de bois* and *voyageurs* it was not only a way to gain some capital, but a way to experience freedom from colonial society. For some it became a way of life, for others it was a temporary life experience.

---

[45] Evidence suggests that Indigenous traders and their nations were initially interested in European goods for their symbolic value, as objects that were incorporated into existing social and religious orders. It was only within the very late stages of the fur trade that Indigenous peoples became interested in these goods for their material utility. White. pp. 99, 103, 133-4.

Where the mandate of the French Crown and its administrative officials appears to have been overwhelmingly colonial, the average Frenchmen who participated within the trade seem to have occupied a more ambiguous space between colonist and guest. There are two main trading roles to be identified here: *coureurs de bois* and *voyageurs.* These roles will be focused on within the licensed (1681 onward) fur trade system, as it was only under this system that these roles were established, and it was this system that provided the basis upon which the fur trade would continue into the eighteenth century – the century within which the majority of fur trade studies are focused.

The *coureurs de bois* (the runners of the wood) are the romanticized outlaws of the Canadian fur trade narrative. While it is a role that can be applied to all common colonists who participated within the fur trade, when participation was initially extended in 1647 (Dechêne, 1992), its use became increasingly synonymous with the illegal traders of the licensed system following the French Crown's 1681 ordinance. After 1681, anyone who traded without the documented authorization of colonial officials was identified as a *coureurs de bois* (Trudel, 1968). This means that even those who stayed within the colony and looked to trade furs at their doorstep would have technically been labelled as illegal *coureurs de bois*, although the term is usually used in the literature to refer specifically to those men who ventured into the interior without licenses for the trade. Colonial officials increasingly branded these men as *sauvages*, a term used to depict the reality that these men were beyond the control and authority of the colony and Crown (White, 1991) - that they were fugitives who were 'going native'. Essentially, these were men who refused to abide by the imposed licensing system and who essentially sought the ultimate freedom from the confines of the French colony – whose actions were largely condoned by common colonists, the courts (Eccles, 1990), and certain colonial officials who saw their presence in the west, their roles amongst Indigenous nations, as ultimately beneficial to economic and expansionist interests.[46] The *coureurs de bois* were not, however, men who completely severed their ties from colonial society. Many would take up rogue contracts for

[46] For instance, Intendant du Chesneau made claims that Governor General Frontenac actually favoured and sought to protect the *coureurs du bois* (and illegal trading more generally).
Indendant du Chesneau. *Letter to Minister Colbert, Nov. 10, 1679.* As cited in: Goulson. p. 322. See also: Harris. p. 180.
As work completed by W.J. Eccles suggests, Frontenac was known to favour short-term profits in trade and colonial expansion over order and good governance within the colony.
Eccles. *France in America.* p. 90.

French merchants, in some cases helping to smuggle furs to Albany where English prices for furs were higher and the quality of European goods were better (White, 1991). And so, many of these men were ultimately looking for personal profit beyond the confines of the licensing system. This suggests that, despite romantic images of *coureurs de bois* within the national narrative, as indigenized men who lived off the land, they might not actually fit so easily into a denizen or perhaps more accurately guest role.

Within the 1690s there was a rise in interracial marriages in the west. This aligns with and appears to be connected to increasingly significant attempts by French colonial officials to force illegal traders out of the frontier and back to the colony. As Richard White argues, this increase in marriage could have been the result of *coureurs de bois* looking to establish kin connections with their host and allied nations that were necessary for their continued presence within the *pays d'en haut* and interior (1992). Such action could be a sign of deference to allied nations at the same time that such an action was necessary for survival. The establishment of such close ties and relationships were not confined to the roles and actions of the *coureurs de bois* but also came to be part of the roles and actions of the legal *voyageurs*. As previously explored, the establishment of close kinship (whether through marriage or fictive kinship methods) was an important component of alliance building and subsistence for Indigenous nations with which the French came into contact. For many Indigenous nations, "economic relations were based on actual or potential kinship links, and the establishment of marital ties with Euro-American traders was a natural strategy" (Prodruchny, 2006, 255) for strengthening trading alliances with both illegal and legal French traders.

While intermarriage was practiced by both *coureurs de bois* and *voyageurs* within the frontier, there may be important differences regarding their motivations (motivations rooted within their status under French law). For both, marriage helped strengthen alliances and hence economic ties, therefore, supporting trade and profit. Yet for the *coureurs de bois,* exiled from the colony, the stakes were higher. The *coureurs de bois* were consciously and purposefully alienating themselves from the colony. Those who sought marriage with Indigenous women were taking up a life amongst their host and allied nations, likely on the understanding that they could not return to the colony (or did not want to) and that their presence within the frontier, amongst their host nations, was permanent. In marrying Indigenous women, and being formally integrated into Indigenous societies, these men were recognizing their foreignness to Indigenous

lands and societies, looking for and accepting invitation into a given society, and, at least in theory, playing by the rules of their new societies (adhering to the customs and laws of their new extended family). On the surface, these men appear to be denizens *par excellence* – men who accepted their roles as guests and yet became more. So fully did they accepted their denizen status, so well did they adhere to the customs and laws of their hosts, that they became part of their hosts' society and left their own along the river.[47]

And yet, these men were still part of the French imperial policy. While they were labelled as savage outlaws by colonial authorities, and they established themselves apart from the colony within the frontier, they were still used by the French Crown to expand imperial influence and to lay claim to territory within the interior. Their presence within the interior and their continued, though unauthorized, ties to the colony helped establish relations between the French and the Indigenous nations in the Mississippi and Ohio Valley at the same time that they helped establish imperial boundaries against the expansion of other European powers. These men might have been outlaws, but the French Crown was happy to use them as pawns of empire (Eccles, 1969; Eccles, 1990). There were definitely sustained ties between the *coureurs de bois* and the French colonial system whether through merchants, the *voyageurs* or French policy. Throughout the interior the *coureurs de bois* and the *voyageurs* frequently interacted and cooperated, despite continuous tensions between the two groups. Often, therefore, Indigenous nations had to establish separate and appropriate social ties with the two different groups of Frenchmen (illegal and legal traders) yet there would have been cases where the two groups came together for mutual benefit and cooperation (White, 1991). And so, even where one might identify the *coureurs de bois* as the most denizen-like of the French actors within seventeenth century New France, they too were not without their colonial leanings and implications.

The *voyageurs* on the other hand, were more directly and consciously linked to French colonial policy. Many would have seen their time in the trade as a temporary sojourn from colony life (Prodruchny, 2006), while others became so attached to their lives within the interior that they became career *voyageurs*. In some cases these career men eventually took up *freemen* status as former voyageurs who chose to relocate within the *pays d'en haut* or interior

---

[47] In the 19th century the descendants of many of these unions within the Prairies would come together to formulate the Métis Nation in response to colonial developments and expansion. And so one can associated the *coureurs de bois* with the founding of the distinct, Métis Nation.
Trigger. p. 196.

permanently, independently relying on trapping, trading, hunting and short labour contracts with fur trading companies for their survival. While the *voyageurs*' participation within the trade directly contributed to the imperial goals of the French Crown, and they benefited economically from their participation within the trade, their roles were actually quite complex. According to Caroloyn Podruchny, the average *voyageur* was shaped by three major influences: his French-Canadian (peasant) roots; the Indigenous peoples and cultures with which he interacted; and his hierarchical, hyper-masculine, transitory workplace (Prodruchny, 2006). Many of these men tended to be illiterate, coming from "an oral world where systems of knowledge and meaning were shared through stories and songs" (Prodruchny, 2006, 303). These men likely would have recognized a similarity between their orally-based ways and the oral tradition of their hosts and allies, lending to greater familiarity and, one would imagine, improved potential for friendlier relations. These men, who fostered their own group culture, went through symbolic rituals and real experiences during the trade that established new cultural values and meanings in their lives that would not have been present along the river. While many likely learned the languages of the Indigenous allies and hosts at the posts where they were stationed, surviving records of the bourgeois and clerks who accompanied these men suggest that French was the predominant language of the *voyageurs* – they spoke French and sang French songs as they worked. These men also maintained Roman Catholic practices, French Canadian values and cosmology (Prodruchny, 2006). These men adapted to the interior, learnt the language and customs of their allies and yet maintained their own language and culture. This sets them up as potentially good guests so long as their dealings were fair and deferential to their Indigenous allies and hosts.

While the values and practices of *voyageurs* were shaped by Indigenous peoples and, specifically, Indigenous material cultures, there was an element of French-Canadian culture that it appears the *voyageurs* never fully abandoned. In order to survive in the interior these men had to adopt certain technologies of their allies – what they ate and how they prepared it, the clothing they wore, and many of the tools they used were all influenced by or adopted from Indigenous allies. For some, connections with Indigenous allies became so strong that their notions of property, wealth and independence were influenced (Prodruchny, 2006). One posits that the more such ontological notions were influenced the greater the likelihood that an individual *voyageur* would become a *freeman*, the later of whose livelihood would be increasingly

dependent on favourable relations with Indigenous nations and so, one posits, would exhibit more denizen or guest-like behaviours and orientations.

Many of the *voyageur* men would marry Indigenous women, having families at posts during travel, which encouraged their continued participation within the trade, if not their desertion of the colony if they decided to live permanently with their wife's family – as a good number chose (Barman, 2014). Occupying unique roles within the fur trade as wives and independent traders themselves, Indigenous women played very important economic and social roles within the trade. They were central figures within alliances, they taught their husbands how to live off the land, they worked as diplomats between French and Indigenous traders, and helped incorporate traders into kin networks thereby facilitating trade (Sleeper-Smith, 2005;Van Kirk, 1999; Van Kirk, 2002; Brown, 1996). The relations between *voyageurs* and Indigenous women tended to be fluid and short-lived as the men would usually be sent to different trading posts each year. While relationships between these French men and Indigenous women were largely fluid, sexual and marital relationships tended to be monogamous. In many cases when these men were reassigned they "passed their wives and lovers onto other traders with the women's consent so that the woman was not left alone" (Prodruchny, 2006, 282). Within this transitory world, *voyageurs* and their Indigenous wives were critical components in maintaining good relations between the French and their Indigenous allies. In their willingness to adapt Indigenous material and even ontological cultures, although one might suggest that the adoption of such cultures was necessary to survival, and their marriage to Indigenous women and induction into kinship relations one might suggests that these men represent denizen-like or guest-like characters. Men who understood their vulnerability and foreignness to interior nations and their lands, while recognizing these nations inherent sovereignty and stewardship over these lands and acting in kind.

In many cases, for both the *voyageur* and *coureur de bois*, it appears the trader recognized his dependence on his Indigenous hosts, he adapted to his new environs and did not appear to superimpose his French-Canadian colonial society within the interior. In some cases he was invited into society (likely through marriage), inducted into pre-existing relations of kinship within which he stayed if he upheld his responsibilities to his wife, and the maintenance of good relations with her people. Though one must remember that unless he became a *freeman*, the *voyageur* was still a sojourner within the interior – experiencing the privilege of moving back

and forth between colonial settlement, trading post and possibly his wife's family's camp. It appears that such liminality may have better enabled these men to adapt to the sort of fluid and cultural order necessary during this time to take up a denizen or guest-like role.

And yet relations between traders and Indigenous peoples were not always positive (Royot, 2007). Many French traders rejected Indigenous demands for generosity. Likely those who did tended to fall within the sojourner-camp, looking for quick profits in the trade that they could live off of (if not prosper from) within their colonial community along the river. There were enough of these profit-seeking men, however, that by the late century nations like the Fox and Potawatomis were developing poor opinions of the French. While the annual markets at Montréal had a role to play here, there is little doubt that avaricious traders, functioning as bad ally, had an important role to play. At various points individual exchanges became so tense that violence ensued. In 1684, for instance, thirty-nine French traders were executed at the hands of western Algonquins when they did not meet the economic or social expectations of their allies and hosts (White, 1991). Undeniably all men who entered the trade were looking for some sort of profit, at least initially. Some were led by this desire for profit and exhibited colonial behaviour (which in some cases led to their deaths), some were led by a search for 'freedom' from colonial society, while others became entwined within a new world and society grappling between their colonial-leanings and denizen potential.

Ultimately, the roles of late-century French men within the interior fur trade are multifaceted, simultaneously demonstrating the actions and interests of colonists, guests, denizens, and those in between. Further and more in-depth study of these actors from a denizen-lens is desirable. The French players were all so diverse, and there were so many of them within the fur trade itself that their study could almost be limitless. There are, however, still some broad claims and insights that can be gleaned from so brief an analysis. These men constitute both legal and illegal actors, those seeking profit at any cost, and those who ultimately abandoned colonial life. There is no one role of the French fur trader within seventeenth century North America. Instead there are those men who readily played into colonial policy, acting as greedy colonists who sought to dupe their allies and hosts. There were others who struggled with their desire for profit and their understanding that they needed to act in respectful and honest ways with their allies and hosts. And there were others still who sought to integrate into their allies and hosts' societies, in some cases eventually abandoning their lives along the river. And, surely, there are

others who fluctuated between these three broadly outlined groups. At the end of the day, irrespective of their status as legal or illegal traders, and independent of how far they had severed ties with the colony, all of these mens' actions occurred within a broader French-colonial project through which the Crown was looking to expand its claim of discovery throughout the continent. These men, independent of their specific roles, had a part to play in making this imperial expansion a possibility. And so, French fur trading actors, variously situated exhibited colonial and denizen/guest behaviours as they grappled with their own vulnerability within the interior, the colonial project that enabled them to travel and trade and their varying desires for profit and freedom.

Summary

While the fur trade was always a tool of French colonial ambitions, during the seventeenth century it's structure and actors underwent several transformations. These transformations had an effect on the roles, orientations and behaviours of non-Indigenous actors as colonists, denizens and guests both along the river and within the interior. During early periods of monopoly (1610-1647), when it was technically illegal for common colonists along the river to trade with Indigenous peoples, those who traded illicitly carved paths for their own denizen-like behaviour. Such early colonists, if they traded during this time for their own subsistence, in mutual-respect and deference for Indigenous trading customs, have been identified here as exhibiting denizen-like behaviours in their illicit relations with local and visiting Indigenous peoples. With the shift to a free-trade economy, however, motivations for entering the trade clearly shifted from subsistence to profit as the scale of involvement and opportunity altered for colonists within the economy. There is, therefore, reason to believe that as the structure of the fur trade shifted from monopoly to free-trade, the roles of average colonists shifted from potential illicit-trader-*denizens* to roles more closely aligned with colonial means and aims focused on profit and personal aggrandisement. As the trade was once again heavily administrated by the end of the century, one sees a plethora of differently situated and motivated actors within the interior whose actions and orientations fall within both colonial and denizen-like camps, sometimes simultaneously. At the end of the day, all of these actors participating with the trade economy during the seventeenth century were working within a structure through which broader French imperial goals were the primary focus. The roles of these men as colonists, denizens, and guests must, therefore, be considered in light of these broader

interests and French policies. Even those who acted deferentially toward interior nations, even those who acted against French policy within guest or denizen-like orientations, were ultimately aiding the broader French colonial project. While one might highlight certain denizen and guest-leanings amongst these actors, such moves must be taken from within this broader context and understanding of the structure of the trade within French imperialism.

<div align="center">***</div>

These last six chapters have been focused on un-covering the roles of seventeenth century French colonists within the northern reaches of North America. Specifically, I have sought to explore some of the multifaceted contexts that French colonists found themselves in (e.g. agrarian colonist, sojourner, religious colonist, etc.) in an effort to explore what their roles and interests in the French colonial project were during the seventeenth century and how their behaviours aligned with colonial and/or denizen orientations toward Indigenous peoples and lands. What I have found, and what this last chapter has continued to demonstrate, is that colonists during these years were caught between dependence and self-interest in their relations and orientations to Indigenous peoples and lands. Both dependence and self-interest were always present to varying degrees and as such, both denizen and guest-like orientations (dependence) and colonialist orientations (self-interest) were also always present. While there is a trajectory one could identify amidst official policy – the more self-sufficient the colony became the less dependent they were on Indigenous allies and so the less denizen and more colonialist their behaviours – such orientations were always context-specific. Consider for instance the fact that trading actors within the interior, where they were outnumbered and vulnerable amongst Indigenous allies and the elements, became increasingly more likely (on an individual/local scale) to act more denizen/guest-like toward Indigenous peoples and lands. And that this occurred at the same time that French colonists along the river are becoming increasingly self-sufficient and colonialist in their interactions with Indigenous peoples and lands. Roles, relations and orientations during this period were highly context-specific. In order to 'find the denizen', to identify the multifaceted roles of variously situated colonists, therefore, one needs to explore the interconnections – identify the limitless number of situations and contexts beyond even the work begun here.

While all of these French actors' roles and actions were ultimately circumscribed within the broader French imperial project that brought them to the shores of North America – there is

still much to be learnt from their study. There are still many insights to be gleaned from analysis throughout the historical chapters. Beyond a more critical re-writing of shared histories – one that highlights, for instance, the less romanticized roles of the *coureurs de bois* or the over-arching imperial goals of French interests in the fur trade, there are the insights to be identified in colonists' actions for a contemporary articulation of the *denizen*. Here one might consider the demonstrated trend that when there is a need for or mutual dependence between non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples, the French colonists were more likely to act deferentially toward their Indigenous allies – to act more like denizens. Yes, ultimately, then, these actors were still acting in self-interest, but they were still ultimately orienting themselves more like denizens (along the river) or guests (within the interior). What might this mean for today? This suggests that identifying common dependencies, ones that exist outside of the citizenship/western state structure (such as concern for the environment), might be an aligning force through which to instantiate a contemporary denizen ethos. It appears that such dependencies may in fact be necessary catalysts toward such re-orientation of the non-Indigenous body.

The following chapter tracks ahead to the mid eighteenth century to uncover how, under British rule, through citizenship regimes, the colonist body gradually shifted into a clearly colonially-oriented body under what became, by the 1860s, a settler colonial structure. As such, this penultimate chapter identifies the relationship between citizenship and settler colonialism through critical theory as well as critical junctures in British-Canadian policies and events in citizenship and colonialism from 1763 to 1982. This exploration, therefore, not only demonstrates the lengths non-Indigenous peoples have formally taken from denizen-like orientations in their relation to state, society and Indigenous peoples and lands, but also the ways that non-Indigenous peoples have indirectly been implicated in colonialism since 1763. This last chapter cements the need to move past contemporary regimes in response to Indigenous calls for decolonization.

Chapter 8: The Development Away from Denizen: Citizenship, Colonialism and the Crown (1763-1982)

Throughout this dissertation, citizenship has been used as a foil to explore the theory and practice of a colonial-focused denizenship as a way toward decolonization. In this final chapter I now turn to a more direct discussion of citizenship and its regimes throughout Canadian history (1763-present). This exploration is an important addition to the dissertation as citizenship is a dominant lens through which scholars of Canadian history and politics have thought, and continue to think, about Canadians and Indigenous peoples. My argument throughout this dissertation is that citizenship should not be the starting point, or the dominant lens here because, as I will show in the following chapter, it is deeply rooted in colonialism. And, as previously identified in chapter 1, it looks to preclude relational possibilities beyond its own logics and boundaries. The ability to think and work beyond contemporary logics and boundaries are, however, necessary in the move toward a substantive decolonization that actually responds to Indigenous calls for change. While I have, up until now, been speaking of New France and French history in North America, in exploring the lens of citizenship, focused within the 19th and 20th centuries, I will be shifting attention to English/anglophone narratives (although still discussing, at various points the continued import of the French/francophone narratives) as the English narratives are the dominant ones that have informed the national citizen lens since 1763. The following chapter, therefore, looks to uncover the relationship between Anglo-grounded citizenship and settler colonialism[48] within the Canadian context as a way of grounding the argument for a paradigm shift away from citizenship toward denizenship. This also serves as a demonstration of the various and quotidian ways non-Indigenous, Canadian citizens are implicated in colonialism through their relations with the state.

At its most basic level, citizenship is about membership within a polity. As such, it is often seen as a progressive good within society – a means through which members understand their sense of place and belonging within a nation. It serves to unify, define and secure a peoples' interests against other worldly actors. Under a liberal-democratic paradigm, citizenship strives to unify and protect its members through the guarantee of select negative and, in some instances, positive rights focused on the individual of the broader citizen-community (Adamoski et al.,

---

[48] I look at settler colonialism specifically because this has been the dominant form of colonialism guiding Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations within Canada since the 1860s.

2002). It is this liberal-democratic paradigm that grounds Canada's formal citizenship regime most clearly manifested in the 1982 *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* which is primarily a classical liberal defense of negative rights at its core. While it has afforded its citizens many privileges, when one peels back the layers and delves beneath the surface of this sort of citizenship - when one approaches its study from a critical, colonial lens - the damaging and negative functionality of its structures and mechanisms become clearer. It subjects its members to state authority at the same time that it provides them freedoms from state interference, it demarcates members from supposed 'others' in potentially harmful ways and, in certain circumstances, it seeks to forcefully incorporate such 'others' within the body politic so as to reduce the threat their otherness presents to the broader whole and its sovereignty. Citizenship, from this lens, is a complex and imperfect mechanism which has played a very specific and important role in the colonization of Indigenous life and land. Thus, citizenship has an important place of analysis within the discursive exercise of the colonial-denizen that I have been presenting throughout my dissertation.

When approaching citizenship in Canada from the standpoint of the colonial denizen, it is clear that citizenship is a story of antagonistic relations of the state toward Indigenous peoples. Under a denizen-lens, the proper guiding relationship for defining belonging within the country should have always been more directly established and sustained between Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous peoples, with non-Indigenous peoples needing to be invited onto Indigenous lands and into Indigenous legal, political and social structures. Such a relationship could have (ideally) guided its non-Indigenous members away from colonialism and towards more deferent, respectful relationships that acknowledged and upheld the primacy of Indigenous nation-hoods and sovereignties. Instead, this more fundamental relationship has been not only ignored but actively attacked by colonial practices. In fact, since the *Royal Proclamation* of 1763 the Crown has been established as arbiter of both non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples. This is a foundational violence within the state, as it superimposed relationships that have not only attempted to displace Indigenous nation-hoods and sovereignties (Palmater, 2011) but that have also looked to foreclose the important and more direct Indigenous-Colonist relations necessary

for meaningful non-colonial relations.[49] Moreover, the separation between non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples has enabled and encouraged non-Indigenous peoples to distance themselves from their colonial implications when they point to the Crown as both colonial problem-maker and solver. The Crown, therefore, has established and sustained the dual arbiter relationships of Crown-Indigenous and Crown-Colonists that has informed and been sustained through various Canadian citizenship regimes and colonial policies. And which has further facilitated the logics and structures that uphold colonial relations. From such a vantage point, as will become clearer within this chapter, citizenship in Canada is not a clear-cut mechanism through which to guarantee the securities and freedoms of its members, as it is commonly understood by non-Indigenous citizens. It is also a colonizing apparatus through which non-Indigenous state and society have sought to erase Indigenous peoples for their own material and psychological benefit as settler-colonists of a vulnerable and super-imposed nation-state.

The following, final, chapter of my dissertation, therefore, focuses on the relationship between Canadian citizenship and settler colonialism from 1763 to the present. While analysis begins prior to the demarcated settler colonial turn of the 1860s (Greer, 2018), the focus throughout this chapter remains on the lead up to as well as the development and sustenance of settler colonial structures and processes within Canada. Herein I suggest that citizenship is a critical mechanism of settler colonialism enabling not only the displacement of Indigenous peoples and their political and legal communities but also their continued erasure. I argue that as non-Indigenous peoples have sought greater definition and autonomy for themselves as political actors, the colonial policies that seek to contain Indigenous peoples (who represent an excess to the citizenization[50] process) have become increasingly destructive and disabling – even when they have been increasingly identified as acts of improvement and redress. This is true within both anglophone and francophone Canada. It is not just mainstream, Canadian identity and citizenship definition that has fed into this relationship. As the work of Joëlle-Alice Michaud-Ouellet identifies, Québécois claims for self-determination and the reification of Québécois identity have, specifically since the Quiet Revolution, been intimately tied to the erasure and/or enclosure of Indigenous peoples within the French-Canadian narrative (2019). This relationship

---

[49] Here I recognize, and will address further below, that the *Royal Proclamation* is also recognized as a positive document in the protection of Indigenous rights in that it has been recognized as a foundational document through which the Crown 'recognized' that, in some capacity, Indigenous lands were 'owned' by Indigenous peoples.
[50] The process through which select people become citizens of a given polity.

between settler identity/belonging and settler colonialism is, therefore, taking place within both anglo- and franco-Canada. Settlers have been using and continue to use citizenship, belonging and self-determination as malleable weapons against Indigenous difference, sovereignty and the threat they pose to settler claims for sovereignty, security and society.

This analysis, therefore, serves a tripartite purpose as part of the broader discursive exercise presented within this dissertation. First of all, this chapter enables me to identify the clear and damaging move in the 19th century from denizenship, as an historical possibility of Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations and belonging within the country, toward colonial citizenship, as a mutually re-enforcing mechanism of settler state and society. Secondly, it allows me to identify what specific functions citizenship has been playing within Canadian settler colonialism and how it has contributed to defining and redefining Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations since 1763. Here focus will remain on the weaponization of citizenship over the decades and how this weaponization has become increasingly surreptitious. An important part of this second point is a demonstration of some of the ways through which contemporary non-Indigenous Canadians are implicated within colonialism through their status as citizens of the Canadian settler state. Finally, in supporting these arguments, this last chapter bolsters the major argument of my dissertation that a paradigm shift is needed and can be accomplished through the instantiation of a contemporary colonial-denizen ethos that itself requires a step away from the contemporary Canadian citizenship regime, the re-alignment of responsibilities as foreigners in need of invitation from local Indigenous peoples, and (as a new point of argument within this last chapter) the renewal of relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples that eliminates, or at least moves beyond, the Crown as arbiter/obstacle to better relations between parties.

This paper begins with a short theoretical overview of the relationship between citizenship and settler colonialism that will help guide the analysis of critical junctures in the citizenship-colonialism relationship as I am presenting it here. From here I will focus on four critical moments in the citizenship-colonialism evolution: the 1857 *Gradual Civilization Act*, the 1869 *Gradual Enfranchisement Act*, the 1969 *White Paper*, and the inclusion of section 35 and the entrenchment of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* into the 1982 *Constitution Act*. I will explore these junctures through a critical colonial lens, focusing on the role that contemporary citizenship regimes were playing within the broader colonial project during these various

moments. Here I will be asking what the relationship between citizenship and colonial policy was and how this relationship influenced the broader settler colonial project and the role of non-Indigenous peoples therein. Throughout my analysis I will be pointing to one particularly troubling structural feature of the relations between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples established by the 1763 *Royal Proclamation* (which placed the British Crown as arbiter of both, and effectively between, Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples), highlighting the real need to move beyond such structural constraints to more direct relations in the search for a denizen ethos and a decolonial future.

The Relationship between Citizenship and Settler Colonialism

There are direct and clearly violent ways through which citizenship has been used as a tool of domination against Indigenous peoples – when it has been imposed upon them by non-Indigenous state and society (Palmater, 2011; Simpson, 2014). There are various examples of this throughout Canadian history from early civilization and enfranchisement acts through to the 1969 *White Paper*, which sought to eliminate 'Indian' status (and with it Indigenous peoples' rights under the Canadian state) through forcefully incorporating Indigenous peoples into the Canadian citizenship regime by constituting them not as autonomous 'peoples' but as individual citizens. While such direct and adversarial applications of citizenship are important to identify and understand, it is also important to identify and understand the less obvious ways through which citizenship has been naturally mobilized toward colonial ends and how these mobilizations implicate colonists in various and quotidian ways within the broader colonial project. Identifying and understanding the latter requires coming to know citizenship as both a structure (or a regime) and a practice.

The concept of a 'citizenship regime' (structure) is relatively new. Its use within the literature on citizenship studies originates with Jane Jenson's work in the 1990s. According to Jenson, and scholars who have since adopted the concept, citizenship is a structure in the sense that for periods of time there is a stability produced through consistent, largely state-associated, social and power relations that are difficult to change (1997). For example, in Canada one might think of the post-war, welfare-state period as encompassing a specific citizenship regime that gave way to a more neoliberally focused regime. Importantly, citizenship is simultaneously a practice, an "act of collective representation in relation to the citizenship regime" (Papillon, 2018, 81) itself. Citizens, therefore, are both parts within a structure as well as agents of, and so

active proponents or opponents to, maintenance and change of this structure. In other words, citizens are both guided by citizenship regimes and capable of collectively invoking change within citizenship regimes.

Whatever specific formulation the citizenship regime has taken throughout the settler-state's history it has always been a tool of colonialism (Simpson, 2014). It has been used to help legitimize the primary goal of the settler project – the claim to and taking up of Indigenous lands by settlers and their settler state for the purposes of their own material gain and privilege. Here, citizenship specifically enables the project of indigenization to foreign lands (the project of settlers claiming foreign lands as their own) as it provides a narrative that discursively and symbolically links settlers 'legitimately' to these lands. This move to define the settler citizen, so important for grounding claims to Indigenous territory, requires the erasure (as physical destruction, isolation and/or assimilation) of Indigenous peoples' continuing sovereign existence since this inherent sovereign existence threatens the legitimacy of the intertwined citizenization and land claiming processes of settler colonialism. Here settler self-constitution (citizenization) as a political body is still dependent on the creation of non-sovereign exogenous and Indigenous others against which the settler body normalizes and so indigenizes itself (Veracini, 2010) – even where this body looks to erase and/or incorporate the very difference against which it defines itself. And so Indigenous peoples, whose nation-hoods and sovereignties are erased, even when their existence as largely a-political or non-political entities is identified, remain a threat to this project of indigenization. The colonial community of citizens, therefore, becomes, as Suneri Thobani argues, "a community based in the legal negation of Aboriginal sovereignty" (2007, 73) wherein the Canadian citizen, as a legal subject, is conceived through the violence of dispossession and erasure - supporting and reproducing the settler state and its colonial structure and processes through her practices as a good citizen. It is because the articulation and sustenance of settler state and society is dependent on this successful destruction, or at least the effective containment, of Indigenous self-determination that the nation is vulnerable and hence re-active to Indigenous land and sovereignty claims. Within this complex alignment of power relations and actors, citizenship (belonging and its rights and privileges) becomes a status that mobilizes national subjects, even where they may be classed, gendered and racialized, to defend the institutions against which claims by Indigenous 'outsiders' are made (Thobani, 2007). Yet, to recognize citizenship as more than a structure but also a practice is to realize that its members are

not beholden to the structures they are both constituted by and help to sustain. There is choice and agency to collectively act and demand otherwise. The move to decolonization demands active recognition of the ability of and need for all to act otherwise.

It is my fundamental contention in this thesis that the recognition of a denizen ethos, as a paradigm shift for non-Indigenous society towards the privileging of responsibilities over rights, requires the recognition of this dual nature of citizenship (as structure and practice) as well as the fact that contemporary manifestations of the citizenship regime are changeable through collective action. It is this very collective action and so recognition of agency that will be necessary in the step away from a politics of negative liberal rights and recognition toward a politics of responsibilities as denizens. It is citizenship and its associated colonial structures and processes (settlement, economic development, nation building), which are all focused on land, that have been continually used by settler state and society to attempt to indigenize settler-colonists and so have necessitated (from within a settler colonial logic) the erasure of Indigenous peoples. The methods of erasure, along with their destructive and productive modes and qualities have changed alongside regime shifts over time. This erasure, as I will show, increasingly embodies productive forces of involuntary inclusions within the regime. It is this understanding of the relationship between citizenship as structure and practice within settler colonialism that guides the following analysis.

Yet how does one study the development of Canadian citizenship itself? As Janine Brodie's work has demonstrated, there are many ways through which to study the development of Canadian citizenship regimes (2002). For instance, one can study it from a legal-lens, a rights-based lens and even a governance-lens. While I will attempt to inclusively discuss all three areas, my focus will remain on governance since analyzing the relationship between citizenship and settler colonialism requires uncovering the different power relations and governing philosophies that have animated both colonial and citizenship-based policy.

Using Jenson's citizenship regime theory, Brodie has traced the evolution of Canadian citizenship through different regimes of governmentality from confederation to the early twenty-first century. She identifies three major regime shifts during this period: the imperial subject (1867-1940s), the social citizen (1950s-1960s), and the entrepreneurial citizen (1980s-present) which correspond to shifts in governing philosophy. The imperial subject aligns with the early governing philosophy and structures of the Dominion. During this time, Britain still maintained a

great degree of control over Canada; there was no clearly defined 'Canadian citizen', only British subjects; and the ideal 'citizen' was a loyal subject to the British empire. The social citizen, alternatively, aligns with post second world war sentiments of a specifically 'Canadian' identity; the instantiation of a defined 'Canadian citizen'; and the rise of the welfare state and so a citizenship based on political and social rights. Here one sees the emergence of the contemporary notion of an ideal Canadian citizen as a bearer of individual rights who believed in state-based pledges of equality and their responsibility toward to collective common good. Finally, the entrepreneurial citizen that has taken shape since the 1980s corresponds to the neo-liberal turn and with it the clawing back of universal social security; a renewed trust and reliance on the market and competition in state-led policy; and diminished citizenship-based rights and democratic governance. Under this regime the ideal citizen is one who supports the recession of government intervention and is able to compete within and contribute to the national and global economy.

I will use these three broad regime shifts (approached through a settler colonial lens) and their instantiations of the 'ideal citizen' to guide my analysis of the four critical junctures in colonial/citizenship policy previously identified: the *Gradual Civilization Act* (1857), the *Gradual Enfranchisement Act* (1869), the *White Paper* (1969), and the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* as well as section 35 of the *Constitution Act* (1982). The first of these critical junctures actually focuses on the shifting relations that took both citizenship and colonial policy from the 1763 *Royal Proclamation* to the 1857 *Gradual Civilization Act* – this broader focus is required here in order to ground not only one's understanding of the 1857 act but also broader analysis within this chapter since it was the 1763 proclamation that set the stage for British North American and then Canadian citizenship as well as colonially-based policy. It is my intention that Brodie's work will enrich the following exploration of the relationship between citizenship regimes and settler colonialism within Canada.

The Gradual Civilization Act, the Pre-Confederate Imperial Subject, and the Targeted 'Indian'

The 1857 *Gradual Civilization Act* was a clear juncture in Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations in British North America. It drastically shifted official colonial policy toward Indigenous peoples and presaged the settler colonial turn of the 1860s. While official policy had previously placed Indigenous allies in more (formally) equal (although always differentiated)

relation to Euro-British and Euro-French subjects under English law (Harring, 1998), this 1857 legislation specifically set Indigenous peoples apart from other subjects as 'Indians' (legal inferiors) who were to be 'civilized' (assimilated) into British-settler society. This policy was derived from various commissions conducted by Britain throughout the early 1800s (Smith, 2014; Harring, 1998) – commissions which supported the increasingly popular civilization theory that Indigenous peoples were at a lower rung than Europeans along an imaginary ladder or scale of progress and needed to be helped in order to achieve the level of civilization within which Europeans had found themselves (Smith, 2012; Asch, 2011). A theory that helped substantiate the equally damaging theory that the disappearance of Indigenous peoples was inevitable (Sioui, 1992). The following analyzes this piece of legislation as a critical juncture in Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations, and the first major weaponization of citizenship within this broader narrative, by exploring the context of its introduction into British North American law. I begin this analysis by briefly exploring the context and implications of the *Royal Proclamation* of 1763 which informs and yet differs from the early settler colonial turn of the *Gradual Civilization Act*. This exploration provides the background through which to understand the original position of the imperial subject in British North America so that one can appreciate the changing interests of this subject body and its influence on colonial policy leading into 1857. I will then investigate the specific citizenship and colonial-based contexts that set the stage for the 1857 *Gradual Civilization Act* with a view toward understanding how it functioned as a formal re-structuring of Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations that the shifting citizenship regime already reflected and so demanded.

The 1763 *Royal Proclamation* was issued by the British Crown following the Seven Years War with France, which was fought over their competing territorial claims in North America. It is generally understood that through this proclamation the British Crown claimed victory over France, her 'settled' North American territories and colonial subjects; formally fulfilled wartime promises to the Crown's Indigenous allies to protect their lands against their European subjects' *further* encroachment – a measure that gained greater importance following Pontiac's Resistance (Lawrence, 2002); and laid the groundwork for claiming sovereignty over the entire continent of North America through the language and theory of protection as well as a program of public purchases (Callow, 2015; Borrows, 1994; Havard, 2013). While identified as an inherently imperial document by many (Otis, 2015; Green and Dickason, 1989; Slattery,

2002; Mackey, 2016; Valcourt, 2015), the *Royal Proclamation* has been seen as an important founding document in the recognition of Indigenous territorial rights (RCAP, 1996; Hutchings, 1987; Walter, 2015) especially when paired with a longer history of treaty-based relations like the 1764 Treaty at Niagara (Borrows, 1997). Importantly, the document formally recognized and entrenched an ongoing process for treaty-based relations (Slattery, 2013), necessary for nation-to-nation relationships, and has been identified as the legal instantiation of the Honour of the Crown to 'protect' Indigenous peoples from further settler encroachment (Slattery, 2014). Drawn in this light, the document has been portrayed in a largely positive light as a document from which to draw decolonial-based initiatives premised on nation-to-nation relations and Indigenous land rights (RCAP, 1996). Approached from such an angle, the document appears to be an exception within the citizenship-colonialism narrative - a moment during which Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations were (at least formally) equal and respectful.

Approaching the document with the specific intention of uncovering its implications within and leading into settler citizenship, however, requires a further parsing of the document's complex colonial entanglements. For my purposes here, one has to also explore the *Royal Proclamation* as representing three major developments in citizenship (or subject-hood) and Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations: the extension of empire, claims of sovereignty, and the disjuncture between the citizenship regime and citizens' interests – advances that are important to identify and analyze in forming one's understanding of the critical juncture represented by the *Gradual Civilization Act* of 1857.

First of all, as grounded in Alan Greer's work (2018), this document represented an extension of the British Empire over the entire North American continent for the purposes of imperial expansion and strength against other European powers. It was a claim for the British Empire to the breadth of lands therein ('settled' and 'unsettled') even though it did not represent the actual, physical colonization of these Indigenous lands themselves. It did, however, present a program for the eventual colonization of these Indigenous lands through which the continent could (and would) eventually be taken up for physical occupation and use by British government and subjects. And while it did recognize a limited right of Indigenous peoples to their territories under the common law, in identifying Indigenous peoples as "Nations or Tribes of Indians with whom we are connected, and who live under our Protection," (1763) it ultimately could be seen

as an early attempt to incorporate Indigenous nations under the Crown's authority through the insidious imposition of vassal-like relations (Havard, 2015).

This points to the fact that, at its core, the *Royal Proclamation* was about formally invoking British administrative control in North America. The document itself identifies the boundaries of its imperial territories and colonies (however poorly), defines the character of its subjects, and establishes the provisions for its subjects' colonial governments and their relations with Indigenous peoples. While the Crown would have been looking to affirm its imperial reach throughout the continent, it could not be entirely direct and straight-forward due to the real power and influence of Indigenous nations therein (Lawrence, 2002). The language of the *Royal Proclamation* reflects the tension between the imperial intentions of the Crown and the realities of power and politics with Indigenous peoples on the ground. While it technically only refers to Europeans as its British subjects, and identifies 'Indian' as a distinct and acceptable category of people, its language confuses the place of Indigenous peoples. Within the document Indigenous peoples are simultaneously identified as 'free' within their own territories and yet are continually subjected to British authority – their own laws and sovereignties identified as secondary to the British common law. Take for instance the power the Crown provides to its own officers to "seize and apprehend all Persons whatever who standing charged of Treason, Misprisions of Treason, Murders, and other Felonies or Misdemeanours, [who] shall fly from Justice and take Refuge in the said [Indian] Territory" (1763) to enter Indigenous territories and arrest their own subjects. If the full sovereignty and autonomy of Indigenous peoples was recognized under the *Royal Proclamation* British officers would not have been permitted to enter Indigenous territories to arrest their British subjects but would have had to enter nation-to-nation negotiations for the criminals' return. While the document appears to pay heed to Indigenous allies, recognizing and identifying their territorial rights under the common law, its larger blue-print for relations suggests an early bent toward the infringement of Indigenous nation-hoods and sovereignties which is indicative of the colonization of Indigenous life and land that would come to define the late 19th century. As uncovered in the work of Alain Beaulieu, the document's application within the boundaries of the present-day province of Québec has historically also been used to diminish the inherent rights of many Indigenous peoples to their traditional territories such as the Wyandot of the Laurentian Valley (2013).

Secondly, it replaced more direct Indigenous-non-Indigenous negotiations over land (a move deemed necessary at the time) and (potential) sharing between peoples to relationships wherein the Crown not only became sovereign but also arbiter over both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in distinctive and distancing ways. This enabled the displacement of more direct relations between Indigenous and colonialist people (necessary in the move toward a denizen ethos) while further encroaching upon Indigenous nation-hoods and sovereignties. While the document did identify Indigenous peoples as 'Indians' (as a category distinct from other subjects), unlike future colonial policies forcefully premised on assimilation, there is a salient implication that this was an ongoing distinction which was acceptable to policy makers and the Crown in ways it would not be following 1857. In this way the proclamation was a policy premised on some form of nation-to-nation relationship, even if it was more vassal-like in nature, that was not clearly premised on assimilation but the maintenance of relations as distinct peoples – even when this was a relationship to be buffered and arbitrated by the Crown and its imposed sovereignty.

The crux around which this vassal-like relationship between the Crown and Indigenous peoples was formulated within the document refers to Britain's focus on limiting the actions of its European subjects in the move to protect its imperial interests in North America. The 1763 document was not only a response to British victory at the end of the 7 Years War, therefore, but also to an aggressive pattern of colonialist encroachment onto Indigenous lands and the fulfilment of promises to stop this encroachment given Indigenous allies' aid in successful war against the French. The establishment of settled boundaries in distinction to Indigenous lands was part of fulfilling this promise, as was the forbidding of individual colonialist and colonial governments from purchasing or settling any identified Indigenous lands (Borrows, 1997). This aspect of the document was, therefore, about establishing a buffer between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples so as to 'protect' and appease Britain's Indigenous allies who were still considered important military and economic allies (Witgen, 2012). Yet the document's stipulations did not end there, it also formally established, within British common law, a program of public purchases (treaties) through which "any of the Said Indians should be inclined to dispose of the Said Lands, the same shall be Purchased only for Us [Britain], in our Name, at some public Meeting or Assembly of the said Indians" (1763). Effectively, therefore, while the *Royal Proclamation* can be seen to protect the treaty process, and hence nation-to-nation

relations, it did so in a way that severely limited Indigenous nation-hoods and sovereignties by identifying a sole party with which all Indigenous nations of North America can make treaty: the British Crown.

Finally, it was also a response *against* the Crown's British subjects, [51] who were aggressively encroaching on Indigenous lands, and so is representative of a disjuncture between the citizenship regime and the actual interests and desires of its citizens. This demonstrates the duality of citizenship as both structure and action as, in the move from the *Royal Proclamation* to the *Gradual Civilization Act*, one sees this structure shift to meet citizens' alternative interests and actions. While there are several reasons why the regime would not have aligned with the nascent settler colonial interest of its subjects at this point (military concerns, the prerogative of the imperial Crown), the fact of the misalignment between imperial policy and subjects' interests, combined with growing calls for democracy and settler self-governance through the 19th century, helps explain how the colonial policy shifted so drastically from the 1763 *Royal Proclamation*, which recognized a level of autonomy and sovereignty held by Indigenous peoples as 'Indians' to be held separate from other British subjects, to the 1857 *Gradual Civilization Act*, which clearly called for their assimilation into colonial society as formally undifferentiated British subjects.

The *Royal Proclamation* is a source of some debate and tension making it difficult to place within a broader schematic of colonialism. Simultaneously a document to be upheld, for its acknowledgement of Indigenous land rights and treaty relations, and a document to be weary of, for its clear imperial overtones surrounding imposed sovereignty and 'protection'. It was primarily, from the British point of view, about establishing authority within the lands they had conquered from the French – lands both physically settled and symbolically claimed through treaty and trade. It established fundamental structures of colonial policy that would last into present day, acknowledging some form of Indigenous land rights while simultaneously placing the British Crown as sovereign and arbiter over Indigenous peoples and its own European subjects. It established a program of public purchases (based within the treaty tradition) that would eventually enable the Crown to physically lay claim to greater and greater swathes of the

---

[51] The expansive focus of the British imperial subject was, according to Alan Greer (2018), due in part to British-specific modes and theories of empire-building and colonization which, unlike French subjects of the Laurentian Valley under the French regime, led to an expansive colonial commons and the aggressive encroachment of Indigenous territories.

country. Importantly, this move to 'protect' Indigenous peoples from an aggressive, land-hungry colonial body also demonstrates a moment through which citizenship structure did not represent the actual interests of its citizens – beyond protection from military force.

As one will recall from Brodie's analysis of the imperial subject, the ideal subject at this time would have been deferent to the Crown and acceded to the sovereign's vision and demands. Encroachers, rebels, and advocates for democracy were not ideal subjects. Yet, as their numbers grew in the 19th century and the Crown became less interested in its North American colony as imperial outpost, the Crown became more willing to adapt policy to these localized interests. The demands for greater autonomy and access to lands demonstrates that the citizen body refused the structural constraints of this initial British North American regime. Thus, as time went on and the imperial subject body became larger, stronger and louder, focused as it was on its own autonomy and settler colonial aspirations, colonial policy, as will be seen, began shifting as early as the mid-eighteenth century. This eventually led to a larger shift in citizenship structure and with it the weaponization of citizenship itself against Indigenous peoples.

By the end of the War of 1812 one sees the first noticeable shift in London's formal colonial policy toward Indigenous peoples who were transformed from allies to obstacles of British imperial interests (Lawrence, 2002). This led to a shift in colonial policy by the 1820s and 1830s from a policy of co-existence between distinct peoples overseen by the British Crown, as final arbiter in relations, toward a more clearly assimilative policy of Christianization and agrarian-based colonization of Indigenous peoples - particularly in the North West. Although the Crown at this point articulated its aspiration to 'civilize' Indigenous peoples as part of its duty to strengthen and 'protect' them from its own European subjects (Harring, 1998). In fact, in the 1820s London actually began civilization experiments when it encouraged Indigenous peoples to gather and settle on isolated reserves where they were taught agriculture and religion. These experiments led to a patchwork of reserves across areas settled by Europeans and became the foundation upon which a formal reserve system was eventually established in 1876 (TRC, 2016a). Britain also supported the creation of day schools for 'Indian re-education' which by the 1840s led to the establishment of a handful of residential schools (boarding schools) that informed the development of the post-Confederation residential schools system (Wesley-Esquimaux & Smolewski, 2004; Milloy & McCallum, 2017; Miller, 1989). Such Crown actions were still indicative of imperial-based interests – the provision of British civilization to the

'other', which was meant to result in the expansion of the same empire across the northern reaches of the continent and which still enabled a policy of 'protecting' Indigenous peoples from European subjects. This is not to say that London's own interests did not include settler colonization, but that colonization was considered a means toward the growth of empire (Buller, 1840) rather than, as within a settler colonial context, a method of nation-building for a settler society. And yet, by this point one sees the interests of empire and colonization, or the Crown and its' subjects, engaging one another at various points within British North America. These actions did eventually lead a path toward the settler colonial turn of the 1860s wherein Indigenous peoples became primarily obstacles "to the economic and social vision of the Founding Fathers" (Green, 2003), and thus the need for isolating them on reserves for their eventual civilization into British society could easily be transmuted to fit settler colonial logics. And so, even in the early 19th century, citizenship was beginning to be weaponized by policy makers even if it was nascent, ill-defined itself, and largely subject-based.

While there might be natural lines of continuity between London and local policy, the Crown's imperial policy of protection was almost always at risk from a growing and increasingly vocal imperial-subject body. The influx of Loyalists in 1783 had already presented a formidable colonial force in British North America which led to fitful adherence to the rules of land surrender and protection identified in the *Royal Proclamation* (Harring, 1998). By the early to mid-nineteenth century there were also large waves of immigrants from the Scottish clearances, famine-ravaged Ireland and the industrial slums of London that were coming to the colony. This led to massive population growth of white colonists within Upper Canada in particular. Between 1814 and 1851 this population grew from 95,000 to 952,000 (Lawrence, 2002). This influx of white immigrants led to an intense pressure on local colonial governments to quickly and effectively provide cheap land for colonists (Harris, 2002; Harring, 1998), which was not possible to provide under strict observance of the 1763 proclamation. This growing, far-away population, with its settler-colonial interests and actions, represented an increasingly difficult body for the Crown to control in its claims to 'protect' Indigenous peoples. Gradually, over the century, this led London to defer to local colonial administration regarding colonial policies and situations (Harring, 1998).

The chasm between the imperial interests of the Crown and the settler-colonial interests of its imperial-subject body reached its peak during the 1837 rebellions of Upper and Lower

Canada. Unsatisfied with limitations of official access to land and a lack of responsible government, colonists of both Canadas (though their situations did differ in important ways) actively and violently rebelled against British authorities for greater access to democracy and autonomy within their colonial societies. Such access and autonomy in turn required further colonially-focused policies of erasure targeting Indigenous populations. While traditionally referred to as rebellions, Alan Greer suggests one should reconceive these moments as *parts* of revolutions and not small, easily quelled and largely insignificant rebellions as they are usually portrayed. Rather these were moments of a broader political phenomenon that involved the "breakdown of an existing regime, the mobilization of previously passive elements of a population, and widespread and [relatively] rapid change in political attitudes and behaviour" (Greer, 1993). While one might question how 'passive' early nineteenth-century colonialists actually were prior to 1837, these were nevertheless moments that helped bring about a colonial society that was more democratic for its white, male citizens and more autonomous from Britain by the 1860s. One sees here that the imperial-subject body became a force that demanded to be heard – constituted by the imperial-subject regime it found itself ruled under at the same time it was becoming its own, settler-colonial, creature (influenced by the recent French and American revolutions) fighting against the same constituting structure from which it sought change and greater freedom.

While the changes called for were not fully and formally instantiated until 1867, as hinted to above, throughout the mid-nineteenth century the increasingly vocal white colonial body invoked important gradual shifts in colonial attitude, policy, and practice. Consider, for instance, Lord Durham's response to a Saugeen Anishinabek petition to protect their remaining lands in the 1840s where Durham cited the 1837 rebellions as "confirming that the will of the white colonists, especially for cheap land, took precedence over the will of the Indigenous peoples" (Lawrence, 2002). This suggests that by the mid-nineteenth century it was not only local colonial officials responding to the colonists' interests and demands through increasingly aggressive colonial practices but also colonial officials in England that began shifting their policies away from the 'protection' of Indigenous peoples and toward fostering the settler-colonial interests of its imperial-subjects in British North America (Harring, 1998). While this shift can be seen as a response to the growing demands and power of the imperial-subject body it can also be understood as Britain's declining interest in protecting Indigenous peoples from settlers by the

1840s and 50s (Harris, 2002; McNab, 1983) as well as a declining interest in the administration of her North American colony more broadly.

Nowhere is this shift more striking than through London's 1857 *Gradual Civilization Act*. While 'civilization' had been a growing focus of colonial policy since the 1830 reserve experiments, it was under this 1857 act that the goal of colonial policy more explicitly became cultural erasure. The document's preamble states that:

> it is desirable to encourage the progress of Civilization among the Indian Tribes in this Province, and the gradual removal of all legal distinctions between them and Her Majesty's other Canadian subjects, and to facilitate the acquisition of property and of the rights accompanying it, by such individual Members of the said Tribes as shall be found to desire such encouragement and to have deserved it (1857)

This places the 1857 act in breach of the *Royal Proclamation* (Milloy, 1983) as colonial policy began to take on a settler colonial character, with a focus on assimilation and erasure, and overtook promises of preservation and 'protection'. Founded upon recommendations of various inquiries and commissions funded by the Colonial Office during earlier decades of the nineteenth century, this legislation bridged earlier policies designed to protect Indigenous lands from further settler encroachment with later policies of broad legal-dualism that situated Indigenous peoples as 'Indians' apart from and needing aid to become 'civilized' citizens of the British Empire (Harring, 1998). As such, the act formally held Indigenous peoples as apart from the rest of the settler body, setting out conditions to be met before any such interested male 'Indian' could be "allowed the rights and privileges granted to Euro-Canadians" (Smith, 2004) where such rights and privileges were to be available through contact with individualized property (Milloy, 1983). Essentially, the document sought to 'protect' Indigenous peoples as 'Indians' from non-Indigenous peoples until such 'Indians' were prepared for civilization and integration (read assimilation), through the functions of capital, into the imperial-subject body. This was a choice the document did not provide to Indigenous women who were automatically enfranchised if their husbands pursued the process.

This 1857 document, therefore, introduced voluntary enfranchisement to Indigenous males as a method of both heeding settler interests and further infringing upon Indigenous nation-hoods and sovereignties for the strength of the British empire and its own settler colonial population. In this sense, the 1857 act was the first formal policy to use a citizenship regime against Indigenous peoples for colonial interests within Canada – an approach which would

become increasingly damaging and forceful following confederation and the polity's commonwealth-autonomy. This document is the first which sought to wed the competing interests of Crown and subject (protection and assimilation) into a single policy whose ultimate goal was the protection of colonial non-Indigenous interests. Indigenous peoples were quick to refuse and resist the imposition of such a damaging act which sought to destroy their ways of life as well as their relations to the land and each other for the sake of British imperialism and colonization (Harring, 1998).

It was in and around this time (1856-60) that the Colonial Office was debating giving control over Indian Affairs to local colonial governments as part and parcel of bringing 'responsible government' and hence self-government to the Canadas (McNab, 1983) - two things that were accomplished in the 1860s. The *Gradual Civilization Act* could be seen, therefore, as a precursor to this move – the establishment of an act through which London began to both formally distance itself from Indigenous-focused policy and heed the self-governance and settler-colonial interests of its European subjects. While the 1857 act can still be identified as fulfilling certain imperially-focused goals (bringing civilization to the 'other', expanding empire through dispossession) it can also be identified as a step toward settler colonial goals of erasure through isolation and eventual integration into the broader citizen-body needed to strengthen and 'legitimize' a settler colonial state. Importantly, this was an erasure that was meant to establish the room for settler colonial moves to indigenize its own subjects/citizens to foreign, Indigenous lands. The instantiation of this act was, therefore, a signal from London that it was no longer focused on 'protecting' Indigenous peoples and their lands, in perpetuity, for the sake of friendly relations but instead was embracing settler colonization of their lands and the erasure of Indigenous peoples into the body politic. This act maintained the distance established between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples under the *Royal Proclamation* (although this became a distance to be overcome through the careful civilization of Indigenous peoples) at the same time that it represented the first formal colonial policy that was effectively informed by the interests of the pre-confederate imperial subject. It is, therefore, the first notable demonstration of citizen-body interests informing colonial policy within Canada and with it the systematic approach to the civilization of all indigenous peoples through the weaponization of citizenship.

The Gradual Enfranchisement Act, the Settler Colonial Proto-Citizen, and the Enfranchised 'Indian'

The 1869 *Gradual Enfranchisement Act* was the first piece of legislation invoked by the Dominion of Canada to concern Indigenous affairs following Confederation in 1867. Its enactment was made possible through section 91(24) of the *British North America Act* which, according to the British commonwealth, provided the federal government with jurisdiction over 'Indians and lands reserved for Indians' (Canada, 1867) – an elite negotiation resisted by many Indigenous peoples (Simpson, 2014; Daschuk, 2014; Rueck, 2014; Ladner, 2001). Where the *Gradual Civilization Act* had looked to 'merely' encourage assimilation, in many respects the *Gradual Enfranchisement Act* forced various assimilations and impositions of western-European structures. Very much the cautious prelude to a settler colonial citizenship policy, the 1857 document gave way to a much more forceful and explicit 1869 policy of assimilation and erasure that the growing autonomy and identity of a nascent settler state believed it required.

Among the various measures the 1869 policy introduced were methods of forced (rather than voluntary) enfranchisement, which disproportionately affected Indigenous women who married non-Indigenous men; the imposition of an elected band council system, as a method of infringing upon the authority of and eventually erasing traditional governance and legal systems; the criminalization of trade between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples; and the introduction of the overbearing powers of to the Superintendent over Indigenous lives and lands. Most importantly for my purposes here, the introduction of this 1869 act greatly augmented the use of citizenship as a weapon, primarily through the use of enfranchisement, against Indigenous difference for the purposes of providing room (both discursively and physically) for the development of a settler nation and its tenuous and damaging claim to 'legitimacy' as the peoples of the land (or self-indigenization). As another clear juncture in Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations, therefore, the following considers how this act (and after it the, still in force today, 1869 *Indian Act*) was a natural development within the regime of the settler proto-citizen (focused on nation-building) as well as how this policy further weaponized the same citizenship regime against Indigenous peoples in ways still seen today. Here I stray somewhat from Brodie's articulation of the imperial subject citizenship regime to demonstrate that even as early as 1867 and 1869, non-Indigenous Canadians were already transforming from 'imperial subjects' (as Brodie defines them during this time) toward 'settler citizens' of a burgeoning settler state.

When London granted a limited form of self-government to the dominion in 1867, the colony's citizenship regime experienced an important formal shift. While Britain's imperial subjects had been establishing a greater sense of themselves leading up to confederation and making calls for greater colonial autonomy to invoke their settler colonial interests, it was only with Confederation that the political body's growing settler colonial interests were afforded more official and active avenues of articulation through the figure of the citizen of the dominion rather than subject of British empire. The citizen body, therefore, went from imperial subjects of the British Crown to settler colonial proto-citizens of the Commonwealth. Essentially, this shift meant that citizens of this new regime had gained greater autonomy to pursue their settler colonial interests within the dominion even though they were still formally subjects of the Crown. Governance within the dominion, and specifically as imposed upon Indigenous peoples, reflected this new citizenship regime.

Broadly speaking, the settler's overarching interest, given greater force within this new regime, was taking up Indigenous lands as his own so that he could benefit from this physical occupation and labour within the western-European world. A world that had been taken over by enlightenment ideals, liberal tenets, and post-mercantile capital by the late nineteenth century – theories and systems that supported and continue to support the logics, processes and structure of settler colonialism (Morgensen, 2011; Bruyneel, 2013; Coulthard, 2014, Lloyd and Wolfe, 2016). Given the continued role of Britain within the governance of Canada and its citizenship regime, one could argue that in the Canadian case this primary settler interest was not completely individually focused but also a claim to be made for the commonwealth (British Empire) more broadly. Regardless of such nuance, this ultimate settler colonial goal required three major things. First of all, it required that the settler citizen indigenize himself to Indigenous lands (dispossess, isolate and erase Indigenous peoples so that he could claim to be 'native' to the land he took up as his own). Citizenship provided a means through which to productively, by providing the settler proto-citizen with narratives of his own false indigeneity; and destructively, by weaponizing these same narratives as well as the structure of citizenship against Indigenous peoples, accomplish this. Secondly, it required that settler citizens actually settle on Indigenous lands as the 'rightful' owners of these lands – a process which also mobilized citizenship as a claim to legitimacy. And, finally, it required that settler citizens capitalize on these lands through their general 'improvement' and resource extraction as a further method of claiming such lands

as their own through mixing their labour with the land. While the British Crown could still technically hold these settler interests in check through the exercise of its fiduciary duty toward Indigenous peoples, as formally established in British law under the *Royal Proclamation*, the increasing political and legal distance between London and its dominion meant it became progressively less interested in doing so (Harris, 2002). At the end of the day, it was these three, overlapping, colonial imperatives that naturally rested within a settler colonial citizenship regime which dominated colonial policy following Confederation. They guide my analysis of the relationship between the citizenship regime and colonial policy during this period.

Following 1867, the nascent settler state of Canada was desperate to lay claim to the entirety of the northern reaches of the continent from sea to sea. Originally a collection of four disparate and distinct colonies, the federation and its citizens were vulnerable to both internal and external forces in their future as a collective body. There was, therefore, a certain degree of discursive nation-building required to strengthen the federation even when physical nation-building took precedence. The discursive and physical went hand-in-hand at this point as did the push to self-indigenize (to lay claim to foreign, Indigenous lands as the settlers' own) and physically settle Indigenous lands throughout the country. Yet both of these moves also required the removal and erasure of Indigenous peoples from the lands that settler state and society were interested in taking over as their own. Components in erasure relate to the control of Indigenous populations through mechanisms like division, dispossession, isolation and, eventually, in the Canadian case, assimilation into the settler society from which they had been isolated. The *Gradual Enfranchisement Act* and the later *Indian Act* looked to accomplish this erasure through various bureaucratic mechanisms. Two of the predominant ones being the imposition of the elected band council system, an attempt to erase traditional governance and legal systems; and the enfranchisement (both forced and voluntary) of status 'Indians'.

An important part of the settler colonial move to erase, Indigenous life and land, and replace it, with settler life and land, requires the (attempted) destruction of Indigenous autonomy through the (once again, attempted) de-legitimization of Indigenous self-governance practices, citizenship structures and legal systems. The introduction of the elected band council system, a policy carried through into the 1876 *Indian Act*, was focused on doing just this. In fact, a parliamentary transcript from March 2, 1876 has MP John Christian Shultz stating:

It is well known, or at least, generally supposed that these rules [embedded within the *Indian Act*] were adopted in the first instances, with a view to breaking up the tribal system and enabling the white man to get possession of the lands of the Indians. (Smith, 2014, 8).

And so the introduction of measures like this were clearly and consciously premised on an 'erase to replace' settler colonial mentality, even when, as a vital form of resistance, many traditional governance structures remained unofficially amongst Indigenous peoples and nations (Ladner, 2001). But this attempt at destructive erasure sought to invalidate not only the governance practices, citizenship structures and legal systems of various Indigenous peoples, but also the very worldviews that grounded the establishment and sustenance of these practices, structures and systems.

The imposition of the term 'Indian' itself was a crucial aspect of the broader settler colonial project focused on erasure. It was a also way of policing Indigenous peoples, erasing Indigenous particularity and homogenizing Indigenous history, culture and politics into the falsely unifying category of 'Indian' in order to introduce and protect a vulnerable settler colonial state and society (Green, 2003). It was a status that also established internal divisions amongst Indigenous peoples as not everyone was afforded the 'privilege' of 'Indian' status by the federal government and so there was also the introduction at this time of non-Status 'Indians' a differentiation that enabled divisions within communities (Palmater, 2011) and so, for the federal government, a weakening of the potential for collective resistance against colonizing endeavours. Ironically, however, 'Indian' status was established so that it would be erased.

The erase to replace logic did not end with the imposition of western governance structures, it went further to a sort of productive erasure through re-education, assimilation, salvation endeavours focused around the enfranchisement of Indigenous peoples. Indigenous peoples' continuing existence posed an ongoing problem to the logic and stability of a settler colonial order – they were people that state and society had to make sense of, people who existed both within and outside of the boundaries of the state and its law. The move to incorporate them, to gradually force this incorporation by 1869 and beyond, was the method by which settler state and society sought to make sense of Indigenous peoples while simultaneously looking to strengthen and further legitimize their own tenuous governance practices, citizenship structure and legal systems. Importantly, to become an Enfranchised 'Indian' at this time meant that one

completely relinquished (whether voluntarily or not) their status as an 'Indian' under Canadian law. Article 16 of the *Gradual Enfranchisement Act*, for instance, states:

> from the date of such letters patent [for enfranchisement], the provisions of any Act or law making any distinction between the legal rights and liabilities of Indians and those of Her Majesty's other subjects shall cease to apply to any Indian, his Wife or minor children as aforesaid, so declared to be enfranchised, who shall no longer be deemed Indians within the meaning of the laws relating to Indians (1869).

This was a clear and targeted method of weaponizing settler citizenship to erase, through assimilation, Indigenous peoples into the settler colonial body. It was carried through, in much the same language, within the 1876 *Indian Act*. And was also indicative of, and further supported by, other policies and systems invoked by the colonial government such as the move to 're-educate' children through the residential school system – an assimilative effort premised on erasure through incorporation that was actively being pursued at the same time as enfranchisement policy.52 Here the distinction established in 1763 between Indigenous peoples, as 'Indians', and non-Indigenous peoples, as 'Her Majesty's Other Subjects', became a distinction to be overcome – the separate relations of Crown-Indigenous and Crown-Colonialist established through the imposition of the Crown as sovereign and arbiter became relations to be combined into Crown-Citizen.

The attempted destruction of Indigenous citizenship structures, through the imposition of western governance structures, in combination with equally aggressive efforts to force settler citizenship onto Indigenous peoples was part of a broader strategy premised on enabling easier access to western settlement while strengthening the claims of a settler colonial citizenship regime, state and society. As such, it was part and parcel of settler society's new found autonomy and freedom following Confederation a freedom through which to fuel their settler colonial interests in land, settlement and nation-building while also attempting to quell their insecurities and fears around the invalidity of their legitimacy on Indigenous lands. The settler government used its internally-derived powers under the *BNA Act* and legislation like the *Gradual Enfranchisement Act* and the *Indian Act* to pursue its largely physical nation-building projects during the late 19th and early 20th centuries – projects like the pacific railway, the 1868 economic

---

52 Non-status 'Indians' and others like the Métis were also be subjected to similar destructive enfranchisement-like policies and treatment. For further reading see: Chris Anderson. (2014). *"Metis": race, recognition, and the struggle for indigenous peoplehood.* Vancouver: UBC Press., H.W. Daniels. (1979). *The forgotten people: Metis and status Indian land claims.* Ottawa: Native Council of Canada.

National Policy, and the 1872 *Dominions Land Act* all of which were projects focused on re-making Indigenous lands into the property of a new settler colonial state named Canada.

At this point the ideal citizen of the post-confederation regime would have been a white, British male who was actively fulfilling the role of pioneer – taking full advantage of nation-building policies like the *Dominions Land Act*, tilling the soil to claim Indigenous lands for himself as well as settler state and society more broadly. He would have still been compliant, as with the previous regime of the imperial subject, but the relationship between settler citizen and state had shifted in 1867 – if not before – with the introduction of more democratic mechanisms grounding the relationship of accountability between white, male, settler citizen and the state. Following 1867 the incumbent government had a more clearly identifiable responsibility to abide by the interests of its settler citizens. As far as the federal government would have been concerned during this period, the settler body to whom it was responsible acted as both instigator and pawn in these nation-building endeavours. For instance, as early as the 1850s there was a developing expansionist movement within Upper Canada that presaged if not directly influenced federal interest in westward expansion following 1867. According to Doug Orwam, such sentiments found a platform within the *Globe* as early as 1856 (2017). The citizen-based proponents of this movement would have been considered instigators of the colonial-focused projects pursued by the government during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. There were others still, who supported the civilization theory and policies directed toward the assimilation of Indigenous peoples (Thobani, 2007; Mackey, 2002; Anderson, 2011).

Yet the population of European, imperial subjects more broadly would have also been considered, if not cited, as reasons for such endeavours. Given the massive onslaught of European immigrants to North America in the 19th century (Gerber, 2006; Lawrence, 2002), there was a 'need' to open up more lands for European settlement. While settlement in the American mid-west was of greater interest to many immigrants, such concerns could easily be cited by the federal government as reasons for western expansion (Chester, 1973; Morton, 2017). Furthermore, the federal government could also cite a need to unite a disparate and growing federation for the sake of more reliably and efficiently governing its growing settler citizen body as another reason for pursuing its aggressive colonization of the west. The negotiation of the numbered treaties which enabled the establishment of a national railway was, after all, the promise through which officials convinced British Columbia to join the federation (Churchill,

2015). And so there were various ways through which settlers, in their position as citizens of the settler state, during this period influenced the development of the settler colonial project that became Canada. Beyond their broadly state roles in initial post-Confederation citizenship regime and their physical participation within the process of colonization (taking up Indigenous lands through systems of private capital), these settler citizens were also less directly participating in settler colonialism through their ascription to civilization theory, their support of and interests in westward expansion and their role as a population that the government could point to in order to legitimize its nation-building and colonial policies.

While Indigenous peoples consistently resisted first the *Gradual Enfranchisement Act* and then the *Indian Act* (Ohsweken Council letter to Hon. Mr. Laid, 1876 cited Smith, 2014; Papillon, 2018; Simpson, 20 14, Ladner, 2001), at the end of the day their implementation – and various amendments (Rueck, 2014; Palmater, 2011) – led to increased government powers to divide and control Indigenous populations through undermining and supplanting their identities and relationships (Simpson, 2014; Palmater, 2011; Thobani, 2007) which, in tandem with the dispossessions that followed the numbered treaties, made it that much easier for Canada to settle the west with its European, settler citizens and to in turn strengthen settler citizenship and state. The implementation of the *Gradual Enfranchisement Act* and the *Indian Act* represented a critical shift in Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations, the citizenship regime and colonial policy. They are demonstrative of a concerted effort not before seen in British North America to bureaucratize Indigenous peoples and weaponize citizenship against them so that they could be more easily dispossessed from their lands for the settlement and indigenization of non-Indigenous settlers and the settler state. These pieces of legislation were the products of a nascent settler colonial society that had just gained the right to a limited but not insubstantial self-governance through which it could formally pursue its interests in settlement, capital, and self-indigenization – the trifecta of settler colonial pursuits. The role of this legislation in enabling the settlement of the west and in their relationship to the treaty process and reserve system is demonstrative of the settler colonial intentions animating their enactment. Herein the interests of the settler proto-citizen body, were always foremost. And so one sees that once political society became specifically settler colonial, colonial policies and their implementation more clearly aligned with the interests of a settler colonial citizenship regime – using this same regime as a tool in the colonization of Indigenous lives and lands.

The White Paper, the Liberal Individual Settler Citizen, and the Non-'Indian'

A hundred years after the introduction of the *Gradual Enfranchisement Act*, the 1969 *White Paper* was proposed, marking yet another juncture in Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations in Canada. This paper was the product of Pierre Trudeau's first government and part of his liberal vision of a 'just society' wherein all 'citizens' were to be treated equally. As such, the proposed legislation argued that "the Indian peoples' role of dependence [on the Crown and government] be replaced by a role of equal status, opportunity and responsibility, a role they [were seen to] share with all other Canadians" (Canada, 1969). Through this paper the government suggested that the special status of 'Indians' in Canadian law and policy be gradually eliminated (this included the elimination of all things that were seen to set them apart from non-Indigenous peoples: the treaties, the *Indian Act*, the reserve system) so that Indigenous peoples could "enhance their own wellbeing" to enjoy political, economic and social life as Canadians (Canada, 1969). Indigenous peoples strongly and vocally resisted this paper (Cardinal, 1969; Indian Association of Alberta, 1970; Union of BC Indian Chiefs, 1970) so much that it was eventually tabled by the government.

Even though the 1969 *White Paper* was never formally enacted as legislation, it is demonstrative of a critical shift, or perhaps more accurately an evolution, in the settler citizenship regime and its concurrent colonial policy. Faced with a major shift in the citizenship regime, colonial policy makers had to grapple with the demands of an increasingly liberal-individual and rights based citizenship that was specifically 'Canadian'. The days of the imperial/commonwealth proto-citizen and with it the state's focus on physical nation-building were gone. And non-Indigenous, Canadian state and society had a much greater sense of itself, as distinctly 'Canadian', following its successful war efforts on the international stage. Correspondingly, colonial policy shifted from voluntary and involuntary enfranchisement to a blanket policy of forced assimilation of Indigenous peoples into a society as individual citizens who were to be seen and treated within the Canadian settler state like any other individuals – because this is what the logic of a liberal-rights citizenship regime required. The following section analyzes this evolution in regime change and its influence on colonial policy through the proposed 1969 *White Paper* in an effort to uncover how shifts in governing philosophy and citizenship structure during the mid-twentieth century led government to attempt a colonial policy focused on the final erasure (as assimilation) of Indigenous peoples in 1969.

The mid-twentieth century was a time of considerable change and growth for Canada and the broader western world. The post-world war period saw the development of the welfare state and a liberal-based culture of rights protection within the international community as well as within western states like Canada. This meant that governance was increasingly focused, for countries like Canada, on the undifferentiated protection of basic, largely negative, human rights of its citizens. Within Canada, specifically, this gave rise to the 1960's *Bill of Rights*, the creation of country-wide medicare, and provincial equalization payments to support social assistance programs throughout the country– programs which provided a sense of continuity (through the centralization of programing and/or standards) as 'Canadian' across many provincialized non-Indigenous identities at the time (Banting, 1982).[53] During these decades, however, one also saw the steady rise of the Québec Separatist Movement, which came to a head in the late 1960s through to the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, fuelled by decades of what supporters identified as culturally destructive treatment by English Canada (Lévesque, 1968). Importantly, this internal division was seen as a credible threat to the unity of the federation both discursively and, potentially, materially, therefore, spurring further efforts to construct a universally-implementable 'Canadian' identity throughout the country.

While the 1931 *Statute of Westminster* had given the country the potential for full legal independence from Britain,[54] the 1946 *Citizenship Act* maintained 'Canadians'' position as still linked to the British Crown when it defined 'Canadian citizens' as British subjects of the commonwealth (Igartua, 2006) even when the development of universal social insurance was creating a common sense of identity – a common sense of citizenship – for non-Indigenous, anglophone, peoples across the country. As such, citizenship infrastructure, national identity and rights access grew dramatically during the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s. According to Brodie, this led to the development of the 'social' citizen regime wherein the ideal citizen of the Canadian state enjoyed both classical negative rights as well as positive social rights – an "individual bearer of rights and other state-based assurances of equality" who believed in the

---

[53] Since social assistance programs and medical care were all provided through provincial governments, falling under their jurisdiction within the constitution, these programs were not extended to Indigenous peoples who lived on reserve and were registered as 'Indians' as these individuals were considered to fall under the jurisdiction of the federal government who had no real infrastructure (or interest) set in place to deliver similar programs.

[54] Given the absence of an amendment formula, Canada did not gain full independence from Britain until 1982 when Ottawa and nine of the ten provinces agreed upon an amendment formula now protected under the *Constitution Act, 1982*.

"liberal-progressivism which guided [the] governing practices" of the country (2002, 60). It was the spread of this governing philosophy amongst non-Indigenous Canadian citizens that was meant to provide them with their collective identity as (social, rights-bearing) Canadians (Brodie, 2002). It was this same governing philosophy that grounded calls for separatism (Lévesque, 1968), calls which themselves pointed to tenets of democracy and liberalism to support independence, which in turn also ended up mobilizing citizenship or identity as a means to further ascertain settler security and certainty (Michaud-Ouellet, 2019). It is this liberal-rights, welfare-state identity that many Canadians still hold dear (Mackey, 2002) and which gradually formulated a common sense of identity for Canadians en masse. Here, however, I would like to make a small amendment to Brodie's categorization of the citizenship regime. While she refers to the citizen of this regime as 'social', suggesting a positive connotation to the regime focused on positive rights and engagement, I believe that when approaching the regime from the purview of critical colonial studies it is a somewhat inaccurate portrayal. It is true that in some ways the post-war period was a time of positive rights (through welfare structure) for the broadest base of the citizenship regime – non-Indigenous Canadians. In exploring the ways through which this regime was weaponized against Indigenous peoples during this period, however, it would be more accurate to focus on the liberal-individualistic, negative rights-based ways through which this citizenship regime was constructed as these were the avenues through which weaponization was focused. I would, therefore, like to re-name this period the liberal-individual citizenship regime for the purposes of this chapter.

The further and clearer articulation of a 'Canadian' identity during this period required further consideration and control over the 'Indigenous excess' leftover from the now predominantly symbolic/discursive (rather than physical) nation-building that was occurring. State and society had to make certain that their approach to Indigenous peoples adhered to the tenets of their new liberal-individual governing philosophy and citizenship regime. The Marshallian, rights-based citizenship regime then required full and complete assimilation because it was premised on the ultimate goal of political society being the provision of equality, as equality of opportunity, for all. This required a formally undifferentiated citizenship body. Within the 1969 *White Paper* it becomes clear, as early as the preamble, just how difficult it was for the government to grapple with the reality of Indigenous difference while attempting to maintain and invoke its assimilative goals. For instance, the preamble states "to be an Indian is to

be a man, with all a man's needs and abilities. To be an Indian is also to be different. It is to speak different languages, draw different pictures, tell different tales and to rely on a set of values developed in a different world" (1969). Unlike the 1876 *Indian Act* where, to be an 'Indian' was to be a non-person – the 1876 act actually defines 'person' as "an individual other than an Indian" (1876), Indigenous men were, as of 1969, to be considered men capable of holding the rights and responsibilities of non-Indigenous people. Such a re-framing was necessary for imposing citizenship at this time because the liberal individual rights-bearer had to be deemed a person capable of reason – reason being the prerequisite for holding and exercising liberal rights (Arneil, 2009). And so the reasoning capacity of Indigenous men, as men with all the same needs and abilities as their fellow non-Indigenous counterparts, was an important first step in justifying and invoking a policy of blanket assimilation from within the regime of the liberal-individual.[55] This citizen regime was drawn to this form of erasure not only because assimilation had been pre-inscribed within nineteenth century policy but because assimilation fit the rules and desires of its evolving governance philosophy wherein diversity was the enemy of a unified, secure state and citizenship regime (Tully, 1995).

While the regime of the settler proto-citizen had been focused on the social, legal and political dispossession, isolation and 'improvement' of Indigenous peoples, through the imposition of the *Indian Act*, the inflicted reserve system, and the forced attendance to residential schools, the regime of the liberal-individual citizen was focused on the 'altruistic' endeavour to solve the so-called and mis-diagnosed 'Indian problem' – through eliminating their special status as 'Indians' within the constitution and common law. The 1969 paper for instance states that

> the Government does not wish to perpetuate policies which carry with them the seeds of disharmony and disunity, policies which prevent Canadians from fulfilling themselves and contributing to their society. It seeks a partnership to achieve a better goal. The partners in this search are the Indian people, the governments of the provinces, the Canadian community as a whole and the Government of Canada (1969).

This excerpt identifies that 'previous' policies (like the *Indian Act*, the reserve system, residential schools) were divisive and subordinating and that the government was not interested in continuing them. It suggests that what the 1969 government was interested in, was something

---

[55] Notice that this was also a highly gendered weaponization of citizenship. The *White Paper* talks of 'Indian' men and not 'Indian' women or persons. This patriarchal imposition, extended as it was from 19th century policy, was part and parcel of the settler colonial move to erase/re-align traditional modes of governance and law. For further reading see: Emberley, 2001; McGrath and Stevenson, 1996; Monture and McGuire, 2009.

more akin to a partnership with Indigenous peoples. Many Indigenous peoples themselves had begun to think, prior to the release of the report, that the government was interested in re-visiting and renewing a more partner-like relationship. The government had, after all, actually consulted with Indigenous representatives in formulating the policy, though the eventual document disregarded the views and suggestions proposed during this consultation (Turner, 2016). Much of the rest of the document makes it clear that the government was not interested in such a direction. For instance, the quote above (with its reference to partnership) is in the same section as the following quote:

> the Government could press on with the policy of fostering further education; could go ahead with physical improvement programs now operating in reserve communities; could press forward in the directions of recent years, and eventually many of the problems would be solved. But progress could be too slow…Something more is needed. We can no longer perpetuate the separation of Canadians…(1969)

This latter quote suggests that the government was interested in ending assimilative programs not because they no longer believed in the goals of these programs but because they believed that these programs were too slow to reach their goals – goals which had gained new prominence in the move to further ground and strengthen the symbolic and discursive foundation of the Canadian citizenship regime and the settler colonial state. These programs were never at odds with the policy of the 1969 *White Paper*, they were merely inefficient means of attaining the same goal: full and final assimilation (erasure) of Indigenous peoples into the citizenship body.

In fact, the 2016 report from the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission* found that the residential school system (one of the 'inefficient' assimilative programs) actually experienced its peak in the post-war period when, in 1953, just over 11,000 Indigenous children were in the system (2016). This hardly seems coincidental given discursive citizenship and nation-building efforts and attitudes and the renewed focus on assimilation in the post-ward period. Through residential schools Indigenous children could be separated from their families, communities and cultures and more easily indoctrinated into British-Canadian civilization. If enough children could be forced into this system, entire future generations of Indigenous peoples (it would seem) would cease to exist as 'Indians' having become 'civilized' members of settler society. While the residential school system experienced a decline that began in the 1960s, even while it maintained periods of increased federal funding during this same decade (TRC, 2016b), it was replaced by the imposition of child welfare services onto reserves. This latter system, animated by the same

philosophy and intention of the residential school system, led to what is often referred to as the 60s scoop (which actually began in the late 1950s) wherein child welfare services forcefully removed Indigenous (Status, non-Status, Metis, Inuit) children from their families and intentionally placed them with white, settler guardians (TRC, 2015; Cardinal, 2018; Kimelman, 1985; Cardinal, 2017) in lieu of the boarding schools of the previous 1879 system. This led to the further removal of thousands of children from their communities through the 1960s and into the present day (TRC, 2015). And so, despite federal calls to end these programs, these programs never went away but were maintained and even, in some cases, shifted to support the quintessentially settler colonial end goal of full and final assimilation – a goal that the federal government had sought and failed to expedite with its 1969 policy proposal.

The 1969 *White Paper* was about more than expediting the process of full and final assimilation, it was also about realigning the justifications of this settler colonial goal with the new-found governing philosophy of the post-war period focused as it was around the liberal individual settler citizen. It is hardly surprising that by the late 1960s the federal government thought it was in a position in which it could and needed to unilaterally assimilate Indigenous peoples through a blanket policy of elimination regarding their special status under Canadian law. Certainly Indigenous peoples had been resisting, and continued to resist, all of these assimilative policies since their inception (Nettelbeck et al., 2016; Smith, 2014; L. Simpson, 2017; Coulthard, 2014, A.Simpson, 2014) but the governing rationale of liberal and settler colonialism combined with the civil rights revolution and the length at which such previous policies had, by then, been functioning, likely contributed to the government's impetus. Initial public support of the *White Paper* (Anderson & Robertson) was no doubt grounded in the messages of the decade's civil rights movement and post-war optimism in liberal tenets of equality which were falsely identified as universal. It was the vehement and vocal resistance of Indigenous leaders, activists and scholars toward the *White Paper* that forced its own shift in policy approach, which contributed to shifts in citizenship identity that followed. After the *Red Paper* (1969) and its associated responses, the federal government and settler society had to reassess and revise their approach to Indigenous peoples. While this led to improved recognition of what would become 'aboriginal' and treaty rights throughout the following decades, as I will explore in the following section, the underlying goal of assimilation remained at the forefront of

such 'recognition'-based settler colonial policy and still maintained the weaponization of citizenship even when it appeared increasingly amicable and benign.

Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, the Settler Canadian Citizen and the 'Aboriginal'

In 1982, a mere thirteen years after the 1969 *White Paper*, Canada gained full legal independence from Britain when it embedded an amendment formula within its re-patriated constitution. This re-patriation came with a larger constitutional package focused around an entrenched bill of rights. This bill of rights was originally premised, once again, on Pierre Trudeau's liberal-democratic vision of a 'just society', a classically liberal (negative) rights vision that was tempered by the demands of minority groups for the protection of their collective rights (Abu-Laban & Nieguth, 2000) but which made little to no reference to social rights beyond the 'security of the person' (unlike the UN Declaration of Rights which had multiple sections on social rights to education, work, etc.). As such, it was very much a document of the liberal-individual citizen – focused as it was on the protection of individual liberal citizens and the equality of those liberal citizens – even where its liberalism was mitigated through the acknowledgement and protection of certain group rights. Indigenous groups were among those whose collective rights were secured. Within the broader *Constitution Act, 1982* 'Aboriginal and Treaty rights' were protected under section 35. The inclusion of this clause was made possible only through the consistent and unyielding advocacy of Indigenous leaders, activists and interest groups that lobbied and petitioned not only the federal government but also the British government and the Crown in their pursuit for inclusion both within the constitutional negotiations leading up to 1982 and the constitutional protection of 'aboriginal' rights moving forward (Green, 2004; McFarlene, 1993; Abu-Laban & Nieguth, 2000). While there was originally broad-based optimism and support for the inclusion of section 35, its alignment with settler colonial logics as well as some disappointments with the results of some section specific court cases, has brought a number of scholars to question its ability to properly protect and enforce Indigenous peoples' rights and claims to land (Maracle, 2003; Coulthard, 2014; Walkem & Bruce, 2003).

The *Constitution Act, 1982* and with it the entrenched *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* did, however, open up considerable judicial space for not only protecting its enumerated groups from undue state interference but also in providing a more popularly-derived (rather than a largely elite-driven) understanding of citizenship, democracy and the constitution. This

represented its own important evolution in the Canadian citizenship regime as it provided a clearer avenue through which to ground a liberal-individual citizenship (specifically through entrenched rights protection within the *Charter*) and with this a unifying document and symbol for Canadian citizens that cut across many regional lines and identities. The protection of individual and group rights therein further mobilized such identified citizens to fight for the maintenance and further extrapolation of their rights as well as a voice in future constitutional change (Cairns, 1991; Russell, 1993; Green, 2003; Cairns, 1992). In this way, the *Constitution Act, 1982* and its entrenched *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* provided more formal avenues for the more popularly-based, as opposed to elitist, democracy that many groups within Canadian society were already calling for (Abu-Laban & Nieguth, 2000). This led to a more active citizenship regime wherein the ideal citizen was still a liberally-based individual but was now one who was considerably more empowered to actively challenge the government through the courts to ensure their liberal rights, and the liberal rights of their future generations, were protected.

Understanding the inclusion of section 35 from the purview of settler colonialism and the liberal-individual regime suggests that 1982 represented not only the moment of full independence of the settler colonial body, but also, through section 35, the attempted 'final' incorporation of Indigenous peoples into the body politic. In other words, it represented a formal attempt to finish the settler colonial project through the attempted formal finalization of both settler citizenship and settler colonialism even when the government had never been interested in protecting Indigenous rights in the constitution in the first place (McFarlene, 1993; Turpel & Monture, 2015). It is important to identify here that the re-patriation of the constitution and the entrenchment of the *Charter* was, for the federal government, about cementing a national civic identity for Canada as, primarily, against the collective claims of Québec nationalists. Faced with the increasingly credible threat of separation, therefore, Ottawa was not just interested in formally patriating the constitution[56] but in attempting to establish/maintain a collective sense of Canadian identity for the sake of holding the federation together. The protection of Indigenous rights within the constitution was never an interest of the federal government when it was organizing pre-patriation conferences. Section 35, in which "the existing aboriginal and treaty

---

[56] During the 20th century there had been many attempts to negotiate, between Ottawa and the provinces, an amendment formula that would enable the patriation of the constitution.

rights of the aboriginal people of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed" was only eventually included due to extensive, concerted lobbying by Indigenous advocates and then only under the provincial stipulation that the term 'existing' was included within the clause. The premiers required the inclusion of this term because they believed that all 'aboriginal and treaty rights' had already been extinguished through the passage of time (McFarlene, 1993). Despite this hesitancy, s.35's inclusion represented a previously unidentified opportunity for the settler colonial incorporation of Indigenous peoples – a control over Indigenous populations – through which the nation could claim it was 'doing right' by Indigenous peoples at the same time that it was closely monitoring and curtailing the recognition of their rights to make sure that they did not threaten the broader project of settler colonialism. Section 35 adopted Indigenous peoples (Status, Métis, Inuit), formally, into the broader citizenship body as 'aboriginals', thereby maintaining the hierarchical divide between Indigenous peoples and settlers even while it incorporated them into the same constitutional document.

Importantly, Indigenous peoples wanted this protection within the constitution. They were afraid that without it the *Charter*, with its entrenched individual rights, would trump the collective protections provided under colonial policies of lesser stature and be used to effectively diminish if not extinguish Indigenous status, rights and protections within the country (McFarlene, 1993). The fact that Indigenous peoples were permitted into the pre-confederation conferences in the late 1970s and early 1980s demonstrates the ground gained between 1969 and 1982 and the fact that by 1969 Indigenous peoples had clearly demonstrated they have voices that must be reckoned with by the state and broader citizenship regime. Yet the method of their inclusion within the pre-patriation conferences demonstrates a continuing effort to control and contain Indigenous difference, nation-hoods and sovereignties for the sake of the broader and vulnerable settler colonial project. Indigenous representatives were not permitted into these conferences as participants (as partners in the federation) but as observers. They were still permitted a voice, but only on areas that the non-Indigenous participants (namely the Prime Minister and provincial Premiers) deemed specifically relevant to Indigenous peoples and with a voice that lacked the same authority within the proceedings as full-fledge 'participants' (McFarlene, 1993). And so there was a considerable amount gained by Indigenous peoples in 1982, a platform through which Indigenous peoples have won important victories against the state through the courts, but at the end of the day section 35 is not the ideal tool. While it has led

to important wins for Indigenous peoples it has not shifted the fundamental structures and processes that animate state, governance and citizenship away from settler colonialism – it has, rather, helped maintain settler colonialism despite these victories because decisions ultimately interpret these inherent rights to the extent that they do not threaten the broader settler colonial project.

Consider for instance, the court's definition of reconciliation in *Van der Peet* where the Supreme Court of Canada, in unilaterally deciding upon the purpose of s.35 itself, stated:

> [w]hat s.35(1) does is provide the constitutional framework though which the fact that aboriginals lived on the land in distinctive societies, with their own practices, traditions, and cultures, is acknowledged and reconciled with the sovereignty of the Crown. The substantive rights which fall within the provision must be defined in light of this purpose; the aboriginal rights recognized and affirmed by s. 35(1) must be directed towards the reconciliation of the pre-existence of aboriginal societies with the sovereignty of the Crown (1990).

The judiciary decided, therefore, in 1990 that s.35 was to be utilized as a tool for reconciling *prior* Indigenous *occupation* of the land (as grounded in practices, traditions and cultures but not governance, laws or sovereignty) with *contemporary* Crown *sovereignty*. Not only does this imply a regulation of Indigenous rights to the land to a historic time (they 'lived on the land') but it attempts to politically de-legitimize their use of the land (by refusing to refer to this prior occupation as sovereignty) all the while maintaining that it is Indigenous peoples that need to be reconciled to the settler colonial state with its assumed, universally justifiable, 'Crown sovereignty'. In other words, this definition of reconciliation places settler colonial state and society (with their various privileges) first, as already justifiable, and places Indigenous peoples and their rights second. The irony here, as Joyce Green has highlighted, is that a fuller and more comprehensive recognition of Indigenous rights and inherent sovereignty is the one thing that could help justify Canadian sovereignty and citizenship – although such a justification would require a substantive and meaningful re-structuring of federalism, citizenship and the state (2003). But from within the confining logics of settler colonialism and the liberal-individual regime, of course, the courts could not and would not recognize a pre-existing/inherent sovereignty here because that would threaten the already fragile and imposed sovereignty of the (British) Crown that grounds the entire Canadian settler colonial project beginning in 1763. Recognizing Indigenous sovereignty here would be risking the validation of the very court within which the decision was proffered – at least from within the internal logic of settler

colonialism. The primacy of the judiciary and s.35 provided the space for such a unilaterally determined definition of reconciliation to be put forward within the common law. While certain important gains have been recognized, the court – as an institution embedded within the settler colonial structure – is not the ideal venue, and s.35, it would seem, is not the ideal tool for reaching beyond the confining logics and structures of settler colonialism and the contemporary citizenship regime.

While the 1982 *Constitution Act*, the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the interpretation of section 35 was, and has in some important respects continued, to be a product of the classical liberal citizen, by the time the legislature was responding to section 35 litigation neoliberalism had already begun shifting the citizenship regime. Neoliberal governance philosophy required the scaling back of the welfare state. This meant that governments like Canada were beginning to scale back social security – allowing for the privatization and decentralization of services as well as for the individualization of risk. While Canada still maintained its basic welfare institutions, scholarship demonstrates that the public funding and delivery of these institutions has declined for all since the 1980s (Church et al., 2018; Donnan, 2014; Prudham, 2004; Braedley, 2012; MacDonald, 2008; Whiteside, 2011) even while the country might, today, be in the midst of a shift to a post-neoliberal regime. This neoliberal turn led to a new ideal citizen who was enterprising, able to successfully compete within the global and domestic market and who supported the scaling back of the welfare state (Brodie, 2002). This shift was deemed necessary for the country to stay competitive and current within the increasingly globalized world market. A market that has been identified as a threat to the state's security at the same time that it has been identified as a method through which to maintain and assert the state's national identity (Rossiter & Wood, 2016; Brodie, 2002). This focus on staying competitive within the global market has led Canadian governments to pursue further resource extraction-based projects like pipelines and mines – claiming that such projects are in the general interest of the nation and its entrepreneurial citizens. Increasingly, it was this new entrepreneurial citizen and the citizenship regime built around him that took over the governance of the state and its policies. This take over included Indigenous-focused policies, government actions and the privatization of security.

According to Rossiter and Wood, neoliberalism has been used in Canada since the 1980s as "a political and territorial project whose effects undermine and manipulate the unresolved

question of Aboriginal title" (2016, 900) only formally recognized in 1982. In this way neoliberalism is a governing orientation, rather than a clearly identifiable set of techniques, which provides the state with a host of strategies to support its capitalist settler colonial interests (Rossiter & Wood, 2016). This permits the easy marriage of settler colonial and neoliberal interests under the entrepreneurial citizenship regime. For under such a citizenship regime, the state looks to continue overriding and erasing Indigenous lives and sovereignties for the sake of continuing the physical nation building project by "stabilizing and perpetuating a national economic system [global in outlook] premised on access to contested lands and resources" (Stanley, 2016, 2437). Here the state also continues to support the discursive nation-building project from within a specifically neoliberal focus – arguing that the pursuit of capital and resource-based extraction projects are part and parcel of the national interest and identity. For MacDonald, neoliberalism has also appeared as somewhat of a wolf is sheep-skin as government policy has shifted to devolution of responsibilities to Indigenous peoples and organizations in ways that appear to recognize their nation-hoods and sovereignties but through means which ultimately uphold the neoliberal, settler colonial, regime (2011). In any case, the regime shift to neoliberalism has proven copacetic with ongoing settler colonial goals of state and society focused as they are on an 'erase to replace' mentality wherein incorporation functions as a form of erasure.

And yet, under a neoliberal regime, there is an important discord between actual, average, Canadian citizens and the entrepreneurial citizenship regime – a discord that, it appears, may be inciting a post-neoliberal regime. Neoliberalism has led to the clawing back of the welfare state, the middle class and the social security Canadian citizens have held so dear to their identity and well-being since the mid-twentieth century. Citizenship has, in turn, become less certain and secure leading to what Guy Standing has identified as the creation of a new precariat class within western political societies. Those within the precariat class range from naturally-born citizens of a given country, who have lost their access to some citizenship-based rights, to foreign born individuals who never had access to the full bundle of rights (Standing, 2011). Such work suggests that under neoliberal influences the structure of citizenship regimes, themselves, have been slowly eroding – leaving all but the wealthiest of global society in increasingly insecure conditions. Not only, therefore, can the entrepreneurial citizenship regime be seen to have negatively impacted colonial policy geared toward Indigenous peoples but also the very

citizenship structure weaponized against Indigenous peoples and directed toward supporting non-Indigenous peoples.

Arguably the rise of populist-style governments that have been elected around the world within the last four years, including provincially within Canada; as well as Justin Trudeau's 2016 federal budget, which planned for a national deficit in order to 'grow the middle class' (Morneau, 2016), can be seen as responses to and potential shifts from this neoliberal regime at the national and local levels. Where these responses may be misguided or inadequate they are representative of a call for change away from the regime of the entrepreneurial citizen. While non-Indigenous peoples have an overarching responsibility to revisit citizenship, colonialism and belonging, this current state of flux, might, in fact, represent a unique moment through which to re-evaluate belonging, rights and responsibilities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

Here it will be important to identify that, as with all previous citizenship regime shifts, the underlying structure and goals of settler colonialism have been preserved. This continuity, and with the continued weaponization of citizenship against Indigenous peoples, is, in truth, the most damaging aspect of Canadian citizenship – its ability to maintain and even enhance the pursuit of land acquisition and erasure under each evolution of the regime. While section 35, and the broader constitutional act within which it is found, is demonstrative of the previous social citizen regime, the ease and ability with which settler colonialism adapts to each successive citizenship regime shift is evidence of the pervasive nature of this type of colonialism and its relationship to citizenship policy and structure. This is not to say that there are not shimmers of light and hope throughout all of this. It appears that non-Indigenous society has become increasingly aware of some of the ongoing colonial issues that collectively face Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. From the 1969 *White Paper* through to the Oka Crisis, Ipperwash, and more recently, Wet'suwe'ten, the release of the *Truth and Reconciliation Final Report* and the *Missing and Murdered Women Final Report*, it seems that non-Indigenous society is slowly becoming increasingly aware of and open to the need for change even when they are left uncertain of the change that needs to occur and their place therein. There is hope embedded within the calls to action of the final reports of both the TRC and the MMWI, the trick in responding to these calls to action will be in overcoming the citizenship-settler colonial relationship to imagine and create something other than this relationship, grounded in Indigenous

calls for decolonial change, reached collectively by Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. It is my belief that a shift to a colonial denizen ethos, the discursive and material results of the thought experiment I have outlined throughout this dissertation, can be one way to move beyond and avoid the continuation of this destructive relationship in the move to a substantive decolonization that adheres to the calls for change Indigenous peoples have been making for decades if not centuries.

Summary

     While considerably more could be said about these individual citizenship regimes and their relations to settler colonialism – I have mobilized this broad-historical survey, rooted in the changing nature of citizenship over the last two centuries in Canada, to demonstrate a specific and overlooked narrative within Canadian political thought: that there is a mutually re-enforcing relationship between citizenship structure and settler colonial policy. And that this is a relationship that implicates settler citizens within the colonial project through various and quotidian ways – a relationship that needs to shift if decolonization is to be achieved. Here I have found that citizenship aids in the development of the settler colonial project through its discursive work, attempting to legitimize settler self-indigenization to foreign, Indigenous lands, settlement and resource extraction. These are all components toward the overarching aim of settler colonialism – the taking up of Indigenous lands as the settlers' own for their own privilege and benefit. Not only does citizenship help in the advancement of settler colonial interests, but its specific nature at any given time also helps shape the content and deployment of colonial policies. In other words a specific citizenship regime influences the focus of the content and aims of colonial policy at any given time. If today's non-Indigenous Canadian citizens are truly interested in moving forward, toward decolonization, they will need to recognize how this relationship functions, and how it has developed over time, in order to understand the damaging nature of this relationship and their roles therein so that they can avoid the re-inscription of such structures and actions.

     I have found that as non-Indigenous colonists became more autonomous from Britain and more interested in searching for and asserting a specifically 'Canadian' identity, the colonial policies they invoked became increasingly damaging to Indigenous life and land and progressively focused on more finalized forms of erasure. For instance, while the 1857 *Gradual Civilization Act* set the stage for erasure as incorporation/assimilation into settler society the

early focus of its implementation relied heavily on earlier and less demanding (although no less destructive) forms of erasure as displacement and isolation. It was only as 'Canadians' developed a greater sense of themselves as 'Canadians' and began establishing a more clearly defined citizenship and identity that erasure as assimilation began to more forcefully and clearly pre-occupy colonial policy content and implementation. Such findings further support the claim that the relationship between citizenship (at least as it has been constituted in Canada) and settler colonialism is mutually re-enforcing. The broad citizenship structure and philosophy of a given regime has been used to help legitimize colonial policies in the minds of its members at the same time that it has helped shape the content and implementation of these same policies.

Throughout all of these regime shifts, an important component of the structure has always been the divisive imposition of the Crown as sovereign arbiter over both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. Since 1763 the British Crown (and then, since 1867, the Crown and/or federal government) has maintained distinct relationships with Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (Crown-Indigenous and Crown-Subject relations) which has encouraged non-Indigenous subjects and citizens to paint themselves as the innocent beneficiaries of state-led colonial actions when the truth is they are also active participants within settler colonialism. Such ethical distancing serves to supplant the original and more direct relationship of Indigenous-Colonialist necessary for the proper acknowledgement of Indigenous nation-hoods and sovereignties. This distancing, therefore, serves to not only dislodge rightful relations of deference between non-Indigenous peoples and the Indigenous peoples of these lands, but has also looked to erase Indigenous peoples as autonomous and sovereign peoples through their displacement and isolation in relation to settler society and state. Taking up a denizen ethos today, however, requires that Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples are in more direct relations with each other so that responsibilities can be shared and properly invoked and so that non-Indigenous peoples can actively and properly defer to Indigenous sovereignties and nation-hoods when asking what invitation and responsibilities (where invitation is deemed acceptable) should look like.

There is a real need to re-evaluate the Canadian citizenship regime, settler colonialism and their relationship. If there is a real interest in decolonization and the instantiation of a denizen ethos today than there is a need to understand the narrative I have presented here. There is a need to move beyond contemporary citizenship regimes and imagine otherwise so that the superimposed structures and relations of settler colonial society can be dismantled to allow for a

new orientation toward Indigenous life and land as well as Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations. This begins at the local level, through dialogue between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, the latter of which approach dialogue through the purview of a colonial denizen ethos. If this move is to be specifically colonial denizen in nature such a shift will require the privileging of responsibilities over rights and the re-instantiation of the Indigenous-Colonialist relationship wherein the Crown and state, while potentially still important players in the move forward, are not situated as sovereign arbiters over Indigenous life and land. While the Crown role as an arbiter over and between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples has historically been premised on the protection of Indigenous peoples from settler goals and interests in their lands, in a world where non-Indigenous peoples re-orient themselves to Indigenous peoples and their lands as potential colonial denizens, such an actor is not required.

Given the primacy of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* in continuing to define formal Canadian citizenship and identity it might be a worthy endeavour to begin an additional thought experiment – one intimately connected to the colonial denizen – wherein Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples who have come together in dialogue begin to think through a heuristic, and perhaps eventually material, 'charter of responsibilities'. Such a move could help re-focus and develop thought, practices and logic toward a re-centering of responsibilities and Indigenous life and land before and beyond liberal-individualistic rights which themselves serve and re-enforce settler colonial practices and structures. This can help guide and support, and cushion, the needed vulnerability and uncertainty that parties will necessarily have to make peace with in the move toward establishing decolonizing relationships – a guide through which non-Indigenous peoples can begin to understand decolonization not as a sacrifice of certainty and privilege but as a mutually re-enforcing and positive step toward a future that better maintains and supports the world beyond the settler. What such a process or document formatively looks like is not for me, as a non-Indigenous person, to say but would need to be worked through between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples alike and which will need to begin as various local, and regional dialogues and practices. I mention it here only because it serves as an identifiable, discursive tool through which to not only challenge current regimes, structures and logics but also provides a grounded, concrete guidepost for the sorts of avenues and activities that might be possible and fruitful in the move to invoking a colonial denizen ethos. As such it also provides a potential line of research and analysis through which to pursue future research on the colonial denizen.

All in all, it appears that the contemporary moment of flux within citizenship, between state and society, and the search for a different order is a particularly apt time to evaluate belonging, colonialism, invitation and responsibilities. While the effects of things like neoliberal policies and the impending doom of global warming are disproportionally felt by Indigenous peoples, they are also felt by non-Indigenous peoples. Whereas non-Indigenous peoples have a pre-existing and inherent responsibility to re-evaluate belonging, colonialism, invitation and responsibilities in the move to responding to Indigenous calls for decolonization, there may be a potential common interest here around which to re-visit relations of non-Indigenous deference to Indigenous life, land and governance. For as earlier chapters have demonstrated it is when there is a mutual interest and need that non-Indigenous peoples are best able to position themselves in denizen-like roles toward Indigenous peoples and lands. The trick here will be to not let such an approach fall into the trap of settler innocence and 'decolonization as metaphor' through the upholding of settler privileges and structures. But the move to the colonial denizen, substantive and challenging as it would be, when taken up in good faith and with the intent for positive and meaningful change, would naturally resist such traps that have plagued previous approaches to addressing collective colonial issues. Where the mutual interests invoked are so detrimental to the continuance of human and non-human life, where the balance of the world ultimately is at stake, taking up a denizen ethos, looking to dialogically and materially instantiate approaches to decolonization are not premised on a leap of faith but are necessary moves from which all parties have only to gain.

Conclusion: Key Insights regarding the Instantiation of a Contemporary Colonial Denizen Ethos

Current non-Indigenous approaches to addressing Indigenous calls for decolonization have not pushed state and society far enough toward invoking meaningful, structural, decolonial change. Instead, these approaches have been stuck reproducing the structures and relations that have established and sustained colonialism – through its various iterations – over the centuries. As I have argued within this dissertation, there is a real need to challenge non-Indigenous state and society to broaden their horizons and to consider a paradigm shift away from the current liberal-democratic structure and its mutual re-enforcement of contemporary settler colonial relations toward a new way of relating specifically to Indigenous life and land but also more broadly to self and society. As a possible avenue toward such a paradigm shift I have proposed the *colonial denizen* as a discursive exercise and contemporary ethos that can not only challenge contemporary non-Indigenous society to re-evaluate the restrictive realities of contemporary, colonial paradigms but that can also re-align society toward a paradigm appropriate for the goals of decolonization: the re-centering of Indigenous life and land and with this the re-centering of Indigenous nation-hoods and sovereignties.

The *colonial denizen* is itself constructed as a response to Indigenous calls to decolonize in that it seeks to re-position non-Indigenous belonging on Indigenous territories away from its current colonial instantiations toward a new alignment that re-centers Indigenous life, land and authority. As such I have suggested that through a denizen-lens non-Indigenous Canadians begin to think of themselves as *colonial denizen* focused on taking up an ethos that encourages them to consider themselves 'foreigners' in need of invitation onto Indigenous lands. Such a re-orientation of belonging and relationship for non-Indigenous society can encourage non-Indigenous peoples to re-evaluate contemporary state structures, the implications of the contemporary citizenship regime and their multifaceted connections to the broader colonial project while encouraging a step away from belonging as based within liberal, colonial rights toward outwardly focused and decolonizing responsibilities to others, and specifically, Indigenous life and land. It can also act as a first step, an orientation, non-Indigenous peoples can take to establishing and/or re-visiting relationships with local Indigenous peoples – asking the very Indigenous peoples upon whose territory they find themselves, what decolonization should, could, needs to look like and what that means for the continued discursive and material position

of local non-Indigenous peoples. This re-alignment through the *colonial denizen* provides the foundation through which non-Indigenous peoples can appropriately meet Indigenous peoples' calls for decolonizing change which require non-Indigenous society to de-center themselves from the discourse while re-centering Indigenous peoples, lands and their nation-hoods and sovereignties.

The work completed here has begun the discursive exercise that leads to the establishment of a denizen ethos as both a discursive and material re-orienting of non-Indigenous society that itself can provide the aforementioned paradigmatic shift. I have focused on the *colonial denizen* as a normative-analytical tool for exploring historical Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations from the seventeenth century up to present day in the hopes that insights gleaned from this analysis can help in the establishment of a contemporary ethos. The use of the *colonial denizen* as an analytical tool is, therefore, a core mobilization of the discursive exercise presented. Such analysis has helped empirically ground the *colonial denizen* through the exploration of real-world and relevant examples of Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations that may be historic in nature but which can provide insights regarding the instantiation of an ethos today. This discursive exercise has also re-storied mainstream narratives of settlement and Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations around the denizen and invitation. Such explorations have helped challenge long-held, colonizing assumptions about the past, settlement and belonging in ways that impact contemporary understandings of these same concepts. This analysis has also helped identify how Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationships have evolved over time, the various structures (state, capital, property) that have both been mobilized by and that helped guide the development of colonialism and its sustenance, as well as highlighted conditions under which civic ancestors exhibited denizen-like behaviours providing readers with avenues through which to consider the various aspects and iterations of a contemporary *denizen ethos*.

The bulk of this dissertation has been focused on the application of the *colonial denizen* as a normative-analytical tool within seventeenth-century Indigenous-French relations within the Laurentian Valley and North American interior. These chapters focused on some of the earliest types of colonialism (trade, agrarian, religious) and variously situated actors (sojourners, agrarian colonists, religious colonists, arrivants, etc.) to explore not only the highly contextualized nature of the denizen but to, as stated-above, ground the exploration as well as contemporary iterations of the *colonial denizen* within an empirically-relevant and historical analysis. While it was my

hypothesis that these early French colonial actors, due to their vulnerable position relative to Indigenous peoples and land, would have been naturally more inclined to demonstrate denizen-like behaviours, I found that even the earliest of colonial actors (early sojourners and agrarian colonists at Champlain's habitation) were pushing against their vulnerability as foreigners on Indigenous lands toward the realization of broader imperial and colonial interests. As analysis through these chapters has demonstrated, however, such observations do not discount the potential for finding denizen-like behaviours amongst these French colonial actors. One is still able to consider their actions (colonial or otherwise) through a denizen lens to contemplate an alternative history of how they could have or should have acted as denizens. Both the search for specific denizen-like moments or behaviours as well as this denizen-focused re-storying occupied analysis within these chapters.

There are three major areas of deduction drawn from these chapters (chapters 2 through to 6) which pertain to: the implications drawn from an historical re-visiting of settlement through the denizen and invitation; insights in denizen-behaviour and the conditions that foster such behaviour; and the context-driven nature of the denizen. To begin with, the re-storying of settlement narratives through a denizen lens has produced some key insights regarding long-held assumptions within non-Indigenous state and society surrounding invitation, belonging and colonialism – insights with which non-Indigenous society needs to grapple with in the move toward a *colonial denizen* ethos. For instance, in chapters 2 and 3 early settlement through forced invitation as well as invasion was explored upon sites where the mainstream narrative has long claimed, or at least implied, justified, friendly and invited settlement of Europeans occurred. Since voluntary invitation from Indigenous peoples is a requirement of invoking denizen-like relations between non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples, such alternative narratives suggest there is a real and pertinent need for non-Indigenous inhabitants of these areas to step back, consider their positions upon such lands, and contemplate with Indigenous peoples whose territories they illegitimately occupy how to move forward and if invitation is appropriate (what this might or might not look like). This re-storying has also demonstrated the very real and damaging position of religion and the Catholic Church in the colonization of and spread of empire within the continent not only through Rome's papal bulls but through the actions of religious colonists who fostered an increasingly self-sufficient, agrarian and so increasingly colonialist colony within the St. Lawrence Valley. These chapters have also shed light on the

important role of capital in not only helping to formulate colonial interests and shifting colonial priorities and instantiations but also within colonialism's very sustenance and modern formulation. Finally this re-storying, completed within the final chapter on citizenship and colonialism from 1763-1982, has demonstrated the Canadian turn away from the denizen as one possible structure informing Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations as well as how damaging this turn away has been for Indigenous life and land.

There have also been important insights regarding denizen-behaviours and the contexts that encourage such behaviours. While I found that there appeared to always be an overarching imperial and/or colonial interest, a sort of self-interest, I was still able to find various moments through which the French colonists of seventeenth-century New France exhibited denizen-like actions. The inclination toward denizen-like behaviours was strongest when colonists found themselves confronted with their own vulnerability or else in a position of mutual dependence with Indigenous peoples. In chapters 2, 4, and 6 for instance, one sees sojourners, agrarian colonists, and trade colonists showing greater deference to Indigenous peoples, customs and laws when they are vulnerable during harsh winter months, English occupation, or outnumbered far away from their colony in trade relations, as well as when they have a mutual interest in defeating a common enemy. This suggests that contemporary instantiations of a denizen ethos will be most successful when common concerns, goals and interests are identified – commonalities along which to develop positive relationship but which, importantly, do not override core differences between parties and which maintain the centering of Indigenous life, land and nation-hoods.

Insights regarding the conditions of denizen-like behaviours have also suggested that trade-based colonialism is naturally more favourable toward denizen-like relations than agrarian-based colonialism. This is due to the temporary nature of trade colonies as well as the requirement that trade foster an environment of relative equality between partners. While Indigenous-French relations during the seventeenth-century were never devoid of imperial and colonial overtones and interests, periods and places of focused trade-based colonialism (early relations along the river and late century relations within the interior) were more likely to give-way to denizen-like relations between non-Indigenous peoples and those Indigenous peoples with which they sought to establish and maintain alliances. As the colony along the river became increasingly agrarian, increasingly focused on more permanent settlement of lands claimed,

colonists became (as seen in chapter 4) increasingly less likely to demonstrate denizen-like behaviours. This was because these colonists became increasingly secure as colonists within the confines of their colonial settlement and so less likely to experience moments of vulnerability that would encourage and/or force them to demonstrate deference to Indigenous peoples and laws. As colonial society became increasingly more self-sufficient, therefore, their behaviours and orientations toward Indigenous peoples and lands developed further and further away from the *colonial denizen*. Of particular interest here is the fact that such self-sufficiency and growing interests were tied up with capital highlighting a very real need, further evidenced in chapter eight's focus on the relationship between nation-building and colonialism, for contemporary consideration of capitalism's structures, roles and processes and its relationship with colonialism today. While this all might suggest there is a natural and unavoidable pull for non-Indigenous peoples toward colonizing relations, such a suggestion is devoid of any corroborating evidence. As the final chapter of this dissertation argues, individuals – though they might be constituted by the structures by which they governed – always have a choice to think and act differently.

Finally, historical analysis of New France through a denizen lens has highlighted the adaptability of the *colonial denizen*. Analysis of variously situated actors throughout these chapters who were engaging with the colonial project through different means and from different positions within society has shown that denizen-like behaviours are not to be confined to a specifically-aligned actor or set of actors but are adaptable to and found amongst a variety of contexts and roles. For instance, there are specific instantiations of denizen-like behaviour anticipated from trade-based actors that differ in content (though not in tone) from denizen-like behaviours to be anticipated from agrarian-based actors. While the actual realization of a contemporary denizen ethos will be even more particularized – based on specific geographic realities, histories, local Indigenous interests and ethics, and lines of belonging/access to state and colonial privileges – such historical analysis provides a platform through which to begin considering these more particularized orientations and behaviours. Furthermore, the broad (though incomplete) analysis of various roles, particularly demonstrable through analysis of the roles of arrivants within the broader colonial project, demonstrates that not all contemporary peoples who look to take up a denizen ethos will take on the same sorts of responsibilities and orientations. What a denizen ethos looks like to me, as a white female of relative privilege within settler colonial society, will look very different from what a denizen ethos might look like for a

racialized Canadian citizen whose ancestors were enslaved by my own for generations. Invoking a denizen ethos today requires the identification of these very real differences and realities, how the past informs them and shapes future orientations and behaviours.

The final chapter of this dissertation focused on the mutually re-enforcing relationship between Canadian citizenship and settler colonialism. Citizenship (through an exploration of belonging, denizenship and invitation) was an implicit focus of analysis throughout the entirety of the previous chapters. As such, this last chapter provided a book-end to the broader discursive exercise in that it: completed the re-storying of settlement, belonging and invitation begun in chapter 2; explored at a deeper level *why* contemporary paradigms that have shaped non-Indigenous responses to Indigenous peoples' calls for decolonization have been insufficient; how non-Indigenous peoples, as Canadian citizens, have been continuously implicated within settler colonialism; and finally why there is a need for a *colonial denizen* paradigm.

Given the general trends identified within previous chapters, it was unsurprising to find within this last chapter that as non-Indigenous Canadians became increasingly interested in autonomy from Britain and self-identity during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, colonial policies became increasingly aggressive and settler colonial in nature. Not only does this represent a 'natural' development from earlier chapters and the shift from trade-based to agrarian-based colonialism, but it demonstrates a core mechanism animating *settler* colonialism itself. Given that settler colonialism is premised on the establishment of a settler society as indigenous to foreign lands, there is an inherent proclivity toward the erasure of Indigenous peoples and lands. An erasure necessary to make room for this settler society as an 'indigenous' or natural society. This erasure has been maintained throughout citizenship regime shifts.

While the focus and content of specific Canadian citizenship regimes have shifted overtime, they have always helped support the advancement of settler colonialism. Changes in citizenship structure merely shaped the focus and execution of specific colonial policies during any given time. Consider for instance the regime of the settler proto-citizen, formally introduced through Confederation, with its focus on the physical aspects of nation-building, the growth of capital and the corresponding focus of colonial policy being on the erasure of Indigenous peoples through dispossession and isolation. And then consider how as the regime changed from proto-citizen to liberal-individual settler citizen, with an increasing focus on the discursive project of nation-building, colonial policy became increasingly focused on latter forms of settler colonial

erasure as assimilation into non-Indigenous society. The relationship between citizenship and settler colonialism remained relatively the same between both regimes, but as the interests of the citizen body shifted so did the focus and implementation of colonial policy.

Analysis of this relationship from 1763 to 1982 and beyond has helped complete an exploration of the shift from a time when denizen-like relations were a potential way forward in Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations toward the instantiation of the colonial citizen as it stands today. A structural relationship that has replaced more appropriate relations of Indigenous-Colonial Denizen, in favour of the divisive relations of Crown-Indigenous and Crown-Colonists. A structural dualism which has displaced Indigenous nation-hoods and sovereignties at the same time it has attempted to foreclose more direct relations between Indigenous peoples and colonists which are necessary for realizing a denizen ethos. Moving forward, therefore, there is a real need to push past this divisive dual relationship and to re-imagine Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations without the Crown as an arbiter and obstacle to more direct Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations. If non-Indigenous peoples can embody this ethos there would be no need for such a division which was ostensibly established as a protective measure.

The relationships between citizenship, settler colonialism and even liberalism and neo-liberalism identified within this last chapter have demonstrated that the contemporary approaches to decolonization attempted from within the logics and constraints of contemporary citizenship and governance regimes will always ultimately fail to bring about real structural decolonizing change. This is why there is a real and palpable need for a paradigm shift – a way to release society from the real and colonizing constraints of contemporary paradigms. Of course any new paradigm will not be without its own constraints – such is the reality of societal structures, they foreclose so that they may provide. If the focus of a regime shift is on decolonization, however, the ethos that I am presenting here presents a credible process through which such a goal might be attained. Certainly the current influences of global neoliberalism (with its focus on capital) and its degradation of the citizenship regime as a tangible concept itself, and national post-neoliberal responses to these forces, presents a particularly apt moment through which to explore and establish such an ethos and with it the potential for meaningful, decolonizing change.

Through my work I have attempted to cover considerable ground, focused as I have been on empirically grounding the *colonial denizen* throughout French-imperial and Canadian history and actively pursuing a discursive exercise around the *colonial denizen* in the hopes that it

informs both the discursive and material instantiations of a denizen ethos today. Given the breadth of this study as well as the real-time and economic constraints of completing a PhD, specific analysis of actors and contexts within seventeenth-century New France as well as nineteenth and twentieth-century Canada could have been more comprehensive. Certainly not all actors and contexts were explore during earlier chapters and further, more in-depth analysis would be advisable within the last chapter. Furthermore, as always, more Indigenous-based materials would always improve this sort of work. Having said this, strong foundations have been provided here for future development of the *colonial denizen* both as a discursive exercise as well as a discursive and material ethos.

Future work that builds on what has been explored and proposed here could further develop this discursive exercise through broader and/or more in depth analysis of historical roles and relations between Indigenous peoples and colonists as well as the relationship between citizenship and colonialism and public education, citizenship and colonialism. Importantly, too, future work should begin to bring the real-world material conditions that the establishment of a *colonial denizen* ethos needs to consider as well as what the material instantiations of such an ethos might look like. I am not sure if it is the place of a settler to say what such material embodiment might be, but the place of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples to collectively discuss and discover what this might be within specific and highly contextualized locales.

This dissertation is a humble proposal to Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples alike – a potential guide/thought experiment/avenue through which to re-consider and re-structure Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations. Grounded within historical research and critical colonial theory, it is my hope that the *colonial denizen* ethos that I have presented here be considered by interested political scientists and historians alike in their studies around colonialism and decolonization (if not beyond these research areas) both nationally and internationally. As I have demonstrated, there is a real need to critically evaluate contemporary structures and think beyond their confines and the *colonial denizen* offers one way through which to accomplish this and potentially help bring about the decolonization society so desperately needs. Even if the *colonial denizen* is not the path taken it is my hope that it can inform or help catalyze meaningful, future research and symbolic and material orientations in the move the decolonize.

Bibliography

Abu-Laban, Y & Nieguth, T. (2000). Reconsidering the Constitution, Minorities and Politics in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science.* 33.3. 465-97.

Adamoski, R., Chunn, D., Menzies, R. (2002). Rethinking the Citizen in Canadian Social History. *Contesting Canadian Citizenship: Historical Readings*. Adamoski, R., Chunn, D., Menzies, R. (Eds.). Toronto: Broadview Press.

An act to amend and consolidate the law respecting Indians, S.C. 1876, c.18

An act to encourage the gradual civilization of the Indian tribes in the province of Canada.

Anderson, M.C. & Robertson, C.L. (2011). *Seeing Red: A History of Native in Canadian Newspapers.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Alfred, G.T.. (1995). *Heeding the Voices of our Ancestors: Kahnawake Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, T. & Corntassel, J. (2005). Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism. *Politics of Identity.* 4, 597-614.

Arneil, B. (2009). "Disability, Self Image, and Modern Political Theory." *Political Theory.* 37.2. 218-242.

--- (2017). *Domestic Colonies: The Turn Inward to Colony.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. (1996). *John Locke and America: The Defence of English Colonialism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

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

Bains, R. (2016). *Duty to Consult with Aboriginal Peoples*. Fraser Institute.

Bannerji, J. (200). *The Dark Side of the Nation : Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender.* Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Banting, K. (1982). *The Welfare State and Canadian Federalism.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Barman, J. (2014). *French Canadians, Furs and Indigenous Women in the Making of the Pacific Northwest.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

Beaulieu, Alain. (2013). "'An equitable right to be compensated': The Dispossession of the Aboriginal Peoples of Quebec and the Emergence of the New legal Rationale (1760 1860)." *The Canadian Historical Review.* 94 (1).

Belmessous, S. (2005). Assimiliation and Racialism in Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century French Colonial Policy. *American Historical Review*. 110 (2).

Berry. E.G.. (1944). Cives Sine Suffragio in England. *The Classical Journal.* 39. (8,) 490-92.

Biggar, H.P.. (1901). *The Early Trading Companies of New France: A Contribution to the History of Commerce and Discovery in North America.* George Wrong (Ed). St. Clair Shores: Scholarly Press Inc.

Borrows, J. (2010). *Canada's Indigenous Constitution.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

---. (1994). Traditional Use, Treaties and Land Title Settlements: A Legal History of the Anishnabe of Manitoulin Island. Diss., York University.

---. (1997). Wampum at Niagara: The Royal Proclamation, Canadian Legal History, and Self Government. *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada: Essays on Law, Equity, and Respect for Difference.* Asch, M. (Eds.). Vancouver: UBC Press. 155-72.

Bowker Lee, D. (2012). "From Captives to Kin: Indian Slavery and Changing Social Identities on the Louisiana Colonial Frontier." *Native American Adoption, Captivity and Slavery in*

Changing Contexts. Ed. Max Carocci and Stephanie Pratt. New York: Palgrave Mcmillan.

Braedley, S. (2012). The Masculinization Effect: Neoliberalism, the Medical Paradigm and Ontario's Health Care Policy. *Canadian Woman Studies*. 29.3. 71-83.

Brodie, J. (2002). Three Stories of Canadian Citizenship. *Contesting Canadian Citizenship: Historical Readings*. Adamoski, R., Chunn, D., Menzies, R. (Eds.). Toronto: Broadview Press. 43-68.

Brown, J. (1996). *Strangers in Blood: Fur Trade Company Families in Indian Country.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Brown, J. and Wilson, C.R.. (2004). Chapter 6: The Northern Algonquins: A Regional Overview. *Native Peoples: The Canadian Experience*. Bruce Morrison and C. Roderick Wilson (Eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bruyneel, K. The American Liberal Colonial Tradition. *Settler Colonial Studies.* 3. 3-4. 311-21.

Byrd, J. (2011). *Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Buller, C. (1840). Responsible Government for Colonies, 1840. As cited in: *The Concept of Empire: Burke to Attlee 1774-1947.* Bennett, G. (Eds.). (1962). London: Adam & Charles Black Ltd.

Cairns, A. (1992). *Charter vs. Federalism: The Dilemmas of Constitutional Reform.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

(2011). *Citizens Plus: Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

---. (1991). *Disruptions: Constitutional Struggles from the Charter to Meech Lake.* Ed. Douglas Williams. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Cajete, G. (8 Sept. 2014). Indigenous Science Education Model. *Indigenous Metholdogies & Epistimologies. EDST508A.* Neville Scarfe Building, University of British Columbia, Vancouver. Guest Lecturer.

Callow, C. (2015). The Proclamation of 1763: Indian Country Origins and American Impacts. *Keeping Promises: The Royal Proclamation of 1763, Aboriginal Rights, and Treaties in Canada.* Fenge, T. and Aldridge, J. (Eds.). Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press. 33-48.

Canada. (2003). Indian Claims Commission. Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada. *Mississauga of the New Credit First Nation Inquiry: Toronto Purchase Claim*. Commissioner Daniel Bellegrade. Ottawa: GPO.

Canada. (2019). National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Women and Girls. Privy Council Office. *Reclaiming Power and Place: Final Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls.* Ottawa: Privy Council Office.

---. (1996). Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Vol. 3: Gathering Strength.* Ottawa: GPO.

----. (17 May 2017). *Statement by the Prime Minister of Canada on Montreal's 375th Anniversary*. *Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada*. Retrieved from https://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2017/05/17/statement-prime-minister-canada-montreals-375th anniversary

---. (2016). Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *Canada's Residential Schools: Reconciliation.* Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Cannon, M. (2013). Changing the Subject in Teacher Education: Centering Indigenous, Diasporic, and Settler Colonial Relations. *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry.* 4 (2), 21 38.

Cardinal, C. (2018). *Ohpikiihaakan-Ohpihmeh Raised Somewhere Else: A 60s Scoop Adoptee's Story of Coming Home.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Cardinal, H. (1999). *The Unjust Society*. (2nd Ed.). Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.

Cardinal, S. (2017). Beyond the Sixties Scoop: Reclaiming Indigenous Identity, Reconnection to Place, and Reframing Understandings of Being Indigenous. Diss., University of Victoria.

de Casson, F.D. (1928). *A History of Montréal 1640-1672*. Ralph Flenley (Ed. and Trans.). London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd..

CBCNews. (17 May 2017). Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/montreal 375-birthday-coderre-1.4119164

Champlain, S. d., & Grant, W.L. (1907) *Voyages of Samuel de champlain, 1604-1618.* New York: C., Scribner's Sons.

Charbonneau et al. (1993). *The First French Canadians in the St. Lawrence Valley.* Cranbury: Associated University Presses.

Chatman, S. (2000). 'There are no Slaves in France': A Re-Examination of Slave Laws in Eighteenth Century France. *The Journal of Negro History.* 85.3. 144-53.

Chester, C. (1973). *Dominion Lands Policy.* Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Choquette, L. (1992). 'Ces Amazones du Grand Dieu': Women and Mission in Seventeenth Century Canada. *French Historical Studies.* 17.(3), 627-55.

---. (1997). *Frenchmen into Peasants: Modernity and Tradition in the Peopling of French Canada.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Church, J., Gerlock, A., Smith, D.L. (2018). "Neoliberalism and Accountability Failure in the Diversity of Services Affecting the Health of the Public." *International Journal of Health Services.* 48.4. 641-62.

Churchill, L.O. (2015). The Conservation and Mounting of the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) Charter. *Journal of the Institute of Conservation*. 38.1. 65-76.

City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York, 544 U.S. 197 (2005).

Codignola, L. (2001). Few, Uncooperative, and Ill Informed? The Roman Catholic Clergy in French and British North America, 1610-1658. *Decentering the Renaissance: Canada and Europe in Multidisciplinary Perspective 1500-1700.* Germaine Warkentin and Carolyn Podruchny (Eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

"Collection Louis-François-Georges Baby (P0058)." Division des archives. *Université de Montréal.* (http://www.archiv.umontreal.ca/: accessed 14 Jul 2017). Pdf document from microfilm P0058B2/2 (mf 947). Séminaire et seigneurie de Montreal. "Villemaire, 18 septembre 1651. De Chomedey. Concession de 30 arpents à Jacques Archambault."

Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (U.K.), 1982, c.11

Cooper, A. (2007). *The Hanging of Angélique: The Untold Story of Canadian Slavery and the Burning of Old Montréal.* Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Coulthard, G. (2014). *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Crosby, D. et al. (19 March 2016). The 'Doctrine of Discovery' and *Terra Nullius*: A Catholic Response. *Commission for Justice and Peace of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops.* Retrieved from

http://www.cccb.ca/site/images/stories/pdf/catholic%20response%20to%20doctrine%20
f%20discovery%20and%20tn.pdf

Crowley, T. (1997). Women, Religion, and Freedom in New France. *Women and Freedom in Early America.* New York: New York University Press.

Daschuk, J. (2013). *Clearing the Plains: Disease, Politics of Starvation, and the Loss of Aboriginal Life.* Regina: University of Regina Press.

Davis, L. et al. (2016). Complicated Pathways: Settler Canadians learning to re-frame themselves and their relations with Indigenous peoples. *Settler Colonial Studies*. 1-17.

Dechêne, L. (1992). *Habitants and Merchants in Seventeenth Century Montréal.* Trans. Liana Vardi. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Delâge, D. (1981). Amérindiens et Européens en Amérique du Nord-est, 1600-1664. Diss. École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris.

Denizen. (n.d.). In *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.oed.com/

Dickason, O. (2001). The Sixteenth-Century French Vision of Empire: The Other Side of Self Determination. *Decentering the Renaissance: Canada and Europe in Multidisciplinary Perspective 1500-1700.* Germaine Warkentin and Carolyn Podruchny (Eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dictionnaire national des Canadiens français (1608-1760). (1965).Vol. 2. Montréal: Institut généalogique Drouin, 1965.

Donnan, M.E. (2014). Life after Neoliberalism in Canada: How Policy Creates Homelessness and how Citizenship Models Fail to Provide Solutions. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences.* 7.5. 585-596.

Douglas, J. (1905). *Old France in the New World.* Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Co..

Doxtator, D. (2001). Inclusive and Exclusive Perceptions of Difference: Native and Euro-Based Concepts of Time, History and Change. *Decentering the Renaissance: Canada and Europe in Multidisciplinary Perspective 1500-1700.* Germaine Warkentin and Carolyn Podruchny (Eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dupras, Daniel. (1992). *The Constitution of Canada: A Brief History of Amending Procedure Disccussions*. Law and Government Division. Government of Canada. Web. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection-R/LoPBdP/BP/bp283-e.htm

Eccles, W.J.. (1988). *Essays on New France.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. (1990). *France in America.* Revised Ed. Markham: Fitzhenry and Whiteside.

---. (1969). *The Canadian Frontier 1534-1760.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

---. (1966). *The Ordeal of New France: Part 1 of a four-part history of Canada.* Montréal: The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Emberley, J. (2001). "The Bourgeois Family, Aboriginal Women, and Colonial Governance in Canada: A Study in Feminist Historical and Cultural Materialism." *Signs.* 27.1. 59-85.

Environics Institute for Survey Research. (2016). *Canadian Public Opinion on Aboriginal Peoples Final Report*. Toronto: The Environics Institute.

Ethridge, R. (2012). "The Emergence of the Colonial South." *Native American Adoption, Captivity and Slavery in Changing Contexts.* Ed. Max Carocci and Stephanie Pratt. New York: Palgrave Mcmillan.

Faillon, E.F. and Nineteenth Century Collections Online. (1853). *Vie de la Soeur Bourgeouys: fondatrice de la congregation de Notre-Dame de Villemarie en Canada: Suivie de l'histoire de cet institute jusqu'a ce jour.* Chez les soeurs de la Congregation de Notre

Dame, Villemarie. Retrieved from
http://numerique.banq.qc.ca/patrimoine/details/52327/2022727

Fischer, D. (2008). *Champlain's Dream.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

"Fonds des greffes de notaires du Québec [document textuel (quelques microformes)] (R11118 0-7-F)." *Library and Archives Canada.* Accessed 22 Mar 2018. Microfilm MG8-A23. Volume/Box number 7. "Marché d'un puits faitre entre le père Gabriel Thubières de Levy de Quelylus, prêtre, et Jacques Archambault. B Bénigne Basset, notaire." 1659, juin, 08. http://collectionscanada.gc.ca/pam_archives/index.php?fuseaction=genitem.displayItem rec_nbr=3076773&lang=eng&rec_nbr_list=3076773,4894299,3060896

"Fonds des greffes de notaires du Québec [document textuel (quelques microformes)] (R11118 0-7-F)." *Library and Archives Canada.* Accessed 22 Mar 2018. Microfilm MG8-A23. Volume/Box number 8. "Marché d'un puits fait par Jacques Archambault aux sieurs Jacques Le Ber, Testard et Charles Le Moyne. Bénigne Basset, notaire." 1660, mai, 17. http://collectionscanada.gc.ca/pam_archives/index.php?fuseaction=genitem.displayItem rec_nbr=3076845&lang=eng&rec_nbr_list=3076845,3083138,3083016,3047262,30770 2,3077014,3077877,3082551,3076747,3083139

"Fonds des greffes de notaires du Québec [document textuel (quelques microformes)] (R11118 0-7-F)." *Library and Archives Canada.* Accessed 22 Mar 2018. Microfilm MG8-A23. Volume/Box number 11. "Marché d'un puits par Jacques Archambault au sieur Claude Robutel de Saint-André. Bénigne Basset, notaire." 1664, novembre, 16. http://collectionscanada.gc.ca/pam_archives/index.php?fuseaction=genitem.displayItem rec_nbr=3077014&lang=eng&rec_nbr_list=3076845,3083138,3083016,3047262,30770 2,3077014,3077877,3082551,3076747,3083139

"Fonds des greffes de notaires du Québec [document textuel (quelques microformes)] (R11118 0-7-F)." *Library and Archives Canada.* Accessed 8 Apr 2018. Microfilm M-1624. "Bail à loyer de Claude Charron à Jacques LeBlanc. Romain Becquet, notaire. 8 avril, 1668. http://collectionscanada.gc.ca/pam_archives/index.php?fuseaction=genitem.displayItem rec_nbr=3080229&lang=eng&rec_nbr_list=1778076,1778985,3080229,3042045,30816 5,1778218,1371316,815771,4519820,4615962

Freeman, V. (2010). 'Toronto Has No History!' Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, and Historical Memory in Canada's Largest City. *Urban History Review.* 38 (2), 21-36.

Gaudry, Adam and Leroux, Darryl. (2017). "White Settler Revisionism and Making Métis Everywhere: The Evocation of Métissage in Quebec and Nova Scotia." *Critical Ethnic Studies.* 3 (1).

Gerber, D. (2006). *Authors of their Lives: The Personal Correspondence of British Immigrants to North America in the Nineteenth Century.* New York: New York University Press.

Gilmour, D. and Turgeon, P. (2000). *Canada: A People's History.* Volume 1. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd..

Goldstein, R. (1969). *French-Iroquois Diplomatic and Military Relations 1609-1701.* The Hague: Mouton & Co. Publishers.

Goulson, C. (1970). *Seventeenth-Century Canada Source Studies.* Toronto: Macmillan of Canada.

Green, J. (2004). "Balancing Strategies: Aboriginal Women and Constitutional Rights in Canada." *Women Making Constitutions: New Politics and Comparative Perspectives.* Ed. Alexandra Dobrowolsky and Vivien Hard. Gordonsville: Palgrave MacMillan.

---. (2003). "Self-Determination, Citizenship and Federalsim: Indigenous and Canadian Palimpsest." *The Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy: Public Policy Paper Series.* 13. 2-29.

Green, L.C. and Dickason, O. (1989). *The Law of Nations and the New World.* Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

Greer, A. (2018). *Property and Dispossession: Natives, Empires and Land in Early Modern North America.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. (1993). *The Patriots and the People: The Rebellions of 1837 in Rural Lower Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

---. (1997). *The People of New France.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Haida Nation v British Columbia (Minister of Forests) [2004] 3 S.C.R. 511, 2004 SCC 73

Harring, S. (1998). *White Man's Law: Native People in Nineteenth-Century Canadian Jurisprudence.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Harris, R.C.. (1966). *The Seigneurial System in Early Canada: A Geographical Study.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Hart, Michael. (2002). *A Trading Nation: Canadian Trade Policy from Colonialism to Globalization.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Havard, G. (2013). "'Protection' and 'Unequal Alliance': The French Conception of Sovereignty over Indians in New France." *French and Indians in the Heart of North America, 1630 1815.* Ed. Robert Englebert and Guillaume Teasdale. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press. 113-37.

Heidenreich, C. (2001).The Beginning of French Exploration out of the St. Lawrence Valley: Motives, Methods, and Changing Attitudes towards Native People. *Decentering the Renaissance: Canada and Europe in Multidisciplinary Perspective 1500-1700.* Germaine Warkentin and Carolyn Podruchny (Eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hutchings, P. (1987). The Argument for the Application of the Royal Proclamation of 1763 to British Columbia, its Force and Effect. Diss., University of British Columbia.

Igartua, J.E. (2006). *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945 71.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Indian Association of Alberta. (1970). *Citizens Plus.* Edmonton: Indian Association of Alberta.

Insin, E. et al. (1999). *Citizenship and Identity.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Irlbacher-Fox, S. (2014). #IdleNoMore: Settler Responsibility for Relationship. *The Winter We Danced: Voices from the Past, the Future, and the Idle No More Movement.* The Kino nda-niimi Collective. (Ed.0. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Jenson, J. (1997). Fated to Live in Interesting Times: Canada's Changing Citizenship Regimes. *Canadian Journal of Political Science.* 30.4. 627-44.

Kainai Board of Education. (2005). *Aboriginal Studies 20: Peoples and Cultural Change.* Tribal Chiefs Institute of Treaty Six. Edmonton: Duval House Publishing.

Kapesh, An Antane. (1976). *Je suis une maudite sauvagesse/Eukuan nin matshimanitu innu iskueue.* Ottawa: Les Éditions Leméac Inc.

Kimelman, E. (1985). *No Quiet Place.* Final Report to the Honourable Muriel Smith, Minister of Community Services. Review Committee on Indian and Metis Adoptions and Placements. Manitoba Community Services.

Kino-nda-niimi Collective. (2014). *The Winter We Danced: Voices from the Past, the Future, and the Idle No More Movement.* Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Khun, Thomas. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LAC - Library and Archives Canada. (2016). The Salt Smugglers. *New France New Horizons: On French Soil in America.* Web. https://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/exploration settlement/new-france-new-horizons/Pages/departure.aspx#5

Ladner, K. (2001). "Visions of Neo-Colonialism? Renewing the Relationship with Aboriginal Peoples." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies.* 21. 105-35.

Lanctôt, G. (1964). *Les filles du joie ou les Filles du Roi: Étude sur l'émigration féminin en Nouvelle France.* Montréal: Les Éditions du Jour.

Landry, Y. (1992a). "Gender Imbalance, Les Filles du Roi, and Choice of Spouse in New France." *Canadian Family History: Selected Readings.* Ed. Bettina Bradbury. Mississauga: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd.

---. (1992b). *Orphelines en France, pionnières au Canada: Les Filles du roi au XVII$_e$ siècle suivi d'un Répetoire biographique des Filles du roi*. Ottawa: Leméac Éditeur.

---. (2013). *Orphelines en France, pionnières au Canada: Les Filles du roi au XVII$_e$ siècle suivi d'un Répetoire biographique des Filles du roi*. 2$_{ieme}$ Ed. Quebec: Bibliothèque Québécoise.

Lawrence, B. (2002). Rewriting Histories of the Land: Colonization and Indigenous Resistance in Eastern Canada. *Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society.* Toronto: Between the Lines. 21-46.

Lawrence, B. & Dua, E. (2005). Decolonizing Antiracism. *Social Justice*. 32 (4), 120-143.

LeBlant, R. (1972). Le Commerce compliqué des fourrures canadiennes au début du XVII$_e$ Siècle. RHAF 26: 53-6.

Leitner, J. (2015). Commodity Frontier as Contested Periphery: The Fur Trade in Iroquoia, New York and Canada, 1664-1754. *Nature, Raw Materials, and Political Economy.* 10. 231 252.

Lévesque, R. (2011). "An Option for Quebec." *The Development of Political Thought in Canada: An Anthology.* Ed. Katherine Fierlbeck. 239-56.

Little Bear, L. (2000). Jagged Worldviews Colliding. *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision.* Marie Battiste (Ed.). Vancouver, UBC Press.

Lloyd, D & Wolfe, P. (2016). Settler Colonial Logics and the Neoliberal Regime. *Settler Colonial Studies*. 6.2. 109-18.

Lowrie, M. (17 May 2017) Festivities galore as Montreal celebrates its 375th birthday. Retrieved from https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2017/05/17/trudeau-other-dignitaries-gather in-montreal-to-celebrate-citys-375th-birthday.html

Lozier, J.F. (2015). "Les Campagnes des Carignan-Salières…vues par ses allies autochtones." *Cap-aux-Diamants*. 122. 24-27.

MacDonald, F.L. (2008). The Neoliberal State and Multiculturalism: The Need for Democratic Accountability. Diss. University of British Columbia.

MacKendrick, P.L.. (1952). Roman Colonization. *Phoenix*. 6 (4), 139-146.

Macklem, P. (2001). *Indigenous Difference and the Constitution of Canada*. Toronto: UTP.

Mackey, E. (2002). *The House of Difference: Cultural Political and National Identity in Canada.* Toronto: UTP.

---. (2016). *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty Land and Settler Decolonization*. Halifax: Fernwood Press.

Mailhot, Amélie-Anne. (2017). "The Perspective of Political Housing in I am a Cursed Savage/Eukuan nin matshimanitu innu-iskueu by Anatane Kapesh." *Feminist Research.* 30 (1).

Maracle, Lee. (2003). The Operation was Successful , But the Patient Died. *Box of Treasures or Empty Box? Twenty Years of Section 35.* Vancouver: Theytus. 309-315.

Marshall, T.H.. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class and other Essays.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maynard, R. (2017). *Policing Black Lives: State Violence in Canada from Slavery to the Present.* Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

McFarlene, P. (1993). *Brotherhood to Nationhood: George Manuel and the Making of the Modern Indian Movement.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

McGrath, A. and Stevenson, W. "Gender, Race, and Policy: Aboriginal Women and the State in Canada and Australia." *Labour.* 38. 37-53.

McNab, D. (1983). Herman Merivale and Colonial Office Indian Policy in the Mid-Nineteenth Century. *As Long as the Sun Shines and Water Flows: A Reader in Canadian Native Studies*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press. 85-103.

Memmi, A.(1965). *The Colonizer and the Colonized.* New York: Orion Press, Inc..

Michaud-Ouellet, Joëlle-Alice. (2019). *On the Relationship between Vulnerability and Sovereignty in Québécois Settler Self-Determination and the Shift to a Relational Conception of the Self as Treaty Partner.* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Victoria.

Mikisew Cree First Nation v Canada (Minister of Canadian Heritage) [2005] 3 S.C.R. 388

Miller, J.R.. (2015). Canada's Historic Treaties. *Keeping Promises: The Royal Proclamation of 1763, Aboriginal Rights, and Treaties in Canada.* Terry Fenge and Jim Aldridge (Eds.). Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Milloy, J.S., McCallum, M. J. (2017). *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential Schools System, 1879 to 1986.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

---. (1983). The Early Indian Acts: Developmental Strategy and Constitutional Change. *As Long as the Sun Shines and Water Flows: A Reader in Canadian Native Studies*.Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press. 56-64.

Mills, A. (2016). The Lifeworlds of Law: on Revitalizing Indigenous Legal Orders Today. *McGill Law Journal.* 61 (4), 847-884.

Molloy, J. (1983). The Early Indian Acts: Developmental Strategy and Constitutional Change. *As long as the sun shines and the water flows: A reader in Canadian native studies*. I. Getty (Eds.). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Monture, P. and McGuire, P. (2009). *First Voices: An Aboriginal Women's Reader.* Toronto: Inanna Publications.

Moogk, P. (2000). *La Nouvelle France: The Making of French Canada – A Cultural History.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

---. (2002). The 'Others' Who Never Were: Eastern Woodlands Amerindians and Europeans in the Seventeenth Century. *French Colonial History.* 1, 77-100.

Morgensen, S. L. (2011). The Biopolitics of Settler Colonialism: Right Here, Right Now. *Settler Colonial Studies.* 1.1. 52-76.

Morneau, W. (2016). Growing the Middle Class: 2016 Federal Budget. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Morton, W.L. The West and Confederation. *Roads to Confederation: The Making of Canada, 1867. Volume 2.* Krikorian, J.D., Cameron, D.R., Martel, M., McGougall, A.W., Vipond, R.C. (Eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 231-250.

n.a. (13 Sept 2017). Reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples – Montreal celebrates the 10th anniversary of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. *Newswire.* Retrieved from https://www.newswire.ca/news-releases/reconciliation-with indigenous-peoples---montreal-celebrates-the-10th-anniversary-of-the-united-nations declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples-644215653.html

n.a. (n.d.) Territorial acknowledgement. *Concordia University*. Retrieved from https://www.concordia.ca/about/indigenous/territorial-acknowledgement.html

n.a. (n.d.) Traditional Territories. *McGill University*. Retrieved from https://www.mcgill.ca/edu4all/other-equity-resources/traditional-territories

Nassaney, M. (2008). "Identity Formation at a French Colonial Outpost in the North American Interior." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology.* 12.4. 297-318.

Nettelbeck, A et al. (2016). *Fragile Settlements: Aboriginal Peoples, Law, and Resistance in South-West Australia and Prairie Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Nicoll, F. (2004). Reconciliation in and out of Perspective: White Knowing, Seeing, Curating and Being Home in and Against Indigenous Sovereignty. *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism.* Aileen Moreton-Robinson (Ed.). Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Noel, Jan. (2013). *Along a River: The First French Canadian Women.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Otis, G. The Impact of the Royal Proclamation of 1763 on Québec: Then and Now. *Keeping Promises: The Royal Proclamation of 1763, Aboriginal Rights, and Treaties in Canada.* Fenge, T. and Aldridge, J. (Eds.). Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press. 69-80.

Owram, D. (2017). Promise of Eden: The Canadian Expansionist Movement and the Idea of the West, 1856-1900. *Roads to Confederation: The Making of Canada, 1867. Volume 2.* Krikorian, J.D., Cameron, D.R., Martel, M., McGougall, A.W., Vipond, R.C. (Eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 251-276.

Papillon, M. (2018). Structure, Agency, and the Reconfiguration of Indigenous Citizenship in Canada. *Citizenship as a Regime: Canadian and International Perspectives*. Fourot, A C., Paquet, M., Nagels, N. (Eds.). Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Palmater, P. (2011). *Beyond Blood: Rethinking Indigenous Identity.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

Palmer, J. (2016). *Intimate Bonds: Family and Slavery in the French Atlantic.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Parmenter, J. (2014). *The Edge of the Woods: Iroquoia, 1534-1701.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Paul, J. *Exilés au nom du roi. Les fils de famille et les faux-sauniers en Nouvelle France, 1723 1749.* Sillery: Septentrion.

Peabody, S. (2011). An Alternative Genealogy of Origins of French Free Soil: Medieval Toulouse. *A Journal of Slave and Post-Slave Studies*. 32.3. 341-62.

Pollack, J. (2012). Native Performances of Diplomacy and Religion in Early New France. *Native Acts: Indian Performance, 1603-1832.* D. Bellin, L. Mielke and P. Deloria (Eds.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Prodruchny, C. (2006). *Making the Voyageur World: Travelers and Traders in the North American Fur Trade.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Programme de recherche en démographie historique/ The Research Program in Historical Demography. "Individual: Françoise Toureau." 1464. Filiation Trouvée dans les MSGCF, Vol. 20 (2), pp.102, 104-105. Université du Montréal. Retreived from https://www.prdh igd.com/Gratuit/en/PRDH/Liste/individu?n=Toureau&p=Francoise&r=True&pg=1

Prudham, S. (2004). Poisoning the Well: Neoliberalism and the contamination of Municipal Water in Walkerton, Ontario. *Geoforum*. 35.3. 343-59.

"Quebec, Canada, Vital and Church Records (Drouin Collection), 1621-1968," database and images, *Ancestry* (http://ancestry.ca: accessed 14 Jul 2017), marriage act, Michel Chauvin and Anne Archambault, 29 Jul 1647, Basilique Notre-Dame paroisse register, Montreal, Quebec. Imaged from microfilm identified as "Gabriel Drouin, comp. *Drouin Collection.* Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Institut Généalogique Drouin."

"Quebec, Canada, Vital and Church Reconrds (Drouin Collection), 1621-968," database and images, *Ancestry.ca* (http://ancestry.ca: accessed 15 Aug 2017), marriage act, Jacques LeBlanc and Suzanne Rousselin, 6 June 1666, Basilique Notre-Dame paroisse register, Montreal, Quebec. Imaged from microfilm identified as "Gabriel Drouin, comp. *Drouin Collection.* Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Institute Généalogique Drouin."

Rapley, E. (1993). *The Dévotes: Women and Church in Seventeenth-Century France.* Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Reconciliation. (n.d.). In *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.oed.com/

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

Rossiter, D.A. & Wood, P.B. (2016). Neoliberalism as Shape-Shifter: The Case of Aboriginal Title and the Northern Gateway Pipeline. *Society and Natural Resources: An International Journal.* 29.8. 900-15.

Royot, D. (2007). *Divided Loyalties in a Doomed Empire: The French in the West from New France to the Lewis and Clark Expedition.* Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Rueck, D. (2014). Commons, Enclosure, and Resistance in Kahnawá:ke Mohawk Territory, 1850-1900. *The Canadian Historical Review*. 95.3. 352-381.

Runyan, A.K. (2010). *Daughters of the King and Founders of a Nation: Less Filles du Roi in New France.* Thesis. University of North Texas.

Rushforth, B. (2013). *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France.* Williamsburg: University of North Carolina Press.

Russell, P. (2004). *Constitutional Odyssey: Can Canadians Become a Sovereign People?* (3rd Ed.). Toronto: UTP.

R v Sparrow, [1990] 1 S.C.R. 10975

R v Van de Peet, [1996] 2 S.C.R. 507

Sagard, G. (1866). *Histoire du Canada et voyages que les Frères mineurs recollects y ont faicts pour la conversion des infidèls depuis l'an 1615.* Vol. 1. Nouv. Éd. Pub. M. Edwin Tross. Paris. Retrieved from http://galenet.galegroup.com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/servlet/Sabin?dd=0&locID=ubcolu bia&d1=SABCP05441101&srchtp=a&c=1&an=SABCP05441101&df=f&s1=Hebert& =123&docNum=CY3805685239&cid=CTRG05 B10672&tvol=on&h2=1&vrsn=1.0&af=RN&d6=123&d3=123&ste=10&d4=0.33&stp Author&d5=d6&ae=CY105685117

---. (1968). *Long Journey to the Country of the Hurons.* Ed. George Wrong. Trans. H.H. Langton. Toronto: Champlain Society publication.

Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Scott, D. (2003). "Culture in Political Theory." *Political Theory.* 31. (1), 92-115.

Shearing, C & Wood, J. (2003). Nodal Governance, Democracy and the New 'Denizen'. *Journal of Law and Society.* 30. (3), 400-19.

Sheffield, R.S. (2004). *The Red Man's on the Warpath: The Image of the 'Indian' and the Second World War.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Simoneau, D. (2009). The Seminary of Québec site: from New France's earliest farm to its first religious institution. *Post-Medieval Archaeology.* 43.(1), 213-228.

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across Borders of Settler States*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Simpson, L. (2011). *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence.* Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

---. (March 5, 2016). *Land and Reconciliation: Having the Right Conversations*. Retrieved from http://www.electriccitymagazine.ca/2016/01/land-reconciliation/

Simpson, P. (1997). *Marguerite Bourgeoys and Montréal, 1640-1665*. Montréal: McGill Queen's University Press, 1997.

Sioui, Georges. (1992). *For an Amerindian Autohistory: An Essay on the Foundations of a Social Ethic.* Trans. Sheila Fischman. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Slattery, B. (2002). The Royal Proclamation of 1763 and the Aboriginal Constitution. *Keeping Promises: The Royal Proclamation of 1763, Aboriginal Rights, and Treaties in Canada.* Fenge, T. and Aldridge, J. (Eds.). Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press. 14-32.

Sleeper-Smith, S. '[A]n Unpleasant Transaction on This Frontier': Challenging Female Autonomy and Authority at Michilimackinac. *Journal of the Early Republic*. 25.3. 417 43.

Smith, D. (1981). The Dispossession of the Mississauga Indians: A Missing Chapter in the Early History of Upper Canada. *Ontario History*. 73 (2), 67-87.

Smith, K (2014). *Strange Visitors: Documents in Indigenous-Settler Relations in Canada from 1876.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, M. (2005). Citizens, Denizens and the *Res Publica*: Environmental Ethics, Structures of Feeling and Political Expression. *Environmental Values.* 14, 145-62.

Snelgrove, C. et al. (2014). Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*. 3 (4), 1-32.

Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class.* New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Stanley, A. (2016). Resilient Settler Colonialism: 'Responsible Resource Development,' 'Flow Through' Financing, and the Risk Management of Indigenous Sovereignty in Canada. *Environment and Planning.* 48.12. 2422-42.

Stark, H. (2016). Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land. *Theory Event.* 19. (4).

---. (2012). Marked by Fire: Anishinaabe Articulations of Nationhood in Treaty Making with the United States and Canada. *American Indian Quarterly*. 36 (2), 119-49.

---. (2010). Respect, Responsibility, Renewal: The Foundations of Anishinaabe Treaty Making with the United States and Canada. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal.* 34. (2), 145-164.

Statement of the government of Canada on Indian Policy. Queen's Printer. No. R32-2469.

Taku River Tlingit First Nation v British Columbia (Project Assessment Director) [2004] 3 S.C.R. 550

Tanguay, C. (1871-90). *Dictionnaire généalogique des familles canadiennes depuis la foundation de la colonie jusqu'à nos jours.* Vol.1 1608-1700. Montréal: E. Senécal.

Taylor, C. (1994). The Politics of Recognition. *Multicultural: Examining the Politics of Recognition.* Amy Gutmann (Ed.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

The British North America Act, 1867, ss 1867, c 3

The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents: Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791: The Original French, Latin and Italian Texts, with English Translations and Notes. Volume IV. (1897). Ed. Reuben Gold Thwaites. Cleveland: Burrows.

The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents: Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791: The Original French, Latin and Italian Texts, with English Translations and Notes. Volume V. (1897). Ed. Reuben Gold Thwaites. Cleveland: Burrows.

The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents: Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791: The Original French, Latin and Italian Texts, with English Translations and Notes. Volume XXII. (1897).Ed. Reuben Gold Thwaites. Cleveland: Burrows.

Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Tobias, J. (1983). Protection, Civilization, Assimilation: An Outline of Canada's Indian Policy. *As long as the sun shines and the water flows: A reader in Canadian native studies*. I. Getty (Eds.). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Trigger, T. (1971). Champlain Judged by His Indian Policy. *Anthropoligca, New Series, Not Commander: Essays in Memory of Diamond Janess.* 13.(1), 85-114.

---. (1985) *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's 'Heroic Age' Reconsidered.* Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press.

Trudel, M. (2013). *Canada's Forgotten Slaves: Two Hundred Years of Bondage.* George Tombs. (Trans.). Montreal: Vehicle Press.

---. (1983). *Catalogue des immigrants, 1632-1662*. Montréal: Hurtubise HMH.

---. (1968). *Introduction to New France.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, Ltd..

---. (1973). *La Population du Canada en 1663.* Montréal: Fides Collection fleur de lys études historiques canadiennes.

---. (1999). *Les écolières des Ursulines de Québec, 1639-1953*. Montréal: Hurtubise, 1999.

---. (1973). *The Beginnings of New France: 1534-1663.*Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd..

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada Staff. (2015). *Canada's Residential Schools The Legacy: Vol. 5: The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

---. (2016a). *Canada's Residential Schools: The History, Part 1, Origins to 1939.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

---. (2016b). *Canada's Residential Schools: The History, Part 2, 1939-2000.* Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press.

Tsilhqot'in Nation v British Columbia [2014] 2 S.C.R. 256

Tuck, E. & Yang, W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeniety, Education and Society.* 1 (1), 1-40.

Tully, J. (2018). On Resurgence *and* Transformative Reconciliation. *Plants, people and place: the roles of ethnobotany and ethnoecology in Indigenous peoples' land rights in Canada and beyond.* N. Turner & P. Spalding (Ed.). Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Turner, B. (2016). We are all denizens now: on the erosion of citizenship. *Citizenship Studies.* 20.(6-7), 679-92.

Turpel, M. & Monture, A. "Ode to Elijah: Reflections of Two First Nations Women on the Rekindling of Spirit at the Wake for the Meech Lake Accord." *Queen's Law Journal.* 15. 345-59.

Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs. (1970). *A Declaration of Indian Rights: The B.C. Indian Position Paper.* Vancouver: UBCIC.

Van Kirk, S. (2002). From 'Marrying-In' to 'Marrying-Out': Changing Patterns of Aboriginal/Non-Aboriginal Marriage in Colonial Canada. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies.* 23.3. 1-11.

---. (1999). *Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur-Trade Society, 1670-1870.* Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer.

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview.* Basingstoke: Palgrave McMillian.

Verney, J. (1991). *A Good Regiment: The Carignan-Salières Regiment in Canada 1665-1668.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Vincent, S. (2002). Compatibilité apparente, incompatibilité réelle des versions autochtones et occidentales de l'histoire: L'exemple innu. *Recherches Amérindiennes au Québec.* 32. (2).

Walkem, A. & Bruce, H. (2003). *Box of Treasures or Empty Box? Twenty Years of Section 35.* Pentitction: Theytus Books.

Wallace, R. (2013). *Merging Fires: Grassroots Peacebuilding Between Indigenous and Non Indigenous Peoples.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Walters, M. (2015). "The Aboriginal Charter of Rights: The Royal Proclamation of 1763 and the Constitution of Canada. *Keeping Promises: The Royal Proclamation of 1763, Aboriginal Rights, and Treaties in Canada.* Ed. Terry Fenge and Jim Aldridge. Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press. 49-68.

Weiss, G. (2011). Infidels at the Oar: A Mediterranean Exception to France's Free Soil Principle. *A Journal of Slave and Post-Slave Studies.* 32.3. 297-412.

Wesley-Esquimaux, C. and Smolewski, M. (2004). "Historic Trauma and Aboriginal Healing." *The Aboriginal Healing Foundation.* Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Weyhing, R. (2013). "Le Sueur in the Sioux country: rethinking France's Indian alliances in the Pays d'en Haut." *Atlantic Studies.* 10.1. 35-50.

White, R. (1991). *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whiteside, H. (2011). Unhealthy Policy: The Political Economy of Canadian Public-Private Partnership Hospitals. *Health Sociology Review.* 20.3. 258-68.

Wilson, S. (2009). *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods.* Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing Inc.

Witgen, M. (2012). *An Infinity of Nations: How the Native New World Shaped Early North America.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Wolfe, P. (1999). *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London: Cassell.

Wrong, G. (1928). *The Rise and Fall of New France.* Toronto: MacMillian Co. of Canada Ltd..

Yeo, C. (1959). The Founding and Function of Roman Colonies. *The Classical Word*. 52 (4), 104-07, 129-30.

Young, R. (2016). *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction.* Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.