

POLISHING THE CHAIN SEMINAR SERIES, PART 4: THE FORGOTTEN PROMISE OF NIAGARA

[Edited Transcript]

SEMINAR VIDEO:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mRfehn8lVc>

FOREWORD:

The 1764 Treaty of Niagara is the foundational agreement between the Crown and the Anishinabek, and a moment of renewal of the foundational Covenant Chain or Two Row Wampum between the Haudenosaunee and Crown. Here the 1763 Royal Proclamation, which announced British arrival and supposed sovereignty in the region, was transformed by Indigenous partners as it was adopted as treaty. Many see Niagara as a constitutional moment anchored in Indigenous and British legal traditions. British promises at Niagara included recognition of Indigenous title and sovereignty, and an on-going commitment to peaceful coexistence and trade for mutual benefit. Indigenous peoples would never sink into poverty. Importantly, The Treaty of Niagara is a foundational context for all subsequent agreements Indigenous nations made with the Crown. In this talk, speakers will explore the significance of this agreement and how (or if) implementing Niagara could contribute towards decolonization and Indigenous calls for Land Back.

PRESENTERS:

Dr. Hayden King Executive Director, Yellowhead Institute; Assistant Professor & Advisor to the Dean of Arts on Indigenous Education at Toronto Metropolitan University

Dr. Eva Jewell Research Director, Yellowhead Institute; Assistant Professor at Toronto Metropolitan University

Vanessa Dion Fletcher Artist

HOST:

Dr. Martha Stiegman Assistant Professor, Faculty of Environmental & Urban Change, York University



MARTHA STIEGMAN:

Hi everyone. Aanii; boozhoo; she:kon; hello. My name is Martha Stiegman. I'm an assistant professor here at York in the Faculty of Environmental and Urban Change. And it's my pleasure to welcome you all to Polishing the Chain, which is this year's edition of our faculty's annual seminar series. There are so many of you here with us today. Thank you. Miigwech for joining us. It'd be great to know who's on the call with us and where you guys are all joining us from so I encourage you to say hello in the chat and let us know where you're joining us from. Today's seminar is going to focus on the 1764 Treaty of Niagara, which John Borrows has referred to as one of the most important meetings between Indigenous and settler leaders in Canadian history.

Our event today is one of six that are being held over the course of this academic year that are exploring what it means to be a treaty person in Toronto. And Tara maybe you can drop in the chat a link to our YouTube channel because the amazing talks that we have this fall are all recorded for people to check out after the fact.

So, we have we have people tuning in from Manitoulin, from Six Nations, from Tkaronto, from Niagara Falls, Halifax, Brooklyn, wow! Nigeria! New York, Scarborough, Treaty 3 Territory. Amazing. It's amazing to have all of you here with us. They are the area that's known as Toronto has been caretaking by the Anishinaabe nation, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and the Huron Wendat Confederacy and it's now home to many First Nations, Inuit and Métis communities. So, I'd like to acknowledge the current treaty holders the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, and I also want to acknowledge that this territory is subject of the Dish with One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant which is a peace agreement between the Anishinaabe and the Haudenosaunee Confederacy; as well as the Treaty of Niagara, the British Haudenosaunee Covenant Chain and many others. So, there's a web of interconnected and sometimes conflicting historical treaties that have been negotiated on these lands, agreements that hold continued relevance and possibility for the present. So, with our seminar series, with Polishing the Chain, we're exploring the spirit and intent of Toronto treaties, we're learning about the ways Indigenous people have and continue to hold them, we're learning about the extent to which they are - and are not - reflected in contemporary Indigenous state relations, and we're asking how we can take our treaty responsibilities - as both Indigenous and non-Indigenous Torontonians. It's a huge honor to be joined today by our

speakers, Dr. Hayden King and Dr. Eva Jewell from Yellowhead Institute, and artist Vanessa Dion-Fletcher. Hayden, Eva and Vanessa are going to help us to understand the significance of the Treaty of Niagara, which many consider to be the foundational agreement between the Crown and the Anishinabek and an important moment of renewal of the Covenant Chain between the Haudenosaunee and the Crown.

So, at Niagara, the 1763 Royal Proclamation, which announced British arrival and supposed sovereignty in the region, was transformed by Indigenous partners as it was adopted in Treaty. British promises at Niagara included recognition of Indigenous title and sovereignty, and an ongoing commitment to peaceful coexistence and trade for mutual benefit. Indigenous nations would never sink into poverty. Importantly, the promises made at Niagara are the context for all subsequent agreements Indigenous Nations made with the crown. Vanessa, Eva and Hayden are going to help us to understand so much deeper what the meaning of this agreement is.

Before we introduce our speakers, I just want to take a minute to thank the many people and organizations that have helped to make this series possible. So, I want to thank Jumblies Theatre and Arts' Talking Treaties project, York's cCenter for Indigenous Knowledges as Languages, Deb McGregor's Indigenous Environmental Justice Project, who along with our Faculty of Environmental and Urban Change are co-presenting the series as a whole. I also want to thank the Toronto Biennial of Art, the Osgoode Hall Law School, York's Vice President of Research and Innovation, the Indigenous Teaching and Learning Fund, YUFA's community projects, and Lisa Myers' Research Chair in Indigenous Art and Curatorial Practice for their support. I also want to acknowledge Ange Loft and Victoria Freeman, who I collaborate with as part of Talking Treaties because this series very much comes out of the work that we've done together in researching and writing *A Treaty Guide for Torontonians* which is a book about treaty relations in Toronto that we'll be launching at the Toronto Biennial of Art this spring. I want to say *chi miigwech* to my colleagues Deb McGregor and Lisa Myers, who helped with conceptualization and fundraising for the series, and to Tara Chandran my amazing research assistant who helps to make everything happen behind the scenes.

So, with that, it's my pleasure to introduce our first speakers. The way we're going to organize today's talk is, I think, Hayden and Eva are going to give us a joint presentation. Then we're going to pass the mic to Vanessa, and then we'll open it up to questions and discussion.

Dr. Hayden King is Anishinaabe from Beausoleil First Nation on *G'Chimnissing*. Hayden is the Executive Director at the Yellowhead Institute at [Toronto Metropolitan University]. Hayden has taught at McMaster, Carleton University, as well as the First Nations Technical Institute and held senior fellowships at Massey College and the Conference Board of Canada and has served in senior advisory roles to provincial and First Nation Governments and Inuit organizations. He's the co-founder of the Language Arts Collective Ogimaa Mikana project, the co-host of The Red Road podcast, and his writing, analysis and commentary on Indigenous politics and policies published widely.

Dr. Eva Jewell is Anishinaabe from Deshkan Ziibiing and a member of the Chippewas of the Thames First Nation with paternal Oneida and Mohawk lineage. Her scholarship supports community led reclamation of Anishinaabe Governance as well as urban Indigenous perspectives on gender, work and care. Eva co-authors an annual report independently tracking Canada's progress on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's 94 calls to action and she is the Research Director at Yellowhead Institute, and an Assistant Professor of sociology at [Toronto Metropolitan University]. So, it's a huge honor to have you both with us. *Chi miigwech* and with that I pass the mic to you.

HAYDEN KING:

Thanks a lot, Martha. And yeah, really nice to be here. Nice to see you all. Some familiar faces that I haven't seen for many years, at least two, and much longer. I think so it's always a little bit trippy. But very, very nice to see familiar faces and recognize familiar names. So yeah, it was wonderful. When Eva and I accepted the invitation to come speak about the Royal Proclamation, I think we had a series of brainstorming sessions and we just sort of, just sort of wanted to talk about our individual presentations - I was sort of thinking about, you know, a strategic interpretation of the Treaty of Niagara and the Royal Proclamation, and Eva was thinking about, I think more of an Anishinaabek perspective on the Royal Proclamation, and we just kept having these conversations, I think both of us found really generative, and we decided well, let's just, let's just keep talking about the Royal Proclamation and the Treaty of Niagara, and maybe we'll just do that. So, that's what we're going to do. We're going to have a conversation around some of the themes that that both Eva and I see in the Royal Proclamation and the Treaty of Niagara and of course, you know there are what Martha mentioned that sort of setting the terms of our material relationship, you know, like settlers can move into Indigenous territories west of the 13 colonies, you know, there's the return of

prisoners that were captured during the Seven Years War, ongoing free trade, military alliances, all that sort of stuff. That was discussed in in the negotiations for you know, the Royal Proclamation, the Treaty of Fort Niagara, in the 24 Belt discussions, all those things are there. But I think in our conversations, we wanted to reflect more on the philosophical frameworks that the Anishinaabek in particular were bringing into these conversations. Then also try to interpret what the English were bringing into these conversations as well, and how that I think, we think sets the stage, or has set the country on a particular trajectory when it comes to Indigenous policy, and just our collective relationship generally.

But I think we really, in our conversation, started to see the Proclamation as sort of this intersection. You know, I think a lot of people would argue the Proclamation is like the foundation of Canada. In fact, I wrote a Toronto Star op-ed arguing just that like 10 years ago - I don't necessarily agree with that anymore; but instead see the Royal Proclamation as this sort of intersection where Indigenous-led treaty making, the Indigenous-led treaty making era that preceded the Royal Proclamation sort of came into to dialogue, maybe even conflict with the colonial-era treaty making that follows the Royal Proclamation. So, it's this moment of time where we see these contrasting, contrasting worldviews, and really, the production of two distinct visions of the future relationship. But we sort of seem to be stuck at that intersection, you know - how much has really changed since 1763, in terms of those clashing world worldviews?

So, in our conversation the Treaty of Niagara, or the Royal Proclamation as this intersection, we started drawing out a couple of themes. So, we thought about, you know, first is the notion of consent, which we think is explicit in polishing the chain, but not really discussed. So, we want to talk about consent. We also want to talk about this idea related to consent around non-interference, but how that relates very much to Anishinaabek notions of the family. Third, we wanted to take up this idea of the forgotten promise, and the act of forgetting, and how that applies in Anishinaabek society, but also among Canadians. And then if time allows us maybe we'll talk a little bit about remembering or what we're calling "radical remembering".

So, you see some slides moving very quickly. These are really just sort of meant to correspond to our presentation for people to look at, and reflect on as we're having a conversation. So, they're not in any particular order, or they're just really meant to accompany our conversation. So, on that first theme: polishing the chain. This was one

that we kept coming back to, you know, what does it mean to polish the chain? And for me, I think I was thinking about it in terms of the importance of gifts. Like I think, you know, in a lot of early treaty making, gifts are so important to maintain those good relationships and a lot of the times, gifts were integral to making treaty, they were sort of like the pre-treaty. But, you know, this was, I think, in conversation with Eva, a little bit too literal, I think. And Eva was really, I think, encouraged me to think more about you know, less about polishing the chain about giving gifts and exchanging gifts and maintaining the relationship in that sense, in that sense, but also that maintaining the relationship requires consent. And this is embedded in the Anishinaabek philosophy going way back, right? It didn't emerge at the Royal Proclamation, this notion of consent relating to polishing the chain. So, Eva, do you want to pick up and talk about this notion of consent and how polishing the chain as it appears in the Royal Proclamation actually has a long tradition, for Anishinaabek at least?

EVA JEWELL:

Sure. I'm hoping my internet stays stable, I'm coming to you from my community and I don't have very good internet out here. So, my apologies in advance if I, if I cut out. So I'm thinking about consent - miigwech for the opening Hayden - and this is actually kind of a conversation we've been really wanting to have. So, I'm really thankful that you're all here and I'm really happy to be here, so chi miigwech for joining us today. So, the best way for me to describe consent, when I think about it from an Anishinaabek lens, is a phrase asemaa nitam, and that means tobacco first in Anishinaabemowin. And this verbiage was shared by an Anishinaabekwe at a language conference I attended a few years ago, but the teaching is one I received growing up. So that is, that we always ask permission of the spirit whose essence or body we need, or that we're desiring to use. And that is, it's always the first protocol. And we gift that asemaa in return. Asemaa nitam is like the request for consent. And it's the first thing that we do before anything, or the gift, or the gesture above all else if I can borrow from those Haudenosaunee sentiments and Thanksgiving Address. And I think a lot about Vanessa Watts' work. She's a Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe scholar, and she writes about this idea of place-thought, and that place is animate, that it can think and that it can form knowledge. It has agency and therefore the ability to influence us in our societies, right. And Anishinaabek - I mean Indigenous peoples when I say Anishinaabek, I mean Indigenous peoples, I mean Ongweh'onweh peoples, I mean all Indigenous peoples to Turtle Island. And so, Watts theorizes that place-thought broadly describes Indigenous land-based cosmol-

ogies, and the ontologies, and epistemologies that flow from there - so the worldviews and the way of thinking and producing knowledge that flow from these interconnected systems of knowledge. And so many Indigenous people actually share those cosmologies, even if their ontologies and epistemologies look different, because their land is different, right? So, they share the worldview that land, water, sky, rock, and all the beings in our, that we share this realm with, that it's all alive and thinking and feeling with agency. That it's a relative and informs who we are and how we govern ourselves. So, these agents, these beings with knowing and perception, that Vanessa Watts refers to as agents, as having the same quality as a human being - they can communicate with one another and they do communicate with one another, and have relationships with one another. And we have a relationship to them, to the world around us, and we demonstrate this and can demonstrate it through asking permission with our *asemaa* or tobacco. And so she talks about this and she writes "so these habitats and these ecosystems are better understood as societies from Indigenous points of view" meaning that they have ethical structures, interspecies treaties and agreements and further their ability to interpret, understand and implement. Non-human beings are active members of society. And not only are they active, they also directly influence how humans organize themselves into that society. So, think of our clan systems being organized - a governance system that we draw from our relatives, our non-human relatives. And so, consent in Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee and indeed, an Indigenous worldview is not only permission given by humans, it's one that non-human beings can freely give or withhold as well. And consent is a sanctity that's rooted in relationality. Leanne Simpson writes about this and how our societies are steeped in consent and acknowledgement of a kind of interdependent autonomy that characterizes this relationality.

And consent also extends beyond time, in this way that I've been describing it as temporal consent, which is really just a jargony way of saying our seven generations teaching. So, if you're, if you're familiar with the seventh-generation teaching, that is consent that is expressed beyond time, that extends, you know, that informs those political, social-economic decisions that we make as Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee people. And it's even in our personal decisions, right? So, we know that these decisions we make, will impact those faces that we've not seen yet. Those ones who have yet to come, and our descendants. So, we extend a principle of consent beyond to them and wait for them, I guess you could say, to come up and to make their own decisions. And these are built into treaties as well. So, a lot

of treaties have this renewal clause for the express purpose of allowing future generations to come and to change the terms of those treaties based on what their needs are in their generation. And, you know, the renewal clause is something that's very critical and something that's really missing in a lot of our contemporary understandings or, or discussions of treaties. And so, I'll hand it over to you Hayden.

HAYDEN KING:

Yeah. So, you know, polishing the chain is, you know, reflecting on this conversation that we've been having, a lot more than just that, you know, meeting up and exchanging gifts or giving gifts, right. Polishing the chain is about the maintenance of consent. And I think, you know, I think about contemporary policy and law - we have these conversations around, you know, free prior and informed consent or the duty to consult and a lot of the conversations revolve around this sort of transactional vision of consent. Which may even have been the case with the Royal Proclamation or the Treaty of Fort Niagara - where it's: okay, we got permission, we're gonna go ahead we'll make this treaty, and we don't have to worry about it anymore, and it gets filed away in in some dusty colonial cabinet. But polishing the chain is really about maintaining that consent, and it comes from, as Eva talks about, this relationship that we have with the land. It's funny, you know, having conversations with Vanessa, about this idea of communicating with the land and, you know, conversations with students and non-Indigenous people as well. It's like, it's difficult, I think, for a lot of non-Indigenous folks to get past this sort of rational approach to the relationship with the land, which you know, that- how do you communicate with animals? How do you communicate with trees? But you know, as a hunter, and anybody that is a hunter knows that, you know, we still can speak to animals. You know, you're calling in turkeys, or ducks or, you know, speaking with deer when you're out hunting. So, it's like, these mechanisms for how we communicate to obtain consent, to obtain that consent, have existed and continue to exist; but there's this, I think, significant challenge among non-Indigenous people to get to that place where: a) you can have these types of conversations with the land, and b) that our relationship is more than transactional, that it requires this ongoing maintenance and consent. And I think I'd extend this challenge in understanding to conflict and violence that we have. When Canadian media, for instance, covers a blockade, you know, not the kind that's happening in Ottawa right now, but we're talking you know, when the native people are out there, and we're preventing gas pipelines from going through unceded territory. There's a lot of narrative that,

that the media spins and it can't quite comprehend. You know, "why is this happening?" And their stereotypes that the savage Indian, and an unwillingness to adapt to, you know, the contemporary times, and standing in the way of "progress". But in a lot of ways, those Indigenous people - and I'll speak from a Great Lakes perspective, Anishinaabek in this part of the world - those are actions that are the result of having no other avenues to enforce Anishinaabek law, Anishinaabek philosophy, or Anishinaabek visions of consent, because we have to go and get consent of the land. We have to defend the rights of the land. We have these obligations. And so even putting down asemaa, it's a difficult, I think, a difficult practice and a difficult concept to grasp. I think that helps us reframe things like the blockade as actual diplomacy, and rooted in consent-based diplomacy, consent-based politics, not only between Indigenous people and the land, but between Indigenous people and the expectation of consent among settlers as well. So, I think this notion of polishing the chain for us, we've been thinking about it as, you know, ongoing consent, and I'm not so sure that that has been the case in our relationship - our treaty making relationship - post 1763. And we'll talk about that in a little bit.

But this leads us to the second theme that we wanted to talk about, which is non-interference and the family, and the Anishinaabek family. And, you know, I think a lot of discourse, a lot of treaty discourse tends to revolve around you know, I think what would, we would describe as pretty masculine interpretations. You know, the institutional high-level cohorts of mostly male, or male identified, leaders. But you know, Eva I have been talking recently about how treaties for Anishinaabek should actually be interpreted through the lens of the family. From, you know, beyond grassroots I mean, we're talking about the family is the source and the reason for the treaty.

EVA JEWELL:

Yeah, I've been really thinking about this a lot lately. And it goes back to just hearing, hearing these teachings from community, from scholars like Alan Corbiere, and I'm learning still more about it. So, I want to give all what I'm about to say a caveat, because I'm still learning [laughs]. Sometimes when you get to these positions of like, you know, assistant professor and you're featured in talks like this. It's presupposed that you're the expert, and it's just not the Anishinaabe Gikendaasowin, or Anishinaabe way of thinking it's like, I'm still very much learning and I don't purport to be an expert in this area. However, I do want to give voice to that perspective. To the perspective of kinship and, and as I understand it, as I've been taught, when I've

listened to our teachings, at home and from other folks who I consider experts. You bring in people. When you have two people meeting and creating kind of a political bond, I think about the statement that "politics is one of the highest forms of spirituality", which was something I read in "Basic Call to Consciousness". And if you look at just the just the whole political system of Ongweh'onweh and Anishinaabe politics is very deeply spiritual. And the terms for being in relationship with one another, this is where we kind of have these practices of adoption or making kin and creating kin, which establishes your responsibilities to one another. Because to be in relationship is to be responsible for one another. So, it's no mistake or surprise when you understand, you know, or come from an Indigenous perspective, that a lot of our political diplomatic practices reflect the sacred institution of the family - and not even like the nuclear family, not the, you know, the monogamous cis-hetero family [laughs]. Like, relationality - sometimes I think back on, on what that means and it's just totally - colonization and cis-hetero patriarchy have done a lot regarding our notions of the family.

And so, you know, one of the things I reflect on is the, the role of children and the role of mothers and fathers, because we see this actually show up in the treaty language. When I was younger, I didn't really understand it. And I'm still of course, like I said, I'm still learning. So how I talk about this in my, in my classes when I teach Indigenous perspectives, and Indigenous approaches to treaty, I talk about the necessity to create and bring people into relationships in order to establish those responsibilities and the connections to one another, and the truth that flows in between relatives, right? So, a lot of these treaties are predicated on principles of Anishinaabe Gikendaasowin that are just not at all shared with the Europeans that we were making treaties with. I think a lot of the times, it's really a real shame and a tragedy that none of these - that these aren't shared or mutual understandings about how to approach political diplomacy.

So, I think on this one point that that when the Jesuits first came here, they were struck by how free our children were, right? And so, the Jesuits of New France, they remarked on how the Algonquin and Iroquoian peoples had such excessive love for their offspring - this is this comes from Kim Anderson's work. The Jesuits had complained that children enjoyed the liberty of wild ass colts. And what the Jesuits were experiencing, what they were seeing, was this principle of this Anishinaabe and Ongweh'onweh principle of non-interference, which relies on this agency as a political principle, which relies again upon the agency that all be-

ings have, regardless of, you know, regardless of their age, I guess. And the autonomy that all agents possess as beings with an inherent right to bimaadiziwin or our “life path” right, so you’ll hear it sometimes referred to as mino-bi-maadiziwin. And so, to expertly exercise that principle of autonomy and non interference that exists in the treaties is actually one that starts in childhood. So, this is, Anishinaabek and Ongweh’onweh were so versed in consent and autonomy and agency because that was the structure of childhood and relationality, I think, before contact. And it’s actually a really interesting turn away from European ideas of dominance that patriarchy and paternalism rely upon.

And this is where I kind of bring in the work of Toby Rollo who talks about this concept of misopedy - and misopedy, if you break it down, it’s kind of like connected to, or kind of related to the word misogyny. Misopedy is the hatred of children. Just like misogyny is the hatred of women. Misopedy was present when Europeans were first, you know, coming into contact with our ancestors, with Indigenous peoples. And because of the way that settlers had framed their ideas of childhood as being a lesser than stage of life, and being an inferior mode of being, and even a bestial or a feral state of being - they projected this idea onto Indigenous peoples. And, because in a Euro-Western patriarchal family unit the father is the boss, right? He has dominion over his women and his children, they are his property - that’s literally the logic that was in the Indian Act, right? But in an Anishinaabe and in an Indigenous lens, the father protects, provides warmth, and shares kindly - inspiring strength. So, the teaching being like to be kind with your strength and be kind with your sharing, which is how I’ve heard it said. And so, while Anishinaabe masculinity embodies all of that and it’s wrapped up in fatherhood and conceptions of a father as a protector, not necessarily as a as dominating. As someone to protect the life path, the life path, which is of course, filled with autonomous beings with agency, with their own right to that life path.

So, when our ancestors were making kin with Europeans, they did so in the diplomatic language of the Child and the Father, and the Anishinaabe with the children and European with the father - in so far that the Europeans would protect us, would provide warmth and provisions, and what I think is really one of the most intense divergences in worldviews is that different ontology of the family that is just radically different. So, Europeans took it to mean paternalism. And again, they used it as this confirmation that Indigenous peoples were inferior and childlike. Again, being a child to them was to be a lesser, feral state of being, and it was devastating, I think. It’s - a more tragic misin-

terpretation than I could really imagine. And it goes back to that patriarchal system that was conceptualized long before invasion. And for a long time, I even questioned our ancestors for characterizing the relationship that way. But now I understand, and it’s taken a lot of decolonizing the mind to understand that arrangement. And I’m reminded of the teaching that Mary Deleary has said in our community before and she said gaawii anishaa, which means “we don’t do anything for nothing”. And so, there’s a reason that this arrangement and this kinship was made the way it is, but the gross misinterpretation and the dominance that is built-in within the worldview of the Europeans is what takes over and corrupts this, you know, the presence of Europeans in these lands, so.

HAYDEN KING:

Yeah, I think I share the same, I guess, like, learning? You know, when I was coming up through university, you’d read the transcripts and, you read the narratives of Indigenous and settler relations, and this this term “Father” kept coming up. And you read the transcripts, to the extent that they exist for the discussions at Niagara - and the Six Nations legacy consortium has done some good work here. You know, again, it’s always referring to William Johnson as you know, the “Father”. And it’s really only when you begin to understand Anishinaabek diplomacy that you fully appreciate what was happening politically in these conversations. And it’s really only after you start to understand or start to look at Anishinaabek treaty making from the view of the family, does that all begin to make a lot more sense.

And so, when we’re trying to interpret the Treaty of Niagara and the discussions about the Royal Proclamation, turning the Royal Proclamation into an Indigenous document or solemnizing it with an Indigenous perspective, this discussion of the family is absent. But you look at examples from our treaty making history and it’s all there! It’s all, actually, pretty plainly obvious. If we conceive of our clan system as being the first treaty with our animal kin, you know, as an Eagle Clan member, I have a treaty with the Eagle. In exchange for the teachings that I’m being granted by the Eagle to learn how to become a good Eagle Clan member in my community and society - I speak on behalf of the Eagle. And same goes with the Bear and the Deer, and you never consumed those animals, and you honor it and your feast it; this treaty that we’ve made, that was all about an organization of society and governance to take care of our family and our children. So, the foundational treaty is about how we take care of one another in society. Some of the earliest treaties that we made with the land that we tell our children today, are about the same things.

So, the treaties that we have as Anishinaabek with the Deer and the Moose, you know that, the common story about how one day the people couldn't find the Deer and the Moose, and it turned out that the Deer and the Moose had left - they decided to go away - because the people had forgotten their obligations to the Deer and the Moose. We were wasting their flesh, we were not doing ceremony, putting our asemaa down. And we were not ensuring that their territory was going to be there for their kin into the future, right? The Moose and the Deer were teaching us to be thinking about our future generations. There's also the story about the woman who married the Beaver and Heidi Stark writes about this and talks about this: where we created that treaty with the Beaver, and the whole point of the treaty with the beaver was to learn how to like take care of our households, to clean up [laughs] you know after ourselves right, to like keep things tidy and to nurture and to care for our children. And you know, sometimes along the along the path, along our history, we forgot some of those teachings - we're talking about forgetting in a minute. So, we would be reminded.

I think about the story of the drum. You know the story of the drum, when the Anishinaabek were in this intense warfare with the Dakota after being squeezed by the Americans on all sides. It was a little girl that brought the drum to the people to create peace and to remind the men in the community, you know, what they were losing and what they were sacrificing in this constant warfare. Even the Dish with One Spoon, we can talk about being interpreted as providing for families into the future. Sharon Venne talks about how, you know as long as the waters flow or as long as the rivers flow or as long as the creeks flow, is a reference to, you know, treaties being valid as long as we're continuing to, to have, and raise, you know, good minded Anishinaabek children or Cree children in that case. So we have all these references explicit/implicit about how children and the family are actually central to Anishinaabek treaty making and diplomacy. But again, it's something that is lost when we hear narratives of the Royal Proclamation the Treaty of Niagara, how it's recorded by historians, primarily white historians and academics, like these things aren't discussed when we talk about that diplomacy.

And, you know, it's not surprising in that sense that Canadian law and policy would have emerged to be defined, as Eva says, by paternalism, domination, misogyny, and frankly, hate for children - at least hate for Indigenous children. So, I think that this misinterpretation - although I'm hesitant to call it a misinterpretation - leads into this third theme that we want to talk about and maybe our last,

seeing how far we get, is the forgotten promise, right? This forgotten promise of Niagara and the practice of forgetting. You know, did settlers, at one point did settlers actually understand these concepts and these terms? I mean, William Johnson is the one that brought the wampum belt to the Anishinaabek and the Haudenosaunee, right? It wasn't the other way around. So, there must have been some understanding Eva, right? What is it about this notion of "forgetting" that I think is important to talk about here.

EVA JEWELL:

Yeah, and I think about when you, this concept of forgetting, and the targeting of the children in a misopedic society, a destructive misopedic society that spawns settler colonialism, and it targets the children. And it's no mistake that you know, the children were targeted in our communities. And were the subjects of the - you can think of this genocide as a forced forgetting. And we're thinking about this idea of forgetting, the forgotten promise of Niagara. And referring to that forgotten promise, speaking to the colonial perspective: forgetting is a luxury that Canadians have as a result of settler colonialism, because settler colonialism creates a new reality, creates a new myth of what these lands can be and who they're for.

But, you know, always, there's always going to be Anishinaabe here [laughs]. Anishinaabeg pane gwa maampii niiyaamin Anishinaabe will always be here, right? And we did not forget. And I think in many ways, I've heard it said that as Indigenous peoples, we held up our end of the bargain in terms of treaty. So, you're now here - if you're a Canadian or a newcomer or guest in our house - you're here with all the privileges that come with colonization because of that domination. And Canadians forgot their side of the deal. Now, just on the concept of forgetting, right, so we're not going to say - Jim Dumont told the story in our community one time, and he said that bears don't have to be told how to be bears, they're bears. And birds don't have to wonder how to be birds, they're just birds. Trees don't have to be told what they're you know, what life is all about, they're trees, and they don't have to remember how to be trees. But Anishinaabe, or humans, we can lose our place in this world easily if we don't maintain our memory of how to be a good relative in this place. And indeed, just how Hayden spoke about all of those reminders that our animal relatives and plant relatives remind us of, consistently, throughout our history - these are all lessons that, was kind of like a vibe-check from the universe, or from our animal kin being like, "Hey, this is not how you act - you need to you need to smarten up", right? And so, that's why our ceremony exists right, our Anishinaabe Aadziwin,

our way of life, our Anishinaabe izhitaawin or our behaviors, or our Anishinaabe nendamowin, or our “thoughts and our mind”. Our ceremony is this continual renewal of the knowledge that emerges from place [internet cuts out].

Ceremony is our institution, for lack of a better word, institutions, not a very good word for it, but if you can, you know, anyway, for lack of a better word, it’s our institutions! And it’s that ceremony; it’s that, it’s the reiteration and the reminder again and again of how we must live in good relation with the world around us - and how to follow the natural law. And again, this forced forgetting through residential schools was incredibly devastating. It removed the children from ceremony and from our institutions, and our cosmologies that connect us to the land. To quote Cree scholar Tamara Starblanket who quotes Sharon Venne, these colonial laws, you know, when we’re looking at colonial laws, they’re rules and regulations, right? They’re not laws in the true sense of the word. Colonial laws are made to be broken, right? So there’s always a fine associated with them, there’s always a there’s always [laughs] some kind of backup plan for what happens when a when a colonial law is broken. Our original laws and instructions are not to be violated, right? So, for example, if freshwater is depleted by colonial greed, there will be no more water left to sustain future generations of creation and that is a law. So, Anishinaabe Inaakinogewin, or Anishinaabe law is really a reflection of how to live in relation to the natural law of creation. And in that word, Inaakinogewin, it means all that we are responsible for, and all that we embody to be in good relation in the society of the natural world. There are times when we did violate that law before colonizers came and we see that through the stories that [internet cuts out] remember, what it means to be a good relative. And in that way, we had to, like I said, smarten up and kind of follow the laws again, because, you know, we were reminded by and checked by our world around us, our relatives, to be to be in alignment with the natural law. And forgetting has consequences, right? So climate change, is a result of the willful and forced forgetting that follows settler colonialism, and the genocide of Indigenous peoples on these lands. To remedy forgetting, this is why there are practices like polishing the chain in our relationships, these annual gatherings of remembering and visiting, and tending to that relationship. And those are critical practices that were, you know, cast aside in favor of European domination. I’m curious to hear what your thoughts are on forgetting.

HAYDEN KING:

I mean, I just I’m thinking about, I’m always thinking about - back here’s one of my kids drawing of the Nimkii-bine-

shiinh and then there’s a little tiny down there in the water is *Mishibizhiw*, you know, it’s like, if Anishinaabek forget their obligations there are consequences, right? So, you know, we’re reminded in our treaty history, the Deer and the Moose will just leave. They’ll go somewhere else. But, also, there’s like, significant world ending consequences to forgetting in some ways, that are a part of Anishinaabek life and law. But I’m also thinking about you know, forgetting as consequences but also lying has consequences, right? [laughs] Like, are we splitting hairs here? Or is there a distinction to make between how non-Indigenous people are approaching the treaty relationship? You know, and I think that there’s something to say there around the privilege of forgetting, that and maybe this is where narrative comes in and you create this canon of narratives that say treaties should be interpreted along these transactional and literal lines as opposed to Anishinaabek interpretations of treaties as being more spiritual, being more embedded in our relationship to the land, being more embedded in family, family life and, and our relationship with children.

So, the question I think sort of becomes - did settlers forget? Or did they sort of lie their way through treaty making? I often think about how the Royal Proclamation and the Treaty of Niagara are held up as, you know, the Indian Magna Carta or the Indian Bill of Rights, as if the English were that benevolent, right? As if as if the English were just you know, recognizing Indigenous self-determination and, and sovereignty and, and land rights out of, you know, out of a place of goodwill. But, you know, I’m sure there’s not many people that naively assume that, but I think that there are shades of it. And we need to be interpreting the Treaty of Niagara in more strategic terms, I think - not only from an Indigenous perspective, but from an English or colonial perspective as well. Like, there’s a reason that Pontiac kept fighting. I don’t think, you know - there was the sentiment at the time, I understand, that, that didn’t believe English would keep their promises. And remember that in the same year that King George is making proclamations about Indian rights, one of his generals, Jeffery Amherst, is talking about, you know, spreading smallpox blankets among Pontiac’s forces! So, you have both of these things happening at the same time. And I think in that light, we have to consider the underlying motivations of treaty for settlers, and there’s a strong argument to make, especially after you start having the accumulation of treaties, and this very specific interpretation - that they’re strategic tools of dispossession. And when you start looking at the history of some of these treaties whether it’s the pre-Confederation blank treaties, you know, the blank documents where the

treaty terms are written in afterwards. Whether it was the purchases that were made, all around Southern Ontario. Certainly, when we start talking about the number treaties and the vastly different interpretations of the number treaties held by Canadians on the one hand, and First Nations on the other, I think you start to see how that is the case. And now even with modern treaties, we're seeing modern treaties, despite being these comprehensive, hundreds of pages long documents, they're ending up in court, because again, we're having this interpretation challenge. We still have this forgetting. And how do you explain that? I think it may be time that we talk less about misinterpretation and more about, about malinterpretation. And this theme that we're talking about in terms of forgetting and the act of forgetting and interpreting forgetting, I think leads us into a conversation around radical remembering.

You know, this, this event is all about educating people in Toronto about obligations and about treaties. I think that the point that Eva and I are trying to make is that the relationship is much, much more than what's written down as the terms of the treaties. We were at that intersection together and Indigenous people brought a particular worldview there, settlers brought a particular worldview, and you know, we decided to go on separate paths. And the history of Canada, and Canadian Indian policy and relationships generally reflect that. And so, I think it's now our obligation to start thinking about how you do that, that radical remembering. And Eva I were having this conversation because, I think, you know, you're sort of stuck at this point where, 'Okay, well, what does radical remembering mean?' For Anishinaabek, I think we have a good sense of what radical remembering means. We described our experiences, understanding what 'the father' meant to treaty relationships, and we understand what we have to do to radically remember. But for settlers, what's, what's the job there? What's the task there? And is it our job to teach settlers, you know, in venues like this or otherwise? And I think about what James Baldwin said, about, you know, "it's our job to teach white people their humanity". And I don't know! I don't know if it is! [laughs] You know, in some ways, I agree with James Baldwin, and I think about that when I'm in the classroom. But then in other ways, I'm like, "No, I don't want to do that!" I'm not interested. So, you know, go and learn your own humanity and come back to me when you find the directions. So, you know, I think that that's probably where we'll leave things. We want to definitely make time to hear Vanessa speak because I think I'm really excited to hear what Vanessa has to say and see what Vanessa is up to, but I don't know. [Eva] Do you have any final thoughts before we sort of move along?

EVA JEWELL:

No, that's a great point. I think at least at some point, maybe the bare minimum is to recenter the natural laws of this house. And that's what, you know, Indigenous peoples have been following for millennia. We've been following the natural laws of the house that we were [internet cuts out] Those are the rules of this house. And so thank you for being in conversation Hayden, and yes, I think that's a good place to end it for today. Chi miigwech to everyone for being here today.

HAYDEN KING:

All right. Ahaaw.

MARTHA STIEGMAN:

Wow. Chi miigwech to both of you for such an incredible, rich conversation. I just feel so lucky and privileged to be able to sit in on it. And thank you for giving us such a thorough picture of what the, what the legal world, the Indigenous legal world that settlers were brought into through treaty, and different avenues for us to consider what our responsibilities and obligations are in relation to that. I have written down you know, treaty renewal is reiterating and reminding us of how to live in relation and how to be a good relative. But I think it's also really important for us to remember, Hayden, you're framing of treaties as a strategic tool of dispossession. And there's this kind of, there's a lot of things that we mean when we try to hold up treaty, and say that we're a treaty, that we're treaty people - it's both trying to learn what those responsibilities and obligations are, and also making good on the historical burden, the ongoing dispossession of Indigenous people that we're all a party to, through these agreements, and our you know, being here as settler-Canadians. I am just so excited to now hear Vanessa talk to us about her work, and in particular about a work that she made, Relationship and Transaction, because it just flows so beautifully from the conversation, I think, and the themes that that you've been bringing up for us. So, I'll introduce Vanessa now.

Vanessa Dion Fletcher is Lenape and *Potawatomi* neurodiverse artist. She studied with Brenda Lee among other Indigenous communities, to learn about wampum and quill work. Graduating in 2005 with a BFA in studio art, Dion Fletcher is a proud University alum. She continued to study receiving an MFA from the Art Institute of Chicago in 2016. And it's my pleasure and honor to introduce Vanessa.

VANESSA DION FLETCHER:

* Introduction in the Lenape Language*. So that was a little introduction in the Lenape Language. I've been

taking classes for coming up on two years now. And I'm really grateful to be able to start by speaking a little bit in the Lenape language. Thank you so much to everyone who made this event happen today, and to, just being invited to be here and share a little bit of what I've made, and what I what I know.

So, I wanted to start after that introduction, with just a little prompt to get everyone to think about the last time that you spent money, or got paid [laughs]. The last time you interacted with money. Maybe it was physical money, or credit card, or debit card, or a Pay Pal purchase. Maybe somebody gave you some money. Maybe you gave somebody money, to just think about what that what that last time was. Maybe it was, like I said, really physical with actual money, or maybe it was automatic withdrawal from your account that just kind of happened and it's very abstract.

And then, if there's room in your brain, also think about the last time that you made an agreement with someone that didn't involve money. So yeah, maybe it was an agreement about cleaning your house with your roommate or your family, about what chores somebody was going to do, maybe you agreed to you know, pick up some kids from school, either your own kids or somebody else's. Yes, think about, just the last time you had some kind of agreement, some kind of relationship with somebody. I think that those two things they've started with, reflecting on the kinds of agreements we make in our lives, and the kind of language that we use, are really the two most important points that I think of when I think about the Treaty of Niagara and broader treaty making practices.

As we know, in Canada in the US, colonization targeted the transmission of language as way of weakening our communities. Residential schools or Indian boarding schools forbid and punished students severely for speaking their languages. I tie this, my thought process, in my reflections to language, in part because I grew up and continue to have a learning disability. So, learning to read and write in English was incredibly difficult for me. It was very puzzling and confusing. And because of this, I really understood the language I was learning - English - as an invented system. There was nothing kind of natural or innate about it. And I also became aware that there were other language systems. You know, I heard, you know, people singing at powwows, I heard, you know, occasional speakers in Indigenous languages. I very often heard people speaking at important events, speaking in their language and in other Indigenous languages. And in those songs and those introductions, I really heard and saw a pride and an understanding of, of

these individuals and an understanding of who they were in, you know, in relationship to themselves and their communities and their nations.



Photo 1 - Quahog shell (screenshot from Polishing the Chain seminar series "The Forgotten Promise of Niagara")

So, what are wampum belts and wampum shells? This picture [see: photo 1] I have here on the screen is a picture of my hand holding a quahog shell that was picked up by a friend of mine in Lenape territory and gifted to me. Wampum belts are mnemonic devices. The treaty or agreement is woven into the beaded structure. It's not only the images that appear in the purple and white pattern, but also the act of holding the beads while reading about it that allows one to access the information it carries. Through researching and working with wampum is a way for me of working and understanding a different language system.

I'm going to hop around a little bit going back to the Lenape language and Lenape people.



Photo 2 - Lenapehoking (Lenape Land) <https://thelenapecenter.com/lenapehoking> (screencap from Polishing the Chain seminar series "The Forgotten Promise of Niagara")

This is a map of the Lenapehoking [see: Photo 2] you can just see the Delaware Bay and River; you can see the Hudson River and the western tip of Long Island and Manhattan. This is a map of the removal or diaspora of the Lenape people in the 1700s. So, my family's community is from, as I said in my introduction, Eelūnaapèewii Lakhèewiit. So that's the name of our reserve community in southwestern Ontario. That's also referred to as a Delaware Nation at Moraviantown, Bucktown, or Nalahii. When I was younger, I heard a lot about wampum beads and belts and shells and agreements, a lot in the context of Haudenosaunee people and a little bit in the context of Anishinaabe people, and I kind of wondered, how does it relate to the Lenape people? So, here's one example [Photo 3].



Benjamin West 1771-72 Oil on canvas 75 1/2 x 107 3/4 in. (191.8 x 273.7 cm.)



Photo 3 - Colonial painting by Benjamin West (top) depicting a treaty agreement, and a Wampum Belt (below) which was exchanged at the Treaty making (screencap from Polishing the Chain seminar series "The Forgotten Promise of Niagara")

On the top we have a colonial painting by Benjamin West, which depicts, you know, his idea of what of a treaty agreement would have looked like, what the event would have looked like. This is Penn, William Penn exchanging wampum with Lenape people. On the bottom is one of the belts that was exchanged at that, at that meeting, at that treaty-making. So, because of, I mean in part because of the removal of Lenape people from our traditional territory and because we now have homes that are, you know, quite dispersed from each other, I find that oftentimes our kind of knowledge and connecting, connection especially as we're growing up - or at least that's been my experience - also involves a lot of trying to make connection over different physical or emotional divides.

So, I learned a little bit about this use of wampum, and then I also learned about the Treaty of Niagara and this wampum belt, the 1764 Covenant Chain Wampum Belt [Photo 4].



Photo 4 - Relationship or Transaction (3'x 2'), 2014, Vanessa Dion Fletcher. "A Reproduction of Western Great Lakes Covenant Chain Confederacy Wampum Belt. This Belt Depicts Two Figures Holding Hands In The Center, Flanked By Pentagons And The Date 1764. My Reproduction Is Made Using \$5 Bills As The Quawahog (Purple) Beads, And Replica \$5 Bills As The Wheelk, (White) Beads." (Courtesy of Vanessa Dion Fletcher: www.dionfletcher.com/relationship-or-transaction)

And what first really intrigued me about these examples is that they were treaties and agreements that weren't written in English; that I didn't have to read English words to be able to understand. And I was and continue to always look for ways that I get to exist in the world without speaking English. I'm really aware of the way that languages, and then particularly in my case English, has been used to oppress and discipline myself and my family and my relations and it's the way that I so often communicate. So anytime that I can, kind of subvert or sidestep my use of English or where I can understand information without reading or listening to English, I get really excited. So yeah, something that I could understand outside of written or spoken English. And it's this treaty, that's it's not written down. It's recorded in wampum. I thought that it was, it was very interesting that at this moment in history, these colonial forces were using this method of wampum to make the treaties. They weren't using their own method of writing treaties down on paper in English words, they were using wampum.

So, in this belt that you can see a little bit more clearly, I've reproduced, the image of the belt, and the quahog shells that are purple are made using \$5 Canadian bills, and the whelk shells are the white shells, are made using screen printed \$5 bills, so kind of a forgery or a replica. This takes us back to thinking about that reflection of the last time we made or, the last time we, you know, exchanged money, or the last time we made an agreement outside of money. At the time of learning about these treaties in 2015, I really started thinking a lot about what does it mean to make an agreement? What, you know, history or information do I need to have? And what do I need to be able to carry or uphold my part of that treaty into the future? And I really felt like at that time, that a lot of ways that I was able for myself or for other people to really get a solid agreement was if there was money being exchanged. So, I wanted to remake this belt to you know, share some of those reflections and to get, to think about, to think about them with different viewers in different communities.

So, I'm using this kind of weighted symbol, the power of the nation state in the \$5 bills to encourage the viewer to consider the colonial dimensions of Canadian society, and in particular the role of money in bypassing or dissolving the nation-to-nation treaty relationships. So, I think that the exchange of money is one way that the Canadian government really, like I, like I said, dissolves these relationships and kind of uses it as a way of getting out of being in a good, a good relationship.

Okay, so I did a little bit of research this morning. The other point that I like to bring up - I always get asked how much money is in the belts, and it's about 7000 Canadian dollars in the \$5 bills. There are a few different series of ones: there's the more papery ones, there's the plasticky ones, there's a few older vintage ones that people collected and exchanged with me, and that's in the making of the belt. So, I made it in 2015. And, yeah, by my calculations, it's decreased in value about \$730 in those past years, so I kind of like to think about how in the future the physical bills that it was made with will be worth nothing. That you know, if our society continues the way it has been, with this kind of use and relationship of money that yeah, that the inflation rate will increase and a \$5 bill won't really be worth anything. Maybe it'll be taken out of use the way the penny was. So really, what in that case, what we have is the meaning in the work, we have the relationships that were made, or carried out in it, and that piece of paper - or that piece of plastic - that is the money, will become worthless. And in this belt, the screen printed \$5 bills that are replicas or forgeries, they're also at the time they were made, and now you couldn't spend them on anything. They are, in capitalism, worthless. They're an integral part of this piece, right? They stand in for those whelk shells, so they have a purpose. So, we have this kind of, two comparisons in the belt, side by side.

And shortly after I made this piece, I was invited to, I was invited by Arprim Gallery to do a little intervention at the Papier Art Fair in Montreal. It's a commercial art fair, that focuses on paper arts. And Alan Corbiere described to me that the word for wampum in Anishinaabemowin references carrying a weight, and references that the headbands or the tumplines that would be used to carry heavy bundles. So, when I was invited to this, to present the work at this show, I thought how am I going to get this very large, very expensive wampum belt to Montreal and to the fair? And so, I bundled it up. I got a large piece of felt and wrapped it up and carried it through the city you can see here in this picture of me carrying the bundle [photo 5].



Photo 5 - Vanessa Dion Fletcher carrying her Wampum Belt to the Papier Art Fair in Montreal (screencap from Polishing the Chain seminar series "The Forgotten Promise of Niagara")

There's lots of people kind of observing and watching and wondering what this, this large piece I'm carrying is. And when I arrived at the fair and unwrapped this, kind of, unique or different wampum belt, and I spread it out on the floor. And then I had the opportunity then to tell different people what it was about. So, by recreating this belt, I recreated a little piece of what it's intended to do, right, to remind us of what the relationship is, and being in Montreal, we had another addition of language, of people speaking French and English. I'm pretty unilingual, I really only speak English. And so, the gallery staff had to help translate for French speakers. And yeah, I think that was that was also a significant aspect, right? We're kind of, by making a bit of a little bit of a scene, and by, you know, presenting a lot of cash, people get very curious. And then you can have the opportunity to tell them a little bit, and remind them a little bit about what this agreement was and continues to be, and why it's important to me. I hope it's important to them. And then I also did this outside a few different locations around Montreal. So that the belt could, and myself could interact with the public. It was pretty windy that day, so I had to roll it up a little bit. And, yeah, so this is the waiting the sitting the hoping that people will come by and get curious. And then eventually, people did! I think when one person kind of starts to ask, "What is this? What am I looking at? What brought you here today?" then more people, it invites more people to join in the conversation. *Pause for time check*.

You can also think about in this work, I talked a little bit about, you know, the idea of the modern claims process and, you know, the viewing new treaties or claims for treaty infringement as cash transactions, instead of really being in a relationship. We can also think about the commodifi-

cation and appropriation of Indigenous culture, right? As something as a cultural object to something that's a weaving, and the ways that Indigenous culture gets appropriated and used to build wealth outside of our communities. And, yeah, then just you know, overall, how Canada's wealth is in part - perhaps in large part - derived from the failure to honour these treaties. So, Wanishi thank you everybody. I think I'm gonna end there and we can [have] some questions?

MARTHA STIEGMAN:

Oh, wow. Wow wow wow! Thank you so much, Vanessa. That was such an incredible talk and such a moving an important piece. There are many, many comments in the chat echoing that and more. So maybe before I open the floor to questions from the audience, I just want to check in and see if Eva, Vanessa, or Hayden, if you have any questions or comments for each other?

EVA JEWELL:

My internet connection is not very good. So, I may have to keep my video off. Sorry. I just was telling Vanessa before we started that I had the pleasure of seeing this piece at Museum London some years ago and just how impressive, and just, moving this piece was so to me, so *chi miigwech* Vanessa for your sharing today.

MARTHA STIEGMAN:

Amazing. Well, we have we have another 40 minutes together. So, there are a lot of, a lot of people on the call here and maybe I can just ask you to raise your hand with the little hand function. If you have questions for our speakers, or you can also put your questions in the, in the chat as well. I'll try to keep my eye on that. Victoria, I see you raising your hand?

Q&A WITH AUDIENCE

VICTORIA:

I'm sorry, I was on mute! [all laugh]. Boozhoo. This has been so wonderful and just so beautiful. I have a comment and a question for Vanessa and the other two presenters. Sadly, I'm sorry, I forgot their names. So, my comment is for Vanessa: your wampum is so beautiful, and you should feel very, very proud. Um, Vanessa, what you just said about settler colonial currency, if I may, whether it's a British, whether it's US dollars, Canadian, or Mexican, or international currency, your comment. Treaty people are in big, big trouble. Because the settler colonial governments must pay treaty people treaty payments. Where I come from, and my dad's people on both sides, my mom

is from Treaty no. 3 territory, but my dad is from Treaty no. 4 territory in Saskatchewan, the settler colonial treaty payments are in approximate \$5 bills. And the settler colonial governments must pay these payments to Indigenous peoples because of the treaty. So that's very concerning to me, because if the \$5 bill is null and void and worth nothing, how can the settler colonial government-- how do we honor our treaty payments and annuities? Which is a part of the-- okay I'm rambling on here anyways. That's just concerning to me because if the money isn't worth anything, it's worth nothing, and then we try to get our treaty payments and then it's not worth anything. It's not...there's no value in it. So that's very concerning and frightening to me. And sadly, I never even thought about it, and it never even came to me until just now so *chi miigwech*, Vanessa. So that's my comment. My question is: there's no such thing as "okay, we're going to have to treaty elections. We're going to vote in our new treaty people like you do in settler colonial elections that vote, okay, we're going to vote in, or else we're going to vote out these new treaty people". There is no such thing as that. Treaty people could never become non-treaty people, like it's not something you vote in or vote out, it's inherent. It just is. We are just treaty people because of the treaties. So, when, sadly I get this more from the non-Indigenous side than I do from the Indigenous side, sadly. How do non-treaty people from the non-Indigenous side become supportive of treaty people, when there are many non-Indigenous peoples who sadly don't know about the treaties? They don't know why we signed treaties, they don't know how the treaties came to be. How do non-treaty people become treaty people? How do they support their treaty education journey? And when non-treaty people become educated about treaties they are, I believe, are going to be a force to be reckoned with because it's an education that benefits both sides, the Indigenous side as well as the non-Indigenous side. *Chi miigwech!* Thank you so much. All of you are so beautiful. Thank you for coming. *Chi miigwech.*

MARTHA:

Thank you for that, Victoria. I see someone in the chat, sort of offering that, you know, settlers have the burden of educating themselves. You know, thinking also about Hayden's comment about not wanting to teach settlers their humanity but... Vanessa, Hayden, Eva, do you have any thoughts for Victoria?

VANESSA:

I think one thing, one thing you said, Victoria - and I'm just connecting it to what you said Martha - was about the burden of learning. But how you know, ideally it shouldn't,

it shouldn't be a burden, right? Victoria was saying that there's so much to be gained for everybody, I think, in being in, you know, understanding what these, why these agreements remain. And in you know, for me, like I you know, it helped me learn and reflect so much, right, both in terms of my role as a Lenape person, as a person who's Lenape and my great grandmother was Potawatomi. And a lot of my father's family are early colonial settlers from Scotland. So, you know, thinking in terms of my own personal relations in the past and going forward. So yeah, I think yeah, what Victoria said about we have so much to, I think, to gain from understanding in this learning, and hopefully it's not a burden. Although I think one of my first lessons about education as a small child was that learning is sometimes really hard and uncomfortable; that there is I think, a lot to be gained.

MARTHA:

Thanks for that, Vanessa. Are there other questions or comments from the audience? So, Rick Hill?

SEMINAR AUDIENCE MEMBER - RICK HILL:

Hello again, yeah. Well, thank you to all the presenters - really great. Vanessa, I really enjoyed yours, because I didn't realize what we had in common. I also went to the Art Institute in Chicago, which is why we're both so creative, I guess [laughs]. And I was glad to finally meet you at least online, because I admired that piece of artwork that you did. I wanted to say three quick things. One: I agree with Hayden, the Royal Proclamation was a unilateral declaration; we weren't involved in negotiations and we've never accepted that line. Because it's a boundary line, where they claim the King had jurisdiction over all the land to the east, and our nations never consented to that. So, to put it as the primary legal instrument by which we're going to view treaties is a big-- it's broad. So, I think, I agree with that. The other thing is that the Treaty of Niagara was really three different treaties: one with Haudenosaunee at Fort Niagara to try to resolve the tensions resulting from what they call the Devil's Hole massacre, second was a treaty just with the Senecas, whereby the Senecas relinquished a corridor of land along the Niagara River, and the third then with the Anishinaabek people at Port George. So, Hayden, I had a question for you: is there a record of the Covenant Chain being mentioned among or between Haudenosaunee and the Crown prior the Fort Niagara Treaty? Because in that treaty, Johnson says he's extending the Chain to the to the Western Confederacy, but is there a mention of it before then?

HAYDEN:

Is there a mention of the Covenant Chain being extended to the to the Anishinaabek? Prior to 1763? Was that your question?

RICK HILL:

Yeah. Did the Chain exist prior to that?

HAYDEN:

I think you know, prior to that the Anishinaabek and the Haudenosaunee weren't really on good terms, right? [laughs] I think that the Haudenosaunee and the English had that alliance through the Covenant Chain leading up to the Seven Years War, and Anishinaabek in my understanding we're not a part of that until post 1763, so I can't think of any references.

RICK HILL:

Yeah, cause that's a good point. I wish you and I-- all of us could have been back there. We could have advised your relatives - throw that chain back across the Niagara River because, don't believe it! [all laugh] Because it becomes a chain that's going to drag you down. And I think the other thing too is the points that you mentioned - I forget who mentioned it - but, we have to be careful to continue to honour these agreements that were done with thieves. We have to be careful. When we say we're all treaty people who want to stand by the treaty, right? You've got to take a hard look at what that treaty says. Because Vanessa - it is true those treaties were written on paper, and the wampum belt was just a deceptive device to get us to agree with what was written in paper. Sir William Johnson pens the words on the paper, and he produces the wampum belt. So, what he says in the council was one thing, what the paper says is different. So, I think we have to be very selective when we start talking about that. But I also agree with everybody that this really is about our relationship. And if we don't get back to improving the quality of our relationship, treaty or not, it doesn't matter. And if all of the waters have become so polluted that we can't eat the fish from them - we've got to think of a whole different kind of-- you mentioned I think, our original treaty with the land that we live on, we've got to renew that first. Because without that, everything else - the politics, the economics - all of that just disappears. If you can't eat-- who, who wants to have a treaty right to catch a polluted fish? We've got to change our thinking about this whole thing. So anyway, I appreciate it very much, the conversations today, and it's good to see you all again.

HAYDEN:

Yeah, thanks so much for that, Rick. I think it's a helpful corrective, and also speaks to this point that we're trying to make around narrative. Like, I think a lot of people will say, 'Okay, well, I'm a treaty person, I have treaty obligations. So, I'm going to go and read Treaty No. 3, or I'm going to go and read Treaty No. 8, what does it say?' But that's, you know, deeply misleading, right? Because we have these oral narratives, and sometimes they're written down. I mean, Treaty No. 3 - the Anishinaabek wrote down their interpretation of Treaty No. 3, just like Treaty No. 8, just like Treaty No. 6. But, in Canada, and I think in the United States as well, certain knowledges are privileged. So those texts aren't reviewed when we start talking about okay, well, what is the treaty text? And I love the story of Treaty No. 9, because the Mushkegowuk would say, 'Well, this is our understanding of Treaty No. 9', and they would recite it year after year and say, you know, 'This is our understanding of Treaty No. 9', and Canada and Ontario would say, 'No, we've got Treaty No. 9 written down right here. This is what it says'. And then, you know, this researcher, this guy named John S. Long finds a diary of an Ontario representative - I think his name was George McKnight - who went to Treaty No. 9 negotiations. And McKnight wrote down everything that was said at the oral negotiations for Treaty No. 9, put his notebook away, you know, tucked it in a drawer, no one saw it again for 100 years. Of course, look, you know, Long finds this diary and what does it say? Well, it confirms the Mushkegowuk's interpretation of Treaty No. 9, right? And we have all these examples, and yet they continue to be ignored when we say okay, well, what's the actual treaty history? And what are the actual treaty terms? Two elections ago, the federal government wanted to create a national treaty commissioner's office, and a couple of provinces have sort of experimented with this model as well, but it's never taken off because of this sort of bedrock foundational disagreement, misinterpretation - or as we're arguing malinterpretation of treaties, because it changes everything. It fundamentally changes everything. It changes how we orient ourselves to each other, how we orient ourselves to the land, who gets to claim, you know, radical underlying title, what sovereignty means. And it's, and it's really hard to imagine that Canadians are prepared to have that conversation.

MARTHA:

Thank you for that Hayden. Are there other comments or other questions? Jon Johnson.

SEMINAR AUDIENCE MEMBER - KARYN RECOLLET:

Hi. Actually, it's Karyn Recollet. You know, I learned so

much thank you! All of the narratives, the sharing, was really generative and lovely, and I appreciate how this conversation was curated. And it's nice to see you Hayden, I haven't seen you in a long time [laughs]. But I wanted to actually think through this idea of polishing. And to think about the futurity that would have been, like these were sort of speculative leaders, people who thought about the future, people who thought about, like, future ancestors. And sometimes I'm thinking about the act of polishing as a way to kind of smooth, to smoothen, and to care for. To think about like, kinship, and then a smoothness. In picking up that, I'd like to think through the porosity of, like, rock or shell, the grooves, sort of like as portals into an otherwise way of thinking, or otherwise way of imagining possibilities for futures and to think through, 'what do these glitches, these, like, porous spaces hold in terms of potentiality in terms of maybe (re) memory or voices having a place to come and be heard, from community?' Yeah, just to say that maybe when we polish, we push things back into those porous spaces where potential futures live, and might breathe and have breath. Yeah, just to comment on that. That very act of polishing and maybe Vanessa, maybe this is a question for you: what does that feel like to create these sorts of shapes? As a making, and maybe it's in between the beads as they're laid out that are these potentials in spaces? Maybe it's the white, what was it? Sort of like a white screen printed? That those might be spaces of you know, I guess, glitches to settler colonial formations?

VANESSA:

Yeah, I think that in learning the skills I needed to make this piece I first learned how to do the kind of the weaving. So, I learned how to weave beads onto a loom, which was really a fascinating process. Very simple, in terms of how to take string and connect, make like a really solid connection between all of the beads using a string. You know, when you're learning a new skill, and it's kind of clunky or weaving the beads and like, 'oh, it's taking so long!' And then I worked on this, you know, ambitious project, and I had to make all of the beads. And I actually, I reduced the number of beads- like if I looked at them, the number of rows and columns in the original, and then I was able to kind of make the same shapes, the two figures and the pentagons that represent the chains in, like, I think it was about a third of the number of beads as that was used in, in the original. So, I made a third of the beads, but I had to make them all, and in that repetitive process I really thought about, 'wow, it's not just this image or this weaving, right? All of these people had to, you know, come together, come together and harvest the shells, and shape them, shape them into these beads.' And I haven't, I haven't worked with actual wampum shells but I have some friends and colleagues

who do and it's an incredibly laborious – a really tricky process. Yeah, I love that question and thinking about the tactility, and in this, in the learning I also heard a lot of people talk about that importance of having something to hold, and about them being a mnemonic device and something that's not only, you know, an image that you look at and you know, read the treaty by looking at this image- that it's important that you hold this material. And you know, the shells were a clam's home, they were a creature, a part of, you know as Hayden and Eva were talking about relations, right- they're an animal, they're something that can be eaten and they fit into those ecosystems of relationships and, you know, offer their, their shells, their homes for us to make these agreements and to have these relationships. So, I think there's, a there's a lot in that tactility and it makes me think all the time about what, again, what can I appreciate, by, through touch and through holding something. So, if I don't want to speak or read English what can be learned through a kind of a contemplation of, through that tactility

MARTHA:

Thanks, Vanessa. There's a question here from Barbara Leaderman, who's asking you: 'how you feel about the fact that this piece is now owned?'

VANESSA:

I think it's maybe appropriate that that a wampum belt that's made out of money is its owned [laughs]. I don't know if it's appropriate that the wampum you know, all of the wampum belts and strings and other you know jewelry and pieces of wampum, I don't know if it's, I don't think it's a good thing that many of them are in museum collections and they're not with their communities and with the people who, you know, they should be with. But this one isn't made out of wampum, it's made out of paper and money. So, I think it is. Yeah, that was one of the reasons that I felt okay about selling it, in a transaction to the collection at Seneca College, and also felt that an educational institution would hopefully continue to carry out that role in teaching.

MARTHA:

Thanks, Vanessa. Are there other comments or questions? Um, I would, I would love to-- I mean, it sounded as though Hayden and Eva that you had more thoughts about radical remembering and about what maybe bringing forward that radical vision that's present in Anishinaabe understandings of the Treaty of Niagara, what that could look like in the present. You know at the Yellowhead Institute you've done so much work around jurisdiction and cash and land back. I'd be curious to hear you think more about what that radical vision could look like.

HAYDEN:

Yeah, I think, you know, I think maybe this is one of the areas that we have gone back and forth on around our role in educating non-Indigenous folks. Like, I think we left off the conversation having a pretty firm grasp from our own perspectives, what radical remembering means from an Indigenous perspective, like, you know, somebody put it in the comments 'has there been talk about polishing the chain with Six Nations?' and I don't know if that was a comment for Vanessa or not, but I think about often, you know, the relationship between the Anishinaabek and the Haudenosaunee in contemporary Ontario, contemporary Canada. And how we fetishize the Dish with One Spoon, for instance [laughs]. You know, like, who knows anything about the Dish with One Spoon other than it's like a fancy, nice sounding metaphor that we can invoke to, you know, feel happy about our presence on stolen native land! Like that's what it's become, and I accept my responsibility in popularizing the Dish with One Spoon. But, you know, how in practice is the Dish with One Spoon beyond a framework for the future, a framework for the past and a framework for the future? When we're invoking things like the Dish with One Spoon, what is our job as Indigenous people to radically remember those obligations and responsibilities to each other and the land? I mean, not what are - those are the responsibilities. But you know, I think about Six Nations and Mississaugas of the Credit-- it was just a couple of years ago when, when Eva Hill and Stacey Laforme were writing, you know, op-eds, chirping each other in Hamilton newspapers right? You could have, you could say that the Dish with One Spoon is effectively dead as far as, you know, band councils go.

So, there is a lot of work that we as Indigenous people have to do to rebuild those relationships. And I think what's really fascinating about the Royal Proclamation and the Treaty of Niagara conversations was the inter-nation diplomacy. Like, I think Rick has taken off here for a minute, but like a lot of the conversations were about how the Seneca had to repair the relationship with each other, you know, within the Haudenosaunee -and it was the same for the Anishinaabek, right? There was a lot of rebuilding. So that, I think, is the type of radical remembering I'm invested in and concerned with and spent my career doing. But the radical remembering for non-Indigenous people- I think that that's, you know, where I have difficulty, right? I, I want to say things like, "well, you know, remember these treaty obligations and, you know, remember that, that Canada is a fiction, and remember that it's your institutions not ours that continue to discriminate against Indigenous people, and you have the job to dismantle them, et cetera, et cetera,

et cetera". But there's only so many times I can say that, you know. I've been teaching for 10 years I've been giving talks like this for, you know, 10, 12, 13-- I don't know how, long saying the same things! So, I guess there's a limit to my thoughts on radical remembering.

MARTHA:

Point very much taken. And I think a very useful reminder to all the settlers on the call that it's our job to take that up now - as well. There's a question from Rick Montour.

Seminar Audience Member – Rick Montour:

Hello, everybody, I'm kind of late to the party and I apologize. But to pick up on what Hayden was saying-- hi Hayden. Good to see ya! - Yeah, I agree, I too have been guilty of romanticizing the Dish with One Spoon to an extent, but not that we did it deliberately. I think it's just a shorthand for coming to understand a kind of a rather complex set of relationships between Indigenous peoples - Haudenosaunee, Anishinaabe, and Huron, Wendat, and Neutral peoples, and the whole bit that lived here in southern Ontario. And I agree there's, it's, it's been simplified and kind of overdone in some ways that kind of alleviate some settler guilt, but I think there's a lot of good stuff to hang on to as well within that, and it's about good relations and conflict resolution. And it's much more, um deeper than this kind of metaphor of sharing, you know, this meal together - it goes a lot deeper than that. And that's the short form that happens. And I think it is something that can be used to think about more deeply: ecologically, politically, socially. I think we need to do that work, all of us. And I, you know, even just looking back in the historical record, talk, we've talked a little bit about New Credit or Credit First Nation and Six Nations over the years. But if you look back in the historical record of when Chief Pakquan kind of, you know, seeded that land, -- err [laughs] rented? Sold? Gave the permission for Six Nations to come into southern Ontario in 1784. He said right in the record that us and the Six Nations are brethren, we are one in the same people. So, he understood then, in 1784, that we were in that relationship together, and I think over time, because of colonial forces, we kind of lost that. So, there's a lot of work that Indigenous nations have to do amongst ourselves around those sorts of things, too. So, I just wanted to pick up on that and, add that to that really quickly. Thanks, and sorry again for showing up late.

MARTHA:

Thanks for that Rick. There's a there's another question from Natalka.

SEMINAR AUDIENCE MEMBER – NATALKA:

Aanii Boozoo, I'm from Saugeen First Nation, Anishinaabekwe, and I've been listening to the conversation and just thinking about the Treaty of Niagara. I feel like we're missing the 24 Nations Agreement that was done along with that. So, I feel like part of that's missing, because I've been sitting with my thoughts for a while, I'm going to come with a whole bunch of stuff. So miigwech Rick, I appreciated that - I think what we're missing in those agreements when we talk about them is the president of the Creator. I feel like, you know, as being Anishinaabek we kind of assume that that's understood, but I think we need to really kind of impress upon that. At a food sovereignty gathering I heard a young woman speak about the Dish with One Spoon, when they spoke about their food and just reminded us that it is an ecological kind of agreement, and that we are responsible to take care of those resources that are in our Dish, so everyone is you know, able to use them. And then you know, to be honest, I raised my hand for something - Oh, I know what it was - to answer this question. The question about 'should the Iroquois and Anishinaabek polish the belt?' So, our people did do that. So, our people would gather in Grand Councils, and they would bring all of our leaders together. So, this is prior to 1900. Bringing the leaders together, and before they would start the meetings, the belts would be brought out and they would be recited. And they would be recited to remind all of the leaders what those agreements meant, because we didn't have, you know, things written down where they could just refer to, you know, a page whatever, appendix six. These had to be given orally. And so, you know, when Hayden speaks about the whole colonialism kind of being imposed upon us, that colonialism being imposed upon us was the fact that we have *inaudible* to survive in this world. If you're sitting at a Grand Council for two weeks waiting for those belts to be recited, you don't have time to pull your crops off the field. So, it's a whole mess of all of these things coming to a head that's kind of put us in this place of picking up our bundles again, I guess. I just wanted to say that you know, that's not new, it's not a new idea about us coming together and polishing those belts. I think the last time I read about that polishing of the belt was 1905 Grand Council and Six Nations. And at that time, they struggled to find somebody who remembered how to read the belts. And so, the Chief had to scramble looking for someone to come and bring those belts forward. And the council members from my community who attended-- they couldn't wait. They became impatient because they had crops that were rotting on the fields and they had to get home to bring them in, so they could survive through the winter. Anyways, I feel like that was really really long, but I just wanted to answer that question, anyway, miigwech!

MARTHA:

Miigwech for your comments Natalka. Do any of the speakers want to respond? There's also there's also a really wonderful comment that Chandra Maracle just dropped in the chat. Chandra, do you want to do you want to speak to that?

SEMINAR AUDIENCE MEMBER – CHANDRA:

Okay. So, Rick and I share a house so rather than be on two different computers [laughs] we're sharing this one - and he had to step away for a call. So, I was just typing in and I see Lisa is there. And we've talked about this in the past, and I had the privilege a few months ago to work with James Whetung in his community- he does wild rice gathering but he invited me to share some stories and teachings around corn. So, I showed up and brought them some corn and they made some stuff out of that, and we had this fabulous day around all these wild rice teachings. Then I added to some of that with corn. And this was not the first time that I was a Haudenosaunee speaker speaking to mostly Anishinaabek people! So, to lighten the mood, I joked about how I was, you know, being allowed to be there, you know, to speak and share some of these stories. And I just was kind of putting forth this idea that, you know, we don't always have to put everything at that political level. I know that Hayden just mentioned this, this thing that happened with you know, the band council leaders, you know, chirping back and forth to each other. And I said, well, you know, one thing that we can do is just as community people, is to re-establish relationships as well as. We don't always have to expect our so-called leaders to do things for us. And you know, one great thing we can do this is we can continue to have gatherings of community people - Anishinaabek and Haudenosaunee people. And of course, Lisa and I would say that one great way to do that is by sharing food. So, if we have this metaphor of the Dish with One Spoon, we can continue that metaphor by saying we can wash the dish instead of politically polishing the chain. And this is where we get together as community people and just do what comes naturally when food is present - we just enjoy each other, right? We just share food and share stories and our foodways and systems. So, when Haudenosaunee people start talking about corn and Anishinaabek people start talking about wild rice, you know, some great things are gonna come from that! Not just, not just our bellies and our hearts are going to be full but then we're going to have these great conversations about re-establishing relationships that way. Hopefully Lisa and I can do some more of that pretty soon. But Six Nations would be a perfect place, actually I think, you know, we live just down the road from New Credit. So, in all the, in like

20 years almost that that I've been living at Six, I know very little about what happens five minutes down the road from me. So, this could be a way we could have this community gathering between New Credit and Six Nations. We both have great community centers where this could be one place where we could have something like this-- where we can, instead of constantly talking about the politics, we can talk about the goodness that comes out of sharing our food, food systems and food stories. Because a lot of us in the community level we actually like each other, you know, there are Haudenosaunee people who like Anishinaabek people! And I hope there are Anishinaabek people who like Haudenosaunee people! [laughs]. You know, despite what the media will always tell you.

MARTHA:

Niawenhkó:wa for that Chandra

EVA:

Miigwech Chandra, I just wanted to respond and say, you know, I'm the result of two Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee, uh you know, [laughs] loving each other, you know? [laughs]. We exist! I'm from Chippewas of the Thames and on the other side of the river is Oneida Nation of the Thames and many of us are, you know-- we're called bridge babies, the ones that are both an Anishinaabe and Oneida. And I wanted to mention that too, that I think that's what's really important about femme or women in leadership, because those are just really practical ways to just be in community with one another and I think that's really what women bring. And what are our gifts are, is to bring that, and what we also bring too is memory. For Anishinaabe women we are we are tasked, or I guess one of our gifts is the gift of memory because we carry water, and water carries memory. And so that's one of the teachings that we have too is that women remember. Women remember the lineages and when we get together and talk and visit, we talk about those lineages. We talk about who's related to and you know, that's been demonized as "gossip" by a lot of people, but we actually really need to just remember and just be together. You know, sharing food and very practically in community, coming together and visiting is so critical. So, chi miigwech for your words, Niawenhkó:wa.

MARTHA:

Wonderful. I think we have time for one final question or comment and Lisa Myers - do you want to do you want to share something?

SEMINAR AUDIENCE MEMBER - LISA MYERS:

Sure, I can. I was thinking, I really liked the idea of, just, a

radical memory and you're mentioning it in relation to water too. But I was thinking about, you know, this artist who I really admire who did a studio visit with me five years ago, and I was showing her some of my work and she talked about -this was Maria Teresa Alves. And she talked about - my work had to do with, you know, it's underpinning was personal stories, and things that I learned from my grandfather— but, it wasn't so much that that it was about. I think, what she identified for me was, she asked me, 'when, so when do our personal stories end up becoming our histories?' and so when does that happen? So, we were talking about that. So, I was thinking about when you're mentioning radical memory, I was thinking about that in relation to histories - and I guess histories is a very vague, broad term [laughs] - you know, in terms I'm thinking of it in terms of, you know, the histories that we carry from our communities, but also official history, right? So how can, how can radical memory/how does radical memory subvert our histories where mostly there's a misrepresentation of the past or maybe I'll pick up Hayden, on what you said, and mal-representation of the past-- anyway, I guess maybe I'm reiterating some of the things that I really liked from the conversation - but if you have any ongoing comments [or] responses, that'd be great too. And it's really, I just wanted to thank you all, chi miigwech, for being part of the panel. It's pretty amazing to see this panel of people, so I feel that it's a pretty special day. Miigwech!

MARTHA:

Miigwech for that, Lisa. Do any of the panelists have any final comments or reflections before we before we sign off? This has been just such an incredibly rich conversation. I'm feeling so privileged to have been able to have been a part of it!

VANESSA:

Salutation in the Lenape language

HAYDEN:

Yeah, nothing from me. I'm happy to be here and have a conversation with you all and have a conversation with some folks I haven't talked to you for a while too! So maybe we'll do it again soon!

MARTHA:

Fantastic.

EVA:

Chi miigwech.

Well thank you, everyone, for joining us today. I hope you all have a wonderful rest of your days. Bye Rick!

AUDIENCE MEMBER - VICTORIA:

May I say one more thing?

MARTHA:

Yes. Yes, Victoria?

SEMINAR AUDIENCE MEMBER - VICTORIA:

I'm so sorry. I've been putting my hand up, by the way. Okay. Where I come from my dad is from Treaty No. 4 territory. Saskatchewan in Treaty No. 4, out by Yorkton and Kenora, Saskatchewan, and this year we just ceremonially and in blood memory got back our bison! So, I think Cote First Nation, they got back I think 30 Bison, and I just sadly I can't remember the numbers. I think there was about 30 or 40 bison there. We're hoping to renew our relationship, our kinship, like how we mentioned - isn't that so beautiful how we mentioned our kinship ties? Isn't that so beautiful? Anyways, the Anishinaabe there are hoping, and Treaty No. 4 are hoping to renew our kinship ties with the bison, and it really, it really was a beautiful ceremony and it really was done in this spirit of peace and friendship, in the spirit of our treaties. Sadly, I don't know the protocol about where/what your traditional protocol treaty is, but where I come from, if I may, I would love for all of the other nations - the Haudenosaunee, the Lakota peoples, the Mi'kmaq people, everyone - I would like, I hope that non-Indigenous treaty people, I hope all of you can travel to Treaty No. 4, and I would, if I may, I would love for all of you to see our little bison herd. And we're so happy to have our bison herd. Please join us if you can these bison around Cote Reserve and the Key Reserve in Treaty No. 4 territory. I would love for all of you to come and see our bison! I hope you can make the trip and may our little bison herd be a part of your blood memory, in the spirit and intent of the treaty relationship! Chi miigwech! I hope you can all make it thank you.

MARTHA:

What a beautiful and generous offering! Chi miigwech, Victoria! Thank you so much for that there's a couple of comments in the in the chat about how grateful people are that you that you brought bison into the conversation.

