



Making home on Anishinaabe lands: storying settler activisms in Nogojiwanong (Peterborough, Canada)

May Chazan

To cite this article: May Chazan (2019): Making home on Anishinaabe lands: storying settler activisms in Nogojiwanong (Peterborough, Canada), *Settler Colonial Studies*, DOI: [10.1080/2201473X.2019.1605963](https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2019.1605963)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2019.1605963>



Published online: 08 May 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 47



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Making home on Anishinaabe lands: storying settler activisms in Nogojiwanong (Peterborough, Canada)

May Chazan

Department of Gender and Women's Studies, Lady Eaton College, Trent University, Peterborough, Canada

ABSTRACT

Reflecting on the contested nature of home-making within settler colonial contexts, this article examines what home means and how it is practiced among differently located settlers in Nogojiwanong (Peterborough, Canada). The article analyses a case study carried out in 2016, as part of ongoing research to document and archive stories of resistance in one settler colonial context. It draws most explicitly on an analysis of three differently positioned settler activists' perspectives to nuance and complicate notions of settler epistemology, futurity, and affect. It argues that, while there is undeniable tension and violence inherent in settler allies invoking and making home as part of their activisms in settler colonial contexts, there is also value in understanding how some settlers are seeking to challenge dominant settler practices, feelings, and epistemologies of home. Differently and to different extents, the stories presented begin to destabilize settler claims to belonging and ways of knowing/being, offering possibilities for meaningful, relational, resurgent, decolonial, and allied home-makings on Indigenous lands.

KEYWORDS

Settler epistemologies;
settler affect; home;
Anishinaabe; activisms;
Indigenous-settler relations;
allyship; settler colonialism

Introduction

On a warm Wednesday morning in October 2016, some 40 activists and students gathered to share and record their stories of working for change in Nogojiwanong (Peterborough, Ontario, Canada).¹ They came together as the first round of research in a multi-year, community-based project called 'Stories of Resistance, Resurgence, and Resilience in Nogojiwanong/Peterborough'. Informed by decolonial, feminist, and queer storytelling methodologies,² the project aimed to create an oral history of Nogojiwanong's diverse and lesser-known activisms³ through a series of annual, intergenerational storytelling and media creation workshops.

Nogojiwanong, which is Anishinaabemowin for 'the place at the foot of the rapids', is the original name for the region 150 kilometres northeast of the major urban centre of Toronto. This is Michi Saagiig Anishinaabeg territory; it contains the mid-sized city of Peterborough, which has a population of approximately 80,000 people.⁴ This territory is governed by colonial treaties, Treaty 20 and the Williams Treaties, although treaty relationships have repeatedly been violated by settlers, corporations, and colonial

governments.⁵ Through colonial processes dating back to the early 1800s, Indigenous Peoples have been continuously pushed out of the City of Peterborough;⁶ they remain underrepresented in municipal governance and elsewhere in community organizations. Since the 1970s, Nogojiwanong has also been a place of settlement for increasingly diverse and differently positioned immigrants, many of whom are racialized in the Canadian context.⁷ While there is a strong mobilization of anti-racist, decolonial leadership in this community – and a strong Indigenous resurgence movement connected in part to local First Nations and in part to Trent University⁸ – racist attitudes toward both racialized people and Indigenous Peoples abound.⁹

In this context, this research-generation workshop brought together a class of 18 upper-year undergraduate students in a course on activisms at Trent University with 12 community activists, plus a number of research assistants and facilitators. Activists were selected to include people across different ages (20s through 90s), abilities, and backgrounds, including Indigenous activists and settlers whose family histories span one to six generations in Canada. As professor of this course and lead researcher on this project, I directed this workshop; as a white, settler, cisgender woman who had lived in this place for only three years at the time, the analysis I offer is also deeply intertwined with my own uncertain relationship to making Nogojiwanong my home, which I will discuss at length later in this article.

On the opening day, participants gathered in a roundtable discussion, reflecting thoughtfully on the question: ‘Can you recall an early politicizing moment in your life – a time, perhaps, when you first came to understand something to be unjust, and when you felt compelled to act?’. The question spurred animated discussion. About 10 minutes into the roundtable, Carmela Valles spoke. ‘So, coming to Peterborough, being new at a university, being new in a community, I felt silenced’, she said. ‘It was frustrating and alienating’. She reflected on her experiences as a racialized woman and international student from the Philippines:

I think the turning point was actually finding people in the community who draw you out and say, ‘Come join, it’s ok’. And I would just like to say that two of these women are here: Linda Slavin and Rosemary Ganley.

She paused; ‘These women ... you know, when you see them, it’s almost like going home’.

As Valles described her connections with activists around the circle, she reminded us of our uneven and differentiated structural privilege, feelings of belonging, and connections to this place. In doing this, she invoked her sense of home as pivotal to her activist work – a theme which later emerged as central to this research, and to understanding what drew participants into social change work in this community and what sustained their activisms over time.¹⁰ It is this theme – specifically, the tensions, limitations, and possibilities around settler activists thinking, feeling and making home in settler colonial contexts – that I explore in this article, with a particular view to understanding how home is understood and practiced for differently positioned settlers in Nogojiwanong.¹¹

In her 40s at the time of this research, Valles explained that she came to Nogojiwanong from the Philippines in the 1990s to attend Trent University, and that she had since become integrally involved in advocacy for and with new immigrants and refugees. She said that becoming an activist in this community was not always easy; she faced significant alienation as a racialized woman and a newcomer. She named Slavin and Ganley – both

white settlers and both a generation older than herself (in their 70s and 80s respectively at the time of the research) – as integral to making her feel *at home*, and thus to enabling her work for change. But, while these relationships and her changing perception of Nogojiwanong as home are critical to understanding her activist trajectory, these dynamics are also enormously complex.

As Lorenzo Veracini and others explain, home is especially contested in settler colonial contexts (like Nogojiwanong), because of how settler colonial states explicitly maintain power, domination, and wealth by mobilizing and controlling access to home.¹² Indeed, one of the central features of settler colonialism is its systematic approach toward re-homing colonized territories by removing colonized people from their lands and repopulating through immigration, assimilation, and settlement.¹³ Critical scholarship over the past decade has revealed the many ways ongoing settler home-making practices underpin large-scale processes of dispossession. Some scholars call attention to how, materially and discursively, colonialism works to naturalize white settlers as ‘at home’ on colonized lands, while simultaneously pathologizing the claims to belonging of racialized people, and erasing the presence, struggles, and claims to home of Indigenous Peoples.¹⁴ Others are investigating the ways in which settler ways of knowing and doing home are being resisted/reinforced by Indigenous Peoples and non-Indigenous settlers in these contexts.¹⁵ Still others are exploring the ongoing, overlapping, and divergent home-makings of Indigenous, white settler, and racialized people within settler colonial contexts, and the possibilities (and limits) for allied relationships among these fluid and heterogeneous groups.¹⁶ It is in within these conversations that I position this article.

Specifically, I examine what home means and how it is practiced among differently located settler activists within the Michi Saagiig Anishinaabeg territory of Nogojiwanong. My focus on settler perspectives seeks to contribute to scholarly efforts to consider Indigenous-settler relations from a perspective that reverses the longstanding gaze on what, in Canada, has been perceived of as ‘the Indian problem’.¹⁷ Such analyses of ‘settler consciousness’ take as a point of departure that decolonization in Canada and elsewhere requires acknowledging and acting on an enduring settler problem – changing the attitudes and practices of most settlers, challenging settler ways of thinking, senses of entitlement, assumed belonging, and epistemological superiority, and ultimately altering colonial structures, infrastructure, and governance models.¹⁸ I concur with this scholarship that critical exploration of settler epistemologies, assumptions, understandings, and affect are crucial and understudied areas of decolonial scholarship.¹⁹

I investigate the complex ways in which three settlers understand and practice home as part of their activisms in Nogojiwanong, focusing on three interconnected stories from my first round of research-generation workshops in 2016. I have selected these stories for the varied insights they offer into activist home-makings, settler epistemologies, and the possibilities/limitations of allyship, from the perspectives of three differently positioned settlers vis-à-vis Nogojiwanong as home: Carmela Valles, as a racialized, first-generation Canadian; Linda Slavin as a white, multigenerational settler with ancestral connections to the early settlement of this territory; and Ziysah von Bieberstein, whose ancestors were Eastern European Jewish refugees who settled in Toronto three generations ago. These activists also speak from varied social locations (ages, gender identities, sexualities, ethnicities, religious backgrounds) and from overlapping but also divergent participation in community organizing and activisms in Nogojiwanong (collectively including migrant

justice, decolonial, environmental, feminist, peace, and anti-racism activism). While I focus on three stories in order to explore each in some detail, the insights and themes that emerge are illustrative of this research more broadly.

Through close analysis of these three settler perspectives, I explore the heterogeneity within their epistemologies and practices. I ask: What are the complexities, tensions, limitations, and possibilities around these settler home-makings? What does it mean for these differently positioned settlers to invoke home as part of an activist practice or logic? What epistemological and political assumptions do they bring? Are there possibilities for such invocations to shift beyond dominant tropes of colonial re-homing? In what ways might their perspectives and home-makings challenge and/or reinforce dominant claims to white settler belonging and other related settler colonial logics, structures, and feelings? Can these differently positioned settlers seek belonging in resistant or decolonial ways? What relationships are revealed or made possible through their discussions and makings of home? Ultimately, I argue that, while there is undeniable tension and indeed violence inherent in settlers invoking and making home in settler colonial contexts, and while shifting settler consciousness does not itself equate with material decolonization, there is still value in understanding how some settlers are beginning to challenge dominant settler norms, logics, feelings, and epistemologies. In small ways, the three activists I discuss in this article do this – and so, their stories offer insights into what allied home-makings could look like on Indigenous lands. Differently and to different extents, these settlers are beginning to destabilize their own claims to belonging, question their own ways of knowing and being on colonized lands, and support Indigenous resurgence through listening, (un)learning, relationship-building, and meaningful allyship.

Thinking, feeling, and making home in settler colonial contexts

In focusing my attention on home in this article, I draw from and contribute to scholarship at the intersection of settler colonial studies and critical migration studies.²⁰ Scholars in these areas deploy home as a complex analytic framework and understand it to be a highly emotive and politicized concept – it is, ultimately, about belonging, alienation, and boundaries.²¹ These scholars conceptualize home not as static, neutral, or geographically bound, but rather as relational, dynamic, performative, embedded in power relations, and both material and symbolic. My analysis engages most closely with four interrelated scholarly themes within this work.

First, I take as a starting point that systematic re-homing of Indigenous lands is central to settler colonialism, as discussed previously.²² I thus draw on a conceptualization of home as always power-laden and political; in contrast to romanticized ideas of home as synonymous with comfort, I follow critical scholars who conceptualize it as a site of power and resistance at multiple, interacting, and overlapping scales.²³ In working with home in this way, I draw on Alison Blunt and Robyn Dowling,²⁴ who investigate the relational dimensions of, and power dynamics involved in, different home-makings. As they reveal, in Canadian and other settler colonial contexts, the home-making practices of some groups can render home ‘unhomely’ for other groups. They thus challenge dominant colonial narratives, as noted previously, which naturalize the claims to belonging of white, multigenerational settler Canadians, while arguing that such claims (and their ongoing home-making practices) function to both pathologize the belonging strategies

of racialized people and invisibilize the ongoing presence (and struggles) of Indigenous Peoples.²⁵ Chris Hiller explains the implications of this re-homing and its associated assumptions of white settler belonging as follows:

Settler identities, spaces, sense of home and place, and constructions of land and nation are brought into being, secured, and enforced through an interplay of settler colonial spatial technologies: an evolving set of mechanisms and practices that function to clear the land discursively, materially, and violently of its Indigenous occupants/ owners in order to make way for (white) settlement and development ... It is these discursive and material mechanisms that school our imaginations as settler subjects, rendering as well as enforcing the given-ness of our place here, and shoring up the legitimacy of our claims to be the true inhabitants of the land. This imagined yet never fully accomplished possession of Indigenous lands runs to the very heart of settler identities, cultures, and social and political formations.²⁶

In my analysis, then, I examine whether and how the three settler activists challenge and/or uphold narratives of white settlers as 'at home', racialized people as foreigners, and the homelands/home-makings of Indigenous Peoples as barely existing. I ask, for instance: how might Valles's reference to home have been received by others around that circle? How might their different belonging strategies be connected, conflicted, and/or mutually implicated?

Second, I draw on a conceptualization of home that is dynamic, fluid, and relational, not one that is fixed to place of origin or ancestral 'homeland'. Thus I consider the possibilities and limitations associated with settler activists un/making home in Nogojiwanong, through reiterative practices and through relationships.²⁷ By bringing attention to home as process in this way, it becomes possible to think about the dynamics of simultaneous home-makings on Indigenous land. In other words, it becomes possible to explore settler home-makings while acknowledging that, in a context where state-led processes continuously seek to dispossess Indigenous Peoples of their own homelands, Indigenous Peoples too are continuously and resistantly making home.²⁸ This allows for the awkward but important questions: Where and how is home un/made for settlers, and to what effect? Where and how is home un/made for displaced peoples, both Indigenous and settler, and to what effect? (In what ways) are our home-makings bound together?

Third, in attending to diverse settler perspectives on and practices of home, I draw on Eva Mackey and others to begin to investigate settler epistemologies, logics, discourses, and affect. Mackey examines ongoing Indigenous-settler tensions around home, suggesting that such tensions are rooted not only in struggles for belonging, land, and material security, but also in a significant 'epistemic impasse'. She argues that settler epistemologies tie home to a dominant belief that humans are not part of the land but are outside or above the rest of creation and thus are entitled to own (control, sell, refurbish, and master) the land in self-benefitting ways. Settler understandings of home have to do, she contends, with ideas about mastery and property.²⁹ This stands in opposition to the perspectives of many Indigenous Peoples, who she suggests understand home in terms of their relations to all of creation; conceptualizing humans as coming from the land and their particular ties to their ancestral lands, which hold ancestral memory, cultures, knowledges, and all that sustains life. She writes:

Such epistemologies of mastery offer no window to imagine a shared project of building relationships within homelands that can account for complex and often violent, but

sometimes fruitful, overlapping histories, or the resulting similarities and differences between settler and Indigenous peoples.³⁰

Connected to this, she notes that, for many settlers in the Canadian context, questions about whose home they inhabit – and indeed associated questions about land rematriation and Indigenous sovereignty – often spark deep fears and preoccupations for their own futures: preoccupations with their own future security and possibilities of property loss.³¹ These feelings, she suggests, structure and reinforce settler ways of knowing and conceptualizing home, thereby contributing to the broader epistemological disjuncture. Mackey's work, like Blunt and Dowling's, also raises salient questions for this research: Again, how did participants understand home? Was there (in)congruency among their epistemological assumptions, their feelings, their associated preoccupations?

Finally, I build on the emerging theme of (im)possibility within critical writings on home – thinking about home-making as potentially both oppressive and transformative. As discussed previously, I explore settler perspectives with a view to considering whether and how their ways of knowing/making home, their discourses around futurity, and their claims to belonging uphold and/or challenge notions of an impasse; I also examine how their varied assumptions, worldviews, and practices make possible and/or preclude meaningful, allied home-makings between settlers and Indigenous Peoples on Indigenous lands.³² As Jill Carter notes in her piece with Karen Recollet and Dylan Robinson:

[W]e are, all of us, afflicted by the disease of the colonial project, a dis-ease, which has grievously disrupted our treaty relationships with each other and with the natural world, and we all share the responsibility to fully engage ourselves in a project of reworlding.³³

I draw on their work in thinking about whether/how certain joint, allied, relational home-makings might be part of such a critical reworlding project, and what kind of deep listening, introspection, and (un/re)learning might be required in the process. In my exploration of particular activist relationships across difference, I also consider what Sarah Hunt and Cindy Holmes call quiet, 'intimate' alliances, which they suggest often take place 'at home' – between friends, family members, or lovers. Extending this idea outward, I consider whether such quiet, intimate alliances might be fostered through activist home-makings in a shared place. Thus, following Carter, Recollet, and Robinson, Hunt and Holmes, and others, I begin from a critical awareness of the power, resistance, and ongoing legacies surrounding settler home-makings, while at the same time I ask whether home might also be a site of relationship-building, alliance, shared resistance, (un/re)learning, and even reworlding?

I take up these four central themes – power, process, epistemologies, and possibility – throughout this article. I turn now to a discussion of my methodology and then to an exploration of home within the stories of Valles, Slavin, and von Bieberstein.

Methodology

This article is based on a multi-year project that aims to create an oral history of Nogojiwanong's diverse and lesser-known activisms through a series of annual, intergenerational storytelling and media creation workshops. The project draws on critical storytelling methodologies, which posit storytelling as important Indigenous, decolonial, feminist, and queer forms of knowledge production.³⁴ This approach – facilitating group-based storytelling

workshops as a form of research – seeks to capture the relational and intergenerational dimensions of knowledge production, recognizing that contexts and relationships inform how stories are constructed, shared, circulated, and remembered. In addition, this project combines storytelling workshops with participatory media creation methodologies in order to offer participants direct input into how their stories are circulated.³⁵ It also draws from scholarship on feminist oral histories,³⁶ conceptualizing participants' stories as performed and situated rather than as linear re-tellings of past truth.

This research was initiated in early 2016, when I was approached by the Ontario Public Interest Research Group Peterborough Branch (OPIRG-Peterborough), an activist umbrella organization, to lead a project documenting a 'people's history of activism in Peterborough'. From my previous research and my own activist involvement in this community, I understood that, in Nogojiwanong, a relatively small group of actors drives much of the work across different activist movements, initiatives, and social justice organizations. So, rather than documenting different localized movements in isolation from one another (i.e. labour, environmental, feminist, and so on), I designed the study to capture and analyse key actors' biographical stories of engaging in multiple activisms in this place, with a view to also examine relationships among differently positioned people and varied movements.

While the project will span 4 years for a total of 48 stories recorded, I carried out the first research-generation workshop over the course of 4 days in the fall of 2016. As discussed, this workshop brought together 12 community activists with students to share and record their stories of activisms in Nogojiwanong. It included roundtables, circle conversations, and small group discussions. Students then worked with activists to create short digital stories.³⁷ In addition to these publicly available materials, the workshop also produced audio recordings of group discussions, participants' written reflections, photographs taken by participants and research assistants, and participant observation notes taken by trained research assistants. Following the first workshop, I engaged in a process of interpretation through close readings of all of the workshop materials, and a combination of narrative and thematic analyses. While we did not explicitly ask participants about being 'at home' or 'home-making' in our interview process,³⁸ these topics became a strong motif in participants' responses and reflections – hence the focus of this article. This analysis thus focuses on home within the interconnecting stories of the three settler activists introduced previously. There are obvious limitations in a journal-length article to how much I can include from the recorded materials, however, the full interviews have been archived and are digitally accessible from the Trent University Library and Archives.³⁹ Within these restraints, I draw on their words and perspectives in order to explore different settler positions and epistemologies. Their stories also intersect with one another – indeed they explicitly name each other as well as other community activists and organizers – and so I offer these three stories together as a way to illuminate certain intimate alliances across difference.

This analysis builds from my longstanding scholarly commitment to critically analysing settler solidarities⁴⁰ and to expanding dominant understandings of activisms beyond Eurocentric and colonial conceptions.⁴¹ It also reflects my ongoing personal deliberations – as an academic, activist, and parent – around my responsibilities, relationships, and subjectivities as a white settler who is deeply invested in and always uncertain about 'reworlding'.⁴² Perhaps most significantly, this project – the relationships and knowledges from

which it springs and which it has also generated – is intricately interconnected with my own (self-conscious) home-makings on Michi Saagiig Anishinaabeg territory, particularly as I only moved to Nogojiwanong in 2013, three years prior to beginning this research. And so, in positioning myself within this analysis, it is appropriate and necessary for me to take up Carter, Recollet, and Robinson's call, for 'settler researchers and Indigenous scholars do some work together apart'⁴³ – to first examine my own gaping hunger for knowledge, belonging, and home by exploring, as Carter (in the same piece) asks, 'who am I in all of this?'.⁴⁴ Such hunger left unquestioned, Carter, Recollet, and Robinson explain, so often consumes Indigenous-settler relationship-building efforts.

My great grandparents were Jewish refugees from Eastern Europe who settled in Kanien'kehá:ka (Mohawk) territory, in what is now called Montreal (Canada), at the turn of the twentieth century.⁴⁵ I was born and raised in Montreal, with all of the privilege of a white, English-speaking, able-bodied, cisgender settler. For the first 18 years of my life, I made home in that territory, with very limited knowledge of where specifically my ancestors hailed from. I was (and am) admittedly hungry for my family's stories; I cherish walking the neighbourhoods where my grandparents grew up, finding hints of what I assume were my ancestors' languages and cultures. I have since grappled – increasingly with each decade of my life – with the tension that this beautiful city/territory was, for millennia, a meeting place for Indigenous Peoples; with the reality that the privilege I know, and my family's fortune to escape violence and make our home there, is intimately bound with Kanien'kehá:ka displacement from their land. This has indeed fuelled another, more recent, kind of hunger: to start to understand, to the extent that is even possible, our interconnected and still unequal histories of violence, dispossession, and resurgence. I have, however, not lived in Kanien'kehá:ka territory in over 25 years; with almost no remaining family contact there in my adult life, I have very rarely been drawn back to unpack and complicate my formative home-making practices.

In 2016, when I was invited into this project, I was in an active process of making home anew – albeit with much less certainty and more discomfort. I was newly living, working, and parenting on Michi Saagiig territory. But, because this project was not designed from the outset to examine home as a core theme, I did not immediately question whether or how participants' stories of activism in this place, and our growing relationships, would inform my understandings and practices of home. This questioning has, however, been opened up through this analysis. Making home here, I am coming to understand, is an ongoing, uncomfortable, and complex process for me, as it is for many participants in this project – a process of un/learning through relationships and in connection to land, water, and people. I am grateful to struggle daily (in a way that I had not previously) with what it means to be a white settler-academic-activist-parent in this place. I credit this shift to the opportunities I have had here: to listen to Anishinaabe Elders; to participate in sunrise and water ceremonies; and to learn from the radical vision, poetic brilliance, and mobilizing know-how of students, peers, colleagues, friends, activists, and artists from this territory and from other Indigenous communities across Turtle Island.⁴⁶ I also acknowledge the un/learning I am doing through relationships with other settlers in this place, who have been at the work of meaningful listening and allied reworlding for many decades.⁴⁷ Many of these relationships figure into, but also extend beyond, this project. So I approach this analysis with a deliberate practice of uncertainty, with an acknowledgement of my own shifting self and sense of belonging within this work, with an open

discomfort about my own necessarily fraught settler relationship to home-making, and in a spirit of doing the hard work 'together apart'.

Carmela Valles

Valles was the first to invoke home in this research, very early in this workshop series, as part of her reflection into what propelled her own activism. As indicated in the opening of this article, she explicitly named Slavin and Ganley in the workshop's opening roundtable, as two activists within the community who fostered her sense of belonging, or felt to her like 'going home'. What was immediately evident was that her understandings and practices of home were relational – made in relation to other people. For Valles, home-making was also a process supported by and imbued with possibilities to form alliances – in this case, alliances with two white settler women a generation older than herself. This resonates not only with idea of home-making as relational,⁴⁸ but also with the theme of home as a potential site for reworlding⁴⁹ or transformation.⁵⁰

In her interview on the second day of the workshop, Valles described the activism she witnesses among racialized and newly arrived settlers. Here, without prompting, she once again alluded to feelings of belonging and activist practices of making home:

To a lot of people [activism] means different things. But for me ... it is about looking out for each other, and immigrants and refugees are very good at that. They share the common story of up-rootedness, of missing families that are in another part of the world. They're straddling two homes: one leg is here, the other leg is on the opposite side of the world or wherever, and that's their struggle to belong.

This speaks to Valles's understanding of home-making as also power-laden and political.⁵¹ Indeed, at many points she describes her home-making in Nogojiwanong as a resistance to the discrimination and exclusion she experiences as a racialized settler in a dominant white settler community. She also noted that 'activism' among Nogojiwanong's racialized settler community is practiced as 'looking out for each other'. This reflects the power of community caring as a collective resistance to racism and alienation. In addition, her words 'straddling two homes' clearly challenge ideas of home as place-bound or necessarily tied to place of origin.⁵²

Elsewhere in her interview, Valles reinforced home-making as a dynamic process for her. Reflecting on the question, 'Has your activism changed at different times in your life, and in what ways?' she again explicitly offered a fluid conceptualization of home as her framework:

In 1999 when my daughter was born, because Peterborough became more home at that time. She was born and raised here. And the work of advocating for meaningful integration for new Canadian families was not anymore just about me and the now. It became about the next generation

Her words suggest her changing perception of Nogojiwanong as home and her shifting home-making practices after having children. After her daughter was born, her activism became more focused forward on future generations; there is also more urgency for her to engage in home-making work. Moreover, her activism became about building a home in which community members better understand how systems of power, privilege, and inequality structure processes of global migration. She went on to say:

My activism is working towards a meaningful integration of new Canadians in Peterborough. And, not only by providing the services and programs that new Canadians and refugee families need when they come to Peterborough, but also working with the community [so] that they meet them half way. That they would also change, that they would understand better the contribution and the dynamic talents that immigrant families bring to the area, and understand the political economic and [all the other reasons] why people move around the world and why they pick Canada, and why they end up in Peterborough ...

Indeed, Valles has worked continuously to make Nogojiwanong into a place that would align with her social justice values and to create a future in which all could feel 'at home' regardless of their skin colour, citizenship, or place of origin.

There are clearly important possibilities in this home-making for resisting racism and white supremacy. But how does her story resonate with – or resist – what has been described as settler affects and epistemologies of home?⁵³ The passages cited so far do not explicitly reflect understandings of home as based on ownership or mastery, although we also did not directly ask what home means to her. In considering her forward-looking reflections on making home, it is also not clear whether her home-making is preoccupied with security in the sense of entitlements. More so, any resonance with security appears to invoke a vision of making a place that is safe and welcoming for people of all backgrounds, and bringing critical understanding to the context of global power dynamics, racism, and the drivers of transnational migration. Most obviously, Valles's reflection on her activist home-making reflects a level of legitimacy to Canada as a settler colonial nation state, which draws settlers transnationally in a number of ways; she does not, unprompted, acknowledge the complexities of home-making on Indigenous lands.

Curious about some of these tensions, at the break on the workshop recording day, I asked Valles about her intervention into the roundtable. I told her I had been thinking about her feeling 'at home' with certain activists, and about what home meant to the different people around the circle, particularly in the context of settler colonialism. Her response offered some insights into the complexities of home-making. To paraphrase, she said the following: many people immigrating to Canada were colonized in their own homelands and, as they are trying to make their new home, they become racialized in this new place. Although they might not realize it, the very same systems of colonialism, capitalism, and white supremacy are to blame for displacing Indigenous Peoples in this place and for driving many people to migrate here from the Global South. In her own words: 'people who experience racism and maybe have been displaced from their own homelands would have a better understanding of these processes and how all of our experiences are really different but also connected'. She saw potential, then, for meaningful connection and perhaps allied struggle between and among Indigenous Peoples and racialized settlers – the possibility that making home together could also mean resisting colonialism and white supremacy together. This resonates with Cory Snelgrove, Rita Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel, Harsha Walia, and others, who similarly explore possibilities for allied efforts that challenge colonial and white supremacist oppressions.

For Valles, then, making home was explicitly the way that she explained what motivated, propelled, and sustained her activisms in Nogojiwanong. She understood and described this home-making a dynamic, relational, power-laden process – a process for her that was rooted in her resistance to racism and her struggle to belong and to act in a place that is not her place of origin. At the same time, when asked, it became clear

that she also appreciated the complexity of invoking home in this way; she understood home as a contested concept, with different meanings and practices based on different histories of connection to (or dispossession from) the land. She did not attempt to deny these politics or the ongoing attempted erasure of Indigenous Peoples from their own lands, but she did offer the possibility of home, or home-making, becoming a process of connection across difference. She pointed to the potential for shared home-makings and allied struggles rooted in understanding the overlapping oppressions of colonialism, capitalism, and white supremacy, between and among Indigenous Peoples and racialized settlers.⁵⁴ While she was never asked about land repatriation or Indigenous sovereignty specifically,⁵⁵ her discussions of her own activist home-making did not appear to reflect epistemologies of ownership/mastery nor to preclude the ongoing home-makings of the Michi Saagiig Anishinaabeg.

Linda Slavin

Slavin's reflections throughout this workshop offer a different (although at times overlapping) settler perspective on activism in place and activist home-makings. As noted previously, Slavin was one of the two older women named by Valles in the roundtable. A white settler whose family is connected to the early colonial settlement of Nogojiwanong, she has been an organizer in this community for over four decades. Of all three activists discussed in this article, Slavin's family has the longest settler history in Canada, and she herself has lived the longest in Michi Saagiig territory. Early in her interview, Slavin, like Valles, also invoked home in her response to the question: 'What drew you into activism in Nogojiwanong?'. Unlike Valles, however, Slavin did not describe her activism as shaped by a politics of belonging, but instead as connected to her work for change and to her long-time place attachment – to her sense that Peterborough is her home. She said:

I grew up in Havelock, just down the road ... My parents were very involved in the community, and I think that responsibility was just there. I have a long-time connection to [place anon] as a settler. I have relations up on the hill, on Parkhill, where the early settlement plaque is, and you just have to keep involved in the community that houses you and contribute back to it.

While Slavin clearly suggests that Peterborough is her 'home', it is noteworthy that, unlike Valles, she never used this language. Instead, she humbly depicts her attachment to this place *as a settler* who was born and raised in this territory. While she does not allude to a struggle for belonging, neither does she entirely naturalize her belonging in this place. Instead, the uncertainty in her voice as she seeks to position herself, and the way she continuously through her interview alludes to her family's complicity in colonizing this land, makes these words ring of acknowledgement: acknowledgement that her ancestral roots lay elsewhere and that her family made its home on Indigenous land. Indeed, by connecting her own settler history to the colonization of this territory ('I have relations up on the hill ... where the early settlement plaque is'), she alludes to her complicity in settler colonialism and in the removal of Nishnaabeg peoples from their land. In other words, she connects her activism to her connection to this place, but she does so without naturalizing her own belonging nor invisibilizing Indigenous homelands.⁵⁶

Later in her interview, Slavin returns to a reflection on the land, offering her own understanding of her connection to this place/her home as relational. Slavin alludes to her

home-making as relational to the land and to the natural world. In sharing this, it is also evident that her understanding of certain teachings, offered by Indigenous teachers (from Trent University), have influenced her understandings and epistemologies. In considering what has sustained her in her activisms, she said this:

The other thing I would say is that I'm privileged to live in a place that has trees and flowers and those connections and learning ... As Dan Longboat put it: 'you love the water and you have to understand that the water loves you'. Until you get to that, I think it's hard for people ... but when you do, it's really sustaining.

In mentioning this teaching offered by Dan Longboat (Mohawk from Six Nations of the Grand River and professor at Trent University), Slavin makes evident that her relationship to the land has been informed by connections across difference in this territory. Her words reveal relationship-building across settler-Indigenous positions – a theme that came up in many interviews, often informing settler participants' approaches to their own activisms and their ways of thinking about Nogojiwanong as home. It is also evident from these passages and throughout her interview that Slavin does not deploy discourses of mastery or ownership in speaking about her connections to place or land in Nogojiwanong. Instead, she often depicts reciprocal connections: 'you love the water and the water loves you'. So, her perspectives – her departures from dominant settler epistemologies – are at least in part a result of having had opportunities to listen to and (un)learn from Indigenous teachers within this community.

Beyond noting the influence of specific Indigenous teachers, Slavin also named other 'quiet' alliances in this place, which she deemed as critical to her work for change.⁵⁷ In responding to the question, 'What has sustained you for your work for change in this community?' she said, 'Well apart from a great family, um, other people ... people like Rosemary Ganley, who you'll interview, people like Ziysah ... I think I would say that's the main thing'. It is important to note that Slavin was not in a room with von Bieberstein at the time of her interview. By naming von Bieberstein alongside her peers and family members, though, she connects her own activisms, as an older, white, straight, cis-gendered settler, and von Bieberstein's work, as a younger, queer, non-binary activist, in an intimate way.⁵⁸ Here Slavin also reveals the interconnected nature of the three stories highlighted in this article.

Thus, Slavin invokes home as underpinning her activisms. The uncertainty and humility with which she positions herself as a 'settler', and her tone of complicity when referencing her family's connection to the early settlement of this territory, reveals her understanding of her connection to place and land as a privilege (not naturalized or entitled) and as relational. For Slavin, home – which is not explicitly stated as such – is made and understood in connection to both other people and to the natural world; in relation to feelings of complicity for her family's roles in settling Anishinaabe lands. Slavin's reflection on her place attachment thus reinforces the idea that home-making is power-laden – in her case she alludes to her own power and the power of her settler ancestors to make home on someone else's homeland. In other words, despite Slavin's position as a white settler, her discussion of her place attachment does not resonate with notions of mastery or ownership;⁵⁹ it does not seek to naturalize her sense of belonging.⁶⁰ Instead, she repeatedly explains that what draws her in and sustains her in activism is relationships and a sense of reciprocity, and she sits in the uncertainty of her own position as a settler on the

land. Making home in this way, for Slavin, has resulted from, and has opened up possibilities for, intimate alliances across difference.⁶¹

Ziysah von Bieberstein

Finally, von Bieberstein is a third-generation Canadian whose ancestors were Jewish refugees fleeing persecution in Eastern Europe. Von Bieberstein grew up with the privilege of being an English-speaking, white settler in the large city centre of Toronto; they moved to Nogojiwanong a decade after Valles to attend Trent University. Unlike Slavin, von Bieberstein's family history is not directly connected to the early settlement of what is now Canada – they came over as refugees and were not granted land as part of the settlement process. At the same time, unlike Valles, they are not currently racialized nor considered 'immigrants' in the contemporary Canadian context, although their family would have been (and is still) racialized in some contexts. So von Bieberstein occupies a third settler/racial positionality and perhaps a different relationship to activist home-making in Nogojiwanong.

In discussing what motivated and sustained their activisms in Nogojiwanong, von Bieberstein too discussed their connections to the place, to particular people, and to the land, and their uncertain but existing sense of belonging as well. They answered the question, 'What sustains you in your work for change in this community?', as follows:

One thing for sure is my connection to the earth, to the land, and to the natural world ... And being here in Nogojiwanong, and reflecting on this question, I realize that I feel more of a connection to this place than I have with any other place in my life, because growing up in Toronto in a family that were at one point refugees, we didn't have a connection, a very deep connection to that land or that place.

Resonating with Slavin's comments, von Bieberstein does not name home *per se*, but they describe their activisms as rooted in connection to the land. Like Slavin, they speak of this sense of connection without naturalizing their place in this territory, invoking the question of where is home for settlers? Their words reflect a concept of home as dynamic and not necessarily tied to place of origin; indeed they describe a shifting relationship with place over time and with experience.

Von Bieberstein then continues, more explicitly connecting their relationship to the land with the learning that has come from connections with Nishinaabeg peoples in Nogojiwanong:

Here, in Nogojiwanong, in Peterborough, I've been so fortunate to be able to learn from people whose families have lived on this territory for thousands of years, and experiencing that community and that knowledge and relationship to the land, it's very enriching and it sustains my commitment to this community ...

They also reference the (un)learning that has come from connection to the work of a local film-maker who identifies as Métis/Anishinaabe. It becomes evident that this learning across Indigenous-settler positions, like Slavin's learning from Longboat, has impacted on von Bieberstein's sustained work in this community, on their sense of their roles into the future, and on their epistemologies of home (or their ways of knowing and understanding the concept of home, in this case not in ways that resonate with liberal ideas about land ownership, property, or domination):

Cara Mumford, who's a filmmaker, is working on this story about 150 years in the future ... when the Michi Saagiig Anishinaabeg have reclaimed this area and are living in a sustainable way, and those of us who are not Anishinaabe can apply for a red card so that we can be part of this sustainable community, as the rest of the world is struggling with climate change. And she has this whole timeline that goes through when the lock⁶² system will be taken down, when the wild fish will return, and um, that kind of image and that idea really sustains me ...

As with both other storytellers, they describe home as made relationally. In other words, relationships (to people, land, knowledges) are clearly important to shaping how von Bieberstein thinks about, experiences, and practices being at home as a settler on Indigenous land. Their words also depict a strong temporal dimension, thinking about what it would mean to make home on this land into the future – and thinking about what activism could and should look like as a settler person. This vision of the future, however, takes a very different tone to settler futurities that are preoccupied with maintaining property and entitlements.⁶³ Von Bieberstein instead offers an example of an alternative settler vision, explicitly challenging settler epistemologies of mastery. Far from naturalizing their own belonging or invisibilizing Indigenous homelands, von Bieberstein reckons with the idea of future settlers requiring passes to be allowed to remain on Treaty lands. Such a pass system (an ironic twist on Canada's history of discriminatory practices *against* Indigenous Peoples) would differentiate people's claims to land and to home, and perhaps most importantly require people to be in relationships with each other and with the natural world. By supporting and even bolstering such a model of sovereignty, they reveal their willingness to be 'at home' amidst a liminal place of belonging.

Thus, Bieberstein offers a third settler reflection on activist home-making and the relationships between working for change in place and belonging in that place. Their reflections point to meanings and practices that conceptualize home as relational, dynamic, and power-laden. Their words offer a vision that is forward-looking without being focused on settler security and entitlement, and without naturalizing settler claims to belonging. Their vision speaks to a radical possibility for shared home-making on Indigenous lands.

Conclusions

This article offers one thematic analysis within a larger project: specifically, I explore varied settler understandings and practices of home within an initiative to generate oral histories of activism in the settler colonial context of Nogojiwanong (Peterborough, Canada). Like Veracini, Hiller, and others, I take as a starting point the tensions and ongoing violence inherent in settler home-makings on Indigenous lands. At the same time, I open the questions of whether it is possible, and what it would look like, for settlers to make home, to belong, and to live meaningfully on Indigenous lands, without reproducing and reinforcing cycles of settler colonial dispossession, displacement, and violence. These questions, which go to the core of my own epistemic uncertainty, settler 'hunger', and activist discomfort, is about the (im)possibility and/or role of mutual, allied home-makings in what Carter, Recollet, and Robinson call 'the project of reworlding'. These are complex and crucial questions, which I do not readily seek to answer in this one project or academic article. Rather, I seek to hold open the questions, which are themselves critical to ask: Can settler home-makings function not only to re-colonize but also to 'reworld'? Can

settler struggles for home and futurity become one critical ‘site of uncomfortable change’ in this project of decolonization?⁶⁴

I explore these questions through the stories of three diverse settler activists. What emerges is that, in different ways and to different extents, these three activists begin to challenge: (1) assumptions of home as epistemically associated with mastery and ownership;⁶⁵ (2) notions of settler futurity as preoccupied with maintaining settler property and security;⁶⁶ and (3) narratives of white settlers as ‘at home’, racialized settlers as outsiders, and Indigenous homelands/home-makings as no longer existing.⁶⁷

Indeed, Valles explained that making home propelled her activism and was tied to her resistance to racism and struggle to belong as a new and racialized settler in this context. Yet, she did not deny the ongoing attempted erasure of Indigenous Peoples from their own lands; instead she suggested possibilities for home-making to involve processes of connection and allied struggles. Slavin likewise discussed her privilege (not naturalized or entitled) of making home in Nogojiwanong. This home-making was connected to other people, the natural world, and her awareness of her family’s roles in colonizing Anishinaabe lands, and as such did not resonate with notions of ownership or domination. And von Bieberstein offered an explicitly forward-looking and decolonial vision of their own home-making. This vision challenged ideas of settler security and entitlement and positioned them in a deliberately liminal space of belonging. While I recognize, as Hiller does in her similar discussion of settler activists, that these three particular individuals all operate within fairly radical political spaces and thus are likely ‘outliers’ in their perspectives on Indigenous-settler relations among the settler majority public in the contemporary Canadian context, I nevertheless offer this discussion because I believe their perspectives open up possibilities for settler consciousness. In the ongoing context of settler colonial abuses of power, their stories collectively provide a glimpse of potential for allied home-makings on Indigenous lands.

The contribution I highlight here is, admittedly, not going to lead directly to land reparation or to reparation and healing from centuries of ongoing abuses. The value I understand in this analysis is, however, significant: Rather than foreclose the possibility of ‘reworlding’ entirely (as one might be tempted to amidst ongoing state-sanctioned extraction on Indigenous lands, ongoing legal system biases against Indigenous peoples, and so on), these activists’ perspectives encourage us to keep asking questions about whether and how home-makings, through their conceptions and practices, might begin to inch beyond the stasis of impossibility or impasse. Their stories, in small ways, raise doubts about (and alternatives to) dominant settler epistemologies, which so violently and vehemently uphold the status quo.⁶⁸ In doing so, they allow settlers to be uncertain about our collective futures, in the best possible way.

Notes

1. Nogojiwanong is the original name of the area now known as the City of Peterborough and the surrounding rural areas of the Kawarthas, in Ontario, Canada. Although Peterborough and Nogojiwanong are at times used interchangeably, they do not refer to the same exact geographical area. I tend to use ‘Nogojiwanong’ to acknowledge the place as it is known by the First Peoples of this territory. At times, however, I use ‘Peterborough’ when I am referring specifically to the City of Peterborough, or when this is the language used by research participants. See: waaseyaa’sin christine sy, ‘Nogojowanong migwe dodaa: I Live at the Mouth of the

- River', *Arthur Newspaper*, September 2012, www.trentarthur.ca/nogojowanong-migwe-dodaa-i-live-at-the-mouth-of-the-river/; Gitiga Migizi (Doug Williams) and Julie Kapyrka, 'Before, During, and After: Mississauga Presence in the Kawarthas', in *Peterborough Archaeology*, ed. Dirk Verhulst (Peterborough: Peterborough Chapter of the Ontario Archaeological Society, 2015), 127–36; Gidigaa Migizi (Doug Williams), *Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg: This Is Our Territory* (Winnipeg, MB: ARP Books, 2018).
2. Ashlee Cunsolo Willox, Sherilee L. Harper, Victoria L. Edge, My Word: Storytelling and Digital media Lab, and Rigolet Inuit Community Government, 'Storytelling in a Digital Age: Digital Storytelling as an Emerging Narrative Method for Preserving and Promoting Indigenous Oral Wisdom', *Qualitative Research* 13 (2012): 127–47; Aman Sium and Eric Ritskes, 'Speaking Truth to Power: Indigenous Storytelling as an Act of Living Resistance', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society* 2 (2013): i–x; Carla Rice, Eliza Chandler, Elisabeth Harrison, Kirsty Liddiard, and Manuela Ferrari, 'Project Re-Vision: Disability at the Edges of Representation', *Disability & Society* 30 (2015): 513–27.
 3. I use the plural 'activisms' to refer to diverse social change practices, expanding beyond including protest/ rally as well as arts-based interventions, land-based practices, performance, cultural resurgence, creativity, survivance, refusal, ceremony, advocacy, and more. See: M. Chazan, M. Baldwin, and P. Evans, *Unsettling Activisms: Critical Interventions on Aging, Gender, and Social Change* (2018); J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "'A Structure, Not an Event': Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity', *Lateral: Journal of the Cultural Studies Association* 5 (2016), www.csalateral.org/issue/5-1/forum-alt-humanities-settler-colonialism-enduring-indigeneity-kauanui/.
 4. Statistics Canada, 'Peterborough (City), Ontario, Census Profile', in *2016 Census Data* (Statistics Canada, 2017), www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=3515014&Geo2=CD&Code2=3515&Data=Count&SearchText=peterborough&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&TABID=1.
 5. *OSHKIGMONG: A Place Where I Belong*, DVD, directed by Anne Taylor and Melissa Dokis, Curve Lake First Nation, 2015.
 6. Migizi (Williams) and Kapyrka, 'Before, During, and After'.
 7. Maddy Macnab, 'Making Home and Making Welcome: An Oral History of the New Canadians Centre and Immigration to Peterborough, Ontario from 1979–1997' (master's thesis, Nogojiwanong (Peterborough, ON): Trent University, 2018).
 8. Trent University is known in Canada as the first university to have an academic program in Indigenous Studies; it draws Indigenous scholars from across the continent and has become a hub of culture and language teaching, resurgence, and mobilization over the past several decades.
 9. Linzy Bonham and Andres Salazar, 'Spaces of Racism II: Racism at Trent University and in Peterborough' (Nogojiwanong (Peterborough, ON): Community and Race Relations Peterborough in collaboration with the Trent Community Research Centre, 2018), www.racerelationspeterborough.org/sites/default/files/SpacesofRacismII.pdf; Zara Syed, 'Editorial: A History of Hate Crimes in Peterborough', *Arthur Newspaper*, November 2015, www.trentarthur.ca/editorial-a-history-of-hate-crimes-in-peterborough/.
 10. See also: Chris Hiller, 'Tracing the Spirals of Unsettlement: Euro-Canadian Narratives of Coming to Grips with Indigenous Sovereignty, Title, and Rights', *Settler Colonial Studies* 7 (2017): 415–40.
 11. See also: Eva Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty, Land, and Settler Decolonization* (Black Point, NS: Fernwood, 2016); Sarah Hunt and Cindy Holmes, 'Everyday Decolonization: Living a Decolonizing Queer Politics', *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 19 (2015): 154–72.
 12. Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). See also: May Chazan, Lisa Helps, Anna Stanley, and Sonali Thakkar, eds., *Home and Native Land: Unsettling Multiculturalism in Canada* (Toronto, ON: Between the Lines Press, 2011); Hunt and Holmes, 'Everyday decolonization'; Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations*.
 13. Emma Battell Lowman and Adam J. Barker, *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada* (Halifax, NS: Fernwood, 2015); Hiller, 'Tracing the Spirals'.

14. E.g. Alison Blunt and Robyn Dowling, *Home* (London: Routledge, 2006); Macnab, 'Making Home'.
15. E.g. Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations*.
16. Sarah Ahmed, Claudia Castada, Anne-Marie Fortier, and Mimi Sheller, *Uprootings/ Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration* (Oxford: Berg, 2003); Harsha Walia, *Undoing Border Imperialism* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2013); Cory Snelgrove, Rita Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel, 'Unsettling Settler Colonialism: The Discourse and Politics of Settlers, and Solidarity with Indigenous Nations', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society* 3 (2014): 1–32.
17. Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2010).
18. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, 'Decolonization is Not a Metaphor', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (2012): 1–40; Regan, *Unsettling*; Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations*; Hiller, 'Tracing the Spirals'.
19. Along with many other scholars in this area, I recognize the limitations of these studies as well, and acknowledge the potential dangers of over-emphasizing settler perspectives or of suggesting that consciousness changing alone will lead to meaningful decolonization. Indeed, while I concur with Mackey, Regan, Alfred, and others in understanding that the settler problem is one important initiative in the larger decolonial project, I also believe that Indigenous perspectives should be centred in visioning a decolonial future for Canada and, following Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (*As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2017); *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence* (Winnipeg, MB: ARP Books, 2011)), Audra Simpson (*Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across Borders of Settler States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014)), waaseyaa'sin christine sy ('At the Boiling Place: Reading Sap for Future Anishinaabeg Sugar Bush (Re)Matriation', *GUTS Magazine*, May 2016, www.gutsmagazine.ca/boiling-place/), and others, I believe that land rematriation and Indigenous sovereignty are at the core of decolonization.
20. E.g. Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2015); Rita Dhamoon, 'A Feminist Approach to Decolonizing Anti-Racism: Rethinking Transnationalism, Intersectionality, and Settler Colonialism', *Feral Feminisms* 4 (2015): 20–37; Katherine Fobear, 'Queer Settlers: Questioning Settler Colonialism in LGBT Asylum Processes in Canada', *Refuge* 30 (2014): 47–56.
21. Blunt and Dowling, *Home*; Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations*.
22. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*; Chazan et al., *Home and Native Land*.
23. E.g. Avtar Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities* (London: Routledge, 1996); Esin Bozkurt, *Conceptualising Home: The Question of Belonging Among Turkish Families in Germany* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2009); David Ralph and Lynn A. Staeheli, 'Home and Migration: Mobilities, Belongings and Identities', *Geography Compass* 5 (2011): 517–30; Ahmed et al., *Uprootings/Regroundings*. Elsewhere, scholars call into question assumptions about home in the sense of domestic spaces, particularly that homes are always (even usually) safe, non-exploitative places of belonging; in many ways, they have illustrated the workings of patriarchy, colonialism, capitalism, and gender inequality within 'the home', suggesting that this is perhaps where some of the most violent oppressions and fierce struggles for justice take place (e.g. Pain, 'Seismologies of Emotion').
24. Blunt and Dowling, *Home*.
25. See also: Katherine Schweighofer, 'A Land of One's Own: Whiteness and Indigeneity on Lesbian Land', *Settler Colonial Studies* (2017): 1–18, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2017.1365410>; Hiller, 'Tracing the Spirals'.
26. Hiller, 'Tracing the Spirals', 417.
27. Jill Carter, Karyn Recollet, and Dylan Robinson, 'Interventions Into the Maw of Old World Hunger: Frog Monsters, Kinstellatory Maps, and Radical Relationalities in a Project of Reworlding', in *Canadian Performance Histories and Historiographies*, ed. Heather Davis-Fisch (Toronto, ON: Playwrights Canada Press, 2017), 205–31; sy, 'Boiling Place'; Ralph and Staeheli, 'Home and Migration'.

28. Indeed, contemporary home-making as connected to homelands is a central feature of Indigenous resurgence movements. L. Simpson (*Our Turtle's Back*), for instance, writes of the resistance involved returning home – home to land, home to knowledge/culture, home to self – when she offers the concept of biskaabiiyang, a process of returning home to oneself by reflecting on how one has been personally marked by colonialism (Jenn Cole, 'Following Nan to the Kiji Sibi', in *Unsettling Activisms: Critical Interventions on Aging, Gender, and Social Change*, ed. May Chazan, Melissa Baldwin, and Patricia Evans (Toronto, ON: Women's Press, 2018)).
29. As Mackey explains, the interconnected principles of property, ownership, individualism, and mastery are pivotal to Western liberal theory, which has propelled and continues to underly the appropriation of Indigenous lands and the colonization of Indigenous Peoples. She draws on seminal theorists, such as Locke, to explain that, according to Enlightenment doctrine, rational and civilized societies must establish private property, which contrasts fundamentally with most Indigenous societies, in which land was not and could not be owned, particularly not by individuals. In other words, liberal theory purports that progress (or the evolution to a civilized society) depended on owning and labouring on the land, as a means of capital accumulation and as impetus for industriousness, and the 'failure' of Indigenous societies to privatize land as property was deemed not only backward but also immoral. Thus, in the name of progress and morality, settler societies were required/ entitled to domination or mastery over Indigenous Peoples and lands, part of which necessarily included turning Indigenous lands into private property for ownership by settlers. This mastery and associated entitlement to own property on Indigenous lands was deemed an inevitable or certain part of societal evolution – a settled or given settler colonial expectation. See Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations*, 53–4.
30. Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations*, 133.
31. See also: Eve Tuck and Rubén A. Gaztambide-Fernández, 'Curriculum, Replacement, and Settler Futurity', *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 29 (2013): 72–89; Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*; Tuck and Yang, 'Decolonization'.
32. On the topic of building solidarities or alliances between racialized settlers and Indigenous peoples: Tuck and Yang, emphasizing impossibility, contend that racialized settlers might have their own relationships to other colonial contexts and feel marginalized in their new homes, but they still they occupy stolen land, so true solidarity with Indigenous peoples is not really possible. They suggest the need to first return the land, offer sovereignty to Indigenous nations, and then move forward with alliances. Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Cornthassel, on the other hand, point to possibilities, looking at racialized immigrants and how to make sense of roles, positions, and home-making in settler colonial context; they examine contextualized practices and relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples that support Indigenous resurgence. They also discuss the interdependence of xenophobia and colonialism, looking at this interdependence as a site to jointly struggle against settler colonialism in shared home-makings. Mackey identifies the important possibilities of this very kind of connection to home across Indigenous and settler locations, but identifies these possibilities by also exposing how many settlers mobilize settler logics of home (and settler 'structures of feeling' around home) to block/resist/mobilize against Indigenous rights, sovereignty, and survivance.
33. Carter, Recollet, and Robinson, 'Interventions', 225.
34. E.g. Susy J. Zepeda, 'Queer Xicana Indígena Cultural Production: Remembering Through Oral and Visual Storytelling', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society* 3 (2014): 119–41; Sium and Ritskes, 'Speaking Truth to Power'.
35. E.g. Meika Loe, 'The Digital Life History Project: Intergenerational Collaborative Research', *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education* 34 (2013): 26–42.
36. E.g. Pamela Sugiman, 'Passing Time, Moving Memories: Interpreting Wartime Narratives of Japanese-Canadian Women', in *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History*, 6th edition, ed. Mona Gleeson, Tamara Myers, and Adele Perry (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2011), 264–282.
37. See www.agingactivisms.org/stories-of-resistance.

38. In these interviews, students asked: What drew you into the work of social change in your life and specifically in this community? Is there a moment or event in Nogojiwanong that you would define as a changing point in your work for social change? Has your activism changed at different times in your life? In what ways? What has sustained you in your work for change in this community? What form/s does your activism currently take in this community? And, is there an area of social change work that you feel is underrepresented in Nogojiwanong?
39. See <http://digitalcollections.trentu.ca/collections/stories-resistance-resurgence-and-resilience-nogojiwanong-peterborough>.
40. May Chazan, 'Settler Solidarities as Praxis: Understanding "Granny Activism" Beyond the Highly Visible', *Social Movement Studies* 15 (2016): 457–70.
41. May Chazan, Melissa Baldwin, and Patricia Evans, eds., *Unsettling Activisms: Critical Interventions on Aging, Gender, and Social Change* (Toronto, ON: Women's Press, 2018).
42. Carter, Recollet, and Robinson, 'Interventions'.
43. Ibid., 210.
44. Ibid., 213.
45. Thus, of the three activists I write about in this article, my own settler history reflects most closely that of von Bieberstein's – who, I would note, has also become a close friend, colleague, and co-activist over my years in Nogojiwanong, and thus very much a part of my most recent and ongoing home-making.
46. E.g. Elder Shirley Ida Williams Pheasant, "'That's My Bridge": Water Protector, Knowledge Holder, Language Professor'; waaseyaa'sin christine sy, 'Introduction to part II: Persisting', 'grandmother', and 'Lip point for bearded womxn'; and Keara Lightning, 'Firekeeper', all in Chazan, Baldwin, and Evans, *Unsettling Activisms*.
47. Jean Koning, 'Learning to Listen: A Half Century of Walking with First Peoples', in Chazan, Baldwin, and Evans, *Unsettling Activisms*.
48. Blunt and Dowling, *Home*.
49. Carter, Recollet, and Robinson, 'Interventions'.
50. Eleanor Jupp, 'Home Space, Gender and Activism: The Visible and the Invisible in Austere Times', *Critical Social Policy* 37 (2017): 348–66.
51. Blunt and Dowling, *Home*.
52. Ahmed et al., *Uprootings/Regroundings*.
53. Here I am referring again to the ideas in Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations*, about settlers' ways of knowing and practicing 'home' as tied into liberal ideas about property, ownership, and domination; the assumptions that settlers are entitled to mastery over land (and peoples) in their homes; and commonly expressed settler anxieties around property loss in discussion of land rematriation.
54. Dhamoon, 'Feminist Approach'; Walia, *Undoing Border Imperialism*; Fobear, 'Queer Settlers'.
55. As per Tuck and Yang, 'Decolonization'; sy, 'Boiling Place'; and others.
56. Blunt and Dowling, *Home*; Ralph and Staeheli, 'Home and Migration'; Hiller, 'Tracing the Spirals'.
57. Hunt and Holmes, 'Everyday Decolonization'.
58. Ibid.
59. Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations*.
60. Hiller, 'Tracing the Spirals'; Blunt and Dowling, *Home*.
61. Hunt and Holmes, 'Everyday Decolonization'.
62. This reference is to the lock system of the Trent Severn Waterway, which is understood to have significant implications of the Michi Saagiig Anishinaabeg in this area – their communications, relations, sustenance, and jurisdiction, among other factors. See Gidigaa Migizi (Doug Williams), *Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg: This Is Our Territory* (Winnipeg, MB: ARP Books, 2018).
63. Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández, 'Curriculum'.
64. Katie Boudreau Morris, 'Decolonizing Solidarity: Cultivating Relationships of Discomfort', *Settler Colonial Studies* 7 (2017): 469.
65. Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations*.

66. Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández, 'Curriculum'.
67. Blunt and Dowling, *Home*.
68. Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations*.

Acknowledgements

I extend my sincere thanks to all of the participants in this research, particularly to Ziysah von Bieberstein, Linda Slavin, and Carmela Valles. I also acknowledge input and assistance offered by von Bieberstein and Melissa Baldwin in the preparation of this manuscript. This project is funded and supported by the Canada Research Chairs program and Trent University.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

This work was supported by the Canada Research Chairs/Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada under Grant 228399.

Notes on contributor

May Chazan is a professor, parent, and activist. With her own ancestral roots in Eastern Europe, she is grateful to live, teach, write, and nurture life in Mississauga Anishinaabe territory. She is a Canada Research Chair in Gender and Feminist Studies and a faculty member in Gender and Women's Studies at Trent University, Peterborough, Canada. She is also on the Executive Committee of the Trent Centre for Aging and Society and a member of the Trent's Frost Centre. May is inspired by how social justice movements form, operate, and generate change, and by how, across enormous differences in power, privilege, and world view, alliances are forged and maintained. In 2015, May published *The Grandmothers' Movement: Solidarity and Survival in the Time of AIDS* (McGill-Queen's University Press). Prior to that, she co-edited the volume *Home and Native Land: Unsettling Multiculturalism in Canada* (Between the Lines Press, 2011). Since 2013, she has been leading the Aging Activisms research collective, out of which she has co-edited *Unsettling Activisms: Critical Interventions on Gender, Aging, and Social Change* (Women's Press/Canadian Scholars' Press, 2018).