

Citation for published version:

Adam J. Barker, 'Deathscapes of Settler Colonialism: The Necro-Settlement of Stoney Creek, Ontario, Canada', *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, January 2018.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2017.1406327>

Document Version:

This is the Accepted Manuscript version.

The version in the University of Hertfordshire Research Archive may differ from the final published version.

Copyright and Reuse:

©2018 by American Association of Geographers, published by Taylor & Francis, LLC.

This manuscript version is made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Enquiries

If you believe this document infringes copyright, please contact the Research & Scholarly Communications Team at rsc@herts.ac.uk

**Deathscapes of Settler Colonialism: the necro-settlement of Stoney Creek, Ontario,
Canada**

Author: Dr. Adam J Barker - Lecturer in Human Geography, University of
Hertfordshire

Abstract: This paper considers the influence of burials and memorials to colonial soldiers from an earlier era on contemporary social and cultural landscapes in Canada. Through the example of a landscape centred on Smith's Knoll, a burial ground for war dead from the British-American War of 1812, it explores the process of 'necro-settlement': the strengthening of settler colonial claims to land based on the development of complex, meaning-laden landscapes of dead and memory. This paper consists of three parts: The first situates geographical studies of deathscapes alongside theories about settler colonialism through intersecting discourses of land use. The second comprises a settler colonial micro historical geography of Smith's Knoll and the local deathscape that surrounds it. The third section will draw upon this case study to reveal new perspectives on the role of burial and memorial in settler colonial place-making, and the erasure of Indigenous histories and peoples.

Keywords: *deathscapes, settler colonialism, Canada, Indigenous people, War of 1812*

Acknowledgements: I owe thanks to Dr. Gavin Brown (University of Leicester), Dr. Anthony Ince (Cardiff University), and Kelly Black (Carleton University) who all read and commented on earlier versions of this paper; to Prof. Clare Anderson (University of Leicester) who viewed and insightfully commented on a presentation on this research; and to Dr. Emma Battell Lowman (University of Hertfordshire) whose expertise in historical research, settler colonialism, and death and dying were invaluable. The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC Grant Agreement 312542.

Introduction

In 1889, in the town of Saltfleet – a hamlet on the shores of Lake Ontario, Canada, later renamed Stoney Creek – a local farmer ploughing his field turned up a number of long-dead bodies. Identified by fragments of buttons, tools, and badges, these bodies were found to be those of several soldiers, war dead from the relatively minor and often forgotten British-American War of 1812. The spot where the farmer found these bodies – a low, flat hill called Smith’s Knoll – had clearly been used as a battlefield burial site, though no official records of this existed. Local authorities, alerted to the discovery of the battlefield graves, consecrated Smith’s Knoll as a cemetery and in 1908 installed a stone monument topped with a British Lion and emblazoned with a Union Jack (see Figure 1). The landscape thus marked with symbols of colonial memory and military honour, the site again faded into obscurity for a century until a re-dedication ceremony in 2000. But far from being an inert part of the landscape, this cemetery and memorial it became a key site in the formation of the identities of many people living in the area – myself included.

Smith’s Knoll is at the centre of a particular landscape that, I argue here, forms an important material and cultural foundation for the ongoing settler colonisation of the region. ‘Colonization’ in this context refers to the violent and supposedly-irreversible transfer of lands from Indigenous polities to a burgeoning settler colonial society: what was founded as British North America and is now called Canada. The battle that resulted in the bodies being interred at Smith’s Knoll was not a battle between European and Indigenous adversaries (though both were involved in the battle), but between British and American forces, and in the sweep of history it is relatively insignificant.

However, the changes that have been marked onto the landscape because of this battle are reflective of pervasive settler colonial cultures of selective remembrance and forgetting, and can tell us a great deal about how settler people – like myself – come to identify with the places we call ‘home’, displacing Indigenous claims and counter-histories. In this paper, I seek to demonstrate how my own settler community attaches to the place of Stoney Creek in part through the materialisation of a complex deathscape – a landscape marked by cemeteries, burial sites, and memorials to the dead – that both reflects and reinforces settler colonialism’s claims to land and belonging.



Figure 1 - Smith's Knoll, Stoney Creek, Ontario. The monument (on left) dates to the original dedication of the cemetery, and was updated in 1956. The crypt (on right) was added in 2000. The canon, Union Jack, and British Lion are conspicuous symbols of British imperial militarism and conquest. (Photo by author, 11 May 2014.)

Settler colonialism as a distinct formation and practice is premised on the imposition of a false temporal barrier dividing two periods: before settlement, a state defined by *terra nullius* and terrifying wilderness; and after settlers arrive with their intent to stay,ⁱ bringing with them ‘civilisation’ and new practices of land use. Yet, this is a false temporal barrier, existing only in the perception of colonisers and newcomers, and it is troubled by an undeniable fact: the land was not empty prior to colonial incursion, but was occupied by many sophisticated Indigenous societies. The histories of Indigenous peoples and their continued presence on the land in the present deeply trouble and “unsettle” settler societies (Regan 2010). As such, settler societies are often observed to reshape the land around them, attempting to obliterate markers of a past that do not conform to settler historical narratives. This paper will examine one example of this reshaping in order to expose quotidian life in Stoney Creek as part of this process of settler colonial memorialisation and forgetting. I assert that, through the example of Smith’s Knoll and the wider deathscape around it, we can observe the workings of settler colonial cultural and material production through the way that the bodily remains and social memories of dead settlers or colonial agents are inscribed upon the land, a process which I refer to as necro-settlement. The first section situates geographical studies of deathscapes alongside theories of settler colonialism through intersecting discourses of land use. The second section comprises a settler colonial “micro historical geography” of the cemetery at Smith’s Knoll and the local deathscape that surrounds it. The third section will draw upon this case study to reveal new perspectives on the role of burial and memorial in settler colonial place-making, and the erasure of Indigenous histories and peoples. In the conclusion, I sketch out the importance of understanding transfer through necro-settlement.

Method and Framework

The research for this paper is rooted in a place-based autoethnography (Butz & Bessio 2009) of my hometown of Stoney Creek. During 2014, I returned to Stoney Creek after five years in the UK, determined to critically interrogate how my own home came to be. Engagements with theories of settler colonialism had made apparent how my own understandings were filtered through a “screen memory” (Veracini 2008, 371-373) – a social remembering in which settler cultures and histories are projected onto a place as a hegemonic narrative that obscures and displaces Indigenous histories and, by informing ongoing colonial acts, Indigenous bodies. As a self-identifying “settler”,ⁱⁱ and much like all settler people, I was both unwittingly recruited into and also deeply complicit with the ongoing production of this false history. I had become aware that my own memory and history of my home was both incomplete and partially false, and decided that I needed to undertake a phenomenological explorationⁱⁱⁱ of my hometown to begin filling in the blanks. Through this, I began to understand how the settler colonial landscape had been created, what it obscured, and how it shaped the identities of settler people like myself.

While I explored and photographed many areas of Stoney Creek, I was repeatedly drawn to Battlefield Park and Smith’s Knoll, and to several cemeteries in the area that I frequently passed by. These places are very familiar to me, mere minutes on foot from my childhood home, and as an undergraduate I spent summers working for municipal parks maintenance out of Battlefield Park. I recalled a time in the summer of 2000, when a curious event took place to which I bore witness:

On June 4, 2000... the battlefield cemetery was reopened as a national historic site during a special rededication memorial service. American military pallbearers from the Third United States Infantry, Fort Meyers, Virginia, took part in the re interment ceremony for soldiers killed in the battle. At the rededication ceremony, the remains of approximately twenty-three soldiers killed were placed into a wooden crate and then reinterred into the locally made new crypt. (Carstens and Sanford 2012, 82)

I watched this rededication ceremony, then cleaned up the park after the celebrants left. I was given a commemorative coin, thanking me for my professional service during the event, which I displayed proudly. But beyond displaying this small token, I rarely thought about the event again for many years until my encounters with theories of settler colonialism gave it new significance. Looking at the same spaces again in 2014, it occurred to me that while I was seeking to understand the role of settler people in colonising this place through their everyday practices, I had ignored the possibility of settler bodies continuing to colonise after their deaths. This prompted me to begin an interrogation of the intersections of settler colonisation and the creation of deathscapes.

Deathscapes and Theories of Settler Colonialism

Deathscapes encompass a wide range of landscape features associated with death and burial, including cemeteries, mass graves, and official and unofficial memorials.

Consistent with most geographical literature on this topic, I use deathscapes to refer to a variety of cemeteries, burial markers, and both permanent and temporary public

memorials to the dead. Deathscapes are part of the landscape, in that they often appear as conspicuous alteration of the environment, but invested with particular spatialities, cultural meanings and embodied practices. As Avril Maddrell and James Sidaway describe, sites of burial and memorial “intersect and interact with other moments and topographies, including those of sovereignty (sovereignty-scapes), memory (memory-scapes) and work, life and beauty (landscapes)” (Maddrell & Sidaway 2012, 5).

Lily Kong’s landmark 1999 article, “Cemeteries and Columbaria, Memorials and Mausoleums,” calls for greater geographical engagement with deathscapes, including the series of questions that she poses to prompt spatial analysis:

...how are some meanings conspicuous by their absence in landscapes?
Which are the groups whose ideas and values do not find translation in landscapes, whether for their living or dead? What are the relations of domination and subordination that submerge the landscapes (and deathscapes) of some groups? (Kong 1999, 8)

These questions of presence and absence, ideas and values, domination and subordination remain important.

Deathscapes have been examined most extensively in colonial spaces through attention to the displacement of Indigenous bodies and disruption of Indigenous gravesites by colonizers (for example: Roy 2006; Highet 2005; Thomas 2000). However, framing deathscapes in conjunction with settler colonialism, formulated as a unique form of

colonization (Veracini 2015, 13-31), is comparatively lacking in consideration. Settler colonial frameworks are increasingly important tools for geographers, and are being used to make important interventions in a number of fields. Historical geographers, such as Alan Lester (2012), Jean Barman (2010), and Penelope Edmonds (2010) have all critically engaged with settler colonial theories, but contemporary geographers are also finding utility in working with settler colonialism as a framework.^{iv} Settler colonialism plays a significant and distinct role in shaping narratives of memory in settler societies such as Canada. Yet there is little attention given to what it means for the settler colonizer to encounter the graves of fellow settlers, or more importantly, what role the spaces of settler deathscapes serve in propping up the larger settler colonial endeavour.

I turn here to a brief outline of some relevant theories of settler colonialism. Studies of settler colonialism have emerged as an important, dynamic, and at times conflicted field of multi- and interdisciplinary inquiry (Macoun and Strakosch 2013), that has increasingly helped to reveal important perspectives on states such as Canada, Australia, the USA, and other ‘settler societies.’ Theories, concepts, and arguments critiquing settler colonialism have shifted how the geographies of settler states are understood. Political theorist Lorenzo Veracini has made a number of contributions to this field, including his extension of Derek Gregory’s concept of ‘imagined geographies’ of colonialism to the settler colonial context. (2010a) He has elsewhere developed a list of twenty-six separate ‘transfers’: methods by which land is claimed by settler collectives, dispossessing Indigenous peoples in the process. (2010a, 35-50) These two concepts provide an important starting point for understanding settler colonial geographies. However, Veracini’s list of transfers, while extensive, is not exhaustive. Given the ‘shapeshifting’ nature of colonialism (Alfred & Corntassel 2005), it is important to

continue to think through different ways in which transfer can occur in order to expose ongoing colonization and prevent disavowal of the settler colonial present.

Deathscapes are often marked by physical alterations on the landscape in the form of memorial structures, whether denoting individual graves or larger sites of remembrance. Kong discusses studies of “memorials as political landscapes which contribute to the construction of the national collective memory... [which argue] commemoration is selective and reflects what society wants to remember. Hence, memorials are a visual effort to orchestrate the collective memory of particular wars”, or other political and social narratives. (Kong 1999, 6) In settler states, political and social narratives are often directed towards enacting or justifying transfers of land. Transfer has been articulated in settler colonial analyses as the functional and immediate goal of settlement: the removal of Indigenous belonging on the land in every sense – essentially the destruction of Indigenous identity – and its replacement with settler belonging or claim, and ultimately settler ‘nativism.’ This is a process of building colonial ‘structures of invasion’ (Wolfe 1999) or social dynamics which displace or replace Indigenous ways of being.

Settler colonialism, by definition, seeks to obscure “the conditions of its own production.” (Veracini 2010a, 14) Despite the violence and intentionality of settler colonial transfers, settler colonization is accompanied by narratives of ‘non-encounter’ with Indigenous peoples, generating a ‘historyless’ settler polity that disavows responsibility for the impacts of colonisation. (Freeman 2010; Veracini 2007) Settler colonialism’s trajectory is ultimately towards transcendence: ‘indigenization’ of the Settler self that erases from memory the illegitimacy of claims to belonging that rely on

colonialism and the violence of dispossession and land transfer. (Barker 2013, 163-165; Veracini 2010a, 22) This transcendence would, if achieved, foreclose the debate on settler colonial belonging as only the settler colonial narrative would remain, and ultimately settlement would ‘end’ – in triumph for the settlers. This end goal of permanent and irrevocable transfer of land is pursued through a three-part process that involves the simultaneous ‘colonizing acts’ of *occupation*, *erasure* and *bricolage* (Barker 2013). These acts, though inter-related, are carried out in different ways and at different times, often by a variety of imperial and colonial agents.

Settler colonial occupation is often taken to mean the founding of settlements and homesteads. It certainly involves this, but occupation is not simply a matter of being in place. Occupation is dependent on measuring, mapping, and drawing boundaries, rooted in the ability to scientifically break place into separate elements and reposition those elements in Settler systems of knowledge. (Mackey 206, 41-62; Bhandar 2015; Soguk 2011, 41) For example, “wilderness” may be protected as national park space, such as Banff (Canada) or Yellowstone (America) National Parks, incorporating these places into Settler geometries of power not because they are occupied, but to serve as a reminder that they potentially could be. (Banivanua Mar 2010) Thus occupation is to some extent irrespective of actual physical settlement; what matters is whether or not a place is occupied *in the settler colonial imagination*. Settlers consider a place occupied when it can be visualised as filled with the markers of settler society, and this can include industrial development and extractive industries which, while not necessitating settlement of the time envisioned when one thinks of prairie homesteaders or other “traditional” settlers, marks the land as being owned, belonging to, and being used by settler people. Jen Preston’s paper (2013) on the Canadian tar sands as a settler colonial

space is prescient here – as she points out, and crucial to my study, settler people need only move through and interact with (and profit from) the land in order to consider it subsumed into the larger network of settler colonial spaces, shared between state and corporate claims on behalf of all Canadians.

Erasure facilitates many other acts of settler claiming and place-making through the removal of Indigenous being on the land, even from history, memory, and culture. This can even be accomplished without the removal of Indigenous bodies, although the actual murder and genocide of Indigenous peoples – “necropolitical transfer” (Veracini 2010a, 35) – is a pervasive feature of settler colonialism. More specifically, erasure seeks the elimination of Indigenous peoples as functional nations and cultures. The goal of erasure is the reconciliation of colonial difference^v through the production a desired or expected *res nullius* or *terra nullius* (MacMillan 2011, 35; Tully, 2000), an ‘empty land’ that, if not actually empty, is at least open: to the entrance of settlers, to being reshaped, to the extraction of profit, and to the creation of structures of state governance. It is easy and not uncommon to ascribe settler peoples the role of occupation while attributing erasure to a combination of ‘just war’ by state and imperial para-/military forces, and uncontrollable diseases like smallpox or influenza, washing settler hands of responsibility.

Settler people do not necessarily intend to *completely* destroy and replace indigeneity through erasure and occupation. Rather, they often seek to preserve particular, decontextualized elements of indigeneity as a form of primitive accumulation particular to settler colonialism. (Mackey 1999) These elements form both the physical and conceptual basis of settler colonial space. This is the settler colonial “bricolage”^{vi}: a

synthetic collection of elements of indigeneity - including appropriated material culture like totem poles and dreamcatchers, aped versions of ceremonies (Aldred 2000), and claims to relationship or descent (Leroux 2014) - and metropole cultural “fragments” (Butlin 2009, 10-11), organised and contextualised to give meaning as part of settler spaces. This *bricolage* changes over time, comprising a constantly evolving “legend of the present.” (Stevenson 2012, 593). Kevin Bruyneel has described how Indigenous leaders like Louis Riel (Métis) in Canada and Geronimo (Apache) in the USA, considered rebels in their time, have in different ways been memorialised in support of settler colonial cultures and polities, decontextualizing their historical memories from their lived realities as leaders of nations that resisted colonial incursions. (Bruyneel 2015) Like the ways that settler colonial memories of these figures are inscribed in local material cultures, the *bricolage* of Smith’s Knoll and Stoney Creek must be understood as a material anchor to the constant reconfiguration and reorientation of material and cultural fragments in space, with the deathscape of the region as one visible manifestation of settler colonialism.

Taken together, the framework of occupation, erasure, and bricolage guided my own sense of place, home, and identity as a suburban, white settler. Despite constantly interacting with spaces so crucial to Indigenous history in the area, my childhood was largely absent contact with Indigenous peoples or histories. I was vaguely aware of the Six Nations reserve – the nearest ‘official’ First Nations community – and I knew some names like ‘Iroquois’ and ‘Cree.’ I had no idea whose territory I lived on, or even that Indigenous people might be anything other than a “minority” within the multicultural Canadian nation. I believed wholeheartedly that Canada was my “home and native land,” as our anthem proclaims. Knowing that others were raised as I was, and still are,

inspired this re-examination of my own place-based identity to understand some of the ways that settler colonialism shapes and limits the perceptions of the people from my hometown, and how that is written onto the landscape in material forms.

Shallow Roots: The deathscapes around Smith's Knoll

It is necessary to undertake sustained critical investigations of visible manifestations of settler colonialism because specific and particular acts of Indigenous erasure, occupation of land, and construction of material and cultural colonial bricolage are often obscured behind larger or longer-term narratives. This is how the “historylessness” of settler colonies is maintained: master narratives inscribed in material landscapes assert whitewashed colonial pasts that obscure both what was done to secure the lands that became Canada, and the ongoing struggles by Indigenous communities to win back those lands. The War of 1812, I argue, serves as one of those narratives for many people born and raised in the region – the colonisation and settlement of places like Stoney Creek are subsumed into the wider sweep of struggles for and against British imperial hegemony, contestations over early American liberalism, the formation of multiple distinct national identities, the celebration of hardy pioneers and homesteaders, and similar narratives that over-determine Settler perceptions of how and why we come to be where we are.

That was certainly my experience as a child growing up in the region, several times a year commemorating imperialist events like ‘Victoria Day’ (a Canadian national holiday in May to celebrate the birthday of Queen Victoria), nationalist events like Canada Day (July 1), or the re-enactment of the Battle of Stoney Creek, all of which

were marked by huge displays of fireworks in Battlefield Park. Returning to these sites as an adult, I have been determined to focus on a very different kind of place-based history: one that tells a story of colonial betrayal and erasure, and ongoing struggles for justice by Indigenous nations, that demand we rethink what was and is celebrated in places like Smith's Knoll and Battlefield Park.

This intervention is inspired in part by the work of historian Kelly Black, who has argued for the importance of "micro-histories" of settler colonialism, which have the potential to disrupt established settler colonial narratives and expose how processes of naming, mapping, and material transformations of the land (such as road building) enforce Settler authority on the land. (Black 2015) Following Black's work, this section pursues a micro-historical geography of Smith's Knoll and the proximate cemeteries and monuments that form a deathscape in and around Stoney Creek, exposing the particular ways that the material deathscape underpins narratives of settler colonial belonging

To understand what is meant by "shallow roots" in this context, it is important to understand the ways that the land has been changed through the process of colonial settlement.^{vii} Prior to the encroachment of settler populations, the lands discussed here were part of the overlapping territories of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and Anishnaabe nations, whose roots in the area are far deeper and thicker. This region was layered with political agreements and arrangements, imbricated systems of law and governance, markers of cultural production, and material bases of incredibly resilient and flexible Indigenous economies. (Hill 2017, 1-131) The Haudenosaunee and Anishnaabe relationship was in part defined by an important treaty agreement, the

Gdoo-naaganinaa ('Our Dish' in Anishnaabe), which articulates a multinational, shared Indigenous sovereignty in this area that predates the assertion of Canadian sovereignty (Simpson, 2008). From the 1600s onward, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy also signed a separate series of treaties, with associated wampum belts as records, with European nations and emergent settler states, creating a complex overlapping network of diplomacy and belonging that included a wide diversity of peoples. (Hill 2017, 79-211; Monture 2014, 13-17)

When early settlers arrived to the area, they would not have found an area of "pristine" wilderness, but rather an area crisscrossed by boundary lines, transportation routes, and extensive cultivation. Further, Indigenous people were prized as military allies by all imperial powers competing for footholds on the land, and the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, like many peoples, shifted alliances to counter and manipulate imperial ambitions. However, the settling of differences between Britain and America following the War of 1812 meant that neither colonial power in this area had the impetus to continue respecting Haudenosaunee autonomy – no more war meant no more need for allies, and eventually the agreement on a permanent border that deeply divided Indigenous nations. The War of 1812 has been described by historian Alan Taylor as a 'civil war,' in which neither Britain nor America decisively won, but Indigenous people most definitely lost. (2010) This war, fought on land from Kentucky and Michigan in the southwest, to Montreal and the St. Lawrence River in the northeast, and featuring naval engagements around the Atlantic and Gulf Coast, came to a head in what would become Stoney Creek, less than a kilometre from where my family home would be built nearly two centuries later.

The Battle of Stoney Creek was not the decisive battle in the War of 1812 – the war ended in 1814 without a truly decisive moment – but it was among the last major engagements of the war, and also marked the farthest that American forces penetrated into British territory. On the evening of 5 June 1813, the Americans set up camp at Gage Farm, adjacent to the road on which they had been marching, and set up their canons on what is now Smith’s Knoll. Warned of an impending attack, a small British force accompanied by an even smaller group of Haudenosaunee warriors, attacked the American encampment during the night, capturing valuable artillery pieces, as well as two American generals, and causing the remaining American forces to flee.^{viii} The knoll where the American cannons had been placed was turned into a battlefield burial ground (City of Hamilton 2005, 119) and then forgotten for decades until the fateful discovery by a 19th century farmer, mentioned at the beginning of this article.

Today, Smith’s Knoll is entangled with three other proximate places to form a distinct deathscape. The first of these related sites is Battlefield Park, across the street from Smith’s Knoll, and the location of Battlefield House Museum, the former Gage farmhouse. More than the old farmhouse, though, the park is dominated by a massive Gothic revival faux-castle, a monument to the British Empire and to the dead of the War of 1812, which each summer overlooks a re-enactment of the Battle of Stoney Creek that draws historical re-enactors from across Ontario and the United States as well as thousands of tourists. The monument has been modified over the years to include plaques honouring local dead from the World Wars, and is fronted by two enormous cannons – representing the cannons captured from the American forces by the British during their decisive night-time raid – reminding visitors that people both died and killed for this land.^{ix}

Nearby, two cemeteries are positioned as differently important sites in this deathscape. The first, Stoney Creek Cemetery, stands less than a kilometre from Smith's Knoll, and while it is no longer "active," it remains a protected space of historical significance in part because it hosts the body of "War of 1812 Hero" Billy Green, as well as many of the bodies of soldiers killed in the Battle of Stoney Creek. (City of Hamilton 2005, 96) Slightly further, just over 3.5 km down the road from Smith's Knoll, is Bartonville Cemetery. This cemetery remains active, and while it does not have direct connections to the War of 1812 or Smith's Knoll, it is a temporal analogue to the others, founded only ten years after the close of the war, in 1824. These two cemeteries are not examined in detail in this study, but provide an important framing of the situation of Smith's Knoll and Battlefield park in the wider regional deathscape.

I turn here to the work of Julie Rugg, whose 2002 study helped to define several key characteristics of deathscapes, and also differentiated cemeteries from mass graves, war cemeteries and pantheons. An examination of the characteristics that Rugg ascribes to these spaces shows that Smith's Knoll does not fit neatly into any of these categories, and that its resonance with both quotidian cemeteries and pantheons nearby as sites of cultural memory and myth-making is indicative of particular settler colonial logics. First, Rugg establishes a cemetery as "more than an ad hoc site in which the disposal of human remains has taken place: its purpose as a site of burial has been formally defined. Furthermore, the site has been so constituted that ritual – customary religious, ethnic and cultural funeral practices – can be readily accommodated." (Rugg 2002, 260) In this, Smith's Knoll certainly qualifies as demonstrated by both its official designation as a cemetery and the ceremony and ritual of the re-internment of the American soldiers

described above. Smith's Knoll also meets Rugg's criteria of having an observable boundary, as a stone wall on one side, and wrought iron railings on the other sides, divides this space from the surrounding suburban landscape. However, one of the primary characteristics that define cemeteries – the provision of spaces for the memorialisation of individuals – are absent from Smith's Knoll:

...cemeteries... offer the possibility of, and a context for, memorializing a particular individual: the identity of the deceased can be enshrined in the site's internal order. Implicit in the landscaping of a cemetery is the ability of users to locate a specific grave... internally, the site will be divided by roads and paths: each grave will have an established 'address'. (Rugg, 2002, 262)

While the nearby Stoney Creek and Bartonville cemeteries both house individual graves, more or less in ordered rows, Smith's Knoll is absent any specific, individual burial site. The only differentiation that is made is between British and American war dead, and that relatively recently. While it is not unusual in some settler societies to go to great lengths to identify war dead (for Israel as one example, see: Weiss 2008), this task has never been taken up with the bodies at Smith's Knoll beyond determining nationality by clothing and similar archaeological markings.

Similarly, Rugg defines war cemeteries as having an internal order and individual graves, with one famous example being Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia (arlingtoncemetery.mil). The notable difference between these spaces and civic cemeteries is "the dead buried in war cemeteries are unlikely to be local to the area: they may come from another country or indeed another continent. As a consequence,

the site may be visited by war veterans and family members who may undertake long journeys to pay their respects and make sense of their loss.” (Rugg 2002, 270) While it is true that the soldiers buried on Smith’s Knoll did in some cases come from far away, without individuating between the bodies, it is impossible to tell professional soldiers recruited in Britain apart from local militia or soldiers enlisted in the colonies, blurring the lines between local and foreign, settlement and metropole.

Historically, Smith’s Knoll would have been more properly defined as a mass grave, with “the boundaries of the site... hastily erected, incomplete or even totally absent.” (Rugg 2002, 268) However, following the official designation as a cemetery in 1908 and subsequent installation of the monument and boundaries, Smith’s Knoll is definitively no longer simply a mass grave. This is significant because mass graves are often “a means of remembering catastrophe... rather than as a place to commemorate individuals.” (Rugg, 2002 268) In none of the markers on Smith’s Knoll, at Battlefield Park or Battlefield Monument, or in fact in any of the literature on the Battle of Stoney Creek, is the event remembered as a “catastrophe” – not even for the retreating Americans. The park information boards rather uphold the bravery of the British soldiers, and the fortitude of Sara Calder, a turn-of-the-century member of the Women’s Wentworth Historical Society who is largely credited with the location and construction of Battlefield Monument. In fact, during my time working at Battlefield Park, I always remember the battle itself being portrayed through re-enactments in an almost festive manner, as a relatively insignificant battle with few casualties. The community of (almost exclusively white settler) re-enactors were jovial, and most folks were friends, as if this were somehow representative of the actual historical experience.

Given the lack of individual memorialisation, and lack of catastrophic remembrance, Smith's Knoll appears increasingly to bear resemblance to a pantheon:

... 'a monument or building commemorating a nation's dead heroes', the pantheon carries strong political purpose as a celebration of nationhood. It is not always the case that the pantheon contains actual interments...

... the pantheon transcends the local context, and is usually owned and maintained by the state. The site can often have political significance.

Generally, the site is sacred because of the presence of the illustrious dead...

(Rugg 2002, 271)

Nearby Battlefield Monument very clearly fills this purpose. Surrounded by a large park, and clearly billed by municipal authorities as a tourist site (official signs directing travellers towards Battlefield Park dot the local highways), the monument was purpose-built to celebrate the War of 1812 and the Battle of Stoney Creek as significant moments in the evolution of the Canadian nation, and also its connection to Victorian imperial ideals. Clearly this is a key site in the production of local memory, with both pantheons and cemeteries in close proximity.

Banal Deathscapes: Boundaries in time and space

Smith's Knoll, Battlefield Park, and Stoney Creek and Bartonville cemeteries occupy space on the land as well as in the colonial imagination in a way that foregrounds settler colonisation as valorous and worthy of remembering, while obscuring Indigenous histories of this place. In effect, this deathscape represents an attempt to fix shallow

settler colonial roots in a particular place by monopolizing the landscape and cultural discourse about the meaning and production of these sites. This is pursued through the generation of tropes of nationalism and militarism through the material spaces of pantheons, while also drawing on the banality and solemn attribution of cemetery spaces.

Settler colonial spaces are often portrayed as banal and everyday (Rifkin 2013; Berg 2011). This includes battlefields, cemeteries and other memorial sites which are simultaneously special and ubiquitous. My school classmates and I frequently visited the battlefield site and pioneer recreations at the nearby museum as part of courses in history, geography, social studies, and sometimes just as a special trip. While we were aware of the martial history of the place, it was presented in a sanitised, almost-fanciful manner – there was little hint of the terror and violence of imperial warfare, or of the pain of dispossession and dislocation imposed on Indigenous people in the process of settler nation building. In a landscape that should obviously be associated with combat and death – decorated by canons and fake fortifications, and draped in many places with the Union Jack – we never discussed it anything but light-hearted pioneer history, versions of which were shared by most Canadians (or so we believed).

Despite this banality, deathscapes such as that which has coalesced around Smith's Knoll, Battlefield Monument, and the nearby active and closed cemeteries, generate a bricolage of memory and story essential to settler colonial narratives. This passage from the *Hamilton Heritage* guide represents the way that banal cemetery deathscapes serve to root contemporary Settler people to the land by materially linking present and past occupation of place:

Part of the interest that cemetery markers possess comes from the documentation incorporated on the stone itself. Cemeteries provide resource materials that are an important component of Canadian Social History. Markers often contain inscriptions and motifs reflecting the views and faith of early citizens of the town and countryside. (City of Hamilton, 2005: 16)

As one example, let us return to Bartonville Cemetery, which features an official historical plaque at the front (south side), adjacent to the entrance, emblazoned with the crest of the City of Hamilton and detailing the history of the church community that originally founded it. The plaque reads in part:

Circa 1824, pioneers... built a wooden church... On February 6, 1859, a brick church that replaced it was dedicated Bartonville Methodist Episcopal Church.

In the 1950's the population growth [sic] created the need to build a larger church building. On January 18, 1959, a new church built across from this cemetery, was dedicated as Pioneer Memorial United Church to honour those pioneers who built so that future generations might be the beneficiaries.^x

This plaque presents a stereotypical settler colonial history: brave pioneers (occupation) build civilized structures (bricolage) like churches in a blank wilderness (erasure). Christian faith is portrayed as synonymous with civilization and also normalized at the root of Canadian culture – this is especially important to consider in the light of the later

role of Christian churches in the residential school system. (Regan, 2010)^{xi} Likewise, settlement is conceptually separated from Indigenous genocide, and from the systems of imperial servitude that brought many people to Canada over the same time period as the founding of Pioneer Memorial. Populations simply grow, with no mention of forced migration or of displacement of Indigenous peoples and so no need to justify further territorial expansion and social construction. Consequently, these initial “pioneering” acts – the founding of a church and graveyard – are memorialised in a founding narrative steeped in non-encounter. Settler folks like myself have passed this sign, read it, and understood it as the true historical narrative of that site, for decades. This story is sedimented, forming layers of socio-cultural assumptions about the history and importance of this place, what Wolfe has referred to as a settler colonial palimpsest. (Wolfe 1999) This palimpsest is both material, as more and more markers of memory are erected around this deathscape over time, and conceptual, as generation after generation of settler Canadian identities in this region are informed by the spatialities created through and with this deathscape.



Figure 2 - The entrance to Bartonville Cemetery in Hamilton, Ontario. The sign (left), unattached to any other grave or monument, reads 'In memory of veterans of World War 1 & 2, Korea, U.N. Action.' (Photo by author, May 2014.)

The founding narrative of settler colonialism, as generally laid out on the Bartonville signage, is given weight and permanence through materialisation in the form of a cemetery because of the ways that people perceive cemetery spaces as sacred “in so far as the site is ‘regarded with respect’.” (Rugg 2002, 264) This makes some sense for cemeteries such as Bartonville where active burials still occur; somewhat less so (and decreasingly over time) for Stoney Creek cemetery, which is closed to burials. It does not hold at all for a cemetery such as Smith’s Knoll, where both the lack of individual graves at which to grieve and the extreme length of time since the burials mean that there is a significant lack of ‘bereaved’ to protect. Yet, Smith’s Knoll continues to assert a demand for solemn respect: while it is common to see family activities around Battlefield Monument and the surrounding park, I have always known Smith’s Knoll to

be far less used, evidence of subtle social messaging about the importance and sacredness of the site.

Generally, the creation of a cemetery is the creation of an inviolable space, both because of cultural and social protocols and prohibitions around cemeteries, and through the formal regimes that delineate and govern cemetery spaces. (Maddrell & Sidaway 2012, 9). Both these formal and informal approaches serve to protect Settler deathscapes from undue interference, creating spatial and temporal boundaries by framing spaces to endlessly celebrate the settler nation and also pinning the War of 1812 and the Battle of Stoney Creek as pivotal and – this is key – *originary* historical events. As the Battle of Stoney Creek as a historical event becomes portrayed as the birth of a place in the settler colonial imaginary, the origin story for the region helps to support the erasure of the thriving Indigenous landscape that early settlers would have encountered, establishing the screen memory that allows for settler claims to non-encounter. It also serves to obscure the ongoing resistance of Indigenous peoples to colonial displacement through literature, historical and anthropological research, and political activism.^{xii}

Various social organizations, churches, and layers of government cooperate to administer the spaces which support this screen memory as exclusive and exclusionary spaces.^{xiii} Zoning as a formal practice of planning, and informal zoning – such as the specification of cemeteries based on ethnicity or religion, separate sections of cemeteries for infant and child bodies, or the creation of family-specific crypts – combine to create spaces of layered but highly exclusive meaning. As Rugg points out, in the UK and North America (unlike many other places) graves in cemeteries are not reused and the body in the grave carries a right of possession, guaranteeing that “graves

would never be disturbed and the remains would stay intact.” (2002, 262) Contesting the ‘rights’ of the dead to ‘rest in peace’ is seen as transgressive. Exhuming bodies even for inquests and criminal investigations is a traumatic act, as the spatial boundary of the cemetery is meant to be one way: you go in, but you don’t come out. The discovery of soldiers’ bodies in a mass grave at the end of the 19th century initiated an immediate and unquestioned transfer of land in the settler colonial imaginary geography, as those lands became inherently sanctified by the glorious dead interred there, serving to displace the territorial claims of the Haudenosaunee or Anishinaabe peoples.

Even as Stoney Creek Municipal Cemetery has ceased to serve as a place to put new bodies, it is unthinkable that it would be discontinued from serving the function of honouring the bodies already interred there – war dead from the Battle of 1812 and other early civic figures are buried there. One can assume that Bartonville Cemetery will one day reach the same critical mass, becoming an inert space, a settler colonial ballast. Demarcating space is both a product of Settler occupation and a way of asserting it, and so protections for Settler deathscapes – such as the protection of cemetery and memorial spaces through heritage legislation, including the Ontario Heritage Act that protects Smith’s Knoll – assert a very real occupation of space by settler colonial power, even in the absence of living settler people.

Settler society cannot hope to compete against Indigenous claims to land on the grounds of duration, so instead they compete on grounds of materiality. Settler deathscapes become prized as collections of dates, as proof of long-term tenure of the land. Settler people in Canada, as in many other settler colonial societies, are haunted by the unanswerable question: if this is your land, where are your stories? (Chamberlin 2003;

see also: Deloria 2003, 165-183) It seems that Settler people must die, be interned, be memorialised, and, ultimately, be forgotten – as the individual soldiers at Smith’s Knoll were, and as many of the people interned at Stoney Creek Cemetery are currently being forgotten – so that they can be resurrected as part of mythic non-encounter origin story that serves to displace Indigenous connections to the land. When a hundred years after the fact, the bodies of soldiers are ‘discovered’, it is used to lend weight to an important “deep colonizing” timeline (Veracini 2011, 178-183). Settlers assert this historical weight through numbers – how many years a family has been in place, how long since first settlement, how long a Settler lived, how many children they had, how many men died in a battle – which are further given cultural mass by their material carving into stone and other monuments. And for people like myself, whose family tenure on the land goes back no further than the mid-20th century, association with these places through linkages of ‘home’ and belonging allowed me to attach my own identity to these deep colonizing narratives despite my relative newness on the land.

Militarism, Nationalism, and Settler Deathscapes

Returning to Taylor's analysis that the War of 1812 represents a definitive 'loss' for Indigenous peoples, the landscape of the region around Smith's Knoll changed rapidly and drastically in ways that inscribed settler dominance on the land itself. After the war, Stoney Creek, like much of Great Lakes Region, went from being lightly settled by Europeans to being increasingly covered by homesteads and villages. So it is that the settler colonization of Stoney Creek and Hamilton is inseparable from the history of imperial warfare and violent death in the War of 1812 that made this colonialism possible. Maddrell and Sidaway acknowledge that battlefields play a key role in many

kinds of deathscapes, noting “that the notion of deathscapes cannot be causally invoked without also conjuring with war, destruction, violence and genocide... With time, battlefields (of all kinds) become caught up in other narratives.” (Maddrell & Sidaway 2012, 6) As such, the deathscapes of Stoney Creek and Hamilton are an interwoven collection of banal burial site and militaristic memorials, all of which are caught up in displacing Haudenosaunee and Anishnaabe presence.

Smith’s Knoll is one of only three cemeteries in Hamilton designated for protection under the Ontario Heritage Act “solely on their merit as cemeteries.” (City of Hamilton 2005, 3). The burials are significant because they honour war dead, and because the bodies are old – they predate Canada itself as an entity. This is a feature Smith’s Knoll shares in common with both Stoney Creek Municipal Cemetery and Bartonville Cemetery, and Stoney Creek Cemetery is cited as particularly noteworthy in the Hamilton Heritage guide for its 1812 connections (City of Hamilton 2005, 96). Meanwhile Bartonville Cemetery, with no connection to the Battle of Stoney Creek, instead boasts an explicitly militaristic and nationalist marker: a massive sign proclaiming honour to the dead of World Wars I and II, Korea, and U.N. “peacekeeping” missions (see Figure 2). At Smith’s Knoll, the imperial lion that tops the stone monument and the replica cannons installed at the site link an overt militarism and imperialism to a solemn, respectful space (see Figure 1). Sites like Smith’s Knoll and Battlefield Monument do not need specific name markings in order to evoke a past that Settler people in the present can look on with pride and patriotism. As Johnston and Ripmeester write, monuments to war dead resonate with “patriotism, courage and duty” to “evoke tales of valour.” (Johnston & Ripmeester 2009, 422)



Figure 3 - Battlefield Monument. (Photos by author, May 2014.)

Veracini asserts that settler collectives see themselves as special and distinct from their imperial forbearers by right of “residency in a special locale” (Veracini 2010a, 55). I argue that the memorialisation of heroically, tragically dead masculine Settlers serves as material reinforcement of the “special” nature of the places that Settlers occupy, and as such, also as justification that they are meant to occupy these places. The mixture of their bodies with the soil makes the place special. Vine Deloria, quoting Chief Luther Standing Bear, locates ongoing colonial anxiety in the preoccupation that the soil itself is made from generations of Indigenous people, while the settler “tree of life” has not yet “grasped the soil” of these lands, an anxiety mixed with ever-present fear of violent Indigenous retaliation. (Deloria 2003, 60) Spaces like the deathscape centred on Smith’s Knoll must be seen as the material product of attempts to address this anxiety.

Rugg notes that pantheons and war cemeteries may be used for particular, nationalistic purposes (2002, 270-271), which should inform considerations of events kicked off in 2010, when a new host of bodies, also soldiers killed in the Battle of Stoney Creek, were found on and adjacent to a private property connected to Battlefield Park. An article in *The Toronto Star* newspaper, stumping for public funds to rebury the remains alongside those at Smith’s Knoll, quoted a local politician who reinforced the nationalist narrative of the settler deathscape. Paul Miller, Member of Provincial Parliament, paradoxically asserted that “*If the British hadn’t won that battle — it was the pivotal battle of the war — if we hadn’t won it, we would probably be flying the American flag in Ontario right now.*” (Coyle 2010, emphasis added) The article goes on to assert that “the young men of 1812 were the first Canadians,” and deserving of “proper respect.”^{xiv}

There are two falsehoods here – first, claiming the bodies as “Canadian,” and second, over-emphasizing the importance of this particular battle while de-emphasizing the role of empire building and colonization in the creation of Canada. (Barker 2009) First, the soldiers buried at Smith’s Knoll may or may not have been settlers with some claim to being early Canadians. Some were likely to have been born in Britain and some likely intended to return there. But the distinct lack of names of the dead at Smith’s Knoll – or attempts to ascertain them – allows for a blurring of the boundary between settlement colony and imperial core, and thus contemporary Settler commentators can claim these long dead soldiers as their own people, regardless of whether or not the dead would have agreed. Meanwhile, responsibility for the aggressive acts that created so much chaos in the area, for the conflict that resulted in the dividing of the Haudenosaunee by the imposition of the British-American border, and which directly or indirectly caused the deaths of many Indigenous people, is displaced away from the settler nation. Canada is still able to maintain its own identity as a peaceful nation, because aggressive military action is the purview of historical British and Americans with whom relationship can be claimed or disavowed as settler Canadians see fit. Further, by focusing on the effects of the war on creating Canada and Canadians, the longer term geopolitical impacts of the war are obscured. Both Canada and the United States were set on trajectories of conquest by this war. For Canadians, their alliance with Haudenosaunee warriors (Taylor 2010; Benn 1998), contrasted with the American driving out of Haudenosaunee communities through the late 18th century, undoubtedly contributed to the “peacemaker myth” that has endured in settler Canadian society as a cover or excuse for acts of violent colonization like the imposition of residential schools. (Regan 2010) Meanwhile for Americans, victories over Tecumseh’s confederacy (Taylor 2010; Sugden 1999) and other Indigenous nations in the west during the War of 1812 certainly foreshadowed the

aggressive expansion of the later Indian Wars. In both narratives, it is obscured that the War of 1812 marked a turning point in relationships between settler states in North America, as the United States never fought another war with either the British or the Dominion of Canada, and consequently the political and military power of Indigenous allies was drastically reduced after the war.

Conclusion

This returns us to the concept of necro-settlement. Developing a growing index of ways that settler colonisers transfer lands away from Indigenous peoples is important for several reasons. First and foremost, because the process of settler colonisation creates a new and ahistorical social reality, understanding the various techniques and technologies of transfer can help us to see them in operation when these processes might otherwise be obscured. For myself, it was not until I became aware of settler colonialism as a concept that I began to question the banality of the landscape in which I was raised. Further, necro-settlement as a concept demands that we re-examine many practices and cultural beliefs around death and dying in settler colonial contexts. Does not the practice of holding settler cemeteries inviolate while frequently destroying or pillaging Indigenous burial sites raise questions of the enduring coloniality of Canadian society? Should not the idea that burial in the ground contribute to a long-running and frequently genocidal colonial project give pause to both scholars of death and dying, and settler people contemplating their own bodily ends? What further changes must we make to our readings of nationalism or militarism in settler societies when we consider

the ways that they may work through the bodies of dead soldiers – even those who might not be from the nation in question?

One of the most compelling reasons for developing necro-settlement as a frame of analysis is its potential role in disrupting settler colonial memory production as a wider project. In order to do this, it is important to understand how memory is rooted in landscape, and how deathscapes as a kind of landscape imbued with particular power are linked into wider geographies of belonging and exclusion. For example, Saree Makdisi has written about the displacement of Palestinian bodies from the Ma'man Allah cemetery in Jerusalem as part of the construction of the ironically named “Museum of Tolerance.” (2010) The museum is itself a memorial space, dedicated to the memory of various peoples killed by various violent regimes. Thus we can see the production of an multi-layered, networked topographical deathscape, a lynchpin in the incredibly complex colonial dynamics of Jerusalem. Similar patterns of enforced remembrance and erasure of indigeneity through the particular, conspicuous situating of settler bodies and memorials are clearly at play in Canada as well, both in and around Smith’s Knoll and Battlefield Park, but elsewhere too. This similarity suggests a pattern that can potentially signal a site of intervention through unsettling colonial burial and memorial practices. Necro-settlement and the treatment of the bodies of dead settlers by living ones compels us to think beyond temporal boundaries and spatial divisions, to understand the entanglements between living embodiments of settler colonial power and the materialisation of that power in the bodies of the dead, and to question not just how settler people colonise while they are alive, but how they might be prevented from continuing to do so after death.

ⁱ Veracini (2010a, 53) argues that settler colonizers are marked by an observable *animus manendi* or intent to stay.

ⁱⁱ There is a complex debate over the capitalisation (or not) of the term ‘settler,’ which I engage more fully along with Emma Battell Lowman in our book *Settler: Colonialism and Identity in 21st Century Canada*. (2015) Rather than rework that debate here, I use the more common lowercase ‘settler’ throughout this paper to refer to the subjective position within settler colonial systems.

ⁱⁱⁱ Soren Larsen and Jay T. Johnson (2012) make a compelling case for embracing phenomenological discovery as a method in Indigenous geography research, and for many of the same reasons – including the need to understand particular places as co-constitutive of local cultures, though in this case looking at a settler rather than Indigenous culture – I believe this method is appropriate here as well.

^{iv} See for example: Collard, Dempsey and Sudburg (2015) and Blomley (2014).

^v This term is adapted from Walter D. Mignolo, who uses it to denote the ways that colonisers conceived of themselves and their spaces as fundamentally different from Indigenous peoples and spaces. (Mignolo 2000, 3) I assert that the colonial difference can also be broadly deployed in reference to the difference between a coloniser’s expectations of colonisation, and the reality of ‘doing’ colonisation in place (for details, see: Barker 2013, 133-137).

^{vi} This term is inspired by Eric Selbin’s (2010) use of *bricolage* to describe how stories are made from pieces of pre-existing narratives, individual experiences, and creative improvisation. I use the term here to describe both narrative and material processes.

^{vii} It is imperative that the historical occupation of the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe in this region not disappear from settler colonial analyses – ethical research on any kind

of colonialism must work to avoid further erasing indigeneity. (Lewis 2012; Smith 1999)

^{viii} For more detail on the Battle of Stoney Creek, see Elliot. (2009)

^{ix} In the summer of 2014, a sculpture by David M. General (Oneida) titled “The Eagles Among Us” was installed on the grounds of Battlefield Park. It was commissioned as part of the War of 1812 Bicentennial Commemoration, in part to recognize the contributions of Indigenous warriors in the Battle of Stoney Creek and elsewhere, but it is not as yet listed on the Battlefield House Museum and Park website (battlefieldhouse.ca) nor is it easy to find information on the sculpture at either at the park or online, and the sculpture sits quite literally on the periphery of the park. Interpreting the meaning of this recent addition is an interesting avenue of inquiry but beyond the scope of this paper.

^x Transcribed by author, May 2014.

^{xi} Thank you to Kelly Black for inquiring into the roles of churches and faith in settler colonial nationalism.

^{xii} Recent Haudenosaunee research and writing has challenged the nationalist historical narratives of places like Stoney Creek. Rick Monture’s 2014 book, *We Share Our Matters*, documents two hundred years of literature developed at Six Nations of the Grand River in opposition to colonial displacement and dispossession, asserting a constant and evolving counter-argument against settler claims. Susan Hill’s 2017 book, *The Clay We Are Made Of*, deconstructs historical and anthropological claims that assert Haudenosaunee people do not belong in or did not ever have claim to land in southern Ontario, particularly by relying on Haudenosaunee oral histories. Finally, Theresa McCarthy’s 2016 book, *In Divided Unity*, demonstrates that Haudenosaunee people have never stopped practicing acts of direct resistance to land loss, but that

settler colonial discourses have predictably attempted to co-opt the land and legal frameworks around these.

^{xiii} Exclusive in theory if not always in practice; for examples of public and social reclamation of cemetery spaces in Britain, see Deering (2012).

^{xiv} The property was eventually purchased, the house demolished, and a comprehensive archaeological dig undertaken in order to properly rebury the bodies, funded by public budgets.

Works Cited

- Aldred, Lisa. "Plastic shamans and astroturf sun dances: New Age commercialization of Native American spirituality." *The American Indian Quarterly* 24, 3 (2000): 329-352.
- Alfred, Taiaiake & Jeff Corntassel. "Being Indigenous: Resurgences Against Contemporary Colonialism." *Government and Opposition* 40,4 (2005): 597-614.
- Banivanua Mar, Tracey. "Carving Wilderness: Queensland's National Parks and the Unsettling of Emptied Lands, 1890–1910." In *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity*, Tracey Banivanua Mar & Penelope Edmonds, eds., 73-93. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2010.
- Barker, Adam J. (Re-)Ordering the New World: Settler Colonialism, Space and Identity. PhD Thesis, University of Leicester, 2013.
- . "The Contemporary Reality of Canadian Imperialism: Settler Colonialism and the Hybrid Colonial State" *American Indian Quarterly* 33,3 (2009): 325-351.
- Benn, Carl. *The Iroquois in the War of 1812*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Berg, Lawrence. "Banal Naming, Neoliberalism, and Landscapes of Dispossession." *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 11 (2011): 13-21.
- Bignall, Simone. "The collaborative struggle for excolonialism." *Settler Colonial Studies* 4,4 (2014): 340-356.
- Black, Kelly. Localizing Settler Colonialism. Paper presented at the Canadian Historical Association annual conference. Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 1 June 2015.
- Blomley, Nicholas. "Making Space for Property." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 104,6 (2014): 1291-1306.

- Bruyneel, Kevin. "Codename Geronimo: settler memory and the production of American statism." *Settler Colonial Studies* 6, 4 (2016): 349-364.
- . *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Butlin, Robin A. *Geographies of Empire: European Empires and Colonies c. 1880-1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Butz, David, and Kathryn Besio. "Autoethnography." *Geography Compass* 3, 5 (2009): 1660-1674.
- Chamberlin, J. Edward. *If This Is Your Land, Where Are Your Stories?: Finding Common Ground*. Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2003.
- City of Hamilton. *Hamilton's Heritage, Volume 6: Inventory of Cemeteries and Burial Grounds*. Hamilton: Planning and Economic Development Department, 2005.
- Collard, Rosemary-Claire, Jessica Dempsey & Juanita Sundberg. "A Manifesto for Abundant Futures." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 105,2 (2015): 322-330.
- Coulthard, Glen. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.
- Coyle, Jim. "Let's show proper respect to heroes of War of 1812." *Toronto Star*, 23 May 2010.
- Carstens, Patrick Richard & Timothy, L. Sanford. *Searching for the Forgotten War – 1812*. Bloomington, IN: Xlibris Books, 2012.
- Deering, Bel. "From Anti-Social Behaviour to X-Rated: Exploring Social Diversity and Conflict in the Cemetery." In *Deathscapes: Spaces for Death, Dying, Mourning and Remembrance*, Avril Maddrell & James Sidaway, eds., 75-95. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.

- Deloria, Vine, Jr. *God Is Red: A Native View of Religion, 30th Anniversary Edition*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2003.
- Edmonds, Penelope. "The Intimate, Urbanising Frontier: Native Camps and Settler Colonialism's Violent Array of Spaces around Early Melbourne." In *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity*, Tracey Banivanua Mar & Penelope Edmonds, eds., 129-154. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2010.
- Freeman, Victoria. "Toronto Has No History!" Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, and Historical Memory in Canada's Largest City. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 2010.
- Hight, Megan J. "Body Snatching & Grave Robbing: Bodies for Science." *History and Anthropology* 16, 4 (2005): 415-440.
- Hill, Susan M. 2017. *The Clay We Are Made Of: Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Kong, Lily. "Cemeteries and Columbaria, Memorials and Mausoleums: Narrative and Interpretation in the Study of Deathscapes in Geography." *Australian Geographical Studies* 37, 1 (1999): 1-10.
- Johnston, Russell & Ripmeester, Michael. "Awake anon the tales of valour: the career of a war memorial in St. Catharines, Ontario." *The Canadian Geographer* 59, 4 (2009): 404-426.
- Larsen, Soren C. and Jay T. Johnson. "Toward an open sense of place: Phenomenology, affinity, and the question of being." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102, 3 (2012): 632-646.
- Leroux, Darryl. "'A genealogist's paradise': France, Québec and the genealogies of race." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38, 5 (2015): 718-733.

- Lester, Alan. "Personifying Colonial Governance: George Arthur and the Transition from Humanitarian to Development Discourse." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102, 6 (2012): 1468-1488.
- Lewis, Adam Gary. "Ethics, activism and the anti-colonial: Social movement research as resistance." *Social Movement Studies* 11, 2 (2012): 227-240.
- Mackey, Eva. 2016. *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty, Land and Settler Decolonization*. Halifax: Fernwood Press.
- . 1999. *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. London: Routledge.
- Macoun, Alissa & Elizabeth Strakosch. "The ethical demands of settler colonial theory." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, 3-4 (2013): 426-443.
- Maddrell, Avril & Sidaway, James. "Introduction: Bringing a Spatial Lens to Death, Dying, Mourning and Remembrance." In *Deathscapes: Spaces for Death, Dying, Mourning and Remembrance*, Avril Maddrell & James Sidaway, eds, 1-16. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.
- Makdisi, Saree. "The architecture of erasure." *Critical Inquiry* 36, 3 (2010): 519-559.
- McCarthy, Theresa. 2016. *In Divided Unity: Haudenosaunee Reclamation at Grand River*. Phoenix: University of Arizona Press.
- Monture, Rick. 2015. *We Share Our Matters*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Preston, Jen. "Neoliberal settler colonialism, Canada and the tar sands." *Race & Class* 55, 2 (2013): 42-59.
- Regan, Paulette. 2010. *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

- Rifkin, Mark. "Settler common sense," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3-4 (2013): 322-340.
- Roy, Susan. "'Who Were These Mysterious People?': ççsna:m, the Marpole Midden, and the Dispossession of Aboriginal Lands in British Columbia." *BC Studies*, 152 (2006): 67-95.
- Rugg, Julie. "Defining the place of burial: What makes a cemetery a cemetery?" *Mortality: Promoting the interdisciplinary study of death and dying* 5, 3 (2002): 259-275.
- Selbin, Eric. 2010. *Revolution, Rebellion, Resistance: The Power of Story*. London: Zed Books.
- Simpson, Leanne. "Looking after Gdoo-naaganinaa: Precolonial Nishnaabeg diplomatic and treaty relationships." *Wicazo Sa Review* 23, 2 (2008): 29-42.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Soguk, Nevzat. "Indigenous Transversality in Global Politics." *Affinities* 5, 1 (2011): 37-55.
- Stevenson, Lisa. "The psychic life of biopolitics: Survival, cooperation, and Inuit community." *American Ethnologist* 39, 3 (2012): 592-613.
- Sugden, John. 1999. *Tecumseh: A Life*. New York: Holt Paperbacks.
- Taylor, Alan. 2010. *The Civil War of 1812: American Citizens, British Subjects, Irish Rebels, & Indian Allies*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Thistle, John. "A Vast Inland Empire and the Last Great West: remaking society, space and environment in early British Columbia." *Journal of Historical Geography* 37, (2011): 418-428.
- Thomas, David Hurst. 2000. *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity*. New York: Basic Books.

- Tully, James. "The Struggles of Indigenous Peoples For and Of Freedom." In *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton & Will Sanders, eds., 36-59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Turner, Dale. 2005. *This is not a Peace Pipe*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Veracini, Lorenzo (2015). *The Settler Colonial Present*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . "Understanding Colonialism and Settler Colonialism as Distinct Formations." *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/1369801X.2013.858983 (2013): 1-19.
- . "Isopolitics, Deep Colonizing, Settler Colonialism." *Interventions*, 13, 2 (2011): 171-189.
- . 2010a. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. Eastbourne: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . "The Imagined Geographies of Settler Colonialism." In *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity*, Tracey Banivanua Mar & Penelope Edmonds, eds., 179-197. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010b.
- . "Settler Collective, Founding Violence and Disavowal: The Settler Colonial Situation." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 29, 4 (2008): 363-379.
- . "Historylessness: Australia as a settler colonial collective." *Postcolonial Studies* 10, 3 (2007): 271-285.
- Weiss, Meira. "Forensic medicine and religion in the identification of dead soldiers' bodies." *Mortality: Promoting the interdisciplinary study of death and dying* 13, 2 (2008): 119-131.
- Wolfe, Patrick. 1999. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London: Cassell.