

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Indigenous Methodologies of Care and Movement

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8gr8q4kv>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 46(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Daigle, Michelle

Publication Date

2023-11-06

DOI

10.17953/A3.1554

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Indigenous Methodologies of Care and Movement

Michelle Daigle

While my story may be very different from that of other Native people (though I suspect it is not as rare as might be believed, and it is becoming much more common), the construction of the geographies at various scales and its impact on our family and cultural relationships have remained the cornerstone of my politics and who I am as a scholar, friend, mother, and family member. I speak of the place from which I come because it is the base of my memories and politics of location; it is also what forms the base of my academic work.

—Mishuana Goeman (Tonawanda Seneca)¹

A kin-space-time envelope can be a memory, but not solely in the sense of recalling a scene or a vignette; it also provides instruction for how to be in the world, or it invokes a sense of responsibility in the person recalling the memory

—Laura Harjo (Mvskoke)²

LEARNING FROM INDIGENOUS CARE WORK

This essay is a reflection on Indigenous methodologies of care and how Indigenous scholars learn these methodologies through relationships and lived experiences that precede and exceed the academy. Even though we might not be aware of it, many Indigenous scholars learn the practices and values that shape our research early on, as we engage in community life and move through reserve communities, the bush, waterways, small rural towns, and large cities—the places and kinship networks that shape Indigenous relational geographies.³ As Laura Harjo states, research trajectories

MICHELLE DAIGLE is Mushkegowuk, a member of Constance Lake First Nation, and of French ancestry. She is an assistant professor at the University of Toronto with a cross-appointment in the Centre for Indigenous Studies and the Department of Geography and Planning.

can begin in community gatherings that we are immersed in as children, learning the methods and approaches that become part of our “repertoire of tools”⁴ that we draw upon in our research and community collaborations. This insight deeply resonates with me as I think about the multiple peoples, places, travels, food sharing, visiting, and caretaking that shape my life and my research methodologies and theorizing.

My own research trajectory began when I was a child, when my sister and I would travel with our mom as she led Indigenous education-based projects. We would routinely travel west from the small rural town bordering our Oji-Cree community in Treaty 9, Constance Lake First Nation (CLFN), to Anishinaabe communities in Treaty 3, and to the southeast to the Haudenosaunee community of Six Nations of the Grand River. Oftentimes, we went to the city of Thunder Bay, an urban hub for Indigenous peoples in northwestern Ontario. During the six-hour drive, we would listen to my mom’s mixtapes that she curated in our living room on the weekends in the spring, anticipating summer days on the road. She would blare a mix of David Bowie, Tina Turner, and Kashtin as we made our way through the flat terrain of what seemed like an endless stretch between home and the mining town of Longlac.⁵ We would stop for lunch at the Longlac Inn and Hotel on the side of Highway 11. After a lunch of chicken salad sandwiches, the soup of the day, and blueberry pie, we would make our way through the sloping hills and bedrock cliffs near Lake Nipigon and Red Rock, eventually passing by the Nanabijou Sleeping Giant on Lake Superior as we entered the city.⁶

During those years, my mother facilitated a summer certificate program for Indigenous language teachers at Lakehead University in Thunder Bay. My grandmother, who traveled to Thunder Bay from CLFN, taught alongside my mom. She took the lead on the structure of language instruction, while my mom focused on second-language methodologies for the classroom. My sister and I spent days with a caregiver—oftentimes an auntie, uncle, or teenage child of one of the students in the course—while my mother and grandmother taught. During the evenings and weekends, we accompanied them to work-related events and social gatherings. I do not remember the specifics of these gatherings (I sat through numerous presentations and workshops as a child), or what the adults discussed as we sat down to share a meal. What I do remember are the many people who were there. These people cared for us, became dear family friends, and witnessed my sister and I grow up. I remember an abundance of good food and the laughter that animated those summer memories. I remember how my mom devoted time to visit with students and their families who traveled from their home communities for the three-week course, and the generosity and kindness she extended to them.

When I reflect on the beginnings of my research trajectory, I often think of these times and others during my adolescence and early adulthood. I think of the women in my life who dedicated their time and work to Indigenous education and language revitalization, and how this work required constant movement. We were continually on the road, driving from town to the reserve, from one Indigenous community to another—to a class in Thunder Bay, to Kakabeka Falls for an afternoon dip in the river, to a powwow in Manitou Rapids, to Toronto for an Indigenous conference, to

Six Nations for a workshop, and back home again.⁷ During that time, we met with many people who became part of a growing constellation of people and places that my mother and grandmother cultivated through their commitments to build Indigenous life, many of whom eventually supported the research I became involved in as an adult.⁸ My mother and grandmother were able to contribute their knowledge and skills to community-building through this movement, yet they always returned to our First Nation community, carrying those experiences with them, which then informed their care work in our family and in CLFN. In reflecting on these family memories, I understand my mother and grandmother's care practices, or their methodologies of care, to be an extension of relations of care that emanate from Mushkegowuk peoples' movement on rivers that shape the muskegs or the swampy lands of the Hudson Bay Lowlands,⁹ and the kinship networks that have been cultivated through these waterways where our genealogical roots (and routes) flow from.¹⁰ As I detail later in this essay, these water relations are crucial in understanding how Mushkegowuk relations of care are embodied through continual movement on and off our waterways, transmitting knowledge on the expansiveness and fullness of Mushkegowuk relational geographies.

In what follows, I situate methodologies of care within the larger pursuit for Indigenous futurities.¹¹ I view Indigenous feminist theorizations of futurities as enactments of Indigenous relationalities, or what some call "radical relationalities."¹² In drawing on this work, I am interested in how Indigenous relationalities are sustained and constantly created through mobile relations of care, or how Indigenous relations of care embrace movement across lands and waters and how these fluid connections offer possibilities for Indigenous futurities.¹³ As I examine, relations of care evoke full and fluid conceptions of Indigenous kinship that exceed colonial territories and identities such as First Nation reserves, treaty territories, geopolitical borders, and fixed notions of indigeneity and family.¹⁴ Along these lines, I discuss how Indigenous methodologies that stem from relations of care can be strategically mobilized to build a myriad of relationships or relational processes (rather than territorial ones) that sustain our communities and that are foundational to Indigenous futurities.¹⁵ I specifically examine how Indigenous relational geographies are routed through Indigenous peoples' movement—and how this movement politic is learned from the nonhuman world—by grounding my discussion in the significance of water relations in the muskegs, and how they have helped me understand Mushkegowuk kinship relations as rippling out through temporal and spatial scales in and beyond that region. I end by considering how mobile relations of care are crucial in shaping the visions and material relations of Indigenous and anticolonial futurities.

I weave in examples from my own research experiences throughout, including lived experiences and family stories. Drawing on Mishuana Goeman, I bring my memories into play, with the understanding that the personal can elucidate broader struggles, work,¹⁶ and relationships that create Indigenous life. I draw on personal stories with the intention of writing for Indigenous and anticolonial relations, rather than centering my experiences as exceptional or as an example of best practices or lessons in research. I return to these memories as they delineate the relations where Indigenous futurities

are already in the making, and with the understanding that kinship and community is formed in many different ways than what might be reflected through the stories shared in this essay. As articulated by Harjo in the opening epigraph, memories can serve as a “kin-space-time envelope” that guide the way we carry ourselves in our research and community work.¹⁷ Building on this, Goeman instructs us on how our family stories can “provide a window into the complexities of spatial subjectivities and geographic histories, giving us a richer understanding of how Native people imagine community and create relationships.”¹⁸ Drawing on these thinkers and the critical body of scholarship by Indigenous feminists, I consider how Indigenous futurities require us to think beyond place, or how places and place-based geographies foundational to Indigenous life are relationally connected through Indigenous peoples’ mobilities.

METHODOLOGIES FOR INDIGENOUS FUTURITIES

Indigenous studies scholars have long discussed how research has a responsibility to transform colonized realities.¹⁹ These discussions are often framed in relation to struggles for decolonization or Indigenous resurgence or futurities, with each of these political projects having deep histories and critiques.²⁰ In this essay, I primarily use the language of futurities to refer to how Indigenous peoples envision, imagine, and generate knowledge on their futures in addition to the practices they are embodying in the present.²¹ I also use this term because Indigenous feminists have paid particular attention to the ways Indigenous relationships and care work shape futurities. For example, Melanie Yazzie (Diné) and Cutcha Risling Baldy (Hupa, Yurok, and Karuk) conceptualize Indigenous futurities through “radical relationality,”²² which they define as “a term that brings together the multiple strands of materiality, kinship, corporeality, affect, land/body connection, and multidimensional connectivity coming primarily from Indigenous feminist [theory].”²³ Building on this, Kanaka Maoli scholar Noelani Goodyear-Kaōpua writes that “Indigenous futurities are enactments of radical relationalities that transcend settler geographies and maps, temporalities and calendars, and/or other settler measures of time and space.”²⁴ Here, Goodyear-Kaōpua highlights how Indigenous futurities “jump scales”²⁵ by refusing colonial renderings of time and space and by being in motion with a web of relations that extend to past and future generations, and that connect human bodies to bodies of land, water, and nonhuman life. Similarly, Mishuana Goeman has extensively written on how Indigenous peoples’ bodies, particularly Indigenous women’s bodies (and I would add gender-diverse people’s bodies), are “meeting places” that are intimately connected to and shaped by webs of human and nonhuman relations, as well as colonial, racial, capitalist, and heteropatriarchal relations of oppression.²⁶ As Goeman explains, colonial renderings of time and space act as modes of exclusion, containment, and control, obstructing the constant (re)making of Indigenous relationships, while Indigenous women and gender-diverse relations reimagine and re-create community, relational geographies, and futurities through Indigenous conceptions of time and space that become “weapon[s] of expansion and inclusion, a means of enlarging identities.”²⁷

Notably, Yazzie and Risling Baldy's framing of radical relationality is informed by an ethics of care, or by the care work that shapes Indigenous relationships. Linking this back to my opening reflections on my mother and grandmother, I am interested in how care work is embodied through movement to sustain, rebuild, and be accountable to the relationships that shape Indigenous life. This movement is in marked contrast to how care work is often conceived as a feminized and depoliticized practice that is confined to private spaces, or as a practice that is restricted to the boundaries of oversimplified notions of the Indigenous community.²⁸ In other words, in following Indigenous relations of care, we begin to see the complexity and expansiveness of relations and places that shape Indigenous communities, and thus how research methodologies of care can embrace movement and connection across large-scale relational geographies.

As Gina Starblanket (Cree-Saulteaux) states, Indigenous feminist theory intervenes in oversimplified conceptions of the Indigenous community by attending to the complexities of Indigenous women's lived experiences.²⁹ She draws attention to how colonial reproductions of domesticity have shaped representations of Indigenous women as being the "keepers of culture"³⁰ who are responsible for renewing relationships with place, or for reproducing relations of care that are confined to the boundaries of the reserve or reservation.³¹ In challenging these narrow conceptions of community, Starblanket states the following:

Indigenous communities can and should be understood as more than collectives of individual bodies who share a similar geography or cultural identity, instead representing a network of relationships between people and places interacting not only in the present, but also the past and future. Following Mishuana Goeman's discussion of the body "as a meeting place," an alternative to homogenized treatments of community might be imagined by thinking about relationship beyond singular sources of identity or a shared physical location. Rather we might think of our very existence as a hub where multiple overlapping relationships of time and place intersect and regenerate.³²

Starblanket proceeds to call for conceptual mobility in Indigenous studies that is unbounded by static and dichotomous thinking and, instead, engages in continual dialogue on whether research methodologies, collaborations, and knowledge production are accountable to the entanglements of relationships that shape Indigenous life and that must be cared for as we strive for Indigenous futurities in the present.³³

Many Indigenous thinkers reflect on how this conceptual mobility can be learned from the politicized movement of human and nonhuman actors who shape Indigenous societies, and who create connectivity across large-scale landscapes and waterscapes.³⁴ Of further importance, some of these discussions focus on how humans have much to learn from the movement embodied by the nonhuman world (land, water, animals, plants, and the cosmos) as they, too, engage in practices of care for one another and for human relations. As Goodyear-Kaōpua writes, movement becomes crucial in embodying Indigenous futurities, as futurities "include ways of relating that involve *putting our bodies in motion with various kinds of nonhuman rhythms* that engage

multiple senses.”³⁵ Similarly, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (Māori) considers how movement can become a critical aspect of Indigenous research methodologies. She draws on Pacific peoples’ relationship with water to consider how research methodologies can integrate the agency and intelligence embodied by water. She states, “the sea is a giver of life, it sets time and conveys movement. . . . The tides represent movement, change, process, life, inward and outward flows of ideas, reflections, and actions.”³⁶ Here, Smith echoes the temporal and spatial dimensions of Indigenous relationships as articulated by Goodyear-Kaōpua and Goeman, while specifically making a link to research methodologies that can benefit from incorporating the movement and connectivity learned from water relations.

In the remainder of this essay, I return to the muskegs as analogous to the relationships, care work, and movement that I am familiar with, and that have shaped my research methodologies and my understanding of Indigenous futurities. While my reflections focus on a smaller region of Mushkegowuk, Anishinaabe, and Oji-Cree relationships, these stories have been foundational to how I understand the heterogeneity and expansiveness of Indigenous life, and how Indigenous relationalities build out from the muskegs and specifically from water relations in this region. In other words, I ground my reflections in relational geographies that I know—that I have experienced and that have shaped me—with the understanding that these relationships can and should be built out more expansively, as we extend on the care embodied by the people we have learned from and who have influenced our research. Overall, my aim is to examine how relations of care provide a window into understanding how Indigenous relationships have always been sustained and built through movement across lands and waters, and how this demystifies Indigenous relationalities and politicizes large-scale forms of connectivity that elucidate the entanglements of colonial conquest and Indigenous resistance.³⁷ Furthermore, relations of care can inform research methodologies that materially build these expansive connections.³⁸

RELATIONS OF CARE RIPPLING FROM THE MUSKEGS

In the muskegs, water relations have significantly shaped how care work is embodied on expansive scales. Kishiichiwan (the Albany River) and the Attawapiskat River have shaped many Indigenous peoples’ lives in this region.³⁹ These rivers, along with a number of others that are part of these watersheds, are connected to livelihood practices such as trapping, hunting, and fishing, in addition to sustenance labor and a myriad of sociopolitical practices.⁴⁰ In spite of the impacts of colonization, many Indigenous peoples of this region continue to understand that they have responsibilities to their water relatives and the web of human and nonhuman relatives that depend on them.

Relationships with water transmit knowledge on the expansiveness and fullness of Mushkegowuk relational geographies. The Albany River Coalition, a group that was formed in Fort Albany First Nation that resisted negative environmental impacts on Kishiichiwan, states that the river helps people understand the meaning of *paquataskamik*, a Mushkegowuk concept that can be roughly translated to the expansive and interconnected ecologies and kinship relations in the muskegs. As founders of

the coalition say, the concept “reminds us that Mushkegowuk land is vast. It’s not just the reserve, it’s not just the camp [where the coalition does its work], but an area that ties together family, history, and identity.”⁴¹ Mushkegowuk conceptions of relational geographies as expressed through *paquataskamik* are made evident through memories and stories on Mushkegowuk waterways. Lived experiences tell us of Mushkegowuk roots in the place of the muskegs and in sites or place names along the shorelines, but they also teach us about the importance of a movement politic, or how movement is crucial in understanding the complexity and expansiveness of relationships in and beyond the muskegs.

As recounted through research interviews, community oral histories, informal conversations with relatives, and lived experiences on waterways, much of this movement is embodied through renewing relationships, and these renewals happen or happened as Mushkegowuk, Anishinaabe, and Oji-Cree peoples engage in or engaged in care work such as harvesting food along waterway geographies.⁴² Many stories of movement recount the structural violence of forced relocation reproduced through colonial policies, extractive industries, and the gendered politics of colonialism that shapes this region.⁴³ For example, the transition to a lumber economy in the early to mid-twentieth century affected Indigenous men’s ability to travel along regional waterways as they did through their participation in the fur trade. However, many still maintained their land and water connections through cyclical food harvests, subsistence practices, and seasonal fur trapping labor. Meanwhile, many Indigenous women became relegated to the home during this time period, as their labor was not valued in the lumber industry, except through intermittent cleaning and cooking.⁴⁴ This reproduced a colonial gendered division of labor between Indigenous women and men in the muskegs which was further intensified through the residential school system.⁴⁵ Indigenous peoples’ freedom to renew their water relations and the constellation of relationships that are socially reproduced through daily practices on regional waterways were negatively affected through the heteropatriarchal foundations of a colonial resource-extractive and wage-based economy. Yet many of these women, such as my grandmother, and gender-diverse relations continually returned to Kishiichiwan to harvest and trade food, to travel by canoe to visit relatives upriver or downriver, and to develop relationships with other rivers in the muskegs as they migrated to southern parts of the region in search of employment.

Recalling these community stories highlights how movement in and beyond the muskegs is tied to colonial dispossession and violence, and to Indigenous peoples’ continually protecting and remaking their lives in resistance to colonial conquest. However, echoing Laura Harjo, it is also important to understand Indigenous mobilities as movement of our own choosing. As Harjo states, “Some of our (re)emergence and migration stories are based on our responses to acts of settler futurity that include Indian removal and relocation; however, we also carry other such stories that are based on movement of our own choosing. Those stories have yet to be conceived, written, and told. Mvskoke people have generated Mvskoke community, even beyond our eleven-county tribal jurisdiction. Thus, conceptions held by Mvskoke and other Indigenous communities disrupt commonly received notions of fixity and place.”⁴⁶ Harjo’s insights are grounded in a particular topography and Mvskoke sociopolitical

practices. Nevertheless, her insights can be drawn on to understand movement in the muskegs and how *free styles* of movement have been historically routed through the currents and connectivity of river systems, water relatives that in turn bring us in relation with land, animal, plant, and human relations that also have a bearing on movement in the muskegs.⁴⁷

Crucially, and central to my argument in this essay, an Indigenous movement politic that is routed through river systems stretches beyond these places or beyond these specific water environments. That is, the agency of water relations informs Indigenous consciousness and material practices of creating life in the muskegs and ripples out from the scale of the body through people's collective practices, which materially shape care work and kinship networks that transcend colonial spatialities such as rural/urban and reserve/nonreserve.⁴⁸ As such, a myriad of practices tied to Mushkegowuk movement is informed by ethics, values, and knowledge that are rooted in and routed through our water relations. This includes people traveling back and forth from the reserve to the city and from one's community to a range of others to attend regional political gatherings, to pursue secondary and postsecondary education, to contribute to language revitalization, to seek out health care, to visit with family, to be in ceremony, to fight for safe housing and clean drinking water, to care for loved ones during times of hardship, and to collectively mourn the loved ones we have lost.⁴⁹ In other words, Mushkegowuk, Anishinaabe, and Oji-Cree relationships with water activate a consciousness and practices that constantly make Indigenous relational geographies within and beyond the muskegs. Relations of care flow from the muskegs—or relations of care are formed through water relations in the place where Mushkegowuk roots flow from—but relations of care are also made through Indigenous peoples' movement along the water *and* movement off of waterways (such as travel on highways) and beyond the muskegs (such as travel to Anishinaabe or Haudenosaunee communities) as they create Indigenous life through an expansive web of human and nonhuman relations.

If Kishiiichiwan and the Attawapiskat River are commonly referred to as ancestral highways in the muskegs, then it is instructive to think of the care work that these highways have historically facilitated and how this care work has expanded over the last century by Indigenous peoples' strategically utilizing colonial transport infrastructure such as the trans-Canada highway to continue this care work amid colonial conquest. My grandmother's generation experienced ruptures to their relationships with water and more generally with their webs of kinship. Yet the resistance embodied by Indigenous women and gender-diverse relations in the muskegs is reflected through how they and many others continually returned to waterways, and also through the relations of caretaking that they embodied beyond them. Significantly, these stories illuminate how Indigenous relationalities are shaped through care work that requires movement, which subsequently has a bearing on how Indigenous studies scholars should conceive of movements for Indigenous futurities. That is, movements for Indigenous futurities require us to think beyond place, or how places and place-based geographies foundational to Indigenous life are relationally connected through Indigenous peoples' mobilities. As Goeman writes, "the linking of moving bodies, moving temporalities, and moving lands [helps us] to think of Native people as becoming and belonging in

movement rather than as stable and unchanging identities.”⁵⁰ This has important implications for Indigenous scholarship, as theorizations of colonial conquest, resistance, and liberation require interrogations of the fixed spatialities and temporalities that Indigenous peoples continue to be relegated to discursively and materially.

RELATIONS OF CARE SHAPING INDIGENOUS METHODOLOGIES

The spatial reach of my grandmother and mother’s relations of care as recalled in the introduction of this essay have had a bearing on my own research trajectory. In research that focused on interviewing elders and knowledge keepers⁵¹ in my First Nation community, Constance Lake First Nation, I was transported through peoples’ memories and stories to other places, specifically Anishinaabe communities both within and outside of the boundaries of Treaty 9, to learn about community members who engaged in ceremonial renewals in the 1990s as a means of rebuilding community life.⁵² In an effort to learn about the process of ceremonial regeneration that was taking place in CLFN in an accountable way, I interviewed people I had preexisting relationships and relational connections with. My main concern in returning to this work is not necessarily in the research methodologies such as qualitative interviews that I drew upon but in how I conceived of Mushkegowuk futurities and nationhood in a limited way by not fully considering how processes of sociopolitical regeneration are always formed in relation with other kin.⁵³ That is, the process of ceremonial regeneration in CLFN was made possible through relationships with Anishinaabe people in and beyond the muskegs, which opens up many questions about past and current relationships that have been formed between Mushkegowuk and Anishinaabe peoples—relationships that emerged through lived experiences of movement, including movement and encounters on waterways in the muskegs. For example, many Anishinaabe people migrated to the muskegs to work in the fur trade but remained there and formed intimacies and new political formations with Mushkegowuk peoples.⁵⁴ Colonial authorities sought to create divisions between Mushkegowuk and Anishinaabe people as Indian reserves were established in the muskegs with the establishment of Treaty 9;⁵⁵ however, Mushkegowuk and Anishinaabe intimacies remain crucial in understanding the plurality of indigeneity in the muskegs and in towns and small cities in northern and northwestern Ontario. Notably, Mushkegowuk and Anishinaabe relations in this region highlight both the importance of Mushkegowuk roots in the muskegs and Anishinaabe migratory routes that shape the complexity of kinship among Indigenous peoples—some might say the *internationalism* of this place. This kinship or internationalism is embodied by individuals, whether they are Oji-Cree and have familial roots in both Mushkegowuk and Anishinaabe nations or whether they are Mushkegowuk or Anishinaabe and have grown up in families and communities that are shaped by the sociopolitical knowledge and practices from both of these nations. These memories and stories of movement and intimacy formation require nuanced understandings of the relations of care that shape life in the muskegs.

Mushkegowuk and Anishinaabe relationships stretch beyond the muskegs, which was crucial in shaping research collaborations after my initial community project in

CLFN.⁵⁶ My family's relational ties supported collaborations with Anishinaabe peoples west of the muskegs, in the region of Treaty 3, to learn about the governance embedded in land-based food practices. While I was living in Anishinaabe country in 2013 and 2014, I often met people who had a connection to my family. The relational processes that informed my mother's involvement in Indigenous education in the region were a guide for my work. In addition, people frequently located me through other relatives such as uncles they used to go hunting with, or who had taught them at Lakehead University in the 1980s and 1990s, or who they knew through regional political networks. Others made connections to an Anishinaabe auntie who is from a First Nation community in Treaty 3, or to another who was a principal for several years in Big Grassy First Nation (also located in Treaty 3). Indeed, these types of relational networks are not unique within the context of Indigenous and anticolonial research. Yet I recount these experiences as my family's relational ties led me to undertake a research project beyond the muskegs, in part because our sense of community extended beyond the boundaries of our immediate family lineage, First Nation community, nation, and treaty territory. The continuation of my work followed the relational geographies rather than territorial ones that CLFN elders and community members highlighted through their stories of ceremonial regeneration. Through this work I found myself embedded in relational accountabilities to my family (in addition to the people I was learning from in Treaty 3) even though I was living and working in Anishinaabe communities west of the muskegs. Yet, like the aforementioned research on ceremonial regeneration, this work was solely conceived within the framework of nationhood that focused on one Indigenous nation's experiences, in this case Anishinaabe life, without fully addressing the relational connections that fostered it.

In terms of research, these examples of Mushkegowuk, Anishinaabe, and Oji-Cree sociopolitical life—in addition to the peoples and places we might find ourselves collaborating with through our research—have a bearing on how Indigenous futurities are theorized. These relations might not neatly fit into preconceived notions of “the Indigenous community”⁵⁷ and understandings of who we think we should be interacting and building relationships with through our research methodologies. To be clear, I am not suggesting that Indigenous studies scholars should seek to expand research methodologies in ways that will discount the importance of building reciprocal relationships and trust over time. Rather, I am more concerned with how narrow framings of Indigenous community, nationhood, and relational kinship may limit our conceptions of futurities in ways that do not fully account for the relations that shape Indigenous life. Furthermore, I am concerned with how these narrow framings might not fully take into account the relations of care that are required for Indigenous *and* anticolonial futurities moving forward.

THE RHYTHMIC MOVEMENTS OF CARE: EMBRACING EXPANSIONS AND INTIMACIES

As I have examined throughout this paper, mobile relations of care illuminate the expansiveness of Indigenous relational geographies and, thus, who should be cared for

in our pursuits for a world otherwise. In closing, I want to reflect on how methodologies of care open up possibilities for creating new relationships into the future. As Yazzie and Risling Baldy state, “Radical relationality is, after all, simply the ontology of being-in-relation-to that describes *all* life and futurity; keeping ourselves open to the possibility of making new relatives is one of the essential functions of life and, indeed, decolonization.”⁵⁸ Here, we can return to Goeman’s crucial insights to consider how “the linking of moving bodies, moving temporalities, and moving lands [helps us] to think of Native people as becoming and belonging in movement”⁵⁹ in relation to the moving bodies, lands, waters, and temporalities that shape the lives of anticolonial kin and coresistors.⁶⁰ In other words, Indigenous futurities cannot be realized without embracing the strands of relationality that tell us the full story of peoples and places who are connected to Indigenous life through the global interconnections of colonial genocide, anti-Blackness, heteropatriarchy, labor exploitation, and poverty, as well as through our embodiments of alternate knowledges, practices, and imaginations.⁶¹ Here, too, water engenders an ethic of relationality by generating political and analytical flexibility in our visions and practices of Indigenous and anticolonial futurities.

Water relations in the muskegs hold memories and stories of these relational connections through migratory routes that shape encounters, intimacies, and relationships yet formed in this region. As community memories recall, intimacies were formed between Indigenous and Chinese peoples in the early 1900s as Chinese indentured laborers moved through the James Bay region on freight ships that circulated staple commodities to Indigenous settlements as part of the fur trade.⁶² More recently, water holds stories of immigrants and refugees relocating to the muskegs from the Philippines and parts of the African continent.⁶³ I continue to learn about these stories as they have bearing on how futurities should be conceived through the multiple experiences and desires that shape life in the muskegs. In another way, connections can be traced through the currents of rivers such as Kishiichiwan that flow into the salt water of the Hudson Bay that in turn flow into the Arctic and North Atlantic Oceans, connecting us to waters that hold stories of empire and resistance and that inform alternate knowledge systems and practices throughout the globe. Indeed, connections between Indigenous life in the muskegs and Indigenous, Black, and anticolonial life in other parts of the globe can be made through the global circuits or movement of capital, goods, and peoples.⁶⁴ These stories are crucial, and yet there is much to be known through an Indigenous vernacular⁶⁵ that arises from our movement across, or with, land, water, and kin relations. From water’s viewpoint,⁶⁶ we begin to see how Indigenous bodies and bodies of land and water connected to Indigenous life, “become conduits for connection”⁶⁷ with the people and places that shape anticolonial collectives across diverse landscapes and waterscapes.

To expand on these stories, I am drawn to how water and movement is conceived through anticolonial scholarship, and both the material and metaphorical stretch made possible through thinking with water and movement. As I began to reflect on the analytics and politics of Indigenous movement through family and community stories, I found my thinking was also informed by the labor and knowledge creation of Black scholars, particularly by Rinaldo Walcott’s theorization of the double meaning of

movement.⁶⁸ Walcott examines the double meaning of movement by tracing how Black migrations and forced relocations evoke Black people's worldliness and how these migrations make space in ways that build the foundations to more expansive social movements for Black liberation. He grapples with Black movement as entangled in the global conditions and infrastructure of anti-Blackness, as well as Black movement as a form of resistance, including the traveling potential of the Black Lives Matter movement (or the potential of the movement's transnational political identification). As Walcott elucidates, Blackness and movement cannot be divorced, not only because of the conditions of anti-Black racism but because Black movement aids in the potential to create a "freedom yet to come."⁶⁹ As I bring this essay to a close, I draw on Walcott's thinking not to compare or conflate Black and Indigenous experiences of movement embodied through our distinct though entangled experiences of resistance within the structures of anti-Black racism and colonial conquest. Rather, I call up Walcott's work as his attention to movement made me reflect on how Indigenous studies is (or is not) accountable to Black studies and Black life, and, in this case, to think through the radical potential of Indigenous movement as relationally entangled with the movement of anticolonial kin and coresistors. In Walcott's words, "A pure decolonial project is one that works to produce new modes of relational logics and conditions in which the racially structured intimacies that European colonial expansion produced, and that we continue to live, might be refashioned."⁷⁰ Similarly, Tiffany Lethabo King writes that Indigenous and Black studies need to develop conceptual and methodological tools based on an ethics of care and responsibility to reckon with the terrain of connectivity, the density of experiences, and the frictions that shape Black and Indigenous life without reproducing narratives of Indigenous and Black peoples (and, I would add, other anticolonial actors) as "isolated, bounded, and discrete communities."⁷¹

As I return to family and community stories on and off our waterways, I increasingly realize how they are inviting me to embrace a movement politic routed through relations of care. Yet the current of our water relations may slow our movements, too. At moments, people stop at sites along the shoreline, many with place names that hold stories of the relationships, land-based practices, conflicts, and humorous encounters that shape these places. People stop at these sites while traveling along waterways in the muskegs, some that have communal bush camps, others where people build camp for short stays. This is often a time for visiting, while people sit by the fire and drink tea, share dinner, and rest after a long day of food harvesting. This ethic and practice of "sitting with," of being more still and of visiting, is something that is learned and embodied through our time on and relations with water. It is my understanding that this, too, informs Indigenous consciousness and material practices of making life in the muskegs, in that our movement always occurs alongside moments of stillness, of being in place, and of visiting. These intimate and closed-in spaces allow us to be present with kin, to be in dialogue with one another, and to care for one another amid colonial legacies and continuities. These intimate spaces are also necessary for building relationships with coresistors and new kin so that we can learn from one another and recognize the violence that has been inflicted on our communities.⁷² In these moments, we too are doing the work of growth and expansion.⁷³

The synergy between movement and stillness, or sitting with, or caring in place, was palpable during my last visits with my grandmother. During the last few years of her life, I found myself sitting by her bedside, caring for her alongside my mother and sister. There was not much time during our trips home to do much else. My research trips to Constance Lake First Nation during this time often turned into caretaking time, as family life took precedence over academic objectives and timelines. We felt the time-space compression of days slowing down and of the small room in the elders care facility in town closing in on us. But then there were moments when my grandmother shared stories with us, and time and space felt much more expansive. Many of those stories transported us to Kishiihiwan, the river she grew up on as a child and youth, and to the Kabinakagami River, where she spent her time as an adult, mother, and grandmother. She shared stories of joy, pain, and strength that flow through these river relations, and she made sure to tell us how important it was to go to these places, perhaps to create stories of our own. Our caretaking responsibilities draw us in like this, as we care for those who have cared for us and who have taught us the methodologies of making life while we simultaneously take on the responsibility to build on their visions and practices. This ebb and flow, sometimes bringing us in for intimate encounters and at other moments expanding out, are the rhythmic movements of care. They are the currents and tides we are continually navigating as we resist, adapt and create relational geographies for better worlds to come.

NOTES

1. Mishuana Goeman, *Mark My Words: Native Women Remapping our Nation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 10.
2. Laura Harjo, *Spiral to the Stars: Mvskoke Tools of Futurity* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2019), 28.
3. Michelle Daigle, "Awawanenitakik: The Spatial Politics of Recognition and Relational Geographies of Indigenous Self-Determination," *The Canadian Geographer* 60, no. 2 (2016), 259–69.
4. Harjo 2019, 14.
5. An extended mixtape in the late 1980s and early '90s would include Annie Lennox, Rod Stewart, Mariah Carey (the 1990 self-titled album and the 1991 *Emotions* album), and Janet Jackson at my and my sister's request.
6. The Sleeping Giant is a natural rock peninsula in the shape of a giant sleeping human on Lake Superior. There are Anishinaabe stories about the Sleeping Giant, including that of Nanabijou. See Tanya Talaga, *Seven Fallen Feathers: Racism, Death, and Hard Truths in a Northern City* (Toronto, Ontario: House of Anansi Press Inc., 2017), 1–3.
7. My mother was coleader of an Indigenous principalship and leadership program in Fort Frances, Ontario, and then in the Haudenosaunee community of Six Nations of the Grand River from the 1990s until 2020. The three-week summer program was administered by Seven Generations Education Institute in Treaty 3 and Six Nations Education Polytechnic, located in Six Nations.
8. For my use of constellation, see Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017). Simpson anchors her thinking on constellations within Nishinaabeg cosmologies and draws on Cree media-maker and writer Jarrett Martineau's work on affirmative refusal, as well as Stefano Harney

and Fred Moten's work on fugitivity, to reflect on how constellations of coresistance provide a flight "out of settler colonial realities into Indigeneity" (217). See Jarrett Martineau, "Creative Combat: Indigenous Art, Resurgence, and Decolonization" (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Victoria, 2015) and Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study* (New York, New York: Minor Compositions, 2013). As I have previously written with coauthor Margaret M. Ramírez, Simpson centers relationship-building across Indigenous, Black, and Brown communities and asks Indigenous peoples who we should be in constellation with in our struggles for freedom, a point I return to in the conclusion. See Michelle Daigle and Margaret Marietta Ramírez, "Decolonial Geographies." In *Keywords in Radical Geography: Antipode at Fifty* (Hoboken, New Jersey, USA: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 2019), 78–84.

9. Hudson Bay Lowlands is a vast region between the Canadian Shield and the south shores of Hudson Bay and James Bay, where approximately 85 percent of the area is muskeg or peat-forming wetlands. Part of the Hudson Bay Lowlands fall within Mushkwogowuk territory, or within the boundaries of Treaty 9, or the James Bay Agreement that was signed between the Crown and Mushkwogowuk (Cree), Anishinaabe, and Oji-Cree peoples in 1905–6 with adhesions in 1929–30. Today, Treaty 9 has forty-nine First Nation communities with a total population of approximately 45,000 registered members, living on and off reserve. Forty-three of these communities are grouped in seven tribal councils; six communities remain independent, but all forty-nine are governed by the Indigenous political regional organization, the Nishnawbe Aski Nation (commonly referred to through its acronym NAN), which represents Indigenous peoples of Treaty 9 to all levels of the Canadian government. See Michelle Daigle, "Resurging through Kishiihiwan: The Spatial Politics of Indigenous Water Relations," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society (Special Issue: Indigenous Peoples and the Politics of Water)* 7 no. 1 (2018), 159–72.

10. I first used the expression of "roots and routes" in a short contribution on rethinking political geographies to reflect on the significance of both place and movement or mobilities for Indigenous resistance and life-making practices. See Michelle Daigle, "Embodying Relational Accountability in Settler Colonial Contexts," in L. Naylor, M. Daigle, S. Zaragocin, M. Ramirez, and M. Gilmartin, *Interventions: Bringing the Decolonial to Political Geography. Political Geography* 66 (2018), 199–209. My thinking on "roots and routes" is influenced by the work of Vicente M. Diaz. See Vicente M. Diaz, "Oceania in the Plains: The Politics and Analytics of Trans-Indigenous Resurgence in Chuukese Voyaging of Dakota Lands, Waters, and Skies in *Mini Sóta Makhóche*," *Pacific Studies* 42 no. 1–2 (2019), 1–44.

11. As I detail in the next section, I use the term *futurities* instead of *futures* to denote the ways that Indigenous peoples envision, imagine, and generate knowledge on futures in addition to the practices they are embodying in the present. See Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua for a detailed discussion on the nuances and connections between the processes of (and scholarship on) Indigenous futurities, Indigenous resurgence, and futurisms: Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, "Indigenous Oceanic Futures: Challenging Settler Colonialisms and Militarization." In Linda Tuhiwai Smith (Goodyear 2019, 87), Eve Tuck, K. Wayne Yang (eds.), *Indigenous and Decolonizing. Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View* (New York, New York: Routledge, 2019): 86–87.

12. Melanie Yazzie and Cutcha Risling Baldy, "Introduction: Indigenous Peoples and the Politics of Water," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society (Special Issue: Indigenous Peoples and the Politics of Water)* 7 no. 1 (2018), 1; Goodyear-Ka'ōpua 2019, 86.

13. There is a large body of mobilities scholarship that has increasingly theorized mobilities justice. More recently, this scholarship has sought to build connections between mobilities justice and the realities of settler colonialism and Indigenous knowledge and practices of mobilities. In addition, Indigenous studies scholarship has engaged in the politics of movement and mobilities. In this piece I primarily use the language of movement, but it is important to note that mobilities scholars

differentiate between movement and mobilities. For example, Tim Cresswell writes that mobility is experienced through the body and that the use of mobilities is often in reference to displacement. That is, movement becomes mobility when it is made meaningful. See Tim Cresswell, "Toward a Politics of Mobility," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28, no. 1 (2010): 17–31. In this essay I use both terms, but mostly use *movement* as a means of underlining the double meaning of movement in regard to social movements for Indigenous decolonization, resurgence, or futurities that are shaped by a myriad of practices, include practices of mobility, and how we can think of Indigenous peoples' movement as actively creating and contributing to the visions of Indigenous futurities. Here, my thinking is shaped by the intellectual work of Rinaldo Walcott, specifically his theorization of the double meaning of movement that I clarify in more detail in the conclusion. For writings on mobilities justice, see Nancy Cook and David Butz, "Moving toward Mobility Justice." In *Mobilities, Mobility Justice, and Social Justice* (First Edition) (Routledge, 2019), 3–21; Mimi Sheller, "Theorizing Mobility Justice." In *Mobilities, Mobility Justice, and Social Justice* (First Edition) (Routledge, 2019), 22–36. For writings on mobilities justice in relation to settler colonialism and Indigenous practices of movement, see Georgine Clarsen, "Special Section on Settler-Colonial Mobilities," *Transfers* 5, no. 3 (2015), 41–48; Kyle Whyte, Jared L. Talley, and Julia D. Gibson, "Indigenous Mobility Traditions, Colonialism, and the Anthropocene," *Mobilities* 14, no. 3 (2019), 319–35; Genevieve Carpio, Natchee Blu Barnd, and Laura Barraclough, "Introduction to the Special Issue: Mobilizing Indigeneity and Race Within and Against Settler Colonialism," *Mobilities* 17, no. 2 (2022), 179–95. For writings on movement in Indigenous studies, see John Borrows, "Physical Philosophy: Mobility and Indigenous Freedom." In *Freedom and Indigenous Constitutionalism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 19–49; Goeman 2013; Vicente M. Diaz, "No Island Is an Island." In *Native Studies Keywords* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2015), 90–108; Simpson 2017; Diaz 2019; Harjo 2019.

14. Goeman 2013; Daigle 2016; My use of the term *full* to conceptualize the complexity and expansiveness of Indigenous geographies is drawn from Willie Jamaal Wright's theorization of Black geographies. See Willie Jamaal Wright, "As Above, So Below: Anti-Black Violence as Environmental Racism," *Antipode* 53, no. 3 (2021), 791–809.

15. Harjo 2019, 42.

16. I draw on feminist geographic scholarship and use the term *work* versus labor in this article to include all of the social reproductive care work and unpaid work (in addition to paid labor) that Indigenous peoples are engaged in to build Indigenous life on a daily basis. See Mitchell, Katharyne, Sallie A. Marston, and Cindi Katz, "Introduction: Life's Work: An Introduction, Review, and Critique," *Antipode* 35, no. 3 (2003), 415–42; Beverley Mullings, "Caliban, Social Reproduction, and Our Future Yet to Come.," *Geoforum* 118 (2021), 150–58.

17. Harjo 2019, 28.

18. Goeman 2013, 11.

19. Melanie Yazzie and Cutcha Risling Baldy, "Introduction: Indigenous Peoples and the Politics of Water," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society (Special Issue: Indigenous Peoples and the Politics of Water)* 7 no. 1 (2018): 1–18, 1; Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (Second Edition) (London: Zed Books, 2012). See Yazzie and Risling Baldy for an extended discussion on how research can contribute to transforming colonized realities. The authors use the language of decolonization, aligned with Linda Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999), a work that stresses the importance of consciousness-raising in processes of decolonization and how research can contribute to this cognitive transformation. As Yazzie and Risling Baldy note, Smith returns to her initial insights on decolonization in the second edition of *Decolonizing Methodologies* (2012) and considers the emancipatory potential of struggle in decolonization. This is a significant revision for Yazzie and Risling Baldy, as they state that Indigenous peoples are provided with a "cacophony of struggle" (6) through Smith's expanded theorization of

decolonization, and this cacophony of struggle carries implications for the role of research in the fight for liberation. As such, Yazzie and Risling Baldy urge Indigenous peoples and anticolonial coresistors to understand the struggle for decolonization as both “healing and consciousness raising” (7) and as a historical and material struggle “that exceed[s] the internal locus of individual healing” (2). From this premise, the authors insist that Indigenous research has a responsibility to materially transform colonized realities beyond merely contributing to consciousness raising.

20. For discussions on decolonization, see Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012); Jeff Corntassel, “Re-envisioning Resurgence: Indigenous Pathways to Decolonization and Sustainable Self-Determination,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 86–101; Nick Estes, *Our History Is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* (London: Verso, 2019). For discussions on resurgence, see Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2014); Simpson 2017; Mandee McDonald, “Theory through Hide Tanning: Resurgence and Indigenous Mobility.” In H. Dorries, M. Daigle (eds.), *Land Back: Relational Landscapes of Indigenous Resistance across the Americas* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, forthcoming). For discussions on futurities, see Karyn Recollet, “Gesturing Indigenous Futurities through the Remix,” *Dance Research Journal* 48, no. 1 (2016): 91–105; Goodyear-Ka’ōpua 2019; Harjo 2019.

21. Goodyear-Ka’ōpua 2019, 86.

22. Yazzie and Risling Baldy 2018, 2; Yazzie and Risling Baldy draw on Kim Tallbear, “Making Love and Relations beyond Settler Sexualities,” February 24, 2016, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zfd02ujRUv8>; Mishuana Goeman, “Ongoing Storms and Struggles: Gendered Violence and Resource Exploitation.” In J. Barker (Ed.), *Critically Sovereign: Indigenous Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2017), 99–126; Aileen Morton Robinson, *Talkin’ Up to the White Woman: Aboriginal Women and Feminism* (St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2000).

23. Yazzie and Risling Baldy 2018, 2. *Relationality* is a term that has been increasingly mobilized in Indigenous studies with some arguing that it has become a catch phrase used in ways that does not meaningfully apply to the materialist and political significance of Indigenous relationships. See Nicholas Anthony Brown, “Continental Land Back: Managing Mobilities and Enacting Relationalities in Indigenous Landscapes,” *Mobilities* 17, no. 2 (2022), 252–68.

24. Noelani Goodyear-Ka’ōpua 2019, 86–87.

25. Goodyear-Ka’ōpua 2019, 87. Goodyear-Ka’ōpua is drawing on Laura Harjo’s work (2019) and language of jumping scales.

26. Goeman 2017, 99–126.

27. Goeman’s conception of the “meeting place” is grounded in a scalar analysis and a careful reading of fiction writer Linda Hogan’s 1997 novel *Solar Storms* that follows three generations of Indigenous women in a town bordering Canada and the United States. The concept of the meeting place helps unpack how Indigenous relationalities become erased through colonial discourses and material processes premised on scales of difference that fix Indigenous bodies and lands vertically in colonial temporalities so that they remain static or fixed in time, and horizontally through human and nonhuman binaries that create divisions and hierarchies between the human and nonhuman world. Colonial power relies on dominant discourses that construct a reality premised on “body-contained and land-contained entities” (101), including Indigenous discourses affected by colonial framings of time and space. Drawing on feminist geographer Doreen Massey, Goeman argues that Indigenous women’s bodies are meeting places, as they are “articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings” (115). In other words, the scale of the body is not a private entity disconnected from other actors, places, and times. For a more extensive discussion on Goeman’s theorization of the

meeting place, see Pavithra Vasudevan, Margaret Marietta Ramírez, Yolanda González Mendoza, and Michelle Daigle, "Storytelling Earth and Body," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 112, no. unknown (2022), 1–17.

28. As I have written with Margaret M. Ramirez, care work is often feminized and depoliticized and understood as contributing to struggles for liberation rather than being a central component of political struggles. In contrast, Indigenous feminist and queer theories highlight how relations of caretaking are sustained through a range of work transcending what is often framed as private and intimate spaces of Indigenous life that are seemingly separate from the public and more visible spaces of Indigenous resistance. For example, visible forms of activism and direct action led by Indigenous peoples are always sustained, protected, and guided by the intimate work of cooking and feeding peoples, caring for children, cleaning camps, delivering provisions, teaching Indigenous languages, sharing stories, and resisting against heteropatriarchal and sexual violence that may arise in spaces of direct action, elucidating the multisited and multiscalar dimensions of Indigenous resistance. For writings that theorize care work, scalar politics, and the scale of Indigenous communities and life, see Sarah Hunt, "Violence, Law, and the Everyday Politics of Recognition," paper presented to the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association, Washington, DC, 2015; Sarah Hunt and Cindy Holmes, "Everyday Decolonization: Living a Decolonizing Queer Politics," *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 19, no. 2 (2015), 154–72; Gina Starblanket, "Complex Accountabilities: Deconstructing 'the Community' and Engaging Indigenous Feminist Research Methods," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 42, no. 4 (2018), 1–20; Madeline Whetung, "(En)gendering Shoreline Law: Nishnaabeg Relational Politics along the Trent Severn Waterway," *Global Environmental Politics* 19, no. 3 (2019), 16–32; Michelle Daigle and Margaret M. Ramirez, "Space." In K. W. Tompkins et al. (eds.), *Keywords for Gender and Sexuality Studies* (New York, New York: New York University Press 2021).

29. Starblanket 2018.

30. *Ibid.*, 6.

31. *Ibid.*

32. *Ibid.*, 6–7.

33. Starblanket provides a crucial reworking of relational accountability through a generous and critical engagement in Shawn Wilson's work by grounding relational accountability in the gendered politics of colonial conquest and in Indigenous feminist conceptions of community.

34. Smith 1999; Goeman 2017; Goodyear-Ka'ōpua 2019; Brown 2022; Kyle Whyte et al., 2019.

35. Goodyear-Ka'ōpua 2019, 86–87, italics mine.

36. Smith 1999, 116, italics mine.

37. Brown 2022, 7.

38. My thinking on the materiality of webs of kinship is drawn from Audra Simpson's work. Simpson writes about how "webs of kinship have to be made material through dialogue and discourse" as she conceptualizes Mohawk understandings of membership and belonging (9). Drawing on Simpson's thinking, I am referring to the ways that research can materially build webs of kinship that are part of larger processes of Indigenous futurities. See Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2014).

39. Recently, I learned from relatives in Fort Albany that there are different spellings for Kishiichiwān that exist even within the small community of Fort Albany. I am not a Cree language speaker and cannot comment further on this except to acknowledge that Kishiichiwān is the term my grandmother (who was a fluent Cree speaker and teacher) used when she spoke of the river relation that is commonly called Albany River.

40. Daigle 2018.

41. *Ibid.*, 168.

42. Daigle 2018; for example, Indigenous water relations in the muskegs evoke memories of continual movement on regional rivers to meet with relatives at the Forks for summer gatherings amid harvesting food.

43. Ibid.

44. In the early to mid-twentieth century, Indigenous men in the muskegs were seeking employment in the lumber and pulp and paper industries in addition to construction labor for infrastructural developments such as the Trans-Canada Highway and the Ontario Northland Railway. In some instances, Indigenous men such as my grandfather would work in resource extractive and infrastructural development industries during the spring and summer. They would continue independent fur-trapping labor during the winter months and they would sell their furs to fur dealers in northern cities such as North Bay, Ontario. Indigenous women's labor was not valued in these industries, although some worked intermittently in camps such as tree-planting camps as cooks and cleaners, and some also engaged in tree planting. Indigenous girls were trained in residential schools in the muskegs, such as St. Anne's Indian Residential School, to take on domestic labors such as cooking, cleaning, and sewing.

45. It is my understanding that, precolonization, some roles within Mushkegowuk communities were gendered to a certain extent, but that there was fluidity within these roles. For example, CIS men took on roles such as birth workers and CIS women were experienced trappers and hunters. See Alex Wilson's work for a more detailed discussion on gender diversity and fluidity among Cree peoples, although I also want to acknowledge that Wilson's work is rooted in Cree communities in a different region than the muskegs that I am referring to here: Alex Wilson and Marie Laing, "Queering Indigenous Education." In Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Eve Tuck, K. Wayne Yang (eds.), *Indigenous and Decolonizing. Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View* (New York, New York: Routledge, 2019), 131–145.

46. Harjo 2019, 32.

47. For example, Indigenous peoples' autonomous movement in the muskegs follows the agency of animal and plant relatives through seasonal food harvesting cycles. While this movement still happens even as people live at the sites of First Nation reserves, historically speaking, mobile living patterns were informed by seasonal harvesting cycles and shaped where people lived throughout the year.

48. My thinking on how the scale of the body builds through collective practices and actions is informed by Goeman's theorizing of Indigenous women's bodies as meeting places. As Goeman argues, Indigenous women's collective practices reimagine and recreate community and alternative futurities. See Goeman 2017.

49. Building on my earlier comments on how Indigenous movement is linked to colonial dispossession and violence, movement is tied to the loved ones Indigenous peoples lost too soon due to colonial legacies and continuities, the lack of proper infrastructure in our communities, and state brutality. As this essay came into formation, I was constantly reminded of how Indigenous movement is enmeshed in loss, mourning, and grief, in ongoing colonial violence, and yet our movement to collectively care for one another during these times is activated by ancestral values and practices that shape our communities.

50. Goeman 2017, 105.

51. My use of the term *knowledge keepers* in this paper is to refer to knowledgeable Indigenous peoples in the muskegs that are not yet considered elders. This term can be used to refer to knowledgeable people who are close in age and in their lifetime experiences to being elders, but it can also be applied to younger adults who hold various land and cultural knowledge in our communities. My use of knowledge keepers also refers to knowledgeable people in our communities who are not always perceived to be so due to addictions, not being able-bodied, the stigma of mental illness, and so on.

52. Daigle 2016.
53. Ibid. In this work I used the language of resurgence rather than futurities.
54. Today, there are a number of First Nation communities in Mushkegowuk territory who identify as Anishinaabe (formal designation of First Nation communities), and there are others who identify as Oji-Cree, including Constance Lake First Nation (CLFN).
55. Daigle 2016.
56. Daigle 2019.
57. Starblanket 2018, 3.
58. Yazzie and Risling Baldy 2018, 11.
59. Goeman 2017, 105.
60. I include kin and coresistors here to denote the time and intimacy that forms kin relations and how these relations are made beyond familial relations, beyond nationhood and Indigeneity. I include coresistors here to reflect the necessity of being in dialogue with and working with people toward anticolonial futurities even though these intimacies may not exist.
61. For works that examine Indigenous decolonization as linked to other struggles for liberation, see Simpson 2017; Glen Sean Coulthard, "A Fourth World Resurgent," *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality* by George Manuel (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018), ix–xxxiii; Melanie Yazzie, "US Imperialism and the Problem of 'Culture' in Indigenous Politics: Toward Indigenous Internationalist Feminism," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 43, no. 3 (2019), 95–117; Nick Estes, *Our History Is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* (London: Verso, 2019). From an Indigenous feminist standpoint, Yazzie states, "Indigenous internationalist feminism provides a framework for transnational Indigenous practices that seek to build counterhegemonic power with other anticolonial, anti-imperial, and anticapitalist liberation struggles, both within and outside of the United States. At the center of these practices is an ethics of relationality between humans, and also between humans and our other-than-human kin" (98).
62. Informal conversation with a CLFN community member in October 2020; At the time of submitting this essay manuscript for review, I am still locating literature and archival materials that detail the presence of Chinese laborers on the coast of James Bay.
63. 2016 and 2021 US Census Bureau data for the town of Hearst, Ontario, that borders CLFN and had a population of 4,794 in 2021, indicates an increase in immigrants from the African continent, including the Republic of the Congo, and from various parts of Asia, including the Philippines and India. General observations in Hearst over the past several years suggest that a number of immigrants from these regions are working in the service and health-care sectors. <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=POPC&Code1=0367&Geo2=PR&Code2=35&SearchText=Hearst&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&GeoLevel=PR&GeoCode=0367&TABID=1&type=0>.
64. Deborah Cowen, "Following the Infrastructures of Empire: Notes on Cities, Settler Colonialism, and Method," *Urban Geography* 41, no. 4 (2020), 469–86; Winona LaDuke, Deborah Cowen, "Beyond Wiindigo Infrastructure," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 119, no. 2 (2020), 243–68.
65. Vicente M. Diaz 2015.
66. Yazzie and Risling Baldy 2018, 2.
67. Goeman 2017, 101.
68. Rinaldo Walcott, "Black Movements: Lampedusa, Black Lives Matter, and Reorienting Freedom," American Association of Geographers—*International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* lecture (2017). <https://www.ijurr.org/news/ijurr-2017-aag-lecture-video/>.

69. Walcott 2017. For more on Walcott's theorization of Black movement, see Rinaldo Walcott, *The Long Emancipation: Moving toward Black Freedom* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2021).

70. Walcott 2021, 56.

71. Tiffany Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2019), 28. King formulates this perspective through the concept of the shoal, which relates to water and movement. The shoal is "a material, constructed, and imagined ecotonal space of becoming" (72) or a meeting place of distinct ecological zones. The shoal "is a mobile, always changing and shifting state of flux" (3) that provides the conditions for encounter, emergent formations, and "the production of a new topography" (8). King considers how Black diasporic studies has been overdetermined by rootlessness and largely metaphorized through water, while Indigenous studies has been overdetermined by rootedness fixed in imaginaries of land conceived through colonial spatialities or territorialities. In terms of Indigenous studies, she argues that there is a need to exceed the analytic of land and to think with Indigenous mobilities, migrations, and relationships with water. I want to highlight how it is my understanding that the concept of the shoal does not discard the material and metaphorical significance of water in understanding Black life, but that it provides flexibility. Similarly, while I am drawn to Indigenous water relations by centering my thinking in the muskegs, I also am seeking to build beyond thinking *only* with water relations, environments, and geographies, and to instead think of water as part of a broader set of kinship relations that shape Indigenous societies. The materiality of the muskegs also brings to bear the water, land, soil, air, and plant and animal life that shapes this place. I am drawing on Walcott and King to point toward the possibilities of creating dialogue among Indigenous, Black, and anticolonial thought that takes into account movement and water relations or the aquatic, and possible connections between King's conception of the shoal and Indigenous conceptions of the shoreline. In this piece, it was important for me to reflect on movement embodied by Indigenous women, and movement with and through water relations, and how this has shaped my research over time. However, I believe that more work is needed to bring together the intellectual work of Black, Indigenous, and anticolonial theories on movement, to be addressed in a piece I am working on as this essay is being finalized. King cites the following texts in Black diasporic literature that involve the space of the ocean: Antonio Benítez-Rojo, *The Repeating Island: The Caribbean and the Postmodern Perspective* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1996); Edward Kamau Brathwaite, *Conversations with Nathaniel Mackey* (Rhinebeck, New York: We Press, 1999); Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1993); Édouard Glissant, *Caribbean Discourse: Selected Essays* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1989); Hortense J. Spillers, "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book," *Diacritics* 17, no. 2 (1987): 64–81; Omiseéke Natasha Tinsley, "Black Atlantic, Queer Atlantic: Queer Imaginings of the Middle Passage," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 14, nos. 2–3 (2008): 191–215. For Indigenous theorizations of the shoreline, see Whetung 2019; Sarah Hunt, "Shoreline Knowledges: Practices of Unsettling the City," *The City Talks* (2022). <https://citytalks.geog.uvic.ca/section/february-17-shoreline-knowledges-practices-unsettling-city>. Finally, I want to note that it is my understanding that King's call to work against boundedness requires engagements with Black indigeneity as well.

72. Michelle Daigle, "Review of *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies* by T. Lethabo King, 2019," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* (2021).

73. Robyn Maynard and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *Rehearsals for Living* (Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf Canada, 2022); Margaret R. Ramirez, Michelle Daigle, "Storying Relations: A Method in Pursuit of Collective Liberation." In V. Lawson, S. Elwood (eds.) *Abolishing Poverty: Toward Pluriverse Futures and Politics* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2023);