Listening to the Trees:
Traditional Knowledge and Industrial Society in the American Northwoods

Aimée Cree Dunn

Adjunct Instructor
Center for Native American Studies
Northern Michigan University
1401 Presque Isle Ave.
Marquette, MI 49855
adunn@nmu.edu
(906) 227-1393

September 9, 2007
Word Count: 10,491

Listening to the Trees: Traditional Knowledge and Industrial Society in the American Northwoods

INTRODUCTION

According to anthropologist John Bodley, the Industrial Revolution in England "launched the developing Western nations on an explosive growth in population and consumption called 'progress,' which led to an unprecedented assault on the world's indigenous peoples and their resources."[1] European corporations, running low on "natural resources" after having fully exploited their own rural regions, sought resource-rich lands abroad over which they could gain political and/or economic control in order to extract those resources. Their most resistant obstacle was neither distance nor expense but rather the Indigenous peoples who called those resource-rich lands home. In attempting to gain access to the coveted resources, Western corporations and their governments were apparently willing to stop at nothing: forced removals, taxations, "human rights" missions, and even ethnocide, genocide, and, after control of the resources was secured, eventual ecocide.

Frighteningly enough, these multinational corporate horrors continue in various parts of the world today – for example, the open pit mines of Papua New Guinea, the Amazonian oil wars, the massive hydro-electric projects built throughout Cree territory in Canada, and, until recently, the deadly battles between Shell Oil and the Ogoni in Nigeria's Niger Delta. Within the United States itself, much of this continues as well.

Although many people are aware of the above, few know the details behind the industrial invasion of the northern Great Lakes area. As a land once replete with vibrant forests, rich veins of minerals, and abundantly healthy waters, American industrial society was quick to place the Northwoods in its sights and to proceed, methodically, to open it up for industrial exploitation. The tales of how this happened are told by various state-sponsored marks of interest, corporate museums, and other similar entities, and have become part of the political mythology that makes up American history. In relating the advent of corporate mining and logging in the northern Great Lakes areas, these tales are often full of the warm fuzzies, painting an image not of intent robber-barons out to make a buck off the Anishinaabeg homeland, but of resourceful and stalwart immigrants forging homes out of a howlingly forsaken northern wilderness after having "discovered" the area's rich "natural resources."

Contrary to these popular versions, however, the story of the Northwoods begins well before industrial society forced its way onto this land, and the arrival of industrialism, instead of the boon it is made out to be in this mythology, actually brought about the near-destruction of the people who had made this land home for generations, and so undermined the health of the land as to alter the Northwoods to this day. Government institutions, corporate agendas, and social engineering worked together to colonize the North for its resources and undermine the subsistence lifestyle[2] enjoyed by both the Native and non-Native rural residents who lived here.

The treaties made with the Anishinaabeg were one of the earliest manifestations of this resource colonization; they helped clear the land by removing the Anishinaabeg to small areas of reserved lands in the 1800s. This was followed by a brief but resolute attempt to relocate the Anishinaabeg in 1850 to west of the Mississippi. Later other policies (elitist, urban-biased, and frequently based on eugenicist attitudes) were used to favor a profit-based economy over subsistence economics. These policies included the emergence of game laws and rural zoning that made it difficult for both Native and non-Native northerners to continue their self-reliant lifestyle.

Today, most of us who live in the north country survive as wage-earners or for-profit farmers. Made dependent on the volatile money-based economy in this way, northern residents have a difficult time remaining on the land and often are forced to forsake the rural for more lucrative urban areas offering a greater number of jobs. As more people are economically forced to remove themselves from the land, fewer people learn traditional land-based knowledge as the years pass by, and fewer people are left to defend the North

from more industrial invasions. Like the treaties, this economics-based forced removal opens up the land for resource colonization. While it may surprise some outsiders, due to this colonization, the North is no longer the pristine wilderness many like to believe it is. And the more polluted the area becomes, the more difficult it is to maintain subsistence activities.

It does not have to be this way, however.

As a collection of knowledge that comes from intergenerational residency in the Northwoods, traditional land-based knowledge offers proven guidelines for how to interact with the community of the land. Further, inherent in this body of knowledge is the responsibility to look after the land, to be what Michigan organic farmer, Maynard Kaufman, calls "the eyes on the land." Thus not only do rural people, Native and non-Native alike, have a cultural and spiritual right to live on the land, they also have the responsibility to protect the land from that element of human society that threatens it. Rural residents are the ones who, through their very proximity, can listen to the trees, the waters, the animals, the land. From this listening comes vital questions about industrial society: What do the increasing number of dead trees lining our northern roads tell us? How do we stop the PCB-contamination of our animal relatives, the mecury poisoning of the fish? Who speaks for the deformed, three-legged frogs? How is this industrial contamination impacting the human community?

We need to listen to what the land is telling us. In turn, those who are not of the land need to listen to us. Will enough people listen in time to make the necessary changes? Only time will tell.

TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE

When the land is inhabited by people living a responsible subsistence lifestyle, it tends to stay ecologically healthy. Like much of America, the Northwoods was ecologically whole prior to European arrival. For example, Henry Schoolcraft, on an 1820 expedition with Governor Lewis Cass into northern Michigan and the Upper Peninsula, frequently remarks in his journal on the abundant richness of the northern land. Along the shores of "Saganaw Bay," some distance north of European settlement at that time, Schoolcraft comments on "the riches of the soil, and the natural beauty of the country" and on how the Ojibwe and Odawa of that area "have long enjoyed the advantages of an easy subsistence from the fine hunting grounds . . . and the abundance of fish."[3] Near present-day Oscoda, Michigan, at the "river aux Sables," Schoolcraft writes of abundant sturgeon in the river.[4] The Sault Sainte Marie area is described as a "dense forest of elm, sugar maple, ash, and pine."[5] In part this abundance was possible because of the Anishinaabeg ability to live within the land's carrying capacity – this largely came from lifestyles that were based on traditional land-based knowledge. Today this is often referred to as traditional ecological knowledge (TEK). After European contact, non-Natives in the North came to live a subsistence lifestyle both in the Northwoods and elsewhere on the American continents; some of these Euro-Americans also learned to maintain a healthy land based on traditional land-based knowledge, which, for the sake of discussion, I will refer to as traditional rural knowledge (TRK) (although this is a bit of a misnomer as the Native societies discussed in this essay are rural as well). Both TEK and TRK offer philosophies that vastly differ from the economic theories that run the world today.

Perhaps because traditional rural knowledge has a much shorter span of existence on this continent, it may be a less easily identified body of knowledge than traditional ecological knowledge. TRK strongly exists nevertheless. Further, when we discuss the TEK of the northern Great Lakes area, we can generally discuss it in terms of the traditional Anishinaabeg cultural worldview. When we discuss the TRK of the same region, however, it is more difficult to discuss it within one cultural paradigm. Without a well-established and cohesive cultural base, TRK can seem fragmented and vague at times, yet there are certain general rural cultural attitudes that are common enough to the non-Native rural experience to form the basis of TRK. Generally speaking, TRK is based on the following principles:

1. the right to live on healthy land
2. the right to be self-reliant
3. the right of families to land that is of a sufficient size to provide physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual sustenance for one's family as well as the right to hunt, fish, and gather on land not already claimed by other families (i.e. lands belonging to corporations, absentee landlords, and the state)
4. the obligation to be a responsible caretaker within one's own human community and within the community of the land
5. honoring time-tested methods of accomplishing various activities (e.g. canning, farming, hunting)
6. the right to freedom from extensive governmental interference with all of the above.

With land a person can provide for the needs of one's family and can survive even when the larger society is having difficulty. Further, for many TRK-people, taking away their land is like taking away their soul.

TEK, of course, also has this strong connection to the land as its basis. TEK creates a human relationship with the land that comes from providing for one's family and community from the land following TEK guidelines. The primary principles guiding one's participation in this relationship are respect, reciprocity, and generosity both within one's human community and within the community of the land. That is, the TEK relationship asks its participants to provide for their family and community in a manner that

1. looks out for all one's relations: if someone cannot procure sustenance on their own, provide it for them; if an animal or plant is no longer abundant in numbers, leave it alone
2. honors the plant and animal whose life is taken in order that you and yours may continue to live
3. respects the right of plants and animals to live their lives in a good and healthy environment
4. honors the future by protecting the earth today
5. shares unstintingly without resentment and gives back when something is taken
6. recognizes the spiritual and cultural right of all to participate in the community of the land

The late activist-scholar-philosopher, John Mohawk, calls this the "subsistence paradigm." For him, this paradigm is not about economics at all. Instead, he says, "[i]t's a cultural, spiritual, social exchange that's intended to go on for generations . . . it's the most *moral* relationship with nature that humans have ever devised."[6]

When a society is based on the subsistence paradigm, emphasis is placed on a healthy land. When a society is based on an industrial economy, however, whether capitalist, communist or socialist, emphasis is placed on extracting resources. As Mohawk writes,

> Let's say you have three people who approach a tree. One's a *socialist* materialist, one's a *capitalist* materialist and one's a traditional native person. The capitalist materialist will explain to you that he has to cut the tree down because this is in the best interest, not only of himself but also of society; that it is a kind of destiny; that by cutting the tree down, he will rationally distribute the materials from the tree and he'll do the most good for the people. A socialist person approaching the tree will also tell you to cut the tree down, because after cutting the tree down you can distribute it equally to everybody and it's going to do the most good for the world that way. But a native person looking at the tree will say that the tree, in its unharmed, original form, has a value that's far greater than anything the others are proposing. . . . The materialist argument boils down to who can make the best argument about the best, fastest and most efficient use of the world's resources. . . . If we think that way, then we're just caught in the socialist versus capitalist paradigm. But we want to have a different kind of discussion; we want to talk about "subsistence."[7]

The problem in the north country is that this materialist paradigm invaded and colonized the Northwoods. As part of this invasion, it deliberately gutted the North's subsistence-based societies in the name of profit and so-called industrial progress. This had a two-fold effect on the subsistence cultures, an effect that is found nearly everywhere on the planet where industrial society seeks to extract resources from rural/Indigenous lands:

1. it makes self-sufficiency difficult, if not impossible, through economic pressures, environmental destruction, and the incorporation of the formerly self-sufficient people into the industrial economy as wage-workers, and
2. a feedback loop develops where the formerly self-sufficient people become less self- sufficient with their increasing dependency on wage-work – the more wage-work, the less self- sufficiency. The less time devoted to the subsistence activities of a self-reliant lifestyle, the less opportunities there are to maintain and/or learn traditional land-based knowledge. As a result, over the years, and particularly over the generations, people begin to lose TEK/TRK and, in the process, lose the knowledge and the values they need to combat the further industrialization of the land.

Anthropologist John Bodley writes, "small-scale cultures [like rural/Indigenous societies] represent a rejection of the materialistic values of the global [industrial] culture. Yet, individuals can be made to reject their traditional values if outside interests create the necessary conditions for this rejection."[8] Thus, handily for industrialism, through its resource colonization industrial society not only undermines those cultures that stand in opposition to it but also absorbs and transforms the members of those cultures, converting them into more fodder for the industrial machine and its accompanying economy of over-consumption. The "industrialization process," Bodley writes, "disempowered millions, driving formerly self-sufficient rural peoples to a precarious and dependent existence in the cities."[9]

How, then, did this "industrialization process" unfold in the Northwoods?

INDUSTRIAL POLICIES SHAPING THE AMERICAN NORTHWOODS

Not long after the Northwoods came under the domain of the United States, it came under American plans for industrial expansion. While Europeans had economically invaded the North well before this through the fur trade, the industrial invasion did not begin in full force until the early part of the nineteenth century. The fur trade subtly hooked many Native people into European economics and made them consumers of European trade goods. It could be argued that this began the initial breakdown of the economic self-sufficiency found in traditional subsistence lifestyles. However, trade in the Americas had been ongoing for millennia, and most Native societies, unless preyed upon by a particularly nefarious trader, adapted, in general, to the influx of European goods without disrupting the overall pattern and essence of their traditional subsistence lifestyles. This changed, however, when the American government and corporations developed a keen interest in the "resource-rich" Northwoods.

Treaties & Removal

From the early 1800s, it was obvious that the United States was greatly interested in the minerals found on Anishinaabeg land. For example, in 1819/1820, Governor Lewis Cass of Michigan Territory made an expedition to the Upper Peninsula. One of his primary goals was to assess the mineral wealth of the region. To do this, Cass took along a mineralogist, Henry Schoolcraft.[10] On this expedition, as written in his journal, Schoolcraft found indications of a great deal of the "natural resources" they sought: iron ore near Marquette, copper along the Ontonagon River, seemingly endless forests – everything they had hoped for.

The two primary goals of the treaties urged on the Anishinaabeg by the United States were first to gain access to the minerals on Anishinaabeg land and later for the U.S. to gain the land itself. For example, the treaty made between the U.S. and the Ojibwe in 1826 only grants the U.S. "the right to search for, and carry away, any metals or minerals from any part of their country."[11]

This access was "not to affect the title of the land, nor the existing jurisdiction over it."[12] As early as 1828, however, the Green Bay treaty "allowed [the U.S.] access to lead mines in Illinois and Wisconsin" and relinquished Native jurisdiction over those mines.[13] By the 1842 treaty signing, historian Mark Keller writes, "[t]he stated policy was to buy title to the land, then remove the tribes. . . . Discovery of iron ore and copper in the Keweenaw Peninsula created a desire to obtain these lands . . . Timber and mining interests were eager to establish claims."[14] Aside from ceding land to the U.S., the 1842 treaty paved the way for the legal means of completely removing the Anishinaabeg from the resource-rich Northwoods. The 1842 treaty states, "The Indians *residing on the Mineral District*, shall be subject to removal therefrom at the pleasure of the United States."[15]

In 1850, the United States found it to its "pleasure" to issue a removal order, calling for the removal of the Ojibwe to lands west of the Mississippi River. This removal resulted in the tragic 1850 Sandy Lake Death March. As Keller writes, "When the government learned the Chippewa refused to leave their ceded lands, it closed the Indian Agency at LaPointe[, Wisconsin], and stopped making annuity payments there. A new site for an agency, Sandy Lake in Minnesota on the Mississippi, was chosen."[16] Anyone who wished to obtain their annuity payment was required to travel to the Mississippi agency at Sandy Lake; those who did not would not receive the annuity payment.[17] In this way, the U.S. government hoped to induce the Anishinaabeg of the Upper Peninsula and northern Wisconsin to move to these lands west of the Mississippi River leaving their traditional land open to industrial exploitation. Over 400 people died as a result of this policy.[18]

The attempted removal was unsuccessful, however. After the tragedy of Sandy Lake, a delegation of Anishinaabeg leaders went to Washington in 1852 to meet with President Fillmore, gathering petition signatures from Natives and non-Natives alike along the way, particularly from small businessmen who appreciated the influx of money provided by the annuity payments.[19] They explained that "[n]one had understood the agreement to give up their lands, and all understood they would never be asked to leave their lands as long as they kept the peace."[20] After consideration, President Fillmore canceled the 1850 removal order and agreed that annuity payments would be made at LaPointe in the future.

The Anishinaabeg managed to resist complete removal from the land they had lived on for generations. The treaties of 1837, 1842, and 1854, however, removed the Anishinaabeg from much of their traditional land in the Northwoods, confining their land claims to small reserved areas. Some, such as the people around the Sault Sainte Marie area, were not even left with reservation lands. Victims of the government's attempts to make the Anishinaabeg into Euro-American-style farmers, the Anishinaabeg around the Sault were apportioned individual allotments instead of a contiguous area of land recognized as a reservation.[21] Most of the Anishinaabeg bands eventually would lose even more land during the allotment era.

Game Laws

When the Anishinaabeg ceded the vast majority of their traditional lands in the 1800s and settled on reservations, confinement to a massively decreased land-base could have quickly destroyed the traditional subsistence lifestyle this society had developed over centuries in the north. However, many of the Anishinaabeg treaty signers reserved their people's rights to provide for their family and community by hunting, fishing, and gathering on the ceded territories. These "treaty rights" were (and continue to be) essential to the maintenance of the Anishinaabeg culture, TEK, and often an individual's physical survival.

By the early 1900s, however, the Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota state governments stopped recognizing the Anishinaabeg subsistence rights and began arresting and fining those who violated the newly developed state game laws. "Then came the laws to control the fishing, the hunting, the trapping, even on the reservation lands," writes Anishinaabe storyteller Ignatia Broker of the turn of the twentieth century.[22] She goes on to say, "The Ojibway, however, continued to net fish and hunt deer as they had always done . . . [They] still laid nets for the fish and pulled them in early in the

morning. But they had to clean, salt, and dry their catch inside their house instead of in the outdoor ovens, so the man who enforced the laws against using nets would not know."[23]

Other Anishinaabeg authors tell of similar predicaments. Jim Northrup writes of three "Shinnobs" from Minnesota near the turn of the twenty-first century discussing their treaty rights, at the time still considered illegal by the state of Minesota:

> "They said we'd get arrested if we go spearing off the rez," said Tuna Charlie.
>
> "Who is going to arrest us for using our treaty rights?" asked Luke.
>
> "Either the rez game wardens or those from the state," answered Sonny Sky.[24]

Later, Northrup highlights the situation with humor: "The daylight was used up as they drove down the backroads. They doubled back a few times to make sure they weren't being followed. It sure is hard to sneak around with a canoe on top of the car, Luke thought."[25]

While parallels are rarely drawn between the two groups, non-Native ruralites of the Northwoods underwent an experience with game laws similar to the Anishinaabeg experience. From the arrival of the first French voyageurs in the Northwoods several centuries ago, most non-Natives who moved to the northern Great Lakes area came to depend on hunting and fishing as their primary means of providing for their sustenance needs. Hunting and fishing, often along with subsistence farming, made the non-Native northerner an independent, self-reliant person, the kind governments found difficult to control, something often lamented in frontier situations.

Quite a few of these non-Native northerners, particularly the French, intermarried with the Anishinaabeg. These mixed-blood ("metís" if of French descent) families were important to Native communities. This is frequently noted in the transcripts of Indian communiqués during the treaty negotiations. Concerns that "our mixed-blood brothers" would be fairly dealt with in treaty deals were often expressed. Unfortunately, the U.S. did not treat with the mixed-bloods or consider them truly Indian, so many mixed-blood families, despite the work of their Native friends and families, were left to fend for themselves. One way they were able to do this was through continuing their subsistence lifestyle of living from the land.

Mixed-bloods and non-Native settlers often chose subsistence lifestyles as hunters, fishers, trappers, gatherers, and/or farmers. These activities directly provided food for themselves and their families. Some combined this with selling meat, fur and harvested plants in order not to make a profit but to make enough to provide for the cash needs of one's family. Consequently, when the northern states developed game laws in the early 1900s, these mixed-bloods and non-Native settlers faced a predicament similar to the Anishinaabeg: if they could not hunt and fish as needed, how were they to provide for themselves?

In such circumstances, the rural residents of the north, across ethnic boundaries, often suffered extreme economic hardship. As a result, many had to seek wage-work in order to buy the food they could have previously provided for themselves. Conveniently enough for the industries invading the North, many of these northerners turned to wage-work in the mining or timber industries as a means to providing for themselves and their families. Some tried their hand at for-profit farming, often failing miserably on cutover lands with poor soil and a short growing season that could not produce an adequate cash income. Others left for more lucrative urban areas.

The tragedy of these game laws is that, while they were derived from laudable preservation-oriented values emerging from the non-Native conservation movement, the enactment of these laws was a means to promoting yet another industry, the recreation/tourism industry, at the expense of the northern subsistence lifestyle. This meant that those who were in the lower economic classes and who, through their very way of life, had an intimate knowledge and connection to the land were crudely sacrificed for the sake of the interests of outsiders from the upper economic classes who made the land a hobby rather than a lifestyle.

Much of these game laws came on the books as a result of the then-popular idea that tourism should win out over subsistence

activities because there was money to be had in tourism. As one prominent social engineer wrote, "These forests will 'pay' even if not a stick of timber is sold from them."[26] Further, he said, "[p]eople are more and more willing to pay taxes to maintain land for the sole purpose of affording pleasure and *re*-creation of mind and body so sorely needed in a modern high tension civilization."[27] "Every acre," writes historian James Kates, "would yield some sort of benefit, whether in the form of timber, tourist dollars, or simply a breath of pine-scented air."[28] Thus, the recreation industry would contribute to the economic growth of the nation while subsistence hunting and fishing would do nothing to further the economic goals of the United States.

As the size of the nation's urban population increased, so too did the recreation industry. Non-rural people sought solace, strength, and an enjoyable excursion in rural-wilderness areas like the Northwoods. As Kates writes, "In tune with the forest-recreation movement, planners eventually would recognize the value of facilitating a sort of playacting in the forest – with camping, hiking, and other pursuits serving to refresh vacationing urbanites and to provide a touchstone to [a] bygone frontier experience."[29] Business interests and sportsmen in particular grew concerned about the health of game populations. In order to preserve these populations, not for the animals' sake but for the recreation industry's sake, regulations and the bureaucracy to enforce these regulations came into being. "Management, it seemed, could make the animal kingdom continuously productive," writes Kates.[30]

As the conservation movement gained power in the early 1900s, residents of the Northwoods who violated the new game laws were repeatedly arrested by the Department of Conservation (later the Department of Natural Resources). Their equipment was often confiscated. Their harvest taken away. Fines and possible jail time were given as punishment. Sometimes, these northerners were set against each other, neighbor against neighbor. For example, the Bay Mills Indian Community faced armed white vigilante groups as well as DNR game wardens on the shores of Lake Superior as they exercised their longtime netting tradition.[31]

In the decades to come, and after a very hard struggle, the Anishinaabeg had their subsistence treaty rights re-recognized. Treaty rights were finally affirmed in the 1970s for several Ojibwe and Odawa tribes in Michigan. In Wisconsin, the 1983 *Voigt* decision upheld Ojibwe off-reservation subsistence rights as reserved in the treaties. It wasn't until 1999 that the *Mille Lacs* decision was handed down affirming Ojibwe treaty rights on the ceded territories in Minnesota.

The recognition of Ojibwe treaty rights to hunt, fish, and gather on ceded territory has helped in the revitalization of Ojibwe identity and culture including the increased interest in understanding traditional Ojibwe ecological knowledge. While the hunting and fishing on ceded territory persevered even in the decades it was illegal, it was an expensive and sometimes even dangerous proposition if an Ojibwe person was caught by the DNR or a vigilante. Legal recognition of these reserved rights has helped many low-income Ojibwe families provide for their families and communities.[32]

Mixed-bloods and non-Natives from low-income families, who could be greatly helped by subsistence rights, have yet to have their right to make a subsistence living from the land recognized.[33] As a result, some northern families today are forced into poaching in order to feed their families. They continue to face the economic hardship of breaking the law to provide for one's family but do not, usually, face danger (although game wardens have been known to draw guns on their quarry). The largest obstacle these people face is an increasingly urbanizing world that does not understand, much less have sympathy for, the low-income need for subsistence rights.

Rural Zoning

The treaties of the 1800s worked for the United States to gain access to and essentially clear the land for the mining and timber industries, and, in the process, undermined the traditional subsistence lifestyle of the Anishinaabeg. The game laws at the turn of the twentieth century were designed to further the goals of the recreation industry, and, in the process, undermined the subsistence

lifestyles of Native, mixed-blood, and non-Native northerners alike. The rural zoning movement in the early 1900s was yet another assault on northern subsistence rights designed by urban university experts. Again these experts sought to promote and protect profitable industries like the timber, agribusiness, and recreation industries and were deliberately intent on eradicating the northerner's subsistence lifestyle, particularly subsistence farming.

While rural zoning was meant primarily to cut down on municipal costs, its priorities included removing people from those areas the social engineers had designated for timber, agribusiness, and recreational use. For example, in 1936, George Wehrwein, one of the social engineers who had great influence with his colleagues and thus on the shaping of the Northwoods, wrote that the relocation of those families ("nonconforming users" he called them) "living in the [newly established] restricted districts, i.e., the forestry and recreation zones" of Wisconsin "is even more urgent than the resettlement" of "isolated settlers" residing outside of the restricted zones.[34] In 1919, P.S. Lovejoy, another urban university expert who was highly influential in shaping the Northwoods, wrote that land-use policies needed to be formulated and should be based on dividing the land into either farmland or lands for the forest industry.[35] Two questions would determine the designations of land, he said: "1. Is it being *profitably farmed* now? 2. Is it a reasonable presumption that it will be *profitably farmed* within the period required for a forest rotation on the site?"[36] "It does not pay to work land which it does not pay to work," he wrote,[37] dismissing the north's versatile subsistence lifestyles. However, it was not enough for Lovejoy simply to farm profitably. He states, "the *maximum economic development* can only come *with the development of all the land*. . . . No island of farms, however rich, if surrounded by barrens or pauper ranches can ever be so prosperous as the farm area surrounded by well managed forest."[38] In other words, all of the land was to be used as a means to generating profit.

Further, according to other influential land-planners Richard Ely and Edward W. Morehouse in 1924, "[S]elf-sufficing agriculture is a relic of the past that can be found only in out-of-the-way corners of America."[39] This was precisely what they wanted to see happen. "A crop *which will not pay for itself with a fair profit* is not worth putting into the ground, and the soil should be put to some other use which will pay for itself," Ely and Morehouse wrote.[40]

According to Kates, in 1939 the *Reader's Digest* printed an article praising Wisconsin's rural zoning laws: "They declared that the existence of submarginal farms [i.e. ones that weren't oriented toward making a profit] had led to countless social 'evils,' including wasted effort and welfare dependence . . . zoning had allowed communities to 'control the land use for the greatest common good.'"[41]

Thus farmers who were unable to turn a profit were either required or strongly encouraged to leave their farms. The fact that farming may have been a way of life, a means of providing one's subsistence without reliance on a cash economy, did not matter. Wehrwein writes, "In spite of the arguments which can be brought to support the self-sufficing and peasant type of agriculture, I believe the goal we should set for American agriculture is the typical farm of the corn belt."[42] He more specifically describes this vision of his when he writes,

> The nation was on the path to the proper balance between the city and the country during the middle 1920's when the area in farms and then number of people on farms were decreasing rapidly. The trend was toward concentration of agriculture on the better lands, and with greater mechanization, a higher income per man. Had the trend continued instead of the 'flight to the land' after 1929, the goal of reducing the farm plant to 3½ to 4 million farmers might eventually have been reached.[43]

This attitude perfectly reflected the goals of twentieth century rural planning policies, goals that continue even into today. These policies deliberately facilitated people's removal from wilder areas and actively encouraged migrations to the towns or urban areas. As Wehrwein wrote, "Zoning without relocation is a job half done."[44] Further, he said,

> Instead of looking upon the city as the enemy of agriculture, I believe that the best form of farm relief would be a vigorous urban and industrial civilization and believe that the goal of a land policy should be the stimulation of industry, commerce and export trade . . . This would mean not only a market for the products of the farm but also a place for the surplus youth of the rural areas . . . What should worry us is not that farm children move to town but that they are inadequately prepared for a place of responsibility in the city.[45]

In other words, urban-based social engineers like Wehrwein felt that people should be encouraged to forsake the land for the urban world. This is a perfect example of ethnocentrism, although few may recognize it as such because contemporary American society still tends to view traditional rural culture as somehow backward and needing to move forward into "modern times."

Wehrwein also writes that the purpose of rural zoning was "a means of preventing scattered settlement" and "[o]nly with the more or less complete relocation of isolated settlers will the cost of government be reduced."[46] Wehrwein placed the government's ability to balance a budget over the spiritual, cultural, and physical sustenance needs of the "isolated settler." Keeping down "the attendant costs for schools, roads, and other public services" became his priority,[47] disregarding the fact that the "isolated settlers" may have preferred to keep their isolation rather than receive such amenities as maintained roads and schooling. However, these isolated residences were a problem for Wehrwein and other social engineers for reasons other than pecuniary ones. To fully understand the social engineering of the time, we need to look at the engineers' attitudes toward ruralites.

ANTI-RURAL ATTITUDES AMONG THE SOCIAL ENGINEERS

Issues of control and blatant anti-rural bias played a large role in the minds of regional planners of the 1920s and 1930s. Denigration of the rural/wild was common among these urban experts. Lovejoy wrote in 1919 that "[t]he mossback point of view is a very potent force in the politics of most of our states and especially in the more backward ones."[48] According to Kates, Wehrwein simply felt that "living in the woods was fundamentally illogical."[49] He also worried that isolated settlers would be "tempted by their isolation to violate game laws"[50] thus flaunting governmental control and interfering with the goals of the recreation industry. Further, in tones reminiscent of British author Joseph Conrad, according to Kates, Wehrwein also feared that "without neighbors to watch over them, people in the forest might revert to a sort of savagery, bereft of any standards of morality or cleanliness."[51]

These attitudes are directly related to the European perception of Native Americans as savages. Rather than being bloodthirsty and cruel, however, as the standard definition of "savage" was perceived, those who lived in rural areas were seen as backward and in need of "proper" (i.e. urban) education or as outright "undesirables" who were believed to have no place in modern American society. Such attitudes applied to all cash-poor people, regardless of ethnicity, who lived in the woods and could ill-afford to profligately participate in the money-based economy. From these anti-rural attitudes grew policies that attempted to shape the Northwoods into a profitable contributor to the nation's industrial economy.

Recreation consumers themselves also carried negative stereotypes of ruralites, and these recreationists often worked to promote favorable conditions for sportsmen over the needs of the low-income subsistence hunters and fishers who lived in the north and whose homeland these sportsmen recreated in. In the early 1900s, the Izaak Walton League was one of the most powerful organizations promoting the recreation industry. The League's mission was to perpetuate, through regulations and game re-stocking programs, "the conditions under which fish and game lived, and thus to increase the sporting opportunities for anglers and hunters."[52] The intent of these Waltonians, as they were called, was to "promote the sort of outdoor experiences that had defined the American character in the nineteenth century."[53] That is, game regulation was intended to provide sportsmen with a simulated frontier experience. It would

act as a proving ground for manhood, a source of romantic adventure found in battling the challenges of a (planned) wilderness.

This sort of ideology, however, had serious consequences for those who, living in the wild North, hunted and fished in order to survive. There was no room for these folks in the new sportsmen's order of things. As Kates writes, sportsmen "sought to transform the calculus of fish and game, away from the animals' subsistence value as meat and in favor of the sporting experience inherent in the take of wild creatures."[54] The restrictions placed on hunting and fishing came from sportsmen "who embraced the English model of gentlemanly conduct afield."[55] Subsistence hunting and fishing were not refined enough for these "gentlemen" as subsistence activities were seen as common and thus vulgar, lowly pursuits. This can be seen in a cartoon, distributed in 1927 by the Izaak Walton League. Kates describes this image:

> It showed a group of Waltonian men, respectable in appearance, standing with the ghost of Izaak Walton at the edge of a forest. Arrayed against them was a rabble of thuggish-looking characters whose labels included "Bad Sportsmanship," "Poacher," and "Game Hog." Tellingly, the Waltonians were excluding the undesirables by building a brick wall around the woods.[56]

Subsistence hunting and fishing ("poaching") was somehow ungentlemanly, beneath contempt, but sportshunting and fishing (that is, killing for fun, not out of necessity) was laudable provided one "restocked" the "game" when one was through.

Contempt for low-income rural culture such as that found with the Waltonians and the anti-rural attitudes of Wehrwein and Lovejoy takes on a sinister and dangerous twist when one examines their writings closer. The frightening truth emerges that these urban-based experts actually harbored a rather nasty view of the people whose lives they would so profoundly impact. Relocating settlers out of the woods and nearer to town, encouraging urban flight, developing policies to promote industrialization of the North, attempting to eradicate subsistence living, all of these policies came from a deep-seated eugenics-inspired Spencerianism, a paradigm quite popular in America in the early half of the twentieth century, echoes of which can still be heard throughout university halls today.

"When it comes to resettling an entire community," Wehrwein wrote, "it will be found that there is not only submarginal land but there are also submarginal people."[57] In fact, he believed, along with Ely and others, as Kates writes "that both peoples and soils could be rank-ordered as to their fitness for agriculture."[58] Those who were "fit" for the soil were to be encouraged to enter the agricultural realm. Ely and Morehouse strongly advocated for selecting settlers "with the intelligence necessary to grasp farm problems, and at least a small amount of capital with which to start."[59] One government official in Wisconsin's Douglas County in 1934 referred to families who were squatting on land as "more or less undesirable and shiftless."[60] To support his own views, Wehrwein reported an observer as saying the settlers in the cut-over area were "the result of generations of eugenic carelessness, they lack the fiber to do anything for themselves . . . The way they live is bound to breed degenerates."[61] In a personal letter in 1922, Lovejoy wrote to another forester that if the Northwoods was not subjected to stiff management, it would continue "breeding paupers and morons and fires."[62] This sort of thinking perfectly reflected the eugenics mores of the time.

The terms themselves were also used by the American eugenicist movement during this era. Poverty, the American eugenicists believed, was genetic, and to prevent the spread of "bad" genes to future generations, "paupers and morons" as well as other "undesirables" and "degenerates" should be forcibly sterilized. Recently there have been some reports on the forced sterilizations of Native American women in this country. They were victims of the eugenicists' racist and classist visions. Their non-Native rural neighbors with lower incomes were often victims as well. In Michigan alone, 2145 people were forcibly sterilized between 1907 and 1940.[63]

Like the term "savage," these perceptions of lower income Northwoods residents, Native, mixed-blood, and non-Native, were

indicative of an extreme racism and classism on the part of these urban experts. These experts were not quacks with small followings, however. Rather, they were highly respected for their work. The Wisconsin Historical Society describes Wehrwein as "[w]idely known as an expert in land utilization, rural zoning, soil conservation, forest taxation, and public land management."[64] Further, the highly regarded conservationist author, Aldo Leopold, wrote Lovejoy's obituary. In it he celebrates his friend's life in many ways including offering up his favorite Lovejoy witticisms including the term "carrying capacity." In discussing this term, "[t]he ultimate question," Leopold quotes directly from one of Lovejoy's letters, "is not how to step up human carrying capacities per habitat but what sort of humans we want to have around at all."[65] From perspectives such as these grew land policies that not only ignored the right of people to live off the land in subsistence lifestyles but actually set out to destroy those subsistence lifestyles and, in its place, encouraged an industrial use of the land for profit.

What, then, have been the long-term effects of this industrialization of the northland?

ECOLOGICAL HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN NORTHWOODS IN MODERN TIMES

Governmental policies intent on industrializing the North, the subsequent corporate practices employed here, and the social engineering schemes to ensure the Northwoods became a profit-producing part of the American industrial economy have exacted their toll on the land. This toll is paid heavily by the plant, animal, and human communities that make up the Northwoods today.

Wildlife

Wisconsin environmental activist/sociologist Al Gedicks writes, "The Chippewa, along with the other Indian nations in northern Wisconsin, already suffer a disproportionate environmental risk of illness and other health problems from eating fish, deer, and other wildlife contaminated with industrial pollutants like airborne polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury, and other toxins deposited on land and water."[66] According to former Lac Courte Oreilles tribal chair Gaiashkibos, "I hear the Great Lakes is one of the seven wonders of the world. You can't drink the water out of Lake Superior. There's young children that will never be able to taste the fish out of those lakes. There's advisories that women of childbearing age and pregnant mothers cannot consume certain species of fish out of the Great Lakes."[67]

Until the advent of industrialization, the Anishinaabeg and other rural northerners did not have to worry about mercury, PCBs or other such industrial contaminants in the fish. However, "[s]ince 1982, the DNR has tested 700 of the [Wisconsin's] 15,000 lakes [for mercury-contaminated fish]; usually one out of the three lakes makes it on the advisory list," wrote Gedicks back in 1993.[68] The mercury and other heavy metal pollution "gets worse every year, as it is cumulative," writes LaDuke.[69] Anishinaabe activist Walt Bresette was very upset about this; "I refuse to eat the fish and I refuse to let my family eat the fish because of the toxins," he said.[70] "You may be surprised to know," writes LaDuke in 1999, "that almost every lake in northern Minnesota has a Fish Consumption Advisory for it. You can only eat one walleye per week or month if you are a woman of childbearing age in many of those lakes because of PCBs or mercury."[71] In recent years, the numbers of mercury-contaminated lakes has risen drastically in all three of the northern Great Lakes states.

"Virtually all the mercury in these [Wisconsin] lakes comes from the sky," says DNR scientist Carl Watras.[72] Gedicks writes, "The major sources of the mercury in rain and snow are latex paints and emissions from coal power plants. [Further, i]n the upper peninsula of Michigan, the White Pine copper mine and smelter [was] sued by the National Wildlife Federation and the Michigan United Conservation Clubs for emitting mercury, lead, and arsenic over the waters of nearby Lake Superior at five times the legal limit."[73]

General Chemical Contamination

If mercury contamination is not enough, around the year 2000, "[f]ish from Lake Michigan show[ed] levels of dioxin more than 100,000 times higher than the surrounding water, plants and sediment," writes LaDuke, adding, "The pulp and paper industry ranks as the leading source of dioxin exposure to the public—a direct consequence of the use of chlorine bleaching in their processes."[74] The Environmental Protection Agency considers dioxin "the most potent carcinogen ever tested in a laboratory," according to LaDuke.[75] In addition, dioxin is a bio-accumulator, meaning it is a fat-soluble chemical found in greater concentrations higher up the food chain.[76] As human beings are at the top of the food chain in most areas, this is of major concern to our own species. Northern Minnesota and Wisconsin as well as the Upper Peninsula of Michigan are home to several paper mills including mills in Duluth, Minnesota; Rhinelander, Wisconsin; and in Michigan in Quinnesec, Escanaba, and on the old K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base near Marquette, Michigan. According to LaDuke, "If you live in the Great Lakes region, your body burden of dioxin may be two to three times greater than that of someone living on the West Coast. Both weather patterns and clustering of Chemical plants produce this additional exposure."[77]

While the North battles mercury and dioxin, other forms of industrial pollution also continue to crop up. Most recently, in August 2007, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was called in to handle dangerous lead levels in Torch Lake near Lake Linden, Michigan on the Keweenaw Peninsula.[78] The EPA On-Site Coordinator, Brian Kelly, said it was "an urgent problem" as the "extremely high levels of lead" were 200 times higher than acceptable levels.[79] Torch Lake is home to several Superfund Sites[80] produced by the copper mining and related activities that took place in the area from the 1890s to 1969.[81] These activities dumped approximately "200 million tons of copper mill tailings" into Torch Lake where it is believed the contaminated sediments reach up to seventy feet in thickness in some areas of the lake.[82]

Further south on the Keweenaw Peninsula, "billions of pounds of stamp sand waste was deposited into Keweenaw Bay" along a beach belonging to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (KBIC) near Baraga, Michigan.[83] These waters are traditional fishing and recreation waters for the Ojibwe. A 2000-2001 study by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers found that six billion pounds of stamp sand had been deposited both above and below the water along KBIC's Sand Point shoreline.[84] The stamp sands came from a copper ore processing plant some four miles up the bay that had operated in the early 1900s.[85] While KBIC took it upon itself to do what it could to clean up the brownfield by covering the thirty-five acres of stamp sands with clean soil,[86] the contaminants, essentially pushed under a rug, appear to be here to stay, yet another lingering effect of the industrial colonization of the American Northwoods.

Wild Rice

Wild rice is a major cultural as well as subsistence staple for the Ojibwe. Today, however, industrial chemical pollution, the tourist industry, and the genetics industry threaten the survival of wild rice. As Thomas Vennum writes, wild rice "does not tolerate chemical pollutants" and is highly sensitive to water levels.[87] "It used to be you would get lost in the rice on that lake [Big Rice Lake, Minnesota]," says Russell Warren, a ricer for twenty years, "They used to have to put flags up at the landings, so you could find your way back. It's the fertilizer [from agricultural operations], and the runoff, that ruins the crop."[88] One Anishinaabe man from Wisconsin, Paul Buffalo, also "suggest[s] that artificial fertilizers (runoff from nearby farms) and a decline in the quality of the air have been responsible for less bounteous crops today" in his area of the northwoods.[89]

Others point to the tourism industry as an additional cause in the decline of the wild rice. Anne M. Dunn, Anishinaabe elder and storyteller, in describing a walk she took one day briefly mentions "[w]ild rice stalks that have somehow *survived the heavy motor traffic."*[90] Vennum writes, "In recent years the rice crop has shown signs of deterioration, and the increase of motorboat traffic, mostly by non-Indians fishing for sport in the sloughs, has been suspected as one culprit. . . . Excessive boat speeds can effect wake damage to the

wild rice plant, to say nothing of water pollution by gasoline engines."[91] Vennum further cites incidents where non-locals, who bought vacation homes on the shores of wild rice lakes, "frequently weeded out the rice and prevented Indians from harvesting" so that they, the vacationers, could sportfish, motorboat, and waterski to their heart's content.[92]

Additionally, wild rice now faces the threat of bio-piracy or genetic research and the subsequent corporate patenting of life-forms as discussed by LaDuke in this volume. Former Lac du Flambeau tribal chair, Tom Maulson, offers this advice: "Mother Nature handles her own reproduction and we shouldn't try to fool her. I think Indian people understand that better than the scientists who are doing this work. Don't mess with Mother Nature."[93]

The Forests

While the wild rice of the northern forests is under siege from industrial society, so too are the northern forests themselves. The Anishinaabeg are of the forest. They have been part of the forest community for hundreds of years. "[O]ur roots are in the land of the forests," writes Ojibwe storyteller Ignatia Broker, "[t]he trees are the glory of the Gitchi Manito."[94] "We, the Anishinaabeg, are a forest people, meaning that our creation stories, instructions, and culture, our way of life are entirely based in the forest, from our medicine plants to our food sources, from forest animals to our birchbark baskets," says LaDuke.[95]

Continuing this forest culture can be very difficult in today's industrially-impacted north. "Sometimes, it takes tribal members days, or even months, of walking through the woods examining birch trees before finding the right tree. The variety of birch bark seems to be declining considerably," writes Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission (GLIFWC) forest ecologist Karen Danielson.[96] Don Chosa, a former ricing chief for the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community, commented that it is difficult to find the right sort of birch bark needed for rice processing these days as the birch tree population has declined.[97] A study done by the GLIFWC/USDA Technical Working Group in 2003 confirms this showing that since the early 1980s, the number of paper birch in the ceded territories of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota has declined.[98]

In many ways, this is indicative of the northern forests in general. In a report written for GLIFWC, Stephen White, Jr. and Danielson write that "[l]ess than one percent of the original forest which existed prior to the cutover period remains.[99] The present state of the landscape is a fragmented matrix of small stands of relatively mature forest surrounded by younger stands of larger successional forest, along with human development such as housing, highway networks, agriculture, and industry.[100]" Along with logging, they cite acid rain, climate change, and increased ozone concentrations at ground level as factors that have added and will add to the decline of trees and plants in the northern forests.[101]

Ojibwe elders are concerned about trees in general. In an article on a meeting between Ojibwe elders and the U.S. Forest Service, Rasmussen writes,

> Since the cutover of ceded territory lands from the mid 1800s to around 1910, young hardwood tree species have dominated the landscape. Routine timber sales through- out the Twentieth Century created forests that never reached maturity. Only a small amount of old growth has survived, tucked away in scattered stands and in protected forests like federal wilderness areas.[102]

One Bad River elder, Sylvia Cloud commented, "I see a slaughter of everything growing in the forest. Did you ever see babies survive without grandmothers and grandfathers? What's going to happen when you take away all of the [mature trees]?"[103]

In blatant disregard to the Anishinaabeg and the earth, unsustainable logging practices that result in destroyed forests and forest communities continue. In research interviews conducted by GLIFWC, Anishinaabe elders identified trees and understory plants affected by logging: zhingwaak (white pine), mitigomizh (red oak), wiigwaasi-mitiig (paper birch), ininaatig (sugar maple), apakwanagemeg (red pine), giizhik (white cedar), wiigob-atig (basswood).[104] Plants the Anishinaabe elders identified as endangered by logging included odatagaagominagaawanzh

(blackberry), minagaawanzh (blueberry), waagaag (ferns), and wiinisiibag (winterberry).[105] Elders cited "increased light, temperatures, drought conditions, and competing vegetation" as factors caused by logging that have led to a decline in understory plants.[106] According to GLIFWC's Danielson and White,

> Modern logging practices continue to influence the environment and affect the complex ecological relationship of plant abundance and regeneration, insects, disease, nutrients, and herbivory. Logging often results in a reduced amount of coarse woody debris. . . . The lack of coarse woody debris has been implicated in the lack of reproduction of kaakaagiwanzh (eastern hemlock), giizhik (white cedar), and other species.[107] Many forested areas have been replanted and managed as monoculture plantations for pulp and paper production; this practice has resulted in a loss of biodiversity.[108]

"NEW" INDUSTRIAL THREATS TO THE NORTHWOODS

Unfortunately, instead of merely having to deal with the offal of old industries, the North faces a series of new industrial threats. For example, corporations interested in uranium mining are seriously exploring the western side of Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Further, pressures to increase logging in the National Forests as a means to boosting county revenues are mounting.

The opening of a metallic sulfide mining district in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan is being spearheaded by Kennecott, a subsidiary of the British Rio Tinto. Kennecott has submitted an application for opening a metallic sulfide mine just north of Marquette in wild lands that boast terrific blueberry harvests and excellent fishing streams. Further, according to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, the local Salmon Trout River is thought to be the only remaining area of natural coaster brook trout reproduction in Michigan.[109] The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has given the application its preliminary approval and awaits only the public's final input this fall, as required by law. As public input has already revealed an overwhelming opposition throughout the application process, it is widely presumed that the DEQ will approve the permit despite a groundswell of citizen opposition.

Metallic sulfide mining is one of the most persistently and dangerously polluting forms of mining. In pursuit of metals such as copper and nickel, the mining process exposes sulfide ores to water. The primary concern is that the mine tailings will come in contact with water through rainwater or some other form of moisture. When moisture mixes with the sulfide ore it creates sulfuric acid. This acid mine drainage (AMD) would be a disaster for the surrounding bodies of water (streams, rivers, lakes, groundwater, wetlands). The citizen-initiated metallic sulfide mining moratorium that was signed into law in Wisconsin April of 1998 forbade any metallic sulfide mining in the state *unless* a metallic sulfide mine somewhere in the U.S. or Canada could be found that had operated for 10 years and been closed for 10 years without contaminating the surrounding area. Such a mine has yet to be found. Further, once the tailings from a metallic sulfide mine come in contact with water, the danger does not fade with the passage of time. AMD can remain toxic for thousands of years.

Electrical power transmission also threatens the Northwoods in a complex web of ecological and cultural tragedy that can be traced from the Northwoods to the Pimicikamak Cree in Manitoba. A high-voltage (345 kV) line known as the Arrowhead-Weston is currently under construction in the rural areas between Wausau, Wisconsin and Superior, Wisconsin. Ojibwe tribes, farmers, and other rural dwellers have fought this line since the early 1990s, but to no avail. Concerns over electromagnetic fields (EMFs) and stray voltage (technically ground currents produced by harmonics[110]) associated with high-voltage transmission lines echo the concerns voiced by others around the nation who are threatened with the construction of high voltage transmission systems in their own backyards.

Long distance transmission of electricity results in the loss of 50% of the electricity transferred between point of production and point of use[111] often producing stray voltage. Stray voltage is

particularly problematic with "the proliferation of computers, variable speed motors and other equipment that generate[s] non-linear loads."[112] As it travels through the ground, this stray voltage follows the best conductor available: usually water. As living beings, such as humans, cattle, and other animals are mostly composed of water, we can end up as electrical conduits in areas heavy with stray voltage. Although expert studies done by power corporations disagree, dairy farmers have long argued that stray voltage adversely affects their dairy herds, causing serious muscle spasms and decreased milk production particularly during stray voltage surges.[113]

The transmission lines themselves often involve maintenance that lies heavily on the land, such as the spraying of pesticides to keep vegetation from interfering with the transmission corridors.

Electrical power production has long been a private for-profit industry. Since 2001, however, the building of high-voltage transmission lines themselves became a for-profit industry as well. American Transmission Company (ATC) is the first utility company founded solely to deal in the transmission of electricity between various states.[114] This means the transmission of power, the majority of which is intended for urban areas, has become yet another for-profit industry to invade the rural northland, potentially transforming the north into a whole new sort of resource colony. ATC has even begun its propaganda in support of its energy colonization of the Northwoods. Radio stations in northern areas slated for ATC activity air ATC ads lauding the corporation's supposed contributions to building "better" communities. As ATC is responsible for the Arrowhead-Weston line, Wisconsin's rural residents would strongly disagree.

The Pimicikamik Cree would also vehemently disagree, for in building the Arrowhead-Weston, ATC connects Wisconsin to the Minnesota grid. This grid imports power from Manitoba-Hydro, thus providing Manitoba-Hydro access to a large market: urban areas in the United States. The megadams generating this electricity are built on lands traditionally used by the Cree for subsistence hunting and fishing. The flooding of three million acres in building these mega-dams has drowned hunting grounds, diverted major waterways, and led to serious mercury contamination of the waters and thus the fish that are a staple in the Cree diet.[115] ATC's activities in northern Wisconsin and Michigan's Upper Peninsula will increase Manitoba-Hydro's available market, and, ironically, will link the American Northwoods' electrical consumption to the destruction of the Pimicikamak Cree's traditional subsistence lifestyle. With the prospect of increased consumer demand with the Arrowhead-Weston (coupled with the constant increase in luxury energy use across the nation), Manitoba-Hydro is looking to further decimate Cree lands and traditional subsistence lifestyles by adding to its already massive hydro-complex in the Cross Lake area of Manitoba.

If this is not enough, some urban-based alternative energy proponents have made serious suggestions about building industrial scale windfarms in the rural American Northwoods. While windpower is a great source of alternative energy, it can quickly become a non-green energy source if, like the supposedly alternative energy of megadams on Native lands in Canada, it is built on a scale that results in the colonization of rural areas to produce energy for distant urban centers. The rural areas of Sault Sainte Marie, Ontario, Canada, were recently subjected to this colonization: the Prince Wind Energy Project was completed in 2006 with 126 wind turbines covering a whopping 20,000 acres.[116] Building industrial-scale windfarms with their accompanying high-voltage, long-distance transmission lines in the American Northwoods is only one more way of industrially colonizing the money-poor north for the sake of a wealthier, more urban south.

CONCLUSION – TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE AS A SOLUTION

"We have got to stop poisoning our land, and our air, our water, and rain," says Lac Courte Oreilles member Ron Winters,

> One time the rain used to bless us, now it poisons us because they are mining and putting things in the air and they are endangering my children. They are putting me on that endangered species list. Whatever that bureau is

> that makes that list, I'd like to be on that list. I'm part of the land here. I'm part of the trees, the water, I'm part of that. I'm Anishinabé.[117]

Thus far, the robber barons have virtually had their way with the American Northwoods, taking from us what they pleased largely because rural Northerners haven't the financial independence or political clout to prevent them from doing so. Despite this, or perhaps because of it, there is a growing movement interested in revitalizing the old ways by learning the traditional knowledge of our Native and non-Native ancestors and adapting it to today. This traditional knowledge involves not only learning the skills required for hunting, fishing, gathering, and farming but it also involves learning the values necessary for protecting the land for all our relations, present and future.

"The difference between a white man and an Indian is this," LaDuke quotes a Central American Indigenous leader as saying, "A white man wants to leave money to his children. An Indian wants to leave forests."[118] There are non-Natives, too, who want to leave forests to their children, real forests. You'll find many of these people in the Northwoods. As long as there are people who make the land a way of life and not simply a recreational pastime, or worse, an industrial resource, we have the hope and the knowledge to protect our land from further ravages by industrial civilization. As Okanagan activist-artist, Jeanette Armstrong, writes, "I know how powerful the solidarity is of peoples bound together by land, blood, and love. This is the largest threat to interests wanting to secure control of lands and resources."[119]

By understanding who we are as people of the land through a knowledge of our past as well as our present, we can come together, as part of the human community of the Northwoods to resist further industrial invasions of our homeland. We must continue listening to the trees, the animals, the waters so that we can protect this piece of Turtle Island, this part of paradise on Earth. After all, Native, mixed-blood, and non-Native, we are *aki anishinaabeg*. We are the people of the land.

Bibliography

American Transmission Company. *Key Facts*. http://www.atcllc.com/A9.shtml (accessed September 5, 2007).

Armstrong, Jeanette. "Community: 'Sharing One Skin'". In *Paradigm Wars: Indigenous Peoples' Resistance to Globalization*. ed. Jerry Mander and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, 35-39. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 2006

BeyondFossilFuel.com. *Canada's Largest Windfarm*. http://www.beyondfossilfuel.com/windpower/canada.html (accessed September 5, 2007).

Black, Edwin. *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race*. NY: Four Walls Eight Windows, 2003.

Bodley, John. *Anthropology and Contemporary Human Problems*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 2001.

Bodley, John. *Victims of Progress*. 4th ed. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1999.

Broker, Ignatia. *Night Flying Woman: An Ojibway Narrative*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1983.

Chosa, Donald. Personal interview. November 19, 2003.

Cleland, Charles E. *The Place of the Pike (Gnoozhekaaning): A History of the Bay Mills Indian Community*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Cree Dunn, Aimée. *Making the Connection: Bears, Dams, Mines and Powerlines*. Northwoods Wilderness Recovery. http://www.northwoodswild.org/newspro/viewnews.cgi?id=EEuuukkuAyxOyQvlwn.

Danielson, Karen. "GLIFWC and USDA Forest Service collaborate on birch bark monitoring protocol." *Mazina'igan*, Winter 2003-2004, 4.

Dunn, Anne M. *Grandmother's Gift: Stories from the Anishinaabeg*. Duluth, MN: Holy Cow! Press, 1997.

Ely, Richard T. and Edward W. Morehouse. Elements of Land Economics. NY: MacMillan Co., 1924.

"EPA recognizes KBIC's brownfield cleanup at Sand Point in Baraga County." *Mazina'igan*, Dagwaagin (Fall) 2007, 10.

Fantle, Will. "Fishing for Trouble." *Isthmus Newsweekly*, June 5-11, 1992. Quoted in Al Gedicks. *The New Resource Wars: Native and Environmental Struggles Against Multinational Corporations*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1993.

Frelich, Lee E. "Old forest in the Lake States today and before European settlement." *Natural Areas Journal* 15 (1995): 157-167. Quoted in White, Stephen Jr. and Karen Danielson. *Threats to Wild Plants in the Ceded Territories*. Odanah, WI: Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, 2002, 3.

Gaiashkibos, "Where are all the hellraisers?" Midwest Treaty Network Forum. Madison, WI: May 1990. Quoted in Al Gedicks, *The New Resource Wars: Native and Environmental Struggles Against Multinational Corporations*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1993, 168.

Gedicks, Al. *The New Resource Wars: Native and Environmental Struggles Against Multinational Corporations*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1993.

Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission. *Sandy Lake Tragedy and Memorial*. http://www.glifwc.org/Publications/SandyLake_Brochure.pdf (accessed September 9, 2007).

Gutknecht, Kurt. " 'Stray voltage' seen as 'electrical pollution.' " Special rpt. from *Wisconsin Agriculturist*, August 1999.

Institute for the Development of Indian Law and Cook Christian Training School, The. "Second L'Anse Chippewa Treaty 1836." In *U.P. Indian Treaties: Treaty Rights Workshop*. 1975.

Institute for the Development of Indian Law and Cook Christian Training School, The. "Text of 1842 Chippewa Treaty." In *U.P. Indian Treaties: Treaty Rights Workshop*. 1975.

Institute for the Development of Indian Law and Cook Christian Training School, The. "L'Anse Chippewa Treaty 1842." In *U.P. Indian Treaties: Treaty Rights Workshop*. 1975.

Jones, Brenda R. *Torch Lake Superfund Site Remediation Monitoring: Fall, 2002 Sampling Overview and Results.* United States Environmental Protection Agency. http://wupcenter.mtu.edu/education/great_lakes_ecology/torch_lake/Overview_Torch_Lake_Superfund_Remediation_Project.ppt (accessed September 5, 2007).

Kates, James. *Planning a Wilderness: Regenerating the Great Lakes Cutover Region*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2001.

Keller, Mark. *The Chippewa Land of Keweenaw Bay: An Allotment History*. Baraga, MI: Keweenaw Bay Printing Department, 1981.

LaDuke, Winona. "A Seventh Generation Amendment." *Ojibwe News* (October 4, 1996). Rpt. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader: A Collection of Essential Writings*. Stillwater, MN: Voyageur Press, 2002: 273-276.

LaDuke, Winona. "Building with Reservations." Delivered: Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture National Conference (Minneapolis: 1999). Rptd. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader: A Collection of Essential Writings*. Stillwater, MN: Voyageur Press, 2002: 44- 54.

LaDuke, Winona. "Dioxin, Incinerators and Breast Milk." *Ojibwe Akiing* (May 31, 2000). Rpt. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader: A Collection of Essential Writings*. Stillwater, MN: Voyageur Press, 2002: 20-24.

LaDuke, Winona. "Don't Cheapen Sovereignty." *The Circle* (March 1996). Rptd. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader: A Collection of Essential Writings*. Stillwater, MN: Voyageur Press, 2002: 191-194.

LaDuke, Winona. "Like Tributaries to a River." *Sierra*, November/December 1996. Rpt. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader: A Collection of Essential Writings*. Stillwater, MN: Voyageur Press, 2002: 55-64.

LaDuke, Winona. *Making the Connections Between Dams, Transmission Lines, and Mines*. Midwest Treaty Network. http://www.alphacdc.com/treaty/winona2.html (accessed September 5, 2007).

LaDuke, Winona. "I Heard the Owl Call My Name: Indian Forests, the Endangered Species Act, and Endangered Cultures." Fall 1993. Rptd. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader: A Collection of Essential Writings*. Stillwater, MN: Voyageur Press, 2002. pp89-99.

LaDuke, Winona. "Under the Wild Rice Moon." *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, September 19, 1999. Rpt. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader: A Collection of Essential Writings*. Stillwater, MN: Voyageur Press, 2002: 28-34.

Leopold, Aldo. "Obituary: P.S. Lovejoy." *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 7, No. 1 (January 1943): 125-128.

Lovejoy, P.S. "Segregation of Farm from Forest Land." *Journal of Forestry*, XVII, No. 6 (October 1919): 627-646.

Meeker, James E., Joan E. Elias, and John A. Heim. *Plants Used By the Great Lakes Ojibway*. Odanah, WI: Great Lakes Indian Fish And Wildlife Commission, 1993. Quoted in White, Stephen Jr. and Karen Danielson. *Threats to Wild Plants in the Ceded Territories.* Odanah, WI: Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, 2002, 3.

Michigan Department of Environmental Quality. *The Superfund Program in Michigan: Fiscal Year 2006 Legislative Report: Summary of Hazardous Substance Cleanups Funded by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 1980 PC 96-510 As Amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), 1986 PL 99-499 and the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfield Revitalization Act, 2002 PL 107-118* (March 2007), http://www.michigan.gov/deq (accessed September 5, 2007).

Mladenoff, David J. and Forest Stearns. "Eastern hemlock regeneration and deer browsing in the Northern Great Lakes Region: a re-examination and model simulation." *Conservation Biology* 7 (1993): 889-900. Quoted in White, Stephen Jr. and Karen Danielson. *Threats to Wild Plants in the Ceded Territories.* Odanah, WI: Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, 2002, 15.

Mohawk, John. "Subsistence and Materialism". In *Paradigm Wars: Indigenous Peoples' Resistance to Globalization*. ed. Jerry Mander and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, 26-28. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 2006.

Nordberg, Jane. "Torch Lake contamination 'an urgent problem.' " MiningGazette.com. August 7, 2007. http://www.mininggazette.com/stories/articles.asp?articleID=8073 (accessed September 5, 2007).

Northrup, Jim. *Walking the Rez Road*. Stillwater, MN: Voyageur Press, Inc., 1993.

Rasmussen, Charlie Otto. "Reflections from Bucko Teeple: Horses on the ice; vigilantes on the beach." *Mazina'igan*. Ziigwan (Spring) 2007: 10+.

Rasmussen, Charlie Otto. "Tribal elders, Forest Service convene talking circle at Bad River." *Mazina'igan*, Winter 2003-2004, 4.

Rasmussen, Charlie Otto. "Wild rice genetic research scrutinized by some Ojibwe tribes: Protesters rally at U of M." *Mazina'igan*, Summer 2002, 1.

Save the Wild U.P. *Coaster Brook Trout in Danger*. http://www.savethewildup.org/blog/coaster-brook-trout-in-danger/ (accessed September 5, 2007).

Schoolcraft, Henry R. *Narrative Journals of Travels from Detroit Northwest through the Great Chain of American Lakes to the Sources of the Mississippi River in the Year 1820*. 1821. Rpt. NY: Arno Press, Inc., 1970.

Vennum, Thomas, Jr. *Wild Rice and the Ojibway People*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1988.

Wehrwein, George S. "An Appraisal of Resettlement." *Journal of Farm Economics* (1937): 190-202.

Wehrwein, George S. "Enactment and Administration of Rural County Zoning Ordinances." *Journal of Farm Economics* (1936): 508-522.

Wehrwein, George S. "Goals in Land Use Policy." *Journal of Farm Economics* (1938): 237-246.

White, Stephen Jr. and Karen Danielson. *Threats to Wild Plants in the Ceded Territories*. Odanah, WI: Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, 2002.

Winters, Ron. Speech to Protect the Earth Gathering and Pow-Wow. Lac Courte Oreilles Reservation, Hayward, WI: September 1991. Quoted in Al Gedicks. *The New Resource Wars: Native and Environmental Struggles Against Multinational Corporations*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1993, 169.

Wisconsin Historical Society. "Term: Wehrwein, George Simon." *Dictionary of Wisconsin History*. http://www.wisconsinhistory.org/dictionary (accessed August 29, 2007).

[1] John Bodley, *Victims of Progress*, 4th ed. (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1999), 12.
[2] The term "subsistence" is used to refer to an economy whose activities directly provide food, shelter, clothing, medicine and other things necessary to a good and healthy life. It should not be taken to imply that "subsistence" means barely scraping along, barely surviving. "Subsistence" relates to that which directly provides for a good and healthy life and is to be distinguished from the capitalistic and communistic economic models.
[3] Henry R. Schoolcraft, *Narrative Journals of Travels from Detroit Northwest through the Great Chain of American Lakes to the Sources of the Mississippi River in the Year 1820* (1821 rpt. NY: Arno Press, Inc., 1970), 97-98.
[4] Ibid., 100.
[5] Ibid., 130.
[6] John Mohawk, "Subsistence and Materialism," in *Paradigm Wars: Indigenous Peoples' Resistance to Globalization*, ed. Jerry Mander and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 2006), 27.
[7] Ibid., 26-27.
[8] John Bodley, *Victims of Progress*, 20.
[9] John Bodley, *Anthropology and Contemporary Human Problems* (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing, Co., 2001), 8.
[10] whom, a few days into the voyage, the Native guides nicknamed Paw-gwa-be-can-e-ga meaning, according to Schoolcraft's journal, "destroyer of rocks." Henry Schoolcraft, *Narrative Journals*, 166.
[11] The Institute for the Development of Indian Law and Cook Christian Training School, "L'Anse Chippewa Treaty 1842," in *U.P. Indian Treaties: Treaty Rights Workshop* (1975), 12.
[12] Ibid., 12.
[13] The Institute for the Development of Indian Law and Cook Christian Training School, "Second L'Anse Chippewa Treaty 1836," in *U.P. Indian Treaties*, 3.
[14] Mark Keller, *The Chippewa Land of Keweenaw Bay: An Allotment History* (Baraga, MI: Keweenaw Bay Printing Department, 1981), 7-8.
[15] The Institute for the Development of Indian Law and Cook Christian Training School, "Text of 1842 Chippewa Treaty," in *U.P. Indian Treaties*, 25, emphasis added.
[16] Mark Keller, *The Chippewa Land*, 13.
[17] Ibid., 13.
[18] Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission. *Sandy Lake Tragedy and Memorial*. http://www.glifwc.org/Publications/SandyLake_Brochure.pdf (accessed September 9, 2007).
[19] Mark Keller, *The Chippewa Land*, 15-16.
[20] Ibid., 20.
[21] Charles E. Cleland, *The Place of the Pike (Gnoozhekaaning): A History of the Bay Mills Indian Community* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2004), 22-26.
[22] Ignatia Broker, *Night Flying Woman: An Ojibway Narrative* (St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Press, 1983), 117.
[23] Ibid., 117.
[24] Jim Northrup, *Walking the Rez Road* (Stillwater, MN: Voyageur Press, Inc., 1993), 137.
[25] Ibid., 143.
[26] George S. Wehrwein, "Goals in Land Use Policy," *Journal of Farm Economics* (1938): 245.
[27] Ibid., 245.
[28] James Kates, *Planning a Wilderness: Regenerating the Great Lakes Cutover Region* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 158.
[29] Ibid., 148.
[30] Ibid., 101.
[31] Charlie Otto Rasmussen, "Reflections from Bucko Teeple: Horses on the ice; vigilantes on the beach," *Mazina'igan*, Ziigwan (Spring) 2007, 10.
[32] The danger, though diminished, still persists as sometimes can be seen at boat landings come spearing time.
[33] In various Canadian provinces, however, the Metís have recently had subsistence rights recognized.
[34] George S. Wehrwein, "An Appraisal of Resettlement," *Journal of Farm Economics* (1937): 199-200.
[35] P.S. Lovejoy, "Segregation of Farm from Forest Land," *Journal of Forestry*, XVII, No. 6 (October 1919): 645.
[36] Ibid., 645, emphasis added.
[37] Ibid., 645.
[38] Ibid., 639-640, emphasis added.
[39] Richard T. Ely and Edward W. Morehouse, *Elements of Land Economics* (NY: MacMillan Company, 1924), 118.
[40] Ibid., 51, emphasis added.
[41] James Kates, *Planning a Wilderness*, 158.

[42] George S. Wehrwein, "Goals in Land Use Policy," 240.
[43] Ibid., 241.
[44] George S. Wehrwein, "Enactment and Administration of Rural County Zoning Ordinances," *Journal of Farm Economics* (1936): 522.
[45] George S. Wehrwein, "Goals in Land Use Policy," 241.
[46] Georege S. Wehrwein, "Enactment and Administration," 514, 521.
[47] Ibid., 514.
[48] P.S. Lovejoy, "Segregation of Farm from Forest," 627.
[49] James Kates, *Planning a Wilderness*, 158.
[50] George S. Wehrwein, "Enactment and Administration," 522.
[51] James Kates, *Planning a Wilderness*, 158.
[52] Ibid., 103.
[53] Ibid., 103.
[54] Ibid., 105-106.
[55] Ibid., 98.
[56] Ibid., 106.
[57] George S. Wehrwein, "An Appraisal of Resettlement," 197.
[58] James Kates, *Planning a Wilderness*, 149.
[59] Richard T. Ely and Edward W. Morehouse, *Elements of Land Economics*, 306.
[60] No citation given, James Kates, *Planning a Wilderness*, 158.
[61] No citation given, James Kates, *Planning a Wilderness*, 158.
[62] James Kates, *Planning a Wilderness*, 48.
[63] Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race* (NY: Four Walls Eight Windows, 2003), 123.
[64] Wisconsin Historical Society, "Term: Wehrwein, George Simon," *Dictionary of Wisconsin History*, http://www.wisconsinhistory.org/dictionary (accessed August 29, 2007).
[65] Aldo Leopold, "Obituary: P.S. Lovejoy," *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 7, No. 1 (January 1943): 128.
[66] Al Gedicks, *The New Resource Wars: Native and Environmental Struggles Against Multinational Corporation* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1993), 167.
[67] Gaiashkibos, "Where are all the hellraisers?", Midwest Treaty Network Forum (Madison, WI: May 1990), quoted in Al Gedicks, *New Resource Wars*, 168.
[68] Al Gedicks, *New Resource Wars*,, 194.
[69] Winona LaDuke, "Don't Cheapen Sovereignty," *The Circle* (March 1996), rpt. In *The Winona LaDuke Reader* (Stillwater, MN: 2002), 192.
[70] Al Gedicks, *New Resource Wars*,, 194.
[71] Winona LaDuke, *Building with Reservations*, lecture at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture National Conference (Minneapolis: 1999), rpt. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader*, 194-195.
[72] Will Fantle, "Fishing for Trouble," *Isthmus Newsweekly* (June 5-11, 1992):8, quoted in Al Gedicks, *New Resource Wars*, 194.
[73] Al Gedicks, *New Resource Wars*, 194-195.
[74] Winona LaDuke, "Dioxin, Incinerators and Breast Milk," *Ojibwe Akiing* (May 31, 2000), rpt. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader*, 23.
[75] Ibid., 22.
[76] Winona LaDuke, "A Seventh Generation Amendment," *Ojibwe News* (October 4, 1996), rpt. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader*, 275.
[77] Ibid., 275.
[78] Jane Nordberg, "Torch Lake contamination 'an urgent problem,'" MiningGazette.com, August 7, 2007, http://www.mininggazette.com/stories/articles.asp?articleID=8073 (accessed September 5, 2007).
[79] Ibid.
[80] Brenda R. Jones, "Torch Lake Superfund Site Remediation Monitoring: Fall, 2002 Sampling Overview and Results," United States Environmental Protection Agency, http://wupcenter.mtu.edu/education/great_lakes_ecology/torch_lake/Overview_Torch_Lake_Superfund_Remediation_Project.ppt (accessed September 5, 2007).
[81] Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, *The Superfund Program in Michigan: Fiscal Year 2006 Legislative Report: Summary of Hazardous Substance Cleanups Funded by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 1980 PC 96-510 As Amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), 1986 PL 99-499 and the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfield Revitalization Act, 2002 PL 107-118* (March 2007), http://www.michigan.gov/deq (accessed September 5, 2007), 137.
[82] Ibid., 137.
[83] "EPA recognizes KBIC's brownfield cleanup at Sand Point in Baraga County," *Mazina'igan*, Dagwaagin (Fall) 2007, 10.
[84] Ibid., 10.
[85] Ibid., 10.
[86] Ibid., 10.

[87] Thomas Vennum, Jr., *Wild Rice and the Ojibway People* (St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1988), 14, 20.
[88] Winona LaDuke, "Under the Wild Rice Moon," *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, September 19, 1999, rpt. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader*, 30.
[89] Thomas Vennum, Jr., *Wild Rice*, 288.
[90] Anne M. Dunn, *Grandmother's Gift: Stories from the Anishinaabeg* (Duluth, MN: Holy Cow! Press, 1997), 73, emphasis added.
[91] Thomas Vennum, Jr., *Wild Rice*, 285-286.
[92] Ibid., 286.
[93] Charlie Otto Rasmussen, "Wild rice genetic research scrutinized by some Ojibwe tribes: Protestors rally at U of M," *Mazina'igan*, Summer 2002, 1.
[94] Ignatia Broker, *Night Flying Woman*, 10, 32.
[95] Winona LaDuke, "Like Tributaries to a River," *Sierra*, November/December 1996, rpt. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader*, 61.
[96] Karen Danielson, "GLIFWC and USDA Forest Service collaborate on birch bark monitoring protocol," *Mazina'igan*, Winter 2003-2004, 4.
[97] Donald Chosa, personal interview, November 19, 2003.
[98] Karen Danielson, "GLIFWC and USDA Forest Service collaborate," 4.
[99] Lee E. Frelich, "Old forest in the Lake States today and before European settlement," *Natural Areas Journal* 15 (1995): 157-167, quoted in Stephen White, Jr. and Karen Danielson, *Threats to Wild Plants in the Ceded Territories* (Odanah, WI: Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, 2002), 3.
[100] James E. Meeker, Joan E. Elias, and John A. Heim, *Plants Used By the Great Lakes Ojibway*, Odanah, WI: Great Lakes Indian Fish And Wildlife Commission, 1993, quoted in Stephen White, Jr. and Karen Danielson, *Threats to Wild Plants in the Ceded Territories* (Odanah, WI: Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, 2002), 3.
[101] Stephen White, Jr. and Karen Danielson, *Threats to Wild Plants in the Ceded Territories – Project Report 02-01* (Odanah, WI: Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, 2002), 16.
[102] Charlie Otto Rasmussen, "Tribal elders, Forest Service convene talking circle at Bad River," *Mazina'igan*, Winter 2003-2004, 4.
[103] Ibid., 4.
[104] Stephen White, Jr. and Karen Danielson, *Threats to Wild Plants*, 8.
[105] Ibid., 8.
[106] Ibid., 8.
[107] David J. Mladenoff and Forest Stearns, "Eastern hemlock regeneration and deer browsing in the Northern Great Lakes Region: a re-examination and model simulation," *Conservation Biology* 7 (1993): 889-900, quoted in Stephen White, Jr. and Karen Danielson, *Threats to Wild Plants in the Ceded Territories* (Odanah, WI: Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, 2002), 15.
[108] Stephen White, Jr. and Karen Danielson, *Threats to Wild Plants*, 15.
[109] Save the Wild U.P., *Coaster Brook Trout in Danger*, http://www.savethewildup.org/blog/coaster-brook-trout-in-danger/ (accessed September 5, 2007).
[110] Kurt Gutknecht, " 'Stray voltage' seen as 'electrical pollution,'" special rpt. of article in *Wisconsin Agriculturist*, August 1999, 2.
[111] Winona LaDuke, *Making the Connections Between Dams, Transmission Lines, and Mines*, Midwest Treaty Network, http://www.alphacdc.com/treaty/winona2.html (accessed September 5, 2007).
[112] Kurt Gutknecht, " 'Stray voltage,' " 5.
[113] Ibid., 4.
[114] American Transmission Company, *Key Facts*, http://www.atcllc.com/A9.shtml (accessed September 5, 2007).
[115] Aimée Cree Dunn, "Making the Connection: Bears, Dams, Mines and Powerlines," Northwoods Wilderness Recovery, http://www.northwoodswild.org/newspro/viewnews.cgi?id=EEuuukkuAyxOyQvlwn.
[116] BeyondFossilFuel.com, *Canada's Largest Windfarm*, http://www.beyondfossilfuel.com/windpower/canada.html (accessed September 5, 2007).
[117] Ron Winters, Speech to Protect the Earth Gathering and Pow-Wow (Lac Courte Oreilles, Hayward, WI: September 1991), quoted in Al Gedicks, *New Resource Wars*, 169.
[118] Winona LaDuke, "I Heard the Owl Call My Name: Indian Forests, the Endangered Species Act, and Endangered Cultures," Fall 1993, rpt. in *The Winona LaDuke Reader*, 99.
[119] Jeanette Armstrong, "Community: 'Sharing One Skin,' " in *Paradigm Wars*, 39.