

Rethinking Reconciliation: Thoughts on the Canadian Government's Initiatives to Reconcile the State-Indigenous Relationship

Michelle (Micki) Honkanen¹
Department of Political Science, York University
mhonkanen@gmail.com

From an Indigenous perspective, an ideal reconciliation of the state-Indigenous relationship entails the Canadian government making every effort to implement, in good faith, the spirit and intent of the treaties as understood within the oral tradition. Several elements are encompassed in the oral understanding of the treaties, but in general include such components as: recognition and accommodation of First Nation distinctiveness, nationhood, and equality, and fostering a relationship of coexistence in perpetuity on the basis of peace, friendship and non-interference. The state, for its part, has made substantive attempts in recent years to reconcile the state-Indigenous relationship, notably through measures such as co-management and self-government. Further, as part of these efforts, the state has embraced the concept of traditional knowledge, which, as the repository of Indigenous world view, can be considered an appropriate adaptation of the spirit and intent of the treaties within the modern context.

Given these developments, the question presents itself: do contemporary efforts by the Canadian government provide a meaningful reconciliation of the state-Indigenous relationship? Through examining co-management and self-government, this paper argues that the state's efforts toward reconciliation amount to rhetoric. Although these measures are, by all appearances, enabling for Indigenous peoples, in reality they do not represent a break from the state's historic pattern of engagement, which has always attempted to disenfranchise, devolve, divorce, or otherwise disengage from the Indigenous "problem" (Tully, 2000). By failing to engage First Nations in a way that is meaningful to them, ultimately, these efforts reproduce colonial relations of dominance in a new form.

This paper argues that in order for reconciliation to take place, Canada must begin to develop trusting, long-term and collaborative relationships with Indigenous peoples that echo the spirit and intent of the treaties. As a colonizing country, Canada must grapple with the Indigenous understanding of the treaties, and the world view that undergirds this understanding, in order to appreciate how the treaties are being fulfilled — or not fulfilled — from an Indigenous perspective. Only the completion of this work can provide an adequate foundation upon which

¹ Sincere thanks to Gabrielle Slowey and Chanchal Bhattacharya for their contributions to this paper. This paper was supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

to engage in a reconciliation process with Indigenous peoples.

The paper begins by examining contemporary efforts toward reconciliation, with an eye toward understanding how these efforts amount to rhetoric and result in a reiteration of historic patterns of colonial domination. Second, the paper describes how the current process of reconciliation falls short in terms of being meaningful to Indigenous peoples. Finally, the paper opines as to how the state can embark on a reconciliatory process that genuinely engages First Nations.

Canada's Efforts Toward Reconciliation

Following from the *Royal Proclamation* (1763), the intention of the British (and later, Canadian) governments, in negotiating treaties with the First Nations of Canada was primarily to extinguish Indigenous title so as to enable unimpeded resource development and settlement by the newcomers (Fumoleau, 2004: 24-27; Borrows, 1997). Since that time, the state has never modified its adherence to a strict interpretation of the written text of the treaties. Indeed, this interpretation is at the foundation of Canada's colonial dominance over the First Nations. Having since been codified within legislation such as section 91(24) of the *BNA Act* (1867) and the *Indian Act* (1876), the written treaties now govern the entirety of Canada's relationship with its Indigenous peoples. So, for example, because many treaties, such as numbered treaties, contain the language of "cede and surrender," First Nations are treated as though they have ceded possession of their respective territories, despite the contrary understanding within the oral tradition (Venne, 1997). The state, therefore, considers First Nations to be mere "stakeholders" with respect to that land, for example, when addressing mineral exploration or wildlife protection in the contemporary context.

This early effort to disenfranchise Indigenous peoples of their land base continues in the current era through modern treaties, which are limited in their scope by former agreements, certainty clauses, harmonization programs and other government mandates, such that the agreements cannot be seen as approximating Indigenous understandings of self-government (Irlbacher-Fox, 2009: 8-9). Indeed, since Confederation, Canada has adopted a string of policies with goal of the "disappearance" of First Nations in mind, notably the *Indian Act* (1876), the residential school system (1870s - 1996), and the "white paper," *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy* (1969) (Ladner, 2001). This impulse toward removal of the Indigenous "problem" also finds contemporary expression within the current trend toward offloading and devolution of government services to the Band level, effectively cleaning the government's hands of the administrative burden toward Indigenous peoples derived from the treaties (Angus, 1991; Slowey, 2008).

Given this history, the state seems reluctant to relinquish its position of dominance. Yet, in recent years, the Canadian government has voluntarily made efforts to reconcile its relationship with Indigenous peoples. The question thus arises: why would the Canadian government engage in this process of reconciliation? Blackburn's (2007) analysis is convincing to this end. She argues that the history of colonial oppression of First Nations, with its unhappy chapters whose effects continue to be felt into the present day, produces a crisis of political legitimation. That is to say, the past actions of the state, when examined through the lens of modern values, undermine the state's legitimacy.

As such, Blackburn argues, contemporary efforts toward reconciliation, involving the state's attempts to break with the past such that it can proceed on a new foundation of legitimacy, constitutes a very modern project, one rooted in enlightenment values. For instance, Blackburn observes that "The treaty-negotiators, policy-makers, and government employees among whom I conducted research often linked the treaty with progress. They wove discussion of the treaty as a form of reconciliation, in its broadest sense, with talk of a break from the past, progress into a new and improved future, and the fulfillment of the civilized values upon which Canada is based" (2007: 625). The state's reconciliatory project thus reinforces the narrative that the harmful actions are "in the past," and that the country is moving toward a "new and brighter future" (Blackburn, 2007).

As part of this project, recent state efforts include: the Royal Commission on Aboriginal peoples (1996), the Chretien government's Statement of Reconciliation (1998), the current Prime Minister's residential schools apology (2008), and the ongoing Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2008). These efforts to address the legacy of the residential schools are likely what come to mind when most Canadians think about reconciliation with Indigenous peoples. However, reconciliation is also an implicit goal within many aspects of the contemporary relations between Indigenous peoples and governments, industry, researchers, NGOs, and other non-Indigenous parties seeking to work with First Nations.

In fact, Regan argues that "reconciliation is the overarching legal and policy discourse that now frames contemporary Indigenous-Settler relations on a number of fronts, including treaty and self-government negotiations, litigation related to land claims and residential schools," indeed, all conflicts between the state and Indigenous peoples (2006: 134). To this end, Regan cites several recent examples, including the Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable (2004) which claims to adopt a "transformative approach" toward Indigenous policy development, and British Columbia's stated commitment to establish a "new relationship" with Indigenous peoples on the basis of recognition of their rights (2005) (2006: 133-4). Thus, the official discourse surrounding state-Indigenous relations is now couched in the

language of reconciliation.

Other contemporary developments along these lines include efforts to reconcile the relationship of Indigenous people to the Crown through creating or clarifying treaties that concretize Indigenous rights. This process, often called “legal reconciliation,” gained strength following from the *Calder* ruling (1973) and the entrenchment of section 35(1) in the *Constitution Act* (1982). This approach includes negotiating new treaties to address unresolved land claims, beginning with the *James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement* (1975) and continuing today, for example, through the BC Treaty Commission which was established in 1992. This process of legal reconciliation has also found expression within negotiations to clarify the existing treaties for the sake of greater certainty and stability, such the *Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement* (1992), a clarification of Treaty 11, or the current Akaitcho negotiations to clarify Treaty 8.

Although legal reconciliation is critical, and as yet incomplete (Ladner, 2009), the focus of this paper is another of component of the state’s broader reconciliatory project: attempts to defuse conflict between government and First Nations through developing more inclusive regimes of governance over areas of mutual concern (Rodon, 1998). This model, known as community-based governance, cooperative governance, or co-management, and to a lesser extent, self-government, fit within a broader project that aims to develop a cooperative working relationship between Canada and its First Nations. These include efforts which purport to incorporate traditional knowledge (TK) into policy processes, to include Indigenous people on regulatory or management boards related to their traditional territories, to address Indigenous priorities within research or conservation projects, to give First Nations greater administrative control over federal and provincial programs that affect them, and so on.

Unfortunately, as this paper will demonstrate, despite the rhetorical qualities of the state’s reconciliatory project, these efforts ultimately reinforce the very paradigm of “disengage, disenfranchise, devolve, divorce” that has informed Canadian policy toward Indigenous peoples since the first treaties were signed in the early 1700s. By all appearances enabling toward Indigenous peoples, these efforts, in fact, address the needs of the colonial power, as opposed to those of First Nations, and as such neutralize these victimized groups. Thus, they amount to a reiteration of the historic patterns of injustice that lie at the foundation of the Canadian state, and reproduce colonial relations of dominance in a new form.

Co-management and Self-Government

To illustrate this argument, the paper will examine co-management and self-government regimes. These institutional structures form part of the state’s

reconciliatory project in that they are intended to enable Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups to work together. Critics have noted that, instead, these regimes manifest neo-colonial relations of dominance and control (McGregor, 2004). This occurs, among other ways, through the relative inflexibility of these institutions toward Indigenous ways. The regimes are imposed from the top-down, and created from a foundation of the dominant Euro-Canadian cultural norms and precepts. These include institutional characteristics such as bureaucratic and hierarchical forms of structural organization, as well as operative principles that are formal, legalistic, adversarial, and process-oriented. According to White (2002), because Indigenous peoples are forced to adapt to an institutional structure and cultural framework that are foreign to them, they are impeded from full participation.

Further, critics maintain that within these regimes the Indigenous point of view — which is reflected within their traditional knowledge and a key indicator of Indigenous participation (White, 2002) — is either not taken seriously or ignored, or, worse, appropriated within a relation of dominance. Indeed, these regimes rarely succeed in incorporating Indigenous values, culture, and world views (Nadasdy, 1999; Spak, 2005). For example, Ellis (2005) and Bielawski (2003) describe the polite silence, and occasional derision, that follows an Elder's testimony at a public hearing or meeting; the significance of the Elder's message is often lost. Alternatively, First Nations report that their traditional knowledge is treated as an "alternative data set" that can be codified, packaged, commodified, and manipulated, like any other form of data, within the conventional scientific paradigm (Stevenson, 2004).

McGregor reports that while First Nations often feel pressured to share their traditional knowledge with the state (2000a: 112), elements of this knowledge are then "cherry picked" depending upon whether they conform to prevailing models of resource and wildlife management. For example, knowledge about the migratory routes of caribou might be adopted, while knowledge related to spiritual forces, myths, legends, or kinship-like relations among all living beings is ignored (McGregor, 2000b). First Nations are, thus, sensitive to the broader power dynamic at play within co-management institutions, often finding themselves on the defensive or choosing not to participate at all.

A similar critique emerges with respect to self-government. The *Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* (1996) introduced the idea that self-determining First Nations could form a third order of government within the existing jurisdictional boundaries of the Canadian state (RCAP, 1996). However, as Monture-Angus, who participated in the Commission, observes, in developing their recommendations the Commissioners were careful to ensure that they not disturb

the existing state-Indigenous power dynamic; indeed, that their proposals would be acceptable to the federal government (1999: 12-13). In the current context, this power dynamic is codified within the Inherent Right Policy (Canada, 1995), which imposes a strict set of parameters upon self-government negotiations such that, in practice, these regimes amount to bureaucratic restructuring rather than a renewal of governance. Indeed, through self-government, Indigenous governments effectively are transformed into the administrative arm of the state, with the state retaining sovereignty as to how and which programs are administered (Ladner, 2003a: 54).

Like cooperative institutions, self-governments often are imposed with insensitivity to Indigenous cultural norms, traditional knowledge, and traditional forms of governance (Nadasdy, 2003). Indeed, the predominant, and driving assumption within co-management and self-government regimes alike is that Indigenous cultural values are integrated automatically by virtue of the presence and participation of First Nations peoples within them (Ellis, 2005). Yet, even in the case of Nunavut, whose parliament was designed explicitly to break from the Westminster tradition, for example, by abolishing political parties, adopting a round, egalitarian seating arrangement and a consensus style of decision-making, White concludes that there has been only a “limited penetration of traditional Inuit values” (2006: 28). Hence, even majority representation of Indigenous peoples within a governance regime may not be sufficient to ensure the integration of traditional knowledge or Indigenous cultural norms and values.

Rhetorically, co-management and self-government sound like great advances for Indigenous peoples, offering them potential decision-making power over areas of governance that are meaningful to them (Manseau et al., 2005). In fact, many Indigenous peoples, themselves, support and are active participants within these efforts (e.g., Kendrick, 2000). Often, however, this participation is reluctant, and pragmatic in focus, because the Indigenous participants recognize that these regimes amount to a renewed effort on the part of the state toward their assimilation, with focus now shifted from the cultural assimilation policies of the past century toward new forms of “institutional assimilation” (Boldt and Long, 1988).

Irlbacher-Fox calls this the “indigenization/assimilation paradigm” (2009: 3-4), arguing that governments negotiate self-government agreements with the goal of integrating First Nations within state structures while at the same time sustaining the hegemony of these institutions. Nadasdy agrees, saying that self-government negotiations amount to “an attempt to incorporate Indigenous peoples’ unique relationship to the land into the existing legal and political institutions of the state” (2003: 223). First Nations are welcome to participate, but only on the state’s terms,

and only insofar as the state's dominance over them is maintained.

More to the point, Irlbacher-Fox (2009) writes, within this paradigm, the real needs of Indigenous peoples, for example, relief of their social suffering, are not directly addressed. Self-government means “not only accepting Aboriginal misery, but agreeing to self-administer that poverty and oppression” (Monture-Angus, 1999: 29). Rather than directly addressing these needs, both cooperative management and self-government regimes reflect an effort on the part of the state to relegate the injustices committed against Indigenous people as “in the past” and “historical” as a remedy to the crisis of legitimation described above by Blackburn. Indeed, key to the “indigenization/assimilation paradigm” is the idea that that social suffering is relieved through Indigenous transformation: “from being Indigenous to being Indigenous in a way that conforms to the norms of the Canadian Constitution, democracy, and dominant culture” (Irlbacher-Fox, 2009: 3). In this way, neo-colonial relations of dominance are reproduced.

Reconciliation from a First Nation Perspective

The reconciliation process, as imagined within the Euro-Canadian cultural context, includes a wrongdoing which is addressed, an acknowledgement of harm, and an attempt to correct for those mistakes, with the goal of creating a new and more harmonious foundation upon which collectively to go forward (Blackburn, 2007). Reconciliation in this sense is an attempt to resolve, and effectively “close the books” on grievances such that the country can move beyond the injustices of the past. In the Canadian case, the process initiated by the state to reconcile its relationship with First Nations reinforces the national narrative of Canada as a “benevolent” and “compassionate” state (Dorrell, 2009); the myth of Canada as a “peacemaker” (Regan, 2006).

Indigenous expectations of reconciliation, however, run contrary to this Euro-Canadian ideal. Drawing from the Indigenous literature, this paper defines reconciliation as a process, imperfect and ongoing, toward building a stronger state-Indigenous relationship (Regan, 2006: 66). To be clear, First Nations are often active proponents of restitutive measures (such as financial compensation, treaty negotiations, etc.), which have an element of closure to them. However, Canada's reconciliation efforts have, thus far, fallen short, and ultimately, are destined to fail, because the state does not recognize the significance of its damaged relationship with, or the importance of rebuilding its relationship with First Nations. This, despite the fact that the concept of relationship-building is at the heart of the Indigenous understanding of reconciliation.

To illustrate, Blackburn describes an encounter with a Nisga'a community member, who “complained that governments think of treaties as a ‘divorce’ when

they ‘should be a marriage’” (2007: 627). Similarly, the Canadian government’s understanding of reconciliation appears to be one of “divorce,” that is to say, closure, from its moral responsibilities to Indigenous peoples derived from the historical injustices that were committed against them. This is inconsistent with the Indigenous understanding of reconciliation, which is more analogous to nurturing and repairing damage that has been caused to their “marriage” with Canada.

From an Indigenous perspective, the act of treaty-signing, including the negotiation of self-government or co-management within the modern context, marks the *beginning, not the end*, of their relationship with Canada. Unlike Canada’s view that in signing treaties they were forging the terms of their “divorce,” First Nations understood themselves as initiating a “marriage.” These events, with their concomitant rituals and ceremonies, e.g., smoking of the pipe, sacred songs (Venne, 1997), can be compared with a “wedding celebration.” In other words, while treaty negotiations mark the beginning of a new relationship, i.e., a “wedding,” the implementation of the regimes is the relationship itself, i.e., the “marriage.”

Like any marriage, this relationship must be nurtured and supported if it is to be long and fruitful. From an Indigenous point of view, then, Canada’s relationship with its First Nations has failed at the level of implementation. Canada has failed to properly tend to the marriage that it forged with First Nations at the time of treaty signing. A meaningful reconciliation process will address the ways in which the actions of the state have damaged the treaty relationship, and also seek to reaffirm and renew the treaty relationship within the present-day context. As Corntassel and Holder (2008) write, a “transformative” reconciliation process is required to repair the very foundation of the relationship such that healing process can take place and a renewed, collaborative relationship can supplant old relations of colonial dominance.

Furthermore, the oral understanding of the treaties should form the basis for this type of “transformative” reconciliation process. The treaty model, as part of the Indigenous diplomatic tradition (Regan, 2006: 111) has mediated First Nations’ relations with the newcomers since the time of first contact. Indeed, Indigenous people have a very specific understanding of their relationship with the newcomers which has more or less persisted since the time of first contact. The persistence of this model can be explained by the fact that it is undergirded by Indigenous world view, which provides an interpretive framework through which the oral treaties are understood and fulfilled. And, although each First Nation is unique in terms of its specific systems of knowledge, law, governance, and so on, collectively these systems abide by a common set of principles, such that they can be said to constitute a single model (Monture-Angus, 1999: 22).

At the very heart of this model is the concept of *relationship*. As Simpson writes of this model: “Our ancestors knew that maintaining good relationships as individuals, in families, in clans, and in our nation and with other Indigenous nations and confederacies was the basis for lasting peace” (Simpson, 2008b). Most First Nation encounters with broader Canadian society take place with the concept of relationship-building in mind, that is to say, building and strengthening of the treaty relationship. Moreover, a set of principles common to the oral treaties, define the terms of the relationship (Henderson, 1994). Akin to “marriage vows,” these include:

1. Distinctiveness — Each party to the agreement is understood to be distinct from the other. The parties agree to uphold mutual respect for each others’ distinctiveness.
2. Nationhood — Each party is understood to be a separate nation. This is clear within the very foundation of the treaties, which are rooted in the diplomatic tradition of First Nations and the precepts of international law on the part of the British, both of which acknowledge the sovereignty of both of the signatories (Borrows, 1997).
3. Equality — Each of the parties is equal to the other. No party will dominate over the other.
4. Co-existence — The parties agree to co-exist and share the same land for their mutual benefit (Venne, 1997).
5. Peace and friendship — The intention of the First Nations in signing treaties with the newcomers was to establish a relationship of peace and friendship between them. For example, this intention is said to be codified within the two-row wampum of the Haudenosaunee (Muller, 2007).
6. Non-interference — No particular understanding of the right way to live will prevail (Borrows, 1997). This principle is manifested in specific terms within many treaties, for example, in the promise that the First Nations be able to hunt and fish across their traditional territory as they did formerly (Fumoleau, 2004).
7. “As Long as the sun shines...” — The agreements were intended by First Nations to be everlasting. This was signified in the ceremonies conducted at treaty signing (Venne, 1997: 188), for example, the exchange of presents or wampum belts (Muller, 2007).
8. Periodic renewal of the treaty — The treaty relationship must be continually nurtured in order to remain vital and long-lasting (Simpson, 2008b: 35). To

this end, Treaty Day, which is the day on which treaty payments are distributed each year, continues to hold symbolic importance for many First Nations because, in the Indigenous view, the treaty is a living document, not a relic from the past, Treaty Day is celebrated as an affirmation and renewal of the terms of the treaty.

To be clear, in signing the treaties, Indigenous peoples never agreed to cede their territories to Canada or extinguish their rights; indeed, the concept of ceding land or rights is fundamentally incompatible with the Indigenous world view. Although this was only recently established within Canadian jurisprudence with the *Paulette* case (1973) (Fumoleau, 2004: 108), it is deeply embedded within First Nation oral traditions, and is a commonplace belief among the members of many signatory First Nation communities (Venne, 1997). From the perspective of First Nations, the treaty model is meant to govern relations between First Nations and Canada within a broader vision that includes principles such as: respecting each other their distinctiveness as independent nations, treating each other as equals, and providing the freedom for each to live their lives peacefully and without interference, upholding a relationship of friendship, in perpetuity.

As such, the treaty model articulates a broader vision of self-determination for First Nations than any policy choices, such as co-management and self-government, that have been developed by the Canadian government. Indeed, Canada's failure to develop a governance regime that respects the vision held by First Nations of their relationship with the state results in a frustrating and alienating experience for First Nation participants. They enter co-management or self-government regimes with expectations derived from their understanding of the treaty, and instead, describe feeling "robbed" of their knowledge or that their participation as a "waste of time." Indeed, given their inbuilt limitations, these regimes dramatically curtail the potential for self-determination among First Nations. As such, the agreements are entered into, but with reluctance, and are seen as merely "symbolic restitution" (Irlbacher-Fox, 2009: 33), "one tool available among the many possibilities that may assist communities to achieve self-determination" (Irlbacher-Fox, 2009: 9).

Some Concluding Thoughts

This paper began by asking what a reconciliatory process that genuinely engages First Nations would look like. An answer to this question was found in the treaty model from the Indigenous diplomatic tradition. The paper has argued that the spirit and intent of the treaties, as understood within the oral tradition, can act as the framework to govern state-Indigenous relations. It was further argued that the treaty model is like a "marriage" in that it constitutes a relationship, is built

upon a set of governing principles which must be honored, and must be continually nurtured and renewed over the long-term to ensure its success.

While these ideas are common sense to many Indigenous peoples, the idea of building the state-Indigenous relationship upon the treaty model is weakly developed within the political science literature, and there is much room for development in this area. To be certain, underpinning the treaty model of the state-Indigenous relationship is a vision of self-determination that increasingly is being articulated within the “resurgence” literature (Irlbacher-Fox, 2009: 3). In this literature, a group of mostly Indigenous academics are carving out a pathway toward decolonization that cuts across disciplinary boundaries and essentially attempts to turn the neocolonial order on its head through, among other means, the revitalization of traditional culture (Alfred, 1999; Alfred, 2005; Battiste and Henderson, 2000; Borrows, 2002; Little Bear, 2004; Monture-Angus, 1999; Simpson, 2008a; Turner, 2006).

Moreover, there has been some exploration within the literature of idea of developing governance regimes on the basis of the treaty model (Ladner, 2003b). Henderson’s (1994) concept, treaty federalism (also (Tully, 2000)), creates separate and distinct spheres of governance for Indigenous peoples and the state, as well as areas of shared jurisdiction, on the basis of the nation-to-nation relationship that was established through the treaties. McGregor (2000b) and Ransom and Ettenger (2001) suggest a model based on the principle of co-existence, or the side-by-side functioning of different systems of knowledge, for co-management regimes.

However, reconciliation — indeed, the treaty model, itself — requires more than the mere coexistence of separate nations. Coexistence is one principle among many within the treaty model. As important as is the principle of coexistence to a successful marriage, it captures only one dimension of the relationship, and in isolation of other dimensions produces a cold marriage, indeed. To reiterate, the treaty model is, at its essence, about building and maintaining good relationships (Simpson, 2008b). As such, it is important to extend the discussion beyond the existing parameters of nation-to-nation co-existence, to imagine what is required to create a *good* (even loving?) state-Indigenous relationship.

To begin, the very survival of Indigenous peoples is contingent upon the survival of their relationship with the land, their relationships within their families and communities, and ultimately, with all of Creation (Wilson, 2004). As a starting point, it is critical, therefore, that the state acknowledge and repair the damage that it has caused by destroying the very relationships that Indigenous peoples need in order to survive as Indigenous peoples. This point is illustrated by a member of the Haida nation: “Well, of course, if they cut the trees down, we’ll still be here. But

then we won't be Haida anymore. We'll just be like everybody else" (Gill, 2009: 112). Thus, to preserve the very foundation of indigeneity, it is critical that the traditional territories of First Nations be returned to Indigenous peoples (Simpson, 2004).

Equally critical, however, is an erasure of the alienation and disconnection that is endemic to the relationships within Indigenous communities (Corntassel et al., 2009) and between Canada and its First Nations. Further, if reconciliation is understood as relationship-building, then it requires more than simply bringing separate parties into a relationship of coexistence with one another. Returning to the example of including Indigenous knowledge within co-management regimes it is not enough to merely include Indigenous participants (or worse, their "knowledge" in the form of "data") within a Euro-Canadian governance regime. To include Indigenous knowledge is to engage in a way of life (Nadasdy, 2003: 63). This requires more than mere rhetoric; it must become a reality.

Works Cited

- Alfred, Gerald Taiaiake. 1999. *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Alfred, Gerald Taiaiake. 2005. *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.
- Angus, Murray. 1991. *And the Last Shall Be First: Native Policy in an Era of Cutbacks*. Toronto: NC Press.
- Battiste, Marie and James (Sa'ke'j) Youngblood Henderson. 2000. *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage : A Global Challenge*. Saskatoon: Purich.
- Bielawski, Ellen. 2003. *Rogue Diamonds : The Rush for Northern Riches on Dene Land*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.
- Blackburn, Carole. 2007. "Producing Legitimacy: Reconciliation and the Negotiation of Aboriginal Rights in Canada." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 13(3): 621-38.
- Boldt, Menno and J. Anthony Long. 1988. "Native Indian Self-Government: Instrument of Autonomy or Assimilation?" In *Governments in Conflict? Provinces and Indian Nations in Canada*, ed. J. Anthony Long and Menno Boldt. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Borrows, John. 1997. "Wampum at Niagara: The Royal Proclamation, Canadian Legal History, and Self-Government." In *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada: Essays on Law, Equity, and Respect for Difference*, ed. Michael Asch. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Borrows, John. 2002. *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Canada. Indian and Northern Affairs. 1995. *The Aboriginal Inherent Right to Self-Government: Federal Policy Guide*. Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Corntassel, Jeff, Chaw-win-is and T'lakwadzi. 2009. "Indigenous Storytelling, Truth-Telling, and Community Approaches to Reconciliation." *ESC: English Studies in Canada* 35(1): 137-59.
- Corntassel, Jeff and Cindy Holder. 2008. "Who's Sorry Now? Government Apologies, Truth Commissions, and Indigenous Self-Determination in Australia, Canada, Guatemala, and Peru." *Human Rights Review* 9(4): 465-89.
- Dorrell, Matthew. 2009. "From Reconciliation to Reconciling: Reading What 'We Now Recognize' in the Government of Canada's 2008 Residential Schools Apology." *ESC: English Studies in Canada* 35(1): 27-45.
- Ellis, Stephen. 2005. "Meaningful Consideration? A Review of Traditional Knowledge in Environmental Decision Making." *Arctic* 58(1): 66-77.
- Fumoleau, Rene. 2004. *As Long as This Land Shall Last: A History of Treaty 8 and Treaty 11, 1870-1939*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
- Gill, Ian. 2009. *All That We Say Is Ours : Guujaaw and the Reawakening of the Haida Nation*. Vancouver, BC: Douglas & McIntyre.

- Henderson, James (Sa'ke'j) Youngblood. 1994. "Empowering Treaty Federalism." *Saskatchewan Law Review* 58: 241-329.
- Irlbacher-Fox, Stephanie. 2009. *Finding Dahshaa : Self-Government, Social Suffering and, Aboriginal Policy in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Kendrick, Anne. 2000. "Community Perceptions of the Beverly-Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 20(1): 1-33.
- Ladner, Kiera L. 2001. "Visions of Neo-Colonialism? Renewing the Relationship with Aboriginal Peoples." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 21(1): 105-35.
- Ladner, Kiera L. 2003a. "Rethinking Aboriginal Governance." In *Reinventing Canada: Politics of the 21st Century*, ed. Janine Brodie and Linda Trimble. Toronto: Prentice Hall.
- Ladner, Kiera L. 2003b. "Treaty Federalism: An Indigenous Vision of Canadian Federalisms." In *New Trends in Canadian Federalism, 2nd Ed.*, ed. Francois Rocher and Miriam Smith. Peterborough, ON: Broadview.
- Ladner, Kiera L. 2009. "Take 35: Reconciling Constitutional Orders." In *First Nations, First Thoughts: The Impact of Indigenous Thought in Canada*, ed. Annis May Timpson. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Little Bear, Leroy. 2004. "Aboriginal Paradigms: Implications for Relationships to Land and Treaty Making." In *Advancing Aboriginal Claims: Visions, Strategies, Directions*, ed. Kerry Wilkins. Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing.
- Manseau, Micheline, Brenda Parlee, and G. Burton Ayles. 2005. "A Place for Traditional Ecological Knowledge in Resource Management." In *Breaking Ice: Renewable Resource and Ocean Management in the Canadian North*, ed. Fikret Berkes, Ron Huebert, Helen Fast, Micheline Manseau and Alan Diduck. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
- McGregor, Deborah. 2000a. "From Exclusion to Co-Existence: Aboriginal Participation in Ontario Forest Management Planning." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Toronto, Toronto.
- McGregor, Deborah. 2000b. "The State of Traditional Ecological Research in Canada: A Critique of Current Theory and Practice." In *Expression in Canadian Native Studies*, ed. Ron F. Laliberte, Priscilla Stettee, James B. Waldram et al. Saskatoon, SK: University of Saskatchewan Extension Press.
- McGregor, Deborah. 2004. "Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Sustainable Development: Towards Coexistence." In *In the Way of Development: Indigenous Peoples, Life Projects, and Globalization*, ed. Mario Blaser, Harvey A. Feit and Glenn McRae. London & New York: Zed/International Development Research Centre.
- Monture-Angus, Patricia. 1999. *Journeying Forward: Dreaming First Nations' Independence*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood.
- Muller, Kathryn V. 2007. "The Two "Mystery" Belts of Grand River: A Biography of the Two Row Wampum and the Friendship Belt." *American Indian Quarterly* 31(1): 129-64.

- Nadasdy, Paul. 1999. "The Politics of TEK: Power and The 'Integration' Of Knowledge." *Arctic Anthropology* 36(1/2): 1-18.
- Nadasdy, Paul. 2003. *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge, and Aboriginal-State Relations in Southwest Yukon*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Ransom, James W. and Kreg T. Ettenger. 2001. "'Polishing the Kaswentha': A Haudenosaunee View of Environmental Cooperation." *Environmental Science & Policy* 4(4-5): 219-28.
- Regan, Paulette. 2006. "Unsettling the Settler Within: Canada's Peacemaker Myth, Reconciliation, and Transformative Pathways to Decolonization." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Victoria, Victoria.
- Rodon, Thierry. 1998. "Co-Management and Self-Determination in Nunavut." *Polar Geography* 22(2): 119-35.
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP). 1996. *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Ottawa: Canada Communications Group.
- Simpson, Leanne. 2004. "Anticolonial Strategies for the Recovery and Maintenance of Indigenous Knowledge." *American Indian Quarterly* 28(3&4): 373-84.
- Simpson, Leanne, ed. 2008a. *Lighting the Eighth Fire: The Liberation, Resurgence, and Protection of Indigenous Nations*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring.
- Simpson, Leanne. 2008b. "Looking after Gdoo-Naaganinaa: Precolonial Nishnaabeg Diplomatic and Treaty Relationships." *Wicazo Sa Review* 23(2): 29-42.
- Slowey, Gabrielle. 2008. *Navigating Neoliberalism: Self-Determination and the Mikisew Cree First Nation*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Spak, Stella. 2005. "The Position of Indigenous Knowledge in Canadian Co-Management Organizations." *Anthropologica* 47(2): 233-46.
- Stevenson, Marc G. 2004. "Decolonizing Co-Management in Northern Canada." *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 28(1).
- Tully, James. 2000. "The Struggles of Indigenous Peoples for and of Freedom." In *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, ed. Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton and Will Sanders. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, Dale. 2006. *This Is Not a Peace Pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Venne, Sharon. 1997. "Understanding Treaty 6: An Indigenous Perspective." In *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada: Essays on Law, Equity, and Respect for Difference*, ed. Michael Asch. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- White, Graham. 2002. "Treaty Federalism in Northern Canada: Aboriginal-Government Land Claims Boards." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 32(3): 89-114.
- White, Graham. 2006. "Traditional Aboriginal Values in a Westminster Parliament: The Legislative Assembly of Nunavut." *The Journal of Legislative Studies* 12(1): 8-31.
- Wilson, Waziyatawin Angela. 2004. "Indigenous Knowledge Recovery in Indigenous Empowerment." *American Indian Quarterly* 28(3&4): 359-72.