Indigenous Identities and Nation-Building within Canadian Urban Centres:

Relevance for Algonquin Nationhood

By

Jeffrey Walter Decontie

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Indigenous Governance

Department of Indigenous Studies
Master of Arts in Indigenous Governance
The University of Winnipeg
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

May 2013

Abstract

I document and analyze, using a decolonization framework, historical and contemporary understandings of Indigenous identities, focusing primarily on Indigenous Canadian identity in urban centres. I describe the reconstruction of Indigenous identities in urban centres through the maintenance of certain connections to specific places, traditions, and narratives. I deconstruct and compare western and Indigenous understandings of nation and nationalism. I analyze fears of nationalism while concluding that, while diverse Indigenous nations are growing in urban centres, Indigenous nations have more to fear from the Canadian nation-building project than the reverse. Rebuilding Indigenous nationhoods is a form of justice and equality because it develops the opportunity for nations to determine their own futures. I then apply my analysis to the Algonquin Nation in the Ottawa River watershed. My research addresses a significant gap in the body of knowledge by focusing on Indigenous nation-building in urban centres in Canada.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

<u>Chapter One – Research Methodology and Literature Review</u>

<u>Introduction</u>

The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) notes that Indigenous people began migrating toward urban centres during the post-World War II era. The severe economic and social conditions on reserves, as well as the baby boom, were cited as primary factors (1993, p. 89). The search for employment, better health care and education, were, and continue to be, major reasons for Indigenous people moving to urban centres. According to the 2006 census, 623, 470 Aboriginal people live in Canadian urban centres, representing 54% of the entire population (Statistics Canada, 2012a). This is an increase from 50% in 1996 (ibid.). 59% of the urban Aboriginals live in metropolitan areas, or cities with a population over 100,000 people (ibid.). Canada is highly urbanized and it should be no surprise that Aboriginal people are part of a new wave of urban citizens. However, unlike other groups of people, Aboriginal Canadians have special rights that municipal governments have a difficult time serving because of jurisdictional issues (Peters, 2011, p. 16).

Urban lifestyles create new issues in the consciousness of Aboriginal peoples. Newhouse and Peters write, "Relationships with urban landlords, searching for employment in urban economies, making spaces for Aboriginal cultures and languages in city places, interacting with neighbors from different cultures and building urban Aboriginal programs and institutions is as much a part of Aboriginal realities as are land claims, conflicts over logging, hunting and treaty rights, and rural economic development" (2003, p. 5). Instead of viewing this phenomenon as cultural loss or the genesis of a new homogenous urban Aboriginal culture, it is most accurately viewed as people coming from distinct nations adding a new narrative experience to their ever changing national stories. They become part of a diaspora, but, nonetheless, they do not lose

their particular Indigenous identity. For example, some Inuk people still live in the land their ancestors lived since time immemorial while others now live in Ottawa. People continue to identify with a nation, but live different contemporary experiences.[1]

Nevertheless, there are many people who reject this narrative. Urban centres continue to be seen as places of assimilation by the majority of non-Aboriginal Canadians and even some Aboriginal ones. Despite ample evidence that Aboriginal people are retaining their distinct identities, many people assume that Aboriginal people must assimilate in order to survive in cities (Cairns, 2000a, p. 125).[2] Simply put, Aboriginal people are meant to live off the land and anything else is deemed inauthentic (Sissons, 2005, p. 39). Even if assimilation does not take place, the argument continues, self-government and nationhood are deemed impossible within urban centres (Cairns, 2000a, p. 129). Yet, Aboriginal people have rights tied to these political entities which are recognized by Canada. These are said to exist wherever they happen to live, urban or rural (Darnell, 2011, p. 42). The reality of these growing urban Aboriginal populations, and the subsequent challenges of negotiating authentic Indigenous identities and the rights associated with them, has led me to ask a fundamental question: has the urbanization of Canada's Aboriginal population helped or hindered the rebuilding of Indigenous identities and nationhood?

<div align="center">Research Questions</div>

What are the methods of rebuilding Indigenous nationhood within the Canadian state in the context of growing urbanization?[3] In particular, I am curious about how the phenomenon of Indigenous urbanization applies to my own Algonquin nation[4] and the cities in which they reside. Researching the topic of Indigenous nation reconstruction led to additional questions. What forms of Indigenous identities exist within Canadian urban centres? Are Indigenous

identities strengthened or weakened in an urban context? What are the implications for

Indigenous and Algonquin nation-building? All of these questions are related to the problem of

rebuilding the idea of nationhood in a geographically dispersed context. Indigenous people

should not have to live an historic lifestyle in order to justify their distinct political rights as First

Nations in Canada (Borrows, 2002, p. 60; Sissons, 2005, p. 82-83). But what does an authentic

urban Indigenous lifestyle look like and how does it maintain its difference from mainstream

Canadian society? By answering these questions, I demonstrate a fluid conception of Indigenous

identities in the 21st century which show a form of *difference*. The answers will help build a

theory and a model on how nation-building[5] projects can work to empower Aboriginal

Canadians to live their diverse cultures, languages, and viewpoints, regardless of where they

reside.

<div align="center">Research Purpose</div>

The purpose of this research project is to document how Indigenous people in Canada's

urban centres have attempted to rebuild their Indigenous identities and nations, culturally and

politically since 1993. Their efforts are examined in the context of Algonquin nationhood and it

is my goal to see my Algonquin nation grow stronger, to produce more knowledge regarding my

nation, and to demonstrate that Algonquin citizens can adapt to urban surroundings while

maintaining their Algonquin identity. This project is a way to give back by enhancing the

knowledge of Indigenous peoples and, more specifically, Algonquin people, in the 21st century.

I hope that Algonquin researchers will use or critique my work as part of an Algonquin discourse

on what it is to be Algonquin. There is a sacredness to inserting and asserting ourselves into the

world and demonstrating that we still exist. This study demonstrates that Indigenous and non-

Indigenous people are different, but equally able to adapt to Canadian urban centres.

Research Design

The research comprised a literature review of academic texts, from 1993-2012, involving consistent codes – ideas or terms – that appeared during the search for the forms of Indigenous identities. I grouped the codes together into categories or major themes concerning Indigenous identities. I analyzed these categories in the context of my research questions on urban Indigenous identities. Finally, after this literature review I applied my findings to the areas of Algonquin identities and nation-building. Further details are discussed in the section on methods.

To facilitate a better understanding of urban Indigenous identities and nation-building I incorporated the *inductive research strategy* put forward by sociologist Norman Blaikie. This strategy allowed me to establish some generalizations of people and social phenomena found in the literature (2010, p. 83). For example, I made generalizations regarding the experiences of Indigenous people living in Canadian urban centres. The characteristics of the social phenomena were found through the lens of decolonization further developed in the theoretical framework and decolonization sections. I then drew conclusions from the data collected (ibid.). I also identified gaps in the literature regarding urban Indigenous identities and nationhood in order to produce a clearer picture of urban Indigeneity and urban nationhood.

Ontology and Epistemology

I chose subtle realism as an ontological assumption introduced by Blaikie because I believe there is a reality which can be known "independently of social scientists" (p. 94). For example, an urban Aboriginal identity exists and is known by people who share it contrary to what others argue as *cultural loss* (Cairns, 2000a; Flanagan, 2000). To complement the inductive method and subtle realism I assume the epistemological position of *Interpretivism* used by Bryman *et al*. Interpretivism is a position which requires the researcher "…to grasp the

subjective meanings people attach to their actions and behaviours" (2009, p. 344). From this

position I understood how Indigenous people make sense of their identities,[6] as well as how they

construct and negotiate them in order to *live well* as Indigenous people.

<div align="center">Theoretical Framework and Justification</div>

I situate myself in this research project by sharing my assumptions on the topic of

rebuilding nationhood in urban centres (Absolon and Willet, 2005, p. 97).[7] I believe that my

topic and problem are important not only because of these assumptions, but because they can

produce more knowledge regarding the Algonquin nation. From a social justice standpoint, one

key assumption is that rebuilding nationhood is a worthy goal for Indigenous people (Alfred and

Corntassel, 2005, p. 611).[8] The second assumption is the powerful notion of identity which

influences nation-building and the health of the specific Indigenous person (Warry, 2007, p.

102).[9]

My theoretical framework combines both an Indigenous critical theory and

decolonization theory within a qualitative methodology. The purpose of critical theory is to help

emancipate people from dominance; my research should continue this tradition. Mark Poster

describes how "critical theory springs from an assumption that we live amid a world of pain, that

much can be done to alleviate that pain, and that theory has a crucial role to play in that process"

(1989, p. 3). This is a powerful statement because it reminds us why people use critical theory in

the first place. My research produces more knowledge regarding Indigenous people living in

urban centres and demonstrates that Algonquin people can adapt to urban settings while

maintaining an identity as a people. I use decolonization theory in the context of Indigenous

peoples in North American urban centres, particularly Canada's. The project of decolonization

uncovers ways of *living well* in urban centres as Indigenous people.[10] Although colonization has

fragmented Algonquin identities, there is hope through the decolonization project that we can re-assert Algonquin-centered identity by re-learning a language that is not extinct, telling our sacred histories and remaining attached to our territory. We can also rebuild our identities through the cultural forms of expression we share with our Indigenous neighbours.

<div align="center">Methods</div>

Data Collection Methods: Bryman *et al.* identify a qualitative content analysis method which involves "…constantly revising the themes or categories distilled from the examination of documents" (2009, p. 300). The academic documents — texts, journals, books, and websites — were published from 1993-2012. I chose 1993 as my start date somewhat arbitrarily. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) did publish a document in 1993 focusing on Indigenous people living in urban centres. Otherwise, there is a paucity of resources predating 1993 and the 1993 RCAP document cannot be characterized as highly significant. With the exception of a few American sources in the late 1990's the focus on urban Indigenous people did not intensify until the 21st century — the works of Jackson (2002) and Newhouse and Peters (2003) are examples of this contemporary academic focus on the issue. Over the relatively short time that I conducted the literature review, I noted that the pace of publications on urban Indigenous people and topics is on the rise.[11]

The data I gathered from the academic sources related to the key themes in my research: Indigenous identity reconstruction, urbanization, and Indigenous nation-building within urban centres. The research includes American and Canadian Indigenous academics on the topic of urban Indigeneity and Indigenous nationhood. Although the research is concerned with Indigeneity within Canadian urban centres, the experience of Indigenous people within some

American cities can be applied to the Canadian situation. Finally, while as an urbanized

Algonquin I held a bias, I attempted to explore all potential queries.

As an urbanized Algonquin, my biases may have influenced the selection of sources in a

manner which ignores controversy and issues regarding urban Indigeneity. To discourage this

potential tendency, I included codes concerning social issues that arise for Indigenous people in

urban centres – i.e. marginalization, cultural fragmentation, pan-Indigeneity, and integration,

which were all cases to support the argument of cultural loss. I was also careful to highlight the

concern over loss of language and connection to land regarding urban Indigeneity. This measure

was crucial to prevent bias during the selection and inclusion of the many sources concerning the

research themes listed above. Bias may have also existed through the lack of empirical data on

Algonquin people in urban centres. This data is limited and not suitable for quantitative studies.

My qualitative research design and theoretical assumptions, along with a large literature review

of urban Indigeneity and nation-building, helped address the implications for urban Algonquin

identities and nation-building.

Data Analysis Methods: The most efficient method for my study was content analysis.

O'Leary writes, "In qualitative analysis, understandings are built by a process of uncovering and

discovering themes that run through the raw data, and by interpreting the implication of those

themes for the research questions" (2004, p. 195). With this in mind, I used both inductive and

deductive reasoning to generate and interpret the themes I came across in the literature. Along

with engaging the literature through my research questions, the themes were influenced by my

own urban Indigeneity, as well as insights gained during the collection of data (ibid.). My

methodological constraints are grounded in decolonization and critical theory. This framework

guided the literature review. The research questions allowed me to search the literature for

consistent and repeated themes. An example of my data analysis is included in the appendix. The

foundation for the chart was provided by O'Connor and Gibson (2003).

Review of Literature

Introduction: What is Indigenous Identity?

The study of *Indigenous identity* is a rich and debatable topic for scholars and Indigenous

studies as a discipline (Alfred and Corntassel, 2005, p. 73). This is the case because control over

identity is a fundamental characteristic of self-determination (Warry, 2007, p. 102). There are

two main approaches to understanding the topic of Indigenous identity in Canada. The first is

through the construction of race, the second through culture. There are also identities which

privilege land-based relationships — the latter are somewhat limiting to urban Aboriginal

people. Ultimately, the purpose of this section is to show that adaptation, decolonization, and the

maintenance of traditional values and practices are crucial tools for the survival of Indigeneity in

an urban context.

Race-based Indigenous Identity

Bonita Lawrence blames the widespread notion of Aboriginal politics as race-based on

the history of Canada. She writes, "a crucial way in which the cultural distinctiveness –and the

nationhood –of Indigenous societies has been denied within the colonizing society has been to

reduce cultural identity to race" (2004, p. 228). Indian status, she argues further, denies

sovereignty by replacing the communal *nation* with the idea of the Indian and "Government-

created differences have now been naturalized as inherent differences, to the extent that Canada

has been successful in tying treaty rights and a nation-to-nation relationship to Indian status" (p.

230). This understanding of identity involves this construction of an *Indian* whose identity is

static and the subsequent oppression this entails.

Certainly some Indigenous people and mainstream Canadians still view identity as race-based. However, scholars in Indigenous studies[12] and who are involved in decolonization projects argue that this is simply a construction of the Indian Act. RCAP states,

Aboriginal peoples are not racial groups; rather they are organized, political and cultural entities. Although contemporary Aboriginal groups stem historically from the original peoples of North America, they often have mixed genetic heritages and include individuals of varied ancestry. As organized, political entities, they have the capacity to evolve over time and change in their internal composition (1996a, p. 177).

The move away from race-based, static notions of identity towards a cultural one with distinct political rights has been supported by many scholars, yet fails to capture the imaginations of the Canadian public.

Cultural Identity

Understanding the difference between a static and fluid culture is the first step in understanding Aboriginal people (Warry, 2007, p. 89). Anthropologist Wayne Warry writes, "To take one metaphor, culture can be thought of as light: it is comprised of dual qualities, particle and wave. Cultures are fluid (wave-like) and malleable and so change through time and flow into other cultures. Yet they also have solid (particle-like) attributes, which allow them to bump up against, resist, or contrast themselves to other cultures" (p. 100). Cultural distinction and fluidity is important for the discussion on Indigenous identity in urban centres. Niigonwedom Sinclair[13] discussed non-essentialist Indigenous-centered identity with the purpose of empowerment in an interconnected world. He described hybridity as: "the multicultural, multidirectional, transient space created in the temporal balance found in mediating competing forces in one's life" (2010, p. 240). Globalization, intermixing, and multiple ethnic identities are prime examples of this

hybridity. According to the theory, Indigenous identities are unstable and Indigenous people are constantly restructuring the identities they have. Sinclair argued that his Anishinabeg teachings – his cultural responsibilities in the world – create a centered identity which fights fragmented hybridity; his Indigenous-centered identity does not oppose the other identities, but is centered. The theory of an Indigenous-centered identity is much more liberating than hybridity theory because it allows Indigenous people to flourish and adapt to surroundings without sacrificing who they are; hybridity prevents this from happening by encouraging a lack of distinction between Indigenous people and non-Indigenous people. There is the possibility that the rights of urban Indigenous people can be limited because of ideas on hybridity and identity.

<u>Land, Behaviour, and Traditions in Identity</u>

Unlike many other cultures, Indigenous cultures exhibit a distinctive and close relationship to land. Indigenous traditions and values are tied to land and this is another aspect of Indigenous identity.[14] Anishinabe scholar Leanne Simpson has stated that "the land strengthens our relationship to our extended families and deepens our spiritual understanding of life and our place in it" (2003, p. 130). The land teaches how to live one's life and how to be a good person, which inevitably influence how the nation conducts itself. Simpson also argued that traditionally, from an Anishinabe perspective, adopted members were not asked to give up their core identity, but were encouraged to adapt that identity "within the web of mino bimaadiziwin" (living the good life) (2011, p. 90). This reinforces the idea how decolonization quite often encourages the maintenance of certain nation-specific practices. Additionally, for the Anishinabeg, identity is tied to how one lives the *mino bimaadiziwin*; this way of life is much more than living to be *good*, but is a responsible life based on understanding relationships with Creation and following

a set of instructions from the Creator. This lifestyle and the understanding of the responsibilities

given by the Creator reinforce this identity (p. 42).

The idea of *peoplehood* states how an Indigenous identity includes four aspects:

languages, ceremonial cycles, land, and sacred histories, all of which are interconnected (Holm

et al., 2003, p. 14). Alfred and Corntassel expand on the four aspects of peoplehood and some

foundations of resistance, which describe relationships that define an Indigenous person. Some

themes in foundations of resistance are: strong families, grounded community, a spiritual

connection to land, use of Indigenous language and storytelling, as well as spirituality (2005, p.

608). According to Alfred and Corntassel, identity is based on action and involvement with

culture; the action being the use of language, storytelling, and songs – texts and thought. If there

is no action, then one ceases to have an Indigenous identity. Additionally, the oral tradition is

primary to Anishinabeg identity (Lee, 2010, p. 236). Craig Womack adds that a new written

tradition complements the oral method of passing down knowledge, songs, poems, chants, and

prayers which all eventually influence Indigenous behavior. Storytelling – written or oral – helps

foster the collective identity of a people, no matter where they are situated (1999, p. 15-16).

Keeshig-Tobias argued that artifacts and history, although important, do not *make* Indigenous

cultures; ideas and actions *make* Indigenous cultures. Stories, songs, games, and humour all

reflect attitudes and behaviours of Indigenous people; it reflects their relationships with other

people and outlooks on life (2010, p. 317). This requires an Indigenous-centred identity, but also

liberates Indigenous people from a static identity in an ever changing and globalized world.[15]

Urban Indigenous Identities

The literature on Indigenous identity demonstrates how we distinguish ourselves from the

peoples that surround us and continue to live according to that identity without being static; this

is the quest for fluid identity (Alfred and Corntassel, 2005, p. 613). The fundamental challenge

for the urban Aboriginal is that the rural Indian *portrait* remains a dominant understanding of

Indigenous identity. Anthropologist Jeff Sissons argued for a distinction between eco-indigenism

and Indigeneity because the discourse on Indigenous people is dominated by being close to

nature and living off the land (2005, p. 16). An oversimplification of Indigenous identity may

harm Indigenous people living in urban centres, especially when it comes to policy. If indigenous

identities within urban centres are based on cultural change, not cultural loss, then traditional

practices and values can continue (James, 2001, p. 316-317). Much like other peoples,

Indigenous people have adapted to urban centres with the rise of global urbanization (Darnell,

2011, p. 43). Silver *et al*. argued that many Indigenous people living in Winnipeg want to have

the benefits of Canadian urban life without losing their distinct identities (2006, p. 172). Indeed,

Indigenous people can still maintain relationships with elders, languages, traditional values, and

even territory, all in order to maintain a distinct cultural way of life within cities. As Cayuga

academic David Newhouse emphasizes, *ruralness* is not a requirement for what makes

Indigenous identity (2011, p. 33).

    The relationship urban Indigenous people have to a territory is different from that of

Indigenous people who live on reserves, but it is nonetheless important (Andersen and Denis,

2003, p. 385). Indigenous identities in urban centres – and within a specific territory – are based

on a network of *relatedness* (Lobo, 2001, p. 77). The connection to other Indigenous people

strengthens urban Indigeneity (Lucero, 2013, p. 280). In most cases, contemporary urban

Indigenous people are generally more worried about the complexities of their identities than

previous generations living in urban centres or even Indigenous people on reserves (p. 281).

Most have to balance their Indigenous identities while engaging with others through wider

mainstream cultures, politics, and business relationships. Fragmentation and confusion regarding identities can take place in urban centres; however, this does not imply cultural loss or lack of authenticity. The belief that urban centres lead to cultural loss fails to take into consideration the rise of networking and organizational growth, or community, happening within urban centres. There is no denying that urban Indigenous identities have changed over time as they have rubbed against other urban cultures, according to Warry's metaphor of light; however, Indigenous identities have also resisted and kept traditions, behaviours, and worldviews which make Indigenous people distinct.

<div align="center">Application to Algonquin Identity</div>

The Algonquin experience is consistent with the literature on identity. The literature regarding Algonquin identity is limited, but sufficient to connect to other attempts by Indigenous people in rebuilding their nations and reconstructing their identities.[16] The term Algonquin is used by the authors to describe the nation, but eventually they move beyond this term to describe a relationship to a local place or an activity on the land. One leader wrote that even though his identity includes the *Algonquin north of the Kichi Sibi* or the Great River (Ottawa River), his people are the *People of the Stone Weir* (Matchewan, 1989, p. 140). Kitigan Zibi historian Stephen McGregor affirmed that the Algonquin called themselves the *Great River People* (2004, p. 18). Finally, Paula Sherman does not use the term Algonquin, choosing instead to use the term *Omàmìwinini* in her writing; this name describes the relationship to the land and how we are known to the spirit world (2008a, p. 77, n1). Despite the focus on land, Algonquin identity and political projects like rebuilding nationhood are just as capable of thriving within urban centres as any other Indigenous nation. The 21st century Algonquin Nation has its roots in territory, but it has expanded to include diasporic populations across Canada and even around the world.

Indications of Indigenous Nationhood in Urban Centres

Canadian urban centres are new places where Indigenous people can obtain valuable skills for rebuilding their Indigeneity. These new *urban meeting grounds* provide new, and old, territories for sharing, obtaining, and appropriating resources and ideas. Armand Ruffo, an Ojibway professor and poet, argued that an Indigenous revitalization movement happened in Canada precisely because of the tools and ideas that were available in Canadian urban centres. Friendship Centres, newspapers, writer's groups, were all available for Indigenous people to utilize to begin solving issues that mattered to them (2010, p. 176). Newhouse (2003) and Lawrence (2004) argued that urbanization, contrary to many people's beliefs, does not lead to assimilation and increased fragmentation. Ironically, the education and tools obtained in the city can liberate Indigenous people from state dominance. Indigenous people can obtain the necessary education and confidence from services which exist in the cities to give them the skills they need to be self-sufficient in the new environment. These people stay in urban settings, yet are taking positions in organizations that serve Indigenous communities and incorporate Indigenous culture. There exist possibilities for Indigenous nationhood to survive in urban centres while Indigenous people decolonize their identities and assist their reserve communities with the nation-building process as well (Lawrence, 2004, p. 232). Brock Pitawanakwat adds how upholding responsibilities to home communities away from urban centres is considered *living honorably* and unifies nationhood (2008, p. 168). Even when Aboriginal people live off reserve, most maintain ties to their home communities through family, friends, and responsibilities (Peters and Wilson, 2005, p. 405-06).[17]

Nationhood

Introduction to Nationhood

The term nation is a contentious one which brings forth many different interpretations. This raises the question of whether Indigenous people should use it in their own political projects. The term nation may be easier to use in a territorial sense, but there are challenges in applying it in urban centres. It is my belief that Indigenous people can use the term nation to describe their people, but we must compare Western and Indigenous understandings of it. Readers may ask, "why not use another term"? My aim is to argue how some scholars have deconstructed the idea of a *nation* and how people can carry this sense of *nationhood* with them into diverse urban centres. The term requires understanding from linguistic and cultural points of view, as well as an engagement with contemporary understandings of it. Before we can discuss nationhood in urban centres though, we must understand the concept of Indigenous nationhood within Canada.

A simple definition of *nation* from the perspective of Aboriginal Canadians is given by political theorist Tim Schouls who writes that Indigenous nations are "communities held together through objective bonds of history, language, and culture, whose members use those bonds subjectively to create a sense of shared nationhood" (2003, p. 6). If we take this definition without considering the historical and political injustices done to Aboriginal people by the Canadian state we can conclude that both language loss and cultural loss limit claims of nationhood. However, those who endorse this view are concerned with either: a) ethnic nationalism as a threat to political unity; or b) how nationhood is not realistic for urban Aboriginal people (i.e. urban = assimilated).

Limitations of Nationhood

Mainstream Canada has been understandably cautious regarding the use of the term *nation* in the Aboriginal context. The term *nationalism* was too closely associated with the concept of independence. Cairns writes, "Nationalism seeks to get out – to achieve maximum autonomy. The ongoing connection with the majority society – the agent of its former subjugation – tends to be seen as a regrettable necessity – not as an instrument of solidarity" (2000b, p. 124-125). If Aboriginal Canadians are too *separate*, ordinary Canadians will come to view them as *others*. There will be no basis for solidarity or shared goals. Cairns argues if there is no solidarity, then there will be no support from Canadians. He writes, "This would have disastrous consequences for the citizens of Aboriginal nations whose governments will lack meaningful governing capacity in the absence of massive, long-lasting flows of resources from the non-Aboriginal majority" (p. 125). The logical conclusion is to stop this *nation* business and accept some special rights as *Canadians*. This is the critical issue for Cairns. Law professor W.A. Bogart understands the nation-to-nation relationship stressed by RCAP, but his arguments against this development lie in what he sees as facts: 1) urban Aboriginal people are losing identity within the cities; and 2) self-government in these cities is not feasible (2005, p. 105-109). Distinct Indigenous nations are thus too complex and too threatening to the Canadian state.

Such assumptions are based on the underlying thoughts that: a) urban Indigeneity equals cultural loss; b) reserve communities are *losing* people to urban centres and hence play no part in the lives of their urban citizens; and c) nationhood is tied to a rural land base and not urban centres (Andersen and Denis, 2003, p. 382). David Newhouse stated that the National Chief in the early 1990's[18] told him that urban Indigenous people left their communities and had to face the consequences of not being cared for by their governments (2011, p. 26). Patrick Macklem, a

professor of law at the University of Toronto, has argued Indigenous people have a distinct

relationship with Canada. However, even as an ally, he understands the term nation as

territorially based with no connection to urban lifestyles (2001, p. 107). Finally, political

philosopher William Kymlicka has stated that it is more accurate to call Canada a multination

state and includes Aboriginal nations along with the English and French. However, he writes,

"these groups are 'nations' in the sociological sense of being historical communities,

institutionally complete, occupying a given territory or homeland, and sharing a distinct language

and history" (2009, p. 24).

Is Indigenous nationhood really threatening and/or impossible in the context of the

Canadian state? Wayne Warry notes, people "who call for separate institutions ignore the fact

that Aboriginal and mainstream institutions will always need to be interfaced and that it is

through this discourse on how Aboriginal politics and law interconnect to mainstream political

and legal institutions that incommensurable practices and values are accommodated or

transformed" (2007, p. 95). Despite this interconnection, the underlying fears of nations are

based out of control and domination in society (Ashcroft et al., 2007, p. 135). Nations can

legitimize an idea of a group which can be maintained by military, judicial, religious,

educational, and political means (ibid.). Therefore, it is imperative for the purpose of this thesis

to deconstruct the term nation and to document Indigenous expressions of nationhood.

<u>Deconstructing Nationhood</u>

The term must be deconstructed and explained for people who have great fears attached

to the term. Some scholars, Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal, merely use the term nation and do not

give a reason for using it. The purpose of this section is not to critique them, but to understand

how the term nation/nationhood can be *redeemed* for libratory purposes. Cherokee literary critic

Daniel Heath Justice argued the underlying Indigenous interpretations of the word nation should reflect "kinship, reciprocity, and responsibility [and] these concepts are often very different from the assimilative and assaultive consumerist patriotism that fuels the modern nation-state" (2010, p. 63). We also need to deconstruct the term nation because of the idea that nationhood is tied to a land base and therefore outside of urban centres. Andersen and Denis argue urban Aboriginal people have a relationship to territory even though the political goals may differ from their counterparts on reserve (2003, p. 385). Imagining the nation as a network as opposed to a group of people in a physical geographical location is useful in this context (Howard, 2011, p. 90). Aboriginal identity is multilayered, but it is also tied to social networks (Proulx and Howard, 2011, p. 6). Belonging to a nation need not imply physically living on a reserve; it is important to remember that reserves are not Indigenous constructions.

Leanne Simpson analyzed the meanings of the words *city* and *nation* in the Anishinaabe language. She connected these two terms to the word *heart* with the implication being that Anishinaabe people view cities as places where hearts gather. She then thought of the nation as an "interconnected web of hearts" (2011, p. 94). Additionally, Mohawk scholar Taiaiake Alfred wrote early in his career about Mohawk nationalism (1995), but in an effort to apply what he thought of as native nationalism, his more recent work aims to provide "a universal understanding and reconstruction of social and governmental institutions embodying traditional Indigenous cultural values" (2009, p. 14). Distinctively, Indigenous nationhood is connected to people decolonizing and rebuilding their communities.

The deconstruction of the term nation can foster an understanding of how Indigenous people rebuild their nations in a manner they feel ties them to the people who came before them. It is a type of political community that ultimately needs to be *imagined* in the manner put forth

by Benedict Anderson. He defines the term *imagined* in this context as meaning that many people in the nation will never know each other, but will have an image of their bond as a group of people. Anderson discussed how Jewish people are descendants of a group of people no matter the languages they speak or nations they live in (1991, p. 149). This is a helpful example for understanding the potential for Indigenous nations to flourish via diaspora populations in Canadian urban centres. While nations are a recent construction, *imagined nations* are said to originate in an immemorial past. This concept is similar to the idea of *time immemorial* and *seven generations* prevalent in many Indigenous cultures. Membership in these traditional communities also depended on the idea that the language was sacred, given to them from a higher power (p. 13). The construction of *nation* and *identity* is rooted in language – similar to Indigenous nations.

Additionally, Anderson argues that cities played a large role in the development of nationalism as places where intellectuals could gather and share information. Education and administration created a base for communities to be imagined (p. 140). Cosmopolitan intellectuals create the loves and fears of nations as Anderson writes, "The cultural products of nationalism – poetry, prose fiction, music, plastic arts – show this love very clearly in thousands of different forms and styles" (p. 141). The elite in any society shape education, politics, law, and culture; they have a significant amount of power in claims of identity as well. Cultural revitalization is strengthened by artists, thinkers, and writers, who shape movements in law and policy, universities, and in society. This concept can be applied to Indigenous peoples' communities as well. An example of this trend can be seen in Creek/Cherokee literary critic Craig Womack's definition of nationhood as "an intermingling of politics, imagination, and spirituality… Nationhood is affected by imagination in the way that the citizens of tribal nations

perceive their cultural and political identity. Nationhood recognizes spiritual practices, since culture is part of what gives people an understanding of their uniqueness, their difference, from other nations of people" (1999, p. 60). Deconstructing the concept of nationhood illustrates that it derives much more from human minds and is ultimately constructed. Nations are what they are imagined to be. This is important for urban Indigenous people because if nations can be imagined, they can exist anywhere.

<div align="center">Conclusion of Literature Review and Limitations</div>

A review of the literature reveals some emerging ideas on Indigenous identities. Although a race-based Indigenous identity remains acceptable to some, they have been increasingly criticized and rejected in the academic literature. The decolonization movement is useful to conceptualize Indigenous identities within urban centres. It is clear that cultural identities within urban centres are recognized, specifically regarding the themes of adaptation, decolonization, and practicing traditional values. Indigenous ideas of the *good life* and the learning and speaking of an Indigenous language are stressed consistently and must be considered in relation to urban identities.

The concept of land-based identities presents a problem in the literature because land is said to shape how Indigenous people ought to live in the world. The centrality of land is a broad theme. It is strongly implied that this is what creates a distinct culture. There are calls by scholars to have ceremony within cities and to connect with the land whenever possible. The rural Indian *portrait* remains dominant and subsequently influences static and race-based notions of identity. However, urban Indigenous identities are increasingly viewed as *a network of relatedness*. Indigenous cultures have adapted and changed over time, but, even in urban areas they maintain

enough traditions and worldviews to remain distinct. Interconnectedness within urban centres seems to be a key idea to self-determination and to combat concerns over political separation.

Nationhood and nation, as terms, have negative connotations and ultimately limitations. Negative interpretations of the two related terms can threaten political unity and perhaps this is why the many Canadians have discouraged the idea of distinct Indigenous identities, and indeed, imagined nations. Although this is a major concern, the embrace of difference and creative forms of politics benefit Canadian society. Networks of Indigenous people and the relationships between them are supported over geographical notions of nationhood. Nationhood is constructed, or imagined, and because of this, urban diaspora of coherent Indigenous nations can exist, thrive, and even help define their collective political projects.

Chapter Two – Race-Based and Culture-Based Identities

The purpose of this chapter is to explain two forms of identity: race-based and culture-based. First, it is imperative to document how race-based identities are embedded within the foundations of colonialism and how they have been normalized over centuries. It will be argued throughout this chapter that race as a concept distorts Indigenous identities as well as authenticity. Race as a concept needs to be dismantled for the sake of Indigenous liberation. This dismantling process is challenging because race has permeated both Indigenous and mainstream societies. The second part of this chapter will focus on culture-based forms of identity, which are currently gaining legitimacy in how Indigenous people distinguish themselves from others. The term *culture* will be analyzed, along with theories about how individuals and groups can maintain a sense of themselves while adapting to contemporary environments. It is important to stress difference in order to support the project of national continuance for Indigenous people. Race-based understandings embedded in colonial policies deter this continuance. In contrast, specific relationships to land are the cultural centers that legitimize difference and assist in creating meaning and understanding for Indigenous people.

Race-based Indigenous Identity

Race-based identity is still an influential concept among mainstream Canadians and even Indigenous people. However, it is the argument in this thesis that race limits the reconstruction of Indigenous identities and nation-building in urban centres and consequently should be exposed and intellectually dismantled. To dismantle the term, it needs to be defined. The concept of race categorizes "human beings into physically, biologically and genetically distinct groups. [It] assumes, firstly, that humanity is divided into unchanging natural types" (Ashcroft et al., 2007, p. 180). This manner of thinking assumes that an individual's physical features, coming from these

fixed groups, are unchanging and transferred through *blood*, which can be measured; this

conceptual foundation can lead to intellectual and moral concerns regarding the group as a

whole.[19] These assumptions were embedded in the thinking of Europeans during the 18th and 19th

centuries. The theories supported the dominance of one group over another; even though Europe

was divided nationally they unified under the construct of racial superiority.[20] Nothing connects

the concept of race to power more clearly than the standard theorized assumption that Europeans

are superior.

<u>European 18th and 19th Century Construction</u>

The European idea that there exist specific categories of people, based on the

transmittance of skin pigmentation and facial features, was established by the late 18th century

and reinforced by the biological sciences of the mid-19th century, which supported models of

descent (Ashcroft et al., 2007, p. 181-182). In short, the idea of *peoples* became the idea of *races*

during this time (Alcoff, 2003, p. 3). These racial categories were used to justify dominance over

any group of people that imperial nations came in contact with; the European/civilized versus

Other/uncivilized binary reflected imperial logic.[21] Caucasians were believed to be at the top of

the race hierarchy, and everywhere outside of Europe was declared *otherness* (Ashcroft et al.,

2007, p. 181), thus giving these imagined categories power and meaning. The construction of

Indigenous authenticity perpetuates the colonial mentality as well as encourages the elimination

of a people through legislation (Sissons, 2005, p. 45). Simply put, the idea of racial categories

created the justification for oppressing peoples who lived and thought outside of the dominant

paradigm, which ultimately benefited the elite in European societies.

Scholars in Indigenous studies who utilize decolonization methods to address issues

regarding Indigenous identities have argued that race-based identities are constructions made

within the logic of colonial legislation (i.e., the Indian Act) which divide and fragment nations.[22]

Bonita Lawrence blames the widespread notion of raced-based Aboriginal politics on the history

of Canada. She argues that Indian status, based on race, denies sovereignty by replacing the

communal *nation* with the idea of *the Indian*. She writes, "Government-created differences have

now been naturalized as inherent differences, to the extent that Canada has been successful in

tying treaty rights and a nation-to-nation relationship to Indian status" (2004, p. 230). This

oppressive understanding of identity involves the construction of an Indian whose identity is

static.

<div align="center">Critique of Race</div>

Many academics who research and write about matters of Indigenous cultural or political

identities overwhelmingly oppose racial categories.[23] Anishinabe writer and thinker Gerald

Vizenor argues that *the Indian* is a simulation, an invention (1993, p. 10-11). He wonders

whether we can survive this constructed Indian term. The construction of the Indian, he argues, is

a reluctance to honor and remember tribal stories and people (p. 10). The Indian, based on racial

categories, contributes to what Vizenor calls *Manifest Manners*, a perpetuation of the myths of

European superiority, dominance, and empty land in the Americas; it erases Indigenous cultures

and must be challenged.

Racial myths freeze identities, which allows for an analysis on the authenticity of a group

of people. Cultural theorist Stuart Hall wrestles with the perpetuation of racial myths in his own

work on the essential black experience; the term *black* has become hegemonic, suppressing the

numerous diverse identities it is supposed to contain (2003, p. 90-91). The acknowledgement of

diverse histories and cultures within what is termed *black* forms an awareness and demands an

eventual weakening of the concept of race (p. 91). In the context of Indigenous people in the

Americas, the idea of mixed-blood people requires the perpetuation of racial categories, according to Métis sociologist Chris Andersen (2000, p. 96); to view oneself as mixed requires that person to logically see *red* and *white* categories. Andersen argues that although *race does not exist*, racism exists and is utilized primarily to reinforce existing structures of power and dominance (p. 97). We begin to freeze our own identities and exclude people who do not live up to that frozen identity (James, 2001, p. 316). Stagnant identities based on race encourage the belief that these constructed groups of people are *authentic*, which leads Jeffrey Sissons to conclude that "Indigenous authenticity is racism and primitivism in disguise" (2005, p. 37). The adoption of racial categories and the supposed authenticity that follows encourages dehumanization in its clearest form, because it denies the natural change in human identities and cultures.

This dehumanization is perpetuated today because Canada and the United States are founded on this race-based construction (Andersen, 2000, p. 96). From this foundation, race-based identities continue to exist in Indigenous communities because Indigenous people give them social capital or "make it real" by using them (Andersen, 2011, p. 28-29).[24] Race influences community membership rules in many Indigenous communities, creating categories of legitimacy and boundaries of purity (p. 30). The logic of racial categories encourages the idea that Métis are less authentic and pure than other Indigenous people.[25] Andersen questions whether people identifying as Métis on the basis of being *mixed-blood* really understand the political and cultural complexity of their identity as Métis people. Race discourse is dominant and unquestioned, and it remains a form of power in Canadian and American societies (p. 35). The legal categories in the Canadian state should be countered by refusing to use them. Anishinabe legal scholar John Borrows agrees. He believes that "race-blind [approaches] to

rights and privileges will sap the concept of 'race' of its life and strength" (2010, p. 205).

However, this idea is not seeping into the public. Indeed, they remain so pervasive now that

many Indigenous people have internalized this logic, as well as a majority of the Canadian and

American public (Gonzales, 2001, p. 170).

<u>Use of Race</u>

Through the literature, it is clear that some Indigenous people continue to use race to

distinguish themselves from others, regardless of their age or where they live. To begin with a

respected Elder,[26] Anishinabe Eddie Benton-Banai has primarily focused on passing down the

teachings of the Anishinabe to younger generations to maintain and strengthen cultural identity.

Yet, even he adopts the concept of race in his book, referring to *white people* as the *Light-*

skinned Race (Benton-Banai, 2010). During the time of the fourth fire, two prophets warn of the

coming of this *Light-skinned Race* (p. 89).[27] The distinction of races does not take away the

veracity and importance of the thoughts of Benton-Banai regarding the history, nationhood, and

identity of the Anishinabeg. After all, he documents traditions, diaspora, and knowledge

extensively. He also reinforces the traditional practices of adoption — concerning French traders

living with the Anishinabeg nation (p. 105). My aim is only to show how widespread and

embedded racial thinking is among Indigenous people, including renowned Elders.

The ideas of blood and race have replaced or distorted Indigenous interconnected ways of

belonging (Valaskakis, 2005, p. 222).[28] The misunderstanding has now been adopted by

Indigenous writers on the topics of *blood memory* — the idea of remembering tribal histories

without human experience. Blood memory is not only controversial, but is inevitably attached to

discussions on belonging and exclusion in communities – James Frideres calls this type of

identity *Primordialism* (2008, p. 315).[29] Respected Anishinabe thinker Leanne Simpson was told

by an unnamed Elder, in the context of personal identity and national identity, that people must

choose between Indigenous or *the white world* ways of living; *mixed-blood* people must choose

one path because a middle road is a life leading to self-destruction (2008, p. 73). In fact, the

topics of *mixed-race* or *mixed-blood* in the literature on Indigenous identities are where the

colonial logic of *blood* most often arises.[30] This makes sense if one does not *fit* into the demands

of unrealistic forms of *authenticity*. Government policies have been created which support the

categories of imperial European thought; the ideas of *half-breed* and mixed-blood — as well as

non-status, off-reserve, etc. — all shape Indigenous communities and are colonial labels

(McCall, 2012, p. 27). With the many categories of Aboriginal people in Canada, it appears

entirely *natural* that deeply held ideas regarding Indigenous identity are influenced by

discrimination found in the Indian Act (Lawrence, 2000, p. 82). This has created a sort of anxiety

for Indigenous people over tribal and racial identities (2003, p. 5).[31]

The American use of the concept of blood quantum and racial categories on the national

census concerning identity, in some ways similar to the logic of *status* in Canada, has also been

embedded in the mindsets of many Indigenous people.[32] Winnebago anthropologist Renya

Ramirez demonstrates that many Indigenous people support race-based notions of identity in the

Greater San Jose area — Silicon Valley (Ramirez, 1998; Ramirez, 2007). The terms *diluted* and

full-blooded arise in her study and reinforce a common attitude among Indigenous people in the

Americas (2007, p. 117-119). While one Elder in the *hub*, or urban Indigenous social network,

expressed his opinion that language and behaviour mattered more in identity, he later was quoted

as believing in "marrying in" and saying that "real Indians" are "full-blooded" (p. 118).

Anthropologist Deborah Jackson in her study of Chippewa families within an American urban

centre, documents one incident where some members of an Anishinabe community used tribal

membership cards to identify as Anishinabe (2002, p. 3-6). The cards were issued by tribal

governments, but were "ultimately based on European American definitions of race" (p. 13).

Additionally, Cherokee sociologist Eva Marie Garroutte, in her work on Indigenous identities,

documents how some people do not want *Indian blood* to disappear (2003, p. 39-41). Indigenous

people are worried about how blood quantum or status used in policy will encourage a legal form

of extinction. The dominant notions of a race-based identity have divided and oppressed

Indigenous people to the extent where they now believe they will cease to exist if a foreign

government refuses to recognize them.[33] Jeff Sissons is accurate when he argues that colonial

governments which require biological authenticity before giving economic support and political

recognition place themselves in a position of dominance and power over Indigenous nations and

individual identities (2005, p. 39).

There are many Indigenous people living in North America who have adopted the

assumption of race-based identities and attempt to protect it because they believe that to do

nothing will mean assimilation and destruction. The focus on race-based identities is *an*

attachment to an imperial and oppressive form of thinking. To counter this, Indigenous groups

can rely on their own distinct Indigenous cultural understandings of membership to free

themselves from race-based understandings of who they are as a people. Traditional forms of

governance are needed, according to Bonita Lawrence, but "without a deep understanding of

how these divisions have been imposed on us, there is a danger that these rebuilt or new forms of

organization will recreate the same divisions as before, restricting citizenship only to those with

Indian status, as the present Indian Act system does" (2000, p. 89). The critique of race is tied to

the State's uses of harmful legislation, deciding not only the identity of a human being, but their

purity or authenticity as well (Andersen, 2011, p. 23). The critique of race is ultimately about the

abuse of power, dominance, and dehumanization. The move away from race-based, static notions

of identity towards a cultural one has been supported by many scholars, yet fails to capture the

imaginations of the Canadian public.

<div align="center">Ending Race-Based Identities</div>

Despite the lack of awareness of the colonial construction of race, and its use to maintain

power over many different peoples around the world, there has been a shift within academic

circles over the past few decades towards understanding identities through cultural and political

lenses. RCAP states,

> Aboriginal peoples are not racial groups; rather they are organized, political and cultural
>
> entities. Although contemporary Aboriginal groups stem historically from the original
>
> peoples of North America, they often have mixed genetic heritages and include
>
> individuals of varied ancestry. As organized, political entities, they have the capacity to
>
> evolve over time and change in their internal composition. (1996a, p. 177)

The argument is clear and involves a drastic turn away from race-based identities. Culture-based

identities for political-cultural groups, like Indigenous people, are more flexible than race-based

ones concerning adaptation in new environments.[34]

It is important to separate the concept of ethnicity from the concept of race. Theorist

Stuart Hall emphasizes an understanding of ethnicity as one where people can speak from

specific places concerning their own histories and cultures without being frozen to that position

or identity (2003, p. 94). It allows for the acknowledgement of how language, culture, and

history shape identity (p. 93). The emphasis in ethnicity is more on socialization rather than

genetics. Angela Gonzales writes, "Although ethnicity is often used in relation to a group's

assumed racial identity, strictly racial attributes are not necessarily a feature of all ethnic groups"

(2001, p. 171). Sociologist Kathleen J. Fitzgerald researched many Americans who are

reclaiming and embracing their Indigenous heritage (2007, p. 4). Her argument is that as people

"deny their whiteness and embrace a denigrated racial identity, their process is evidence that race

is a social and political construction and, therefore, can be deconstructed" (p. 16). This process is

also a destabilizer of the fixed idea called race. By adopting their specific Indigenous ethnic

backgrounds, these people are challenging race-based notions of identity embedded in legislation

and the minds of the public (p. 11). However, one problem Fitzgerald highlights is the confusion

people have over *race* and *ethnicity* when reclaiming their Indigenous ancestry, essentially

viewing them as interchangeable (p. 160-162). Unfortunately, ethnicity is another example of a

term that can be misused and reinterpreted through colonial thinking.

While race-based constructions of Indigenous identities are recognized by some of the

academic community as a 17th century construction, mainstream society remains transfixed by

this notion. Wade Davis has written about the fiction of race as it has been applied to Indigenous

people (2009, p 17). Davis suggests that if we are all from the "same genetic cloth", it follows

"that all cultures share essentially the same mental acuity, the same raw genius" (p. 18). There

should be no hierarchy between cultures although there is *difference*. Similarly, John Borrows

has argued it is not race but sociological differences produced by cultural practices that

distinguish Indigenous people from other groups of people (2010, p. 202). Culture(s) must be

understood as fluid as opposed to fixed constructions, or the same oppression inherent in the

notion of race is likely to continue.[35]

<div align="center">Culture-Based Indigenous Identity</div>

According to *Oxford Dictionary Online*, the word culture comes from the Latin root

referring to cultivation, but gradually societies began applying the term to the act of cultivating

human minds and manners ("Culture," 2012). It was not until the 19th century that the term

culture described the ideas, customs, and social behavior of a group (ibid.). This commonly

accepted understanding of the term lacks an indication of the diversity or difference among

individuals in the group, glossing over rich, complex roles in a distinct society. Nonetheless,

cultural critic Raymond Williams wrote in addition to the above definition that the study of

culture is "the study of relationships between elements in a whole way of life" (2001, p. 63). This

stress on relationships by Williams echoes the concepts of Indigenous knowledge. It implies

interrelatedness within an ecological system and this understanding is then used to describe a

given culture. Culture also depends on shared speech, beliefs, traditions, values, and a sense of

identity (Eagleton, 2000, p. 37). These *shared characteristics* and the relationships within culture

imply that one system is *different* to another. This view of cultural identity recognizes that there

are noteworthy differences which highlight who a people are, what they have become, and who

they will be (Hall, 1996, p. 112).

<p style="text-align:center">Strategic Essentialism and Difference</p>

From a traditional perspective, Indigenous communities have distinguished other peoples

through a cultural lens — specifically through language, traditions, and organization — as

opposed to ancestry (Jackson, 2002, p. 13-14). To avoid the same mistakes and oppressive

categorization of race-based identities, a firm grasp of what culture is and the dangers of creating

difference need to be addressed. The idea of difference within the topic of cultural identities

inevitably allows for discussing ideas of essentialism and constructivist thought, with the

concern that we may reestablish *otherness*. Understanding cultural identity for Indigenous people

demands more than *essentialist* notions — which assume that a fixed and permanent social group

identity exists (Dhamoon, 2009, p. 59).[36] Yet there is another extreme, that of *constructivist*

notions of identity — which deny this permanent and fixed notion of a social group (Huddart,

2006, p. 148). Essentialism is said to freeze our identities, while also being highly reductive.

Constructivism is so fluid that Indigenous identities become too loose so that any claim of

Indigeneity is considered meaningless.[37] Despite this debate, Indigenous people must retain a

cultural center in order to assert their difference from other people. Craig Womack argues that in

order to write and speak as Indigenous people we need to make essentialist claims (Weaver et al.,

2006, p. 96). He writes elsewhere, "It is difficult to argue that a group faces oppression if you no

longer believe the group exists because you have deconstructed its identity to death" (Womack,

1999, p. 205).

This leads us to the use of strategic essentialism, which allows for the understanding of

historical conditions of an identity in a given situation (Dhamoon, 2009, p. 60). The use of the

word *strategic* identifies the conscious use of a given essential identity, based on difference,

which gains a certain type of legitimacy in a given context. A common example is claiming to be

a woman in one situation relating to men (difference), but also recognizing that this identity will

not be privileged exclusively in all situations (fluidity). This context keeps identity fluid, but also

situates difference within social relations to work for political ends (p. 60).[38] Strategic

essentialism focuses on the specific types of difference to gain legitimacy and meaning in a

specific situation (p. 61). The focus on the context of one's position "destabilizes the idea that an

identity is ontologically one thing or another, while also situating difference within identifiable

social relations" (p. 60).

The elaboration of Indigenous cultural identity usually involves emphasis on *difference*

while remaining sensitive to the potential oppressiveness of *otherness*; the idea is to be different

and equal, not separate and marginalized.[39] All cultures change, but this change does not

eradicate the specific characteristics of what makes cultures distinct. For example, René

Descartes is remembered as a French philosopher but it would be ludicrous for people to argue

that to be French is to behave how Descartes did in the early 17th century. The French essence is

maintained even while people still transform and adapt to contemporary environments. Although

identities are an acknowledgement of our positions within historical narratives, cultural identity

is also a transformation; it is a process (Hall, 1996, p. 112). The literature primarily stresses this

fluidity, and this change, without sacrificing the very foundation people stand on.

<div align="center">Cultural Change</div>

Understanding the difference between a static and fluid culture is the first step in

understanding Indigenous people (Warry, 2007, p. 89). Warry states, "To take one metaphor,

culture can be thought of as light: it is comprised of dual qualities, particle and wave. Cultures

are fluid (wave-like) and malleable and so change through time and flow into other cultures. Yet

they also have solid (particle-like) attributes, which allow them to bump up against, resist, or

contrast themselves to other cultures" (p. 100). Cultural distinction and fluidity is important for

the discussion on Indigenous identity in the 21st century. Yet, historically speaking, the tendency

in understanding cultural identities from a hegemonic perspective was to freeze and control

them. Stuart Hall argues that the process of freezing African identities was an action of Western

dominance (1996, p. 117). For Indigenous people, the challenge is slightly different, but the

problem is fundamentally the same: the belief that any form of change in Indigeneity renders a

person no longer authentic or amounts to cultural loss (James, 2001, p. 316). Ironically, the act of

freezing identities in the past for preservation is a way to kill them (Womack, 1999, p. 42).[40]

Within Indigenous circles, there is a massive stress on cultivating identities as opposed to

preserving them.

The importance of adaptability and change for culture-based identities of Indigenous people, especially concerning highly diverse spaces such as urban centres, is widely recognized.[41] The privileging of cultural identities may provide an answer to the challenge of establishing a distinct culture without freezing it in time. Indigenous people can use their specific cultures to help continuously form their identities with a historic national narrative of how their group used to do things; but culture can also provide a center which people currently draw from to make decisions today and pass down new knowledge in the future (Battiste and Youngblood Henderson, 2000, p. 56).[42]

It must be stressed that cultural loss is not interchangeable with cultural change. Change is inevitable and the agency of Indigenous people may help in adapting new practices to continue and endure as a people. Cultural loss implies having no agency while the imposition of new ethics and values destroys the very essence of a people (James, 2001, p. 317). This view of change and adaptation arguably deters Indigenous people from adopting certain practices, materials, and ideas which may be threatening to the moral strength of the culture; this adaptation has cultural boundaries and limits (Alfred, 2009, p. 182n11). Thus, the knowledge of cultural change and adaptation that exists among contemporary Indigenous cultures can create additional qualifications for the term culture. Battiste and Henderson write, "Culture then is the collective agreement of the members of the society about what is accepted, valued, and sanctioned – both positively and negatively – and about what will be the society's protocol and beliefs" (2000, p. 56). Indigenous people and communities are doing this in the 21st century, and developing a tremendous focus on land and traditions.

Land and Traditions in Indigenous Identity

Indigenous cultures in particular exhibit a distinctive and close relationship to land (Valaskakis, 2005, p. 94).[43] Leanne Simpson has stated that "the land strengthens our relationship to our extended families and deepens our spiritual understanding of life and our place in it" (2003, p. 130).[44] The land teaches how to live one's life and how to be a good person in one's homeland (Battiste and Youngblood Henderson, 2000, p. 253-254).[45] The land inevitably influences families first and radiates outward to communities and nations. A renewed relationship and spiritual tie with the land is a strong factor in the formation of a healthy identity (Anderson, 2000, p. 181). Finally, within Indigenous ontologies[46] the land is considered a gift; it should not be owned, and must be cared for with a clear understanding of a sacred purpose (Champagne, 2005, p. 7).

The *peoplehood* concept complements an Indigenous identity based on land. The four aspects of peoplehood are: languages, ceremonial cycles, land, and sacred histories — all of which are interconnected (Holm et al., 2003, p. 14). Alfred and Corntassel expand on the four aspects of peoplehood with some *foundations of resistance*, which describe relationships that define an Indigenous person. Some themes in foundations of resistance include strong families, grounded communities, a spiritual connection to land, use of Indigenous language and storytelling, as well as spirituality (2005, p. 608).[47] Additionally, for the Anishinabeg, identity is tied to how one lives the *mino bimaadiziwin* (the good life); this way of life is much more than living to be *good*, but is a responsible traditional life based on understanding relationships with Creation and following a set of instructions from the Creator. This lifestyle and the understanding of the responsibilities given by the Creator reinforce this identity (Simpson, 2011, p. 42).

According to Alfred and Corntassel, an Indigenous identity is based on action and involvement with a specific Indigenous culture; the action being the use of language, understanding and belief in traditions, and songs — thought, texts, and narratives. Although the land is pivotal, Indigenous traditions and values are ultimately intertwined in a cultural epistemology which then creates a central component to Indigenous identity (Anderson, 2000, p. 28). Traditions and language are the methods of transferring an Indigenous cultural epistemology between generations (Battiste and Youngblood Henderson, 2000, p. 254). The oral tradition is a crucial part of an Indigenous identity (Lee, 2010, p. 236). Kim Anderson defines traditions as the, "values, philosophies and lifestyles that pre-date the arrival of the Europeans, as well as [those] that are being created *within* a larger framework of Euro-Canadian culture, or *in resistance* to it" (2000, p. 35).

Indigenous people form their identities by practicing traditions from a cultural epistemological framework, and this can be found in the stories of a people. Craig Womack adds that a new written tradition complements the oral method of passing down knowledge, songs, poems, chants, and prayers, which all eventually influence Indigenous behavior. Storytelling — written or oral — helps foster the collective identity of a people, no matter where they are situated (1999, p. 15-16).[48] A narrative tradition draws on the values and principles of a specific Indigenous culture (Alfred, 2009, p. 182n11). Keeshig-Tobias argued that artifacts and history, although important, do not *make* Indigenous cultures; ideas and actions *make* Indigenous cultures. As Battiste and Youngblood Henderson write, "Philosophies are culture in theory, while customs are culture in practice" (2000, p. 56). Stories, songs, games, and humour all reflect attitudes and behaviours of Indigenous people; these practices and activities are social and spiritual and it reflects their relationships with other people and outlooks on life (p. 214).[49]

The behaviours, traditions, and cultural knowledge all come back to the land and this is why it is privileged in Indigenous cultural identity. Leanne Simpson writes, "Our children must have a strong connection to land in order to be able to maintain the necessary connections with the plant and animal nations and the spirit world to nurture balance" (2008, p. 74). For Indigenous communities to be strong again Simpson argues that Indigenous people must live their distinct cultural knowledge (ibid.). However, an obvious question arises concerning urban Indigenous people: are they less Indigenous if they have never formed their identities from the land? As anthropologist Regna Darnell writes, "Language and land are most often identified as the pillars of contemporary Native identity. Crucially, neither can be maintained by an individual in isolation. Maintenance and revitalization of language and culture inevitably depend upon family, community, and, for many, the reserve as home place, regardless of present residence" (Darnell, 2011, p. 42).[50]

While land is a crucial aspect of Indigenous identity, legal scholar Karen Engle has already noticed that a cultural identity which privileges land may have some unintended consequences in contemporary contexts. The benefits of a cultural land-based identity include creating a focus on protecting a culture through land title and collective rights over the territory (Engle, 2010, p. 164-165). On the other hand, the focus on land misses many people who may be considered Indigenous but have been displaced and forced into urban centres in the 20th century.[51] She argues that the narrow definition of Indigenous people may exclude those who cannot reveal their ancestral connection to their traditional territories (p. 181).[52] The privileging of land may provide the mainstream with ammunition for determining claims of authenticity in the context of concerns over resources (p. 182). Finally, and most obviously, the idea of privileging land raises potential problems for Indigenous people living in cities.[53]

Multiple Cultures

When describing cultural membership, Patrick Macklem argues for a type of cultural

pluralism that enables the individual to have multiple alliances as opposed to one. The

overlapping quality of cultures allows these multiple attachments (2001, p. 53). Macklem doubts

whether people can belong to a single culture with fixed ways of life in our modern world given

that we are all interconnected in some way (ibid.).[54] Given the realities of nation-within-nation

existence, perhaps it may lead to more Indigenous people identifying with more than one

historical background. In addition to the idea that cultures are changing and mixing with others,

the notion of hybridity arises — as do the dangers of essentialism. Ashcroft *et al.* define

hybridity as "the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by

colonization. As used in horticulture, the term refers to the cross-breeding of two species by

grafting or cross-pollination to form a third, 'hybrid' species" (2007, p. 108). An example of

hybridity, to those wedded to the theory, may use a person in Canada who is of half European

and half Indigenous descent. Critical theorist Homi Bhabha believes that hybridity is liberating

because it is fluid and escapes the fixed patterns of cultural identities. Bhabha's position on the

dangers of cultural identities is summarized by academic David Huddart, who writes, "there are

no cultures that come together leading to hybrid forms; instead, cultures are the consequence of

attempts to still the flux of cultural hybridities" (2006, p. 7).[55]

The theory of hybridity is alarming for Indigenous people. McCall writes, "hybridity is

often used as ammunition against essentialism, which is viewed as a politically dangerous

valorization of purity, while hybridity is aligned with heterogeneity, openness, and a politics of

difference" (2012, p. 25). In this context, when the theory of hybridity is applied to Indigenous

people their cultural claims are argued to be attempts at freezing cultural change and a fluid

identity. Hybridity taken to this extent will not free Indigenous people, but will be problematic

concerning land rights, treaties, spirituality, and even passing down traditions to the next

generation. For example, Indigenous Elders who remind the next generation about their distinct

nations' treaty history, traditions, and beliefs are not entirely fundamentalist attempts at freezing

cultural change. Indigenous people can be of European descent and can adapt to new

environments with new tools without losing the very essence of their Indigenous identities

(Sinclair, 2010, p. 255). To endure as Indigenous people, some tactics of strategic essentialism,

defined earlier, must be practiced to maintain Indigenous cultural differences.

Anthropologist Wade Davis describes culture as "a blanket of comfort that gives meaning

to lives…Culture is a body of laws and traditions, a moral and ethical code that insulates a

people from the barbaric heart that history suggests lies just beneath the surface of all human

societies and indeed all human beings" (2009, p. 198). Davis goes on to describe for several

paragraphs what societies are like when their "cultures are squeezed [and] extreme ideologies

often emerge" (p. 198-200).[56] However, for Indigenous people in North America the categories

of status and non-status, and creating communities based on such colonial logic, are a clear

reminder that Indigenous cultures were *squeezed*, and the blood-quantum ideology was set up to

protect a false notion of Indigeneity. Cultures can be oppressive at times, but without culture life

can be miserable as well. Strategic essentialism is a helpful tool to employ in recovering and

developing Indigenous cultural identity.

Anishinabe scholar Niigonwedom Sinclair discussed employing non-essentialist

Indigenous-centered identities for the purpose of empowerment in an interconnected world.

Sinclair argued that his Anishinabeg teachings — his cultural responsibilities in the world, based

off of land and people — create *a centered identity* that fights fragmented hybridity (2010, p.

249). The theory of an Indigenous-centered identity is much more liberating than hybridity theory because it allows Indigenous people to flourish and adapt to surroundings without sacrificing who they are as Indigenous people with specific histories, regardless of whether they have mixed heritages. Hybridity encourages adaptability and change, but a limited focus on distinct histories and rights can be harmful for an Indigenous cultural identity, as argued above. People have multiple heritages, but this does not mean they are hybrid. Especially with the Métis people in mind, we should acknowledge that cultural, historical and political foundations can form a cultural center and this center should not be blurred to maintain fluidity.

The identifier *Métis* is, according to academic Chris Andersen, "associated with a distinctive collective history, culture, language, land tenure and political institutions" (2011, p. 28). Being Métis is a corporate identity — one that people had to fight to maintain and adapt to new social and economic conditions; it was about mixed ancestry and culture based on the land, which inevitably influenced their language, traditions, and politics (ibid.).[57] Andersen's point is that the political formation of people sharing a culture, along with a relationship with land, usually contributes to an identity rather than ancestry — although multiple ancestries were a factor. Land, cultural distinction, and governance were just as important in forming a new distinct culture. Even when multiple cultures and positions exist for Indigenous people, they understand the importance of ties to land and kin relationships within a specific group of people. The worldviews of Indigenous people are based on land and kin relationships, regardless of how many cultures they are connected with.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

This chapter has attempted to show the history of race-based identities and why they were accepted. Race as a constructed concept needs to be critiqued because it limits the rebuilding of

Indigenous identities. The foundations of race reinforce an imperial logic to this day through policies and legislation. Race also divides Indigenous people; the concept distorts distinct Indigenous people as well as creating boundaries based on descent rather than culture. It has been discouraged, but some Indigenous Elders as well as the general population continue to use it. Nevertheless, culture-based forms of identity are gaining legitimacy in how people distinguish themselves from others. Culture is more than the ways of a people; it is the shared characteristics and relationships within the group as well.

The ongoing debate between essentialism and constructivism shows the trouble people have in understanding how people can maintain a historic essence while adapting to contemporary environments. The point of being different is not the desire for segregation or for oppressing others, but the desire to continue living as Indigenous people. The main hindrance to this task is the notion of the unchanging rural image of the Indian; any deviance from this picture is deemed unauthentic. Yet, Indigenous people must adapt to their present surroundings, so there are boundaries and limits set by the cultural center. The land, which is the foundation for cultural identity, is the place that reinforces distinction and fosters meaning and purpose in the world for Indigenous people. A specific area of land and the relationships with it are tied to beliefs about knowledge, people, and the sacredness of language and narratives. Finally, many Indigenous people identify with multiple cultures, but this does not destroy Indigeneity. The purpose of addressing hybridity in this chapter was to show how, when adopting a mixed identity as the foundation of an identity, it is limiting for Indigenous people compared to being centered on land and the teachings that come from it. An Indigenous-centered identity is crucial to understand before addressing nation-building projects and identities in urban centres.

Chapter Three – Nationhoods[58] and Urban Indigenous Identities

Indigenous cultural identities exist within urban centres, but non-Indigenous people as well as Indigenous people are often concerned as to how this is possible when separated from a rural identity. Due to alarming examples of nationalism throughout the globe, the term *nation* becomes problematic for Canadians when these Indigenous cultural identities become *centered* for people in the political realm to assert their own agendas. This discourse in Canada, including the term *nationalism*, conjures up historical events such as independence movements. Alan Cairns writes, "Nationalism seeks to get out – to achieve maximum autonomy. The ongoing connection with the majority society — the agent of its former subjugation — tends to be seen as a regrettable necessity — not as an instrument of solidarity" (2000b, p. 124-125). Segregation for a specific group of people has been viewed as unjust according to the political tradition of liberalism and Canadians apply this standard to Indigenous people as well.[59] Assimilation, under the guise of unity and solidarity, has been and continues to be seen as a good thing for Indigenous people within Canada. Cairns argues that limited solidarity between Canadians and Indigenous people will deepen the divide, distrust, and lack of empathy within the dominant non-Indigenous segment. He explains, "This would have disastrous consequences for the citizens of Aboriginal nations whose governments will lack meaningful governing capacity in the absence of massive, long-lasting flows of resources from the non-Aboriginal majority" (p. 125). The logical conclusion, according to Cairns, is to end or discourage discussions of Indigenous nationhood and to adopt some special rights as Canadians.

This attitude becomes stronger when applied to Indigenous people living in urban centres. The *problems* concerning Indigenous nationhood in urban centres usually fall in two categories: (1) urban Indigenous people are losing their identity within urban centres; and (2)

Indigenous governance in cities is not feasible due to loss of a rural/territorial-based identity (Bogart, 2005, p. 105-109).[60] In this chapter, both problems will be addressed from an Indigenous perspective and will expose a dominant narrative which continually attempts to define how Indigenous people should identify themselves and how they should collectively view *the good life*.

<div align="center">Introduction to Nationhood</div>

The term nation is a contentious one, and it brings forth many different interpretations. This raises the question of whether Indigenous people should use it in their own political projects. Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in academia have supported the use of the term, which has only been asserted since 1975.[61] However, it has largely been applied to people in a territorial and rural sense.[62] It is my belief that Indigenous people can use the term nation to describe their people, but we must compare Western and Indigenous understandings of it first. Readers may ask, "why not use some other term"? My aim is to explain how certain scholars have deconstructed the idea of a *nation*, and demonstrate how people can carry this sense of *nationhood* with them into diverse urban centres. The term requires understanding from linguistic and cultural points of view, as well as an engagement with contemporary notions of it.

Political theorist Tim Schouls gives a simple definition of *nation* as it applies to Indigenous people in Canada. According to him, nations are "communities held together through objective bonds of history, language, and culture, whose members use those bonds subjectively to create a sense of shared nationhood" (2003, p. 6). If we take this definition *without* considering the historical and political injustices done to Aboriginal people by the Canadian state we can conclude that both language loss and culture loss limit claims of nationhood. This chapter documents two issues preventing Indigenous nations from flourishing within urban centres while

providing a different view of nationalism for Indigenous people along with the acceptability of

asserting it in urban centers. The two issues are: (a) the fear of ethnic nationalism becoming

another oppressive ideology; and (b) the legitimacy of national claims within urban centres for

Indigenous people.

<div align="center">The Fear of Nationalism</div>

For the majority of Canadians, nationalism may conjure up images of violent

independence movements, but post-colonial theorists are just as suspicious of the term. Much

like our identities, nations are constructed and never stagnant.[63] However, the main concern of

these theorists is over the creation of new categories of *exclusive* traditions and narratives that

ultimately benefit the dominant power groups in a society (Ashcroft et al., 2007, p. 135). The

authors obviously prefer a type of plurality and multiculturalism in whatever nation there is over

one based on ethnicity or religion (p. 139). At this level of critique, the exclusion and oppression

is said to be found in narratives. Race-based thinking and imperialism were created from

dominant narratives which were inevitably used to discourage *different* narratives (Said, 1994, p.

xiii).[64] A national narrative overpowers the stories of minority groups in favour of unity, which

then encourages these minority groups to rethink the idea of a nation (Huddart, 2006, p. 101-

102). The dominant narratives enter education systems and the media, which encourage what

Edward Said considers the unhealthy patriotism glorifying specific national traditions (1994, p.

xxvi). In short, nationalism leads to oppression and destruction because of the inevitable

metanarratives and fundamentalism which arise (p. 299). These are the troubling aspects of

nationalism.

<div align="center">Deconstructing Nationhoods</div>

We must ask whether Indigenous nationhoods are truly threatening to the world and more specifically within the Canadian state. First, Indigenous nationhoods are not modeled on Western foundations of what a nation is, even though there are some cases of Western boundaries creating divisions.[65] However, the term must be deconstructed and explained for people who have great fears and negative experiences tied to it. The nation[66] is a type of political community that ultimately needs to be *imagined* in the manner put forth by Benedict Anderson. He defines the term *imagined* in this context meaning that many people in the nation will never know each other, but will have an image of their *bond* as a group of people (1991, p. 6-7). Cherokee literary critic Daniel Heath Justice argued the underlying Indigenous interpretations of the word nation should reflect "kinship, reciprocity, and responsibility [and] these concepts are often very different from the assimilative and assaultive consumerist patriotism that fuels the modern nation-state" (2010, p. 63). Nationhoods involve commitment to kinship[67] rather than loyalty to the state. This sense of kinship and responsibilities connects a people as a whole and creates opportunities for them to draw from their specific worldviews and narratives (the cultural center) for continuance and for living their version of the good life (Justice, 2006, p. 23-24).[68]

The Indigenous *bond as a group*[69] is tied to the specific histories, lands, and kinship responsibilities that reinforce an identity (Brooks, 2008, p. 241). The center for Indigenous cultures — the worldviews and narratives — is imperative for identifying Indigenous nationhoods; it can be maintained by active participation or it can be destroyed by neglect (Justice, 2006, p. 27).[70] Leanne Simpson philosophized about the meanings of the word *nation* through her Anishinaabe language and worldview, understanding the term relating to the words *heart* and *truth*. She then thought of the nation as an "interconnected web of hearts" (2011, p.

94). Additionally, Taiaiake Alfred writes that Indigenous nationhoods involve "a universal understanding and reconstruction of social and governmental institutions embodying traditional Indigenous cultural values" (2009, p. 14). Distinctively, Indigenous nationhoods are connected to people decolonizing and rebuilding their communities with an Indigenous-centered worldview, which encompasses basic ideas of how people ought to live. Some Indigenous nations are quite large, and it is impossible to know every citizen of such a nation, but this does not weaken the culture or kinship responsibilities because these are based on relationships in a given environment (Lawrence, 2012, p. 129).

The *good life*[71] Indigenous people desire, which is based largely on specific Indigenous worldviews and historical and sacred narratives, does not reinforce new dominant narratives to oppress other people. Rebuilding nations does not necessarily lead to excessive patriotism and self-centeredness,[72] but is a form of cultural and national recovery of legitimate nations and webs of kinship (Justice, 2006, p. 218). Rebuilding Indigenous nationhoods is a form of justice and equality because it develops the opportunity for nations to determine their own futures. Much as Indigenous cultural identities imply a difference between them and other identities (Howard and Proulx, 2011, p. 6),[73] nations need to show difference as well in order to exist.[74] There needs to be boundaries between nations, and this is not necessarily negative or even non-Indigenous. Boundaries determine who is in and who is out, and they are a vital part of how a group strives towards its good life (Andersen and Denis, 2003, p. 385).[75] From an Indigenous perspective, boundaries and difference do not inevitably prevent the forming of relationships with nations and people beyond one's own, but they are essential for distinct Indigenous national and cultural narratives to flourish (Simpson, 2008, p. 83-84). These narratives, which are based on the land, are able to flourish within geographic boundaries. Leanne Simpson writes, "As someone moves

away from the centre of their territory — the place they have the strongest and most familiar

bonds and relationships — their knowledge and relationship to the land weakens. This is a

boundary, a zone of decreasing Nishnaabeg presence as you move out from the centre of the

territory" (2011, p. 89). The boundaries are for understanding one's place in life and

relationships with others. The call for difference[76] is not a call to oppress others with a brutal

kind of nationalism — especially since adoption and intermarriage have been well documented

historically among Indigenous nations (Valaskakis, 2005, p. 219). Asserting nationhood is

ultimately an attempt at striving for a different *good life*, rather than for the dominant one of

Western modernity, which has caused so much damage to Indigenous ways of being.

      There are legitimate cases for alarm concerning nationalism, exclusion, and dominant

narratives in the world. However, the problems seem to arise when narratives are based on race-

based foundations and an attitude of superiority over other peoples — backed with enough

power to fulfill this delusion. This is the other underlying fear of nationalism: the power, control

and domination in society (Ashcroft et al., 2007, p. 135). Within this framework, political

entities can legitimize an idea of a group which can be maintained by military, judicial, religious,

educational, and political means (ibid.). However, Indigenous people are in the position of

rethinking the idea of destructive nationalisms as opposed to creating a dominant narrative and a

false sense of superiority. In Canada, Indigenous nationhoods do not reinforce dominant

narratives, although they do pose challenges to a strong form of unquestioned Canadian

nationalism with foundational traits derived from liberalism.[77] Instead, it serves as a reminder of

historical justice and as an incorporation of a distinct worldview that usually opposes the

foundations of the state (Simpson, 2000, p. 114).

At the beginning of this chapter, I quoted Alan Cairns's argument that fears of separation and lack of support from the majority of Canadians are enough to discourage talk on Indigenous nationhoods. However, his position intensifies the problems with Western notions of the nation-building project concerning Canada. It reinforces all of the concerns theorists have had about dominant narratives and their impacts via education, media, and the disempowerment of minorities.[78] Cairns's fears of Indigenous nationalism illogically outweigh his fears of Canadian nationalism. If the majority of Canadians are discouraging Indigenous nationhoods and threatening to sever political relationships with Indigenous people, these are clearly tactics of negative nationalism, which target minorities who do not follow the dominant narratives. These tactics will not curb historical injustices nor create opportunities for Indigenous people to flourish in their own way. Regardless of whether Canadian or even Quebecois nationalism is more of a threat to the world than Indigenous nationhoods are, it is clear that Indigenous nations want to remain on traditional territories and Canadian citizens want to remain within the lands they call home. Indigenous nations and institutions are interconnected with non-Indigenous Canadian institutions. Calls for the severing of these relationships are not feasible for strengthening Canada's claims of a *just* nation or for Indigenous struggles to obtain the good life (Warry, 2007, p. 95).[79]

In addition to the moral and legal imperative of rebuilding Indigenous nationhoods within Canada,[80] the embrace of Indigenous cultural and political differences can display Indigenous philosophies to the world, including the manner in which Canadians conduct their politics. To claim to respect Aboriginal rights while excluding or ignoring different worldviews and Indigenous languages from the nation-building process is counter-intuitive; it will not allow Indigenous people to shape their futures according to their own distinct paths. To put it bluntly,

Indigenous people have more to fear concerning Canadian nationalism than vice-versa. The current struggles of Indigenous people within Canada demand an assertion of nationhood and the practice of their distinct cultures and histories — or else these communities risk further disintegration by assimilation (Lawrence, 2012, p. 2).[81] From the perspective of Indigenous rights and Indigenous forms of belonging, it is shameful to the world and Canada if Indigenous people *cannot* assert their nationhoods. The external struggles of rebuilding nationhoods are necessary, and they continue to be fought in many different social areas. However, rebuilding nationhoods demands inward focus, to strengthen national narratives, traditions, and any pursuits which add to distinct cultural continuance (Simpson, 2011, p. 18).[82]

Narrative Focus (Nation)

Our understanding of what constitutes a nation-state has only existed for a few centuries, according to Benedict Anderson. While nations are young, *imagined nations* are said to originate in an immemorial past. Membership in these traditional[83] communities also depended on the idea that the language was sacred, given to them from a higher power (Anderson, 1991, p. 13). The construction of *nation* and *identity* is rooted in language. Writers, teachers, lawyers, and those professions where language is central are to be found at the center of nation building (p. 74). While rebuilding distinct Indigenous nations is necessary and just, we should be cautious of treating it as an end. There must be a worldview and a version of the good life for the collective (Fanon, 2004, p. 142-143). Traditions, storytelling, and culture need to be shared and passed on to the next generation for the ultimate good of Indigenous continuance. This continuance is sacred and, therefore, narratives are sacred (Whittles and Patterson, 2009, p. 98). To assert nationhood is to tell a different narrative, an alternative understanding of the world (Justice, 2006, p. 209).[84]

Alternative worldviews and stories are vital to rebuilding Indigenous nations. Indigenous nations premised on race-based notions or colonial understandings of Indigenous identity will inevitably clash with alternative worldviews and perpetuate colonial divisions within the rebuilding process (Lawrence, 2012, p. 299). The foundation of alternative Indigenous narratives is the rejuvenation of Indigenous knowledge and traditions with the writers and teachers at the center of this movement (Maracle, 2010, p. 88). Citizens then add to their own national narratives and knowledge of who they are by simply living wherever they happen to be (p. 93). Additionally, knowing specific national narratives helps the continuance of Indigenous people within cities to develop a certain worldview and ties to kinship (Whittles and Patterson, 2009, p. 97).[85] Many Indigenous people have a connection to their nations while not being physically present, which can be described as transnationalism, or transporting their roots and narratives (Ramirez, 2007, p. 13). However, there are cases of diaspora and disconnection due to a colonial legacy.[86] Diaspora is not only the condition of being away from a physical or spiritual *home*, but away from the narratives and social structures of a people as well (McLeod, 2001, p. 19). Diaspora is an alienating experience at times, but it also adds new narratives to Indigeneity and nationhood (Ramirez, 2007, p. 11).[87]

Residential-school narratives are also encouraging the reconstruction of Indigenous identities in addition to healing and empowering the survivors (McKegney, 2007, p. 45). It is important to clarify that new narratives add to the diversity of experiences of specific Indigenous nations and they are usually grounded in continuance as opposed to despair and separation *as conclusions* for Indigeneity. Nevertheless, nation and diaspora no longer have to be at odds with each other; Indigenous history has now provided interdependent examples that may go a long

way to help adopt the experiences of diaspora into national narratives of urban and mixed-cultural members (McCall, 2012, p. 22).

Cities have also historically played a large role in the development of non-Indigenous nationalism as places where intellectuals could gather and share information.[88] Education and administration created a base for communities to be imagined in (Anderson, 1991, p. 140). Cosmopolitan intellectuals create the loves and fears of nations. As Anderson writes, "The cultural products of nationalism — poetry, prose fiction, music, plastic arts — show this love very clearly in thousands of different forms and styles" (p. 141). The elite members of any society shape education, politics, law, and culture; they have a significant amount of power in claims of identity as well. Thus, cultural revitalization, as outlined above, is strengthened by artists, thinkers, and writers who shape movements in the law and policy, universities, and society in general. These reflections on imagining nations can be applied to the experiences of Indigenous people in the Americas. An example of this imagination can be seen in Craig Womack's definition of nationhood as "an intermingling of politics, imagination, and spirituality… Nationhood is affected by imagination in the way that the citizens of tribal nations perceive their cultural and political identity. Nationhood recognizes spiritual practices, since culture is part of what gives people an understanding of their uniqueness, their difference, from other nations of people" (1999, p. 60). When one deconstructs the concept of nationhood, it comes from the creation of culture by people and is adaptable to new experiences and environments. Nations are what they are imagined to be. This is vital for urban Indigenous people to consider, because if nations can be imagined, they can exist anywhere. Therefore, because urban centres are included in Indigenous narratives, it follows that national claims to these spaces become more legitimate.

<u>Urban Indigenous Identities</u>

We have already established how cultural identity for Indigenous people is centered in their pursuit of the good life.[89] From this position we can understand claims like, "In the Anishinaabe worldview, then, responsibility, together with power, control, respect, and autonomy, form a semiotic web that guides Anishinaabe thought and action at a very deep level and permeates virtually all aspects of life" (Jackson, 2002, p. 124).[90] This reconstructed identity involves some human agency but it also implies that we are also dependent on forces around us to verify that identity (Alcoff, 2003, p. 3).[91] Additionally, strategic essentialism becomes pivotal for urban Indigenous identities enabling them to function in contemporary environments, because it allows for a type of positioned yet fluid identity (Dhamoon, 2009, p. 60-61).[92] Strategic essentialism assists in Indigenous agency and the maintenance of an Indigenous essence within urban centres while challenging Western state notions of Indigenous identity.

There are characteristics which separate urban Indigenous populations from other forms of Indigeneity with no loss implied. To quote Howard and Proulx, "To suggest that these urban Aboriginal spaces are somehow artificial because they are constructed reifies the problematic idea that Aboriginal people are more natural than cultural beings, and bolsters counterproductive posturing about the authenticity of urban Aboriginal peoples' practices of culture" (2011, p. 4).[93] From a foundation of cultural identity, Indigenous people are reconstructing their identities within urban centres. However, there is the argument that distinct forms of Indigenous governance (i.e., national governance) in urban centres are not feasible for the increasing number and diversity of urban Indigenous people.

Issues in Urban Indigeneity

The question of whether or not Indigenous nationhoods are too complex for urban centres

is another important concern to address. Questions concerning representation and accountability

arise for Indigenous governance in urban centres (Todd, 2003, p. 256). The answers will look

different for each Canadian urban centre,[94] but Aboriginal service organizations are starting to

emerge and are able to influence the political realm to improve the quality of life for urban

Indigenous populations (Newhouse, 2011, p. 28). Some academics say that the argument for

Indigenous organizations as a *legitimate representation* is politically naïve concerning the

diversity among Indigenous nationhoods as well as Canada's different jurisdictional

responsibilities (Abele and Prince, 2007, p. 187).[95] In order to address these issues, the colonial

legacy of marginalization, fragmentation, pan-Indigeneity and integration of Indigenous people

within urban centres all need to be highlighted. I argue that dominant narratives and the effects

of the colonial legacy are preventing the development of Indigenous national legitimacy within

urban centres – these developments are occasionally at odds with the Canadian nation-building

process. Additionally, cultural identities and actively created safe spaces for Indigenous people

will continue to insert Indigeneity into urban centres. Distinct Indigenous nationhoods practicing

urban governance become feasible when nations have the powers and responsibilities to care for

their citizens.

Marginalization[96] and Fragmentation

Economic marginalization and social exclusion are major issues in urban centres for

Indigenous people (Silver et al., 2006, p. 131).[97] Jaccoud and Brassard (2003) have documented

how Indigenous women in Montreal are marginalized. Despite the horrifying experiences and

exclusion for the women in the city, the authors write, "our findings do not allow us to conclude

that migration to the city…is in itself a marginalizing factor. The marginalization process begins

in early childhood and is rooted in a much broader social context associated with the

consequences of the colonization of First Nations in Canada and Quebec" (p. 143).[98]

Marginalization and exclusion are serious problems in many urban centres throughout Canada,

especially ones in the prairies (Silver et al. 2006, p. 26).[99] The colonial legacy is stressed as a

new framework for understanding Indigenous marginalization in urban centres, rather than

focusing on the claims of Indigenous inability to adapt to urban centres (Peters, 2010, p. 83).

The marginalization created by land-based notions of identity is also problematic for

urban Indigeneity. Andersen and Denis argue that RCAP (1996) "perpetuates, rather than

rethinks, a long-established but conceptually contingent relationship between nation and

territory. As a result, it naturalizes relations of power that marginalize urban Aboriginal

communities" (2003, p. 374). If the nation is based on colonial definitions of Indian status and

living on reserves, and if it is supported by the state's dominant view about how to live well as

human beings, then this national framework will most likely continue to distort the rebuilding of

Indigenous nationhoods and marginalize some urban citizens, who have all the rights other

Indigenous people have (p. 384). This process is tied to how Alan Cairns views urban Indigenous

people in Canada. His view of culture tied to a land base is not necessarily his own idea; RCAP

(1996) rightly argues land is essential in cultural protection and development (2000, p. 123).

Cairns's analysis of urban Indigenous revitalization is pessimistic because of his reading of the

report (p. 124). Although Cairns had great doubts concerning the cultural flourishing of urban

Indigenous people, he did grasp that the definition of identity was too fixed and exclusive with

respect to urban experiences; identity loss can be curbed if the tools Indigenous people have for

reconstructing their identities complement their worldviews and current environments (p. 131).

In other words, if RCAP's view of Indigeneity is taken as is (rural), then urban Indigenous

people can expect to continue the experiences listed by the Commission.[100] If urban centres are

outside of Indigenous national experiences, then nation building will inevitably be fragmented.

Marginalization creates the potential for cultural fragmentation. Although many older

Indigenous people participate in cultural activities in cities, the youth are often an exception,

which may be problematic in the near future (Environics, 2010, p. 60). Regarding the

fragmentation of languages, researchers Mary Jane Norris and Lorna Jantzen found that cultural

diversity within urban centres presents a problem for language learning (2003, p. 112-114).[101]

They documented that less than 10% of Indigenous people had mothers who spoke an

Indigenous language in 1996. They write, "Given UNESCO'S caution that a language is

endangered if it is not learned by at least 30 percent of the children in that community, it

becomes apparent that any prospect of increased urbanization of Aboriginal populations is

worrying in that it is liable to contribute to further erosion of Aboriginal languages being spoken

in the home" (p. 114). In addition to language and cultural loss, David Newhouse said over a

decade ago that if there is no connection to life out on the land, then the growing majority of

Indigenous people growing up in cities "may not hold the same traditional emotional and

spiritual views of it. It also means that many Aboriginal people will want to have access to the

consumer goods and material life they see around them" (2000, p. 404). If urban Indigenous

youth are not interested in cultural activities, do not speak their tribal language(s), and desire

material wealth in their urban environment, then it is reasonable to assume that assimilation[102] is

happening in urban centres.

<div align="center">Pan-Indigeneity in Urban Centres</div>

Pan-Indigeneity is also a phenomenon that has been taking place in urban centres for

decades. The term is used to describe the creation of a shared culture and identity for all Indigenous people in the Americas. Some positive aspects of pan-Indigeneity include political unity, networking and communications, and reinforcing relationships with the concerted effort to resist colonial dominance. However, pan-Indigeneity can place little emphasis on distinct national identities that have been formed on particular lands and have influenced distinct languages and traditions. Pan-Indigeneity *may* reinforce race-based notions of the *Indian* for some (Straus and Valentino, 2001, p. 85),[103] but it can also be used as a shared sense of historical trauma with a common agenda to defend Indigenous people from further oppression. Pan-Indigeneity is more concerned with common history and unity than with blood or race. The main caution is that pan-Indigeneity may *repeatedly ignore* specific cultural and national narratives in favour of this agenda.

Specific cultural and national stories need to be stressed more than ever in urban centres, where Indigenous people are deemed unauthentic. While it is true that some Indigenous people have no problems maintaining their specific cultural identities, there are cases of people being separated from their nations through colonial policies and legislation. These urban Indigenous people were forced to create a community that shared characteristics with other nations, creating a common Indigenous identity (2001, p. 87). So it is understandable when the Urban Aboriginal Task Force reports that the top two cultural activities in cities are powwows and National Aboriginal Day, with an importance placed on *traditional Aboriginal culture* (2007, p. 81).[104] Urban Indigenous people are attempting to maintain relationships with other Indigenous people in the specific city along with members of their own nation (Andersen, 2013, p. 74). This distinguishes urban Indigeneity from other forms.

Indigenous people are generally dispersed in most Canadian urban centres,[105] but if there is a cultural *hub* for at least half of the population it is to be found at Aboriginal service providers and cultural spaces, especially the Friendship Centres.[106] These entities are part of a network which may influence local politics and call attention to Indigenous life in urban centres (Newhouse, 2010, p. 28).[107] Graham and Peters argue that Aboriginal service providers "see the situation of the local population on a daily basis and often make heroic efforts to improve circumstances and have the capacity to provide adequate programs" (2002, p. 11). Friendship Centres have the enormous task of protecting the accuracy of specific national practices while remaining inclusive to multi-national Indigenous participation and the non-Indigenous population, which does not generally happen on reserves in Canada (Howard, 2011, p. 104).[108] Perhaps this is the main reason for the encouragement of status-blind practices. There may be a pragmatic reason for uniting when dealing with the three levels of government in Canada. Regardless of the type of pan-Indigenous organizations and services provided, this does not mean that cultural specificity disintegrates (Hanselmann 2003, p. 11).[109]

<u>Integration</u>

The theme of integration is a more subtle issue for urban Indigenous identity formation. Some members of the Indigenous middle-class have made a critique of urban Indigenous services and organizations. While half of the Indigenous population in urban centres are utilizing these services, the other half have no use for them (Environics, 2010, p. 68, 70). The rising urban middle-class was documented as having a similar interest in reconstructing their Indigeneity, yet did not feel a part of existing Indigenous organizations, which tended to focus on social service delivery (UATF, 2007, p. 193). In some cases they did not feel that they were a part of the larger urban Indigenous community; they listed stereotypes and name-calling by other members of the

urban Indigenous community as strong reasons for avoiding these spaces (ibid.).[110] Sociologist Terry Wotherspoon highlights the changing lifestyles and behaviours of consumption by the middle-class urban Indigenous people, which may encourage individualism and separation from the collective values that are vital for Indigenous cultural identities (2003, p. 152).[111] There are a number of social and economic factors concerning survival in cities that make it challenging for young urban Indigenous people to find and sustain relationships with other Indigenous people. For example, high costs of living and social pressures of employment may override or limit social involvement in certain cultural spaces (Lucero, 2013, p. 285; Darnell, 2011, p. 47). Why is the Canadian state's nation-building project more important than the rebuilding of Indigenous nations in urban centres? Why are there not more opportunities to rebuild Indigenous nations in urban centres? These questions are not in favour of maintaining Indigenous unemployment or to support radical separatism, but for Indigenous nations to gain the skills found in urban centres *on their own terms in order to rebuild their own nations*.

<div align="center">Urban Indigeneity and Continuance</div>

Although some of the problems of urban Indigeneity continue to exist, they do not represent all experiences of urban Indigenous people and neither do they present Indigenous people as having agency in their lives. This is part of the long-standing trend of presenting Indigenous people as passive recipients of the worst that city life has to offer. Until recently Indigenous leaders thought the same about city life. In the early 1990s, David Newhouse stated that the National Chief told him that urban Indigenous people left their communities and had to face the consequences of not being cared for by their governments (2011, p. 26).[112] Instead of blaming the National Chief for not caring about urban Indigenous people, we can understand his viewpoint; the presentation of cities has always been that of *loss*.

Yet the mentality of cultural loss has changed dramatically since Newhouse's experience. Not only are the majority of Indigenous people now living in Canadian urban centres, but there is evidence of revitalization movements happening in *safe spaces* within cities. This does not mean Indigenous people all live together within urban centres, but it does mean that cultural spaces exist where Indigenous people can meet. Philosopher Eduardo Mendieta writes, "Cities have become the point of destination of most of the displaced and exiled masses of the world…[but] cities are the frontiers in which national identities are formed and recontextualized" (2003, p. 411). Cultural anthropologist Susan Lobo argues that while cities are not places that ultimately determine an identity, the experiences gained from them certainly contribute to the formation of one (2001, p. 73). In the case of Indigenous people in North America, it is clear that the statements made by Medieta and Lobo are true to a certain extent. Urban centres as an environment do shape the behaviour and thinking of Indigenous people, but there are spaces within urban centres where Indigenous people can reconstruct identities and add narratives to their national stories (Whittles and Patterson, 2009, p. 105). Yet, the fundamental challenge for urban Indigeneity is that the portrait of the rural *Indian* slowly losing his or her culture remains the dominant understanding of Indigenous identity in urban centres. The dominant discourse on Indigenous people is that living off the land and being close to nature is the only true form of Indigeneity (Sissons, 2005, p. 16). This oversimplification of Indigenous identity concerning land may harm Indigenous people living in urban centres, especially when it comes to policy (Andersen and Denis, 2003, p. 384). Again, we see colonial policies and dominant narratives continuously striving to name and control Indigenous agency and identity —after all, if people cease to be Indigenous by moving to urban centres, the governments will no longer be responsible for them as they will, essentially, cease to exist.

Cultural adaptation and a continuance of distinct worldviews ultimately provide a strong defence against oppressive tactics that seek to exclude Indigeneity from urban life.[113] Much like other groups of people, Indigenous people have adapted[114] to urban centres with the rise of global urbanization (Darnell, 2011, p. 43).[115] Indeed, Indigenous people can still maintain relationships with Elders, languages, traditional values, and even territory, all in order to maintain a distinct cultural way of life within cities.[116] David Newhouse emphasizes that *ruralness* is not a requirement for what makes Indigenous identity (2011, p. 33).[117] The relationship urban Indigenous people have to a territory is simply *different* than that of Indigenous people who live on reserves, but the relationship is nonetheless important for matters of kinship and narratives that tie a person to a collective history (Andersen and Denis, 2003, p. 385). The main theme of Indigenous identities in urban centres, and within a specific territory, is based on a network of kinship in the urban Indigenous community (Lobo, 2001, p. 77).[118] In order for urban Indigenous communities to continue, they need to have boundaries that are fluid and can adapt through this relatedness (Gonzales, 2001, p. 172-73).

From an Indigenous perspective, the late Jack Forbes asked whether or not dense populations and buildings defined urbanness (2001, p. 10). He wrote, "I must argue that the key to urbanness is not the presence of closely spaced structures but rather the intimate interaction of substantial numbers of people in a given geographical space. In other words, urbanness is a form of association where communication and networking, as opposed to isolation, are the norm" (ibid.). He also argued that ancient Indigenous cities in the Americas were most likely kinship-based divisions that formed a large centered unit, a space for a market and ceremonies (p. 7). In her study of Indigenous communities in the area of Silicon Valley and San Jose, Renya Ramirez shares the idea of the *hub*. The urban centre "acts as a collecting center, a hub of Indian peoples'

new ideas, information, culture, community, and imagination that when shared back 'home' on the reservation[119] can impact thousands of Native Americans" (2007, p. 2). This hub asserts tribal identities in urban centres, provides a sense of belonging, and maintains social networks (p. 3). Perhaps these hubs are what Bonita Lawrence has in mind when she writes, "[Aboriginal] urban communities cannot continue for much longer to rely on the reserves to 'maintain the culture' for them" (2004, p. 233).

Kinship notions of identity and historic narratives can create the conditions for inclusive Indigenous communities that are flexible but not too free. Garroutte writes, "the themes of the sacred stories provide models of community life in which all members are instructed in and held to a rigorous standard of responsible participation" (2003, p. 135-36). Although urban Indigenous communities are less geographically fixed than historic communities, responsibilities and traditions remain valued. Lobo highlighted one urban community in which ancestry, appearance, cultural knowledge, and community participation generally influenced the internal and external forms of identity, but she also listed examples of places where cultural knowledge and participation can make up for lack of appearance and proof of ancestry (Lobo, 2001 p. 81-82).[120] As mentioned earlier, community boundaries make sense, because identities naturally express a type of difference (Hall, 1996, p. 4; Howard and Proulx, 2011, p. 6). In the context of community, the power lies in the collective. The lack of cultural knowledge and relationships separates one from a community.[121] In this case, the boundary opposes the dominant narrative that the individual is more important than community and nation. It is not that boundaries make people uncomfortable per se; we live within boundaries determined by the powers that be. It is the question of *who* has the power to make these boundaries that worries people. Indigenous

nations will at times make decisions relating to boundaries that clash with what Canada considers acceptable.

Space and Legitimacy

The potential for integration among urban Indigenous people is high, yet there are safe spaces to promote traditions, pride in culture, and stress on kinship (Silver et al. 2006, p. 25).[122] Generally, urban Indigenous people understand the distinctive cultural importance of preserving and practicing Indigenous languages and traditions (Environics, 2010, p. 62).[123] It is possible that post-secondary education, specifically universities, may have an effect on how urban Indigenous people reconstruct their identities.[124] Urban centres attract people who desire a higher education in terms of skills to survive as well as knowing about issues that are relevant to who they are as Indigenous people (Graham and Peters, 2002, p. 6).[125] Indigenous academics within universities are actively involved with reconstructing Indigenous identities and nations, as well as struggling with Indigenous people against oppression through ideas and knowledge. Universities can be seen as Indigenous spaces when Lawrence writes, "When urban Native people appropriate urban spaces as Native spaces, the sovereignty movement from the reserves is inevitably strengthened" (2004, p. 232).[126] Alternatives to the status quo can be fostered within certain spaces in urban centres and taken back to the reserves (p. 235).[127] Indeed, universities may be seen as safe spaces for Indigenous people and their specific cultures in the rebuilding process (Pitawanakwat, 2008, p. 166).

Indigenous leadership and representation also need to be highlighted within urban centres. Even if some urban Indigenous people distrust Indigenous public spaces, the home and the homes of kin remain vital spaces for Indigenous continuance (Peters and Lafond, 2013, p. 130). Cultural revitalization demands that families, mothers, and elders continue sharing

Indigenous narratives and worldviews (Pitawanakwat, 2008, p. 167). This transforms our

understanding of leadership, because it can be found in families, schools, and even businesses in

urban centres (Cornell and Kalt, 2007, p. 27) and therefore it should be clear that Indigenous

people do indeed possess the tools. Regardless of fears concerning marginalization, cultural

fragmentation, and pan-Indigeneity, retaining ties to non-urban Indigenous communities are still

important for Indigenous people (Helin, 2008, p. 244). Indigenous governance is limited in cities

but this does not mean there is no legitimacy to claims of nationhood within them. Canada's

nation-building exercise largely opposes legitimate Indigenous nation building projects, which

differ from the dominant Western narratives of Canadian nationalism.[128] Colonial narratives that

reinforce the tired notion that Indigenous people lose culture when they move to the cities or that

Indigenous nation building is a threat to Canadian unity curb nation-building legitimacy within

urban centres and prevent Indigenous nations from taking better care of their citizens than does

the status quo. Indigenous claims of nationhood and governance within urban centres will

become feasible when Canada relinquishes the powers of naming Indigenous people as well as

determining their futures and their definition of the good life.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

This chapter began by raising two important issues concerning the rebuilding of

Indigenous nations within urban centres: the fears tied to oppressive nationalisms and the

supposed illegitimacy of Indigenous forms of nationalism in urban centres. Nationalism has been

perceived as oppressive because of the exclusive and fundamentalist assumptions embedded in

the process of asserting it. Deconstruction of the term nationhood was essential to show how

Indigenous forms of nationhood are similar to any other form and are no more oppressive than

Canadian nationalism. In fact Indigenous nationalism can be seen as less oppressive than the

Canadian form when we look at the term, through Indigenous worldviews, as an interconnection of a family. It is also imperative at this stage to assert nationhood for Indigenous national survival in urban centres. These assertions are tied to why Indigenous people are different and how their views differ from mainstream notions of the good life; this inevitably leads to a focus on narratives and passing these on to the next generation. Nations not only apply to Indigenous people, but because the sense of nationhood is traveling with the citizens and attached to the cultural centre of people it made no sense to say that it could not be asserted in urban centres.

        The remaining half of this chapter explored urban Indigeneity and national claims within cities. Theories discussed in chapter two reminded the reader that Indigenous people are not losing the fundamental essence of who they are as Indigenous people within contemporary environments. However, asserting Indigenous nationhood within Canadian urban centres continues to be argued as too complex with regards to the marginalization, cultural fragmentation, pan-indigeniety, and integration of Indigenous people. It was argued that Canadian nation building offsets Indigenous nation building efforts within urban centres. Colonial policies continue to be used to control the definitions of who is Indigenous, and dominant narratives are used to reinforce fears of separation and radical nationalism that threaten Canadian unity. Finally, a dominant worldview has constantly been embedded in Canada's proposals to help Indigenous people live better rather than the solutions being grounded in Indigenous worldviews on how to live well. These are the dominant narratives within Canadian nationalism preventing Indigenous people from rebuilding their nations within cities.

        The concern should not be on how Indigenous diversity makes urban Indigenous nationhoods too complex; the concern should be on what narratives and policies as well as forms of nationalism and power are encouraging this complexity. The perceived illegitimacy of urban

nationhoods should not be used to further prevent Indigenous governance. In fact, urban

Indigenous governance practices will become more feasible when Canada relinquishes the power

to decide identities and gives up its assumptions about what is best for the futures of Indigenous

people. Indigenous leadership exists in homes, distinct national representation already exists in

urban centres, and public Indigenous safe spaces like universities and cultural centres are sites

where nationhoods are being rebuilt. In the end, asserting nationhoods, rebuilding narratives, and

preserving and practicing distinct worldviews will only increase the chances of legitimacy within

the mainstream.

Chapter Four — Identities and Nation Building — Application to the Algonquin

Race versus Culture for Algonquins

The Algonquin[129] experience as a nation and as a group of people is consistent with the

literature discussed thus far. The literature regarding Algonquin *identity* is limited, but sufficient

to connect to other attempts by Indigenous people in rebuilding their nations and reconstructing

their identities.[130] The term *Algonquin* is used by most authors to describe the nation, but

eventually they all move beyond this term to describe a relationship to a local place and

experiences on the land. One leader wrote that even though his identity includes the Algonquin

north of the Kichi Sibi or the Great River (Ottawa River), his people are the *People of the Stone*

Weir (Matchewan, 1989, p. 140).[131] Kitigan Zibi historian Stephen McGregor affirmed that the

Algonquins called themselves the *Great River People* highlighting our attachment to the

lifeblood of the nation, the Ottawa River (2004, p. 18). Finally, Paula Sherman does not use the

term Algonquin, choosing instead to use the term *Omàmìwinini* in her writing; this name

describes the relationship to the land and how Algonquins are known to the spirit world (2008a,

p. 77, n1). For Sherman, Indigenous identity is tied to how the spirit world knows human beings

and how we human beings behave on traditional territories (2010a, p. 7, n1). Without this stress

on a specific land base to which the people are attached, the distinct Algonquin identity becomes

blurred with surrounding nations.

To be Algonquin is to be tied to a specific historic place through narratives, kin, and

experiences.[132] This is what separates Algonquins from other Indigenous people. Throughout this

thesis, race has been challenged and deemed not only useless for identification, but harmful to

rebuilding Indigenous nations. However, the concept of race maintains a presence through years

of the colonial legacy. In chapter two, I quoted the late Elder William Commanda thinking

through this race-based lens in order to distinguish ourselves[133] from European nations. This is

not a critique of Elder Commanda, who I consider to be an amazing person, but is meant to

demonstrate how pervasive race-based thinking is within the Algonquin nation. Bonita Lawrence

documented a phenomenon happening in many communities, in this case, Algonquin

communities. She writes that the term *paper Indians* describes "individuals who are legally

recognized (on a piece of paper) as Algonquin because they are of proven Algonquin descent but

…have no real affiliation with other Algonquins, no knowledge of their own culture or heritage,

and no desire to learn about being Algonquin" (2012, p. 94). Algonquin identity should be tied to

relationships and community membership, not colonial logic and status (p. 299). Some citizens

stand to lose a lot on the political path laid out by Lawrence. However, perpetuating a logic

which is contributing to the fragmentation of a once powerful nation is more damaging than

losing an identity that a foreign government determined for you. Boundaries and resources can

be protected with new guidelines consistent with the community's mandates. When funding is

limited for whatever reason, community attachment should be privileged over a status card.

There is plenty of diversity within the Algonquin nation. Indeed, with a provincial

boundary line drawn right through the heart of our territory, it appears that diversity and division

define the nation. Parliament and the Supreme Court, which are the political and legal centres for

Canada, are situated right along the Ottawa River. Additionally, the interrelatedness within an

ecological system and *shared characteristics* argued for in chapter two on culture are difficult to

apply in the city of Ottawa. The answer lies in the cultural centre, the narratives and worldviews,

which reinforces why Indigenous people maintain their difference. There has been an Algonquin

presence along the Ottawa River and within the territory of the Ottawa River watershed for

thousands of years. Our bond within the complexity of a diverse nation is our ancestral

connection to the Ottawa River watershed. This territory and our political powers within it made us known throughout the region and were vital for travel from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic.[134] Our narratives were told through the rivers and land in Algonquin territory and this made us different from other nations. Even our governance practices were shaped around the seasons; they were localized through the winter and large gatherings took place during the summer season (Lawrence, 2012, p. 26). The rivers were free to travel for Algonquin people, but it is more reasonable to assume that small bands and families had their local knowledge and attachment to a specific waterway and land base within the territory. The Algonquin nation as a collective was temporal rather than spatial (p. 27) and this is central to rebuilding Algonquin nationhood in Ottawa and along our rivers.

Algonquins need to reclaim stories to specific rivers and lands within the watershed, with the addition of the city of Ottawa as well. It may be a mistake to claim a stake in the entire territory because that would paint over specificity and local knowledge within the nation (p. 286). The Ottawa River runs a distance of 1130 km in total (NRC, 2008, para. 1). So it is vital to have knowledge of the specific attachment to place or the connection appears abstract and less relational. Connecting one's history to the land expresses an identity based on an attachment to those who came before you. A land claim or legal victories cannot magically create or rebuild a nation in the manner which Algonquins have traditionally sought: a nation and identity based on attachment to specific watersheds. This is why it is so important to return and tap into the cultural centre.[135] Rebuilding Indigenous worldviews and revitalizing specific Algonquin narratives are the most powerful tools against national and cultural disintegration.

For example, Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg is the name of the community I belong to. It is an *Indian* reserve according to Canada. However, the name means the Original People of the River

of Gardens. In 1820, where the *River of Gardens* meets the Gatineau River, there was the trading

post and a settlement of the Algonquin people (McGregor, 2004, p. 159). There are Algonquin

who do not live or have family in Kitigan Zibi and yet are every bit as Algonquin as me. So my

community is not a *nation* of people. It is a group of people with a specific narrative within a

nation. We have members who live in different places in Canada, and they remain attached to

family in different communities and their respective land narratives. The importance of this

space according to *my* history is that one can travel from the city of Ottawa (and the Ottawa

River) down the Gatineau River and make it to Kitigan Zibi and the town of Maniwaki. As far as

I know, I have no narrative from the western lands near Temiskaming, the northern tips near

Pikogan, or the southern tips in eastern Ontario near Ardoch. The consensus is that some of my

Algonquin ancestors were near the eastern boundaries of the watershed close to Montreal and

most likely traveled these ancient routes to a convenient trading post near present day Kitigan

Zibi (p. 163). Although Kitigan Zibi was a physical place to settle, which inevitably became a

reserve, the people would travel these ancient waterways to get to other places within the nation.

Rivers were the veins of our nation and kept the life flowing throughout the watershed. The

intention was not to remain in a small place reserved for Algonquin but to preserve a way of life

in the face of increasing threats of an Indigenous lifestyle near present day Oka, Quebec (p. 164).

For the Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg, the Gatineau and Ottawa Rivers, as ancient routes, speak of an

ancient presence and knowledge.

Understanding the political and cultural history, especially the narratives from the Ottawa

River watershed are key methods of shaping the identity of individuals and the collective

Algonquin nation. While some narratives have been lost, this does not mean that Algonquins

cannot add new narratives in addition to the historic ones attached to a specific place. If there are

urban Indigenous people who have a limited connection to the land, it is the responsibility of other members in the nation to share their historic and cultural narratives in safe cultural spaces to reinforce what it means to be Algonquin and what their responsibilities to the territory are. This responsibility involves questioning dominant colonial narratives that surround Algonquins everyday. There may come the day when mere descent in and of itself will mean very little to rebuilding Algonquin nationhood. Culture and language will be the new foundations.

It is true that learning the Algonquin language as an adult is extremely difficult, and the language is in its infancy in terms of revitalization among Algonquin people, but this does not mean the people are less Algonquin when we speak English or French. At one extreme, there are some elders in the northwestern part of Algonquin territory who believe a person is not fully Algonquin unless they speak their language. The argument is that the people must think, speak, and act in accordance to who they were created to be (Spielmann, 1998, p. 53). Another extreme would claim that Algonquins can speak and think in whatever language they desire while not caring about the worldviews embedded in the language. There is some truth in both of these claims, but both need to remember ongoing Algonquin narratives regarding the colonial legacy. The Algonquin language is immensely important, because this language was essentially born out of the land and rivers. Language use is fundamental in creating a major distinction in individual and collective identities. However, there needs to be a grace period to revitalize the language as well as an acknowledgement that some citizens will never learn the language through no fault of their own. Many Algonquins speak French as their first language, while others speak English exclusively. Maintaining a distinct essence involves some of the Algonquin language, but it also entails a foundation in the truest centre of the culture: the attachment to our territories and the narratives that come from it. Although the worldviews may be embedded within Indigenous

languages, they can be translated into English and French. Ottawa is a multicultural space, and many urban Algonquins will form families with multiple cultures, but Algonquinness endures if memories and knowledge of the territory and relationships with the people continue.

<center>Algonquin Nationhood</center>

Even if Algonquins are distinct, do they have legitimate claims of nationhood? Despite overblown worries about separation and violent ethnic nationalism,[136] Canadians should not have unreasonable fears when Algonquins assert nationhood in places that include the city of Ottawa.[137] The assertion is to let others know that Algonquins are different than other peoples, and have a distinct historical attachment to the Ottawa River. Non-Algonquins are encouraged to recognize the territory which they are on.[138] Algonquins must work with the Canadian government more than other Indigenous nations because of the physical space the two share in the city of Ottawa. Algonquins have to worry about Canadians asserting their own forms of nation-building (Canada and Quebec) and the privilege these forms have long held over Algonquin forms. The status of Algonquin nationhood should be that of a nation that the province of Quebec must dialogue and work with in order to access resources in Algonquin territory. Sometimes Indigenous belief systems will require preservation of land over extraction as well as different forms of government; these decisions should be respected.[139] Algonquin citizens are diverse, but most would undoubtedly like to continue being Algonquin and pass that sacredness onto the next generation. In addition to continuance as a people, it is the responsibility of Algonquins to make sure the lands are protected for future generations. Algonquins do not have that responsibility on the west coast of Canada, the prairies, or even in northern Quebec. In the end, a recreated Algonquin nationhood will not resemble how it was

practiced before the French arrived over 400 years ago. Again, this does not mean it is any less authentic, but it has adapted to survive, like any other nation around the world.

What is important is to maintain an essence and a cultural centre that distinguishes us from others — both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Algonquin difference shares certain characteristics with surrounding Indigenous nations, but it is the Ottawa River watershed which distinguishes our nation from others. Asserting nationhood also works to prevent assimilation into a monolithic notion of Aboriginality. In most cases, we will not know everyone tied to the Algonquin nation. There is a bond, mentioned in the second chapter, which holds us together based on the cultural centre — narratives tied to the Ottawa River watershed. There will be different stories and even political differences for French and English-speaking Algonquins, due to their specific colonial histories tied to the place. However, this does not shatter the chances of having a legitimate Algonquin nation.[140] Algonquin nation building may need to take on a confederacy model, which allows communities to set their own agendas in their specific areas (i.e., the southern part of the nation will have completely different issues than the northern tip) (Lawrence, 2012, p. 29).

Although Algonquin people have fragmented identities due to colonization, there is hope through the decolonization project that we can maintain an Algonquin-centered identity. We can attempt to relearn a language that is not yet extinct, sacred histories that are tied to a large territory, and similar ceremonies and culture that we share with some Indigenous neighbours; these four aspects of Algonquin people share enough in common with our neighbours to be able to learn from them.[141] Paula Sherman argued that Algonquin people can learn from our Odawa and Ojibwe neighbours (2008a, p. 17).[142] However, this also requires some form of language revitalization and a type of thinking that is distinct from other types of knowing. Renaming and

rethinking our relationships should influence how we live in urban centres and rebuild our

nations. The ethics expressed within narratives are often similar for most Algonquian tribal

groups from Ojibwe territory in Northwestern Ontario to Mi'kmaq territory near the Atlantic

Ocean (Morrison, 2002, p. 59). Without risking submersion in some pan-Algonquian linguistic

family, we can learn enough from our Indigenous neighbours to decolonize ourselves.

<center>Rebuilding National Narratives</center>

Rebuilding Algonquin nationhood should include stories of historical use in Algonquin

territory, by status or non-status people alike. The rebuilding effort should record stories of

migration,[143] dispossession,[144] adaptation, and endurance (Lawrence, 2012, p. 280). Stories of

not having access to *Indian Reserves* for non-status Algonquins in the south are a part of our

national story. People may disagree, but this is perfectly acceptable; there is room for

disagreement in strong, confident, and healthy nations. It should be noted, however, that even if

an attempt is made to silence non-status people again in the rebuilding stages, non-status people

will continue to add to a dynamic and lively nationhood. But these are secondary issues to be

discussed amongst ourselves. Lawrence argues that new stories can play a part of rebuilding

nationhood, when she writes, "given the genocidal nature of the experiences of forced

urbanization and assimilation that so many Native families come from, these diasporic

experiences that individuals and families carry must be seen as part of their nations' history,

rather than the individual 'accidents' they are usually assumed to be" (2004, p. 203-204). Instead

of criticizing the non-status or even the urban Indigenous population and excluding them, we

should adopt traditional principles by being good neighbours and encouraging them in their quest

for being part of a nation. Additionally, despite the focus on land, Algonquin identity and

nationhood are just as capable of thriving within places like Ottawa as are the identity and

nationhood of any other Indigenous nation in urban centres. The 21st-century Algonquin nation

has its roots in territory, but it has expanded to include diasporic populations across Canada and

around the world.

<div align="center">Urban Algonquins</div>

Algonquins are finding urban centres attractive for the same reasons other Indigenous

people and non-Indigenous people find them attractive (i.e., post-secondary education,

employment, etc.). Asserting nationhood within urban centres may be complex, according to

political thinkers,[145] but these concerns often overshadow the rebuilding happening back on

reserves as well as off-reserves in safe spaces. Algonquins may not have a *parliament* in

downtown Ottawa, but there are hubs or safe spaces where people use the resources within urban

life to rebuild their identities, their worldviews, and their nation. Rebuilding is happening as long

as they remember their historical narratives attached to the watershed. Canada and the provinces

may offer economic promises, but they do not provide an ontology or an epistemology for

Algonquins to make sense of their lives and futures. In fact, Canada interrupts Algonquin nation

building efforts through the Indian Act, and through the imposition of a Canadian identity.

It is not the primary responsibility of the Algonquin nation to solve the complexity of

urban Indigenous governance within Canadian urban centres for three levels of government.[146]

The most pressing matter is that Algonquin families are rebuilding, whether publically or in the

home. Another vital area of nation building demands safe cultural spaces[147] to come together for

nation building projects. Again, it is not a separatist political project. Leaders are mothers,

fathers, elders, teachers, writers, even elected leaders under the Indian Act, that do their part to

rebuild our nation to what it once was — a political body of people within a specific territory

who had different interests according to the local area and unified themselves with a specific

language and common goals. Nation building is tied to what it means to be a people and how the

group wants to live (Lawrence, 2012, p. 301). As Algonquins, rediscovering how we were

supposed to live can be a collective learning process that can help unify a diverse nation. The

worldviews, the responsibilities to the territory and people, and the cultural narratives in the

Algonquin consciousness within the Ottawa River watershed are the foundation for rebuilding

healthy Algonquin identities and nationhood.

<div align="center">Research Scope and Recommendations</div>

This thesis argues for the legitimacy of urban Indigeneity as well as the potential for

asserting nationhood in urban centres, particularly in relation to urban Algonquin continuance.

There are themes concerning urban Indigenous identities that were beyond the scope of this

thesis which I recommend for further research.

Indigenous youth born and raised in urban centres have different challenges, and

therefore ideas, concerning their identities than previous generations of urban Indigenous people

(Lucero, 2013, p. 281). Additionally, Indigenous youth speak their respective Indigenous

languages in less numbers than previous generations (Norris and Jantzen, 2003, p. 114). This will

inevitably affect conceptions of nation-building within urban centres.

The revitalization of Indigenous languages within urban centres is also a vital study for

the future of urban Indigenous people and their nations. Due to the importance of cultural

knowledge embedded in Indigenous languages, briefly discussed in chapter two, another

important and challenging question for future research is whether or not urban Indigenous

identities can survive without Indigenous languages. Problems may also arise in urban centres

which have diverse Indigenous cultures and languages, particularly large urban centres such as

Vancouver and Toronto. It is crucial that future research be completed on the differences and difficulties that arise in the many Canadian urban centres.

Finally, the term *nation* presents a challenge for rebuilding Indigenous political systems in Canada due to negative interpretations of the term. Part of this thesis highlighted how the general population has discouraged the idea of distinct Indigenous identities, and nations, due to underlying conceptions of the term. Some Indigenous academics have introduced the term *peoplehood* but *nation* is more commonly used. Additionally, it is also important to ask whether or not nationhood will apply to people with claims over the traditional territory or to the people with the largest population in the given urban centre. Future research may be better served by emphasizing *peoplehood*, a term that does not carry the baggage of *nation*.

There are many important questions to ask in this study on the rise of urban Indigenous identities and nationhoods. An important question which entered my mind repeatedly was: is the way I am living - the relationships I am in, the way I think, the language I speak, the city I live in, my responsibilities and values, my knowledge of my people and territory, my grasp of the stories – leading to Indigenous continuance in Canadian urban centres? The answer to this question may lead to discovering more truths regarding the revitalization of urban Indigenous identities and ways of obtaining the good life in urban centres.

Endnotes

[1] Although Inuk people are recognized as an ethnic and cultural group, I apply the term nation to describe the Inuk people because the individuals are from "communities held together through objective bonds of history, language, and culture, whose members use those bonds subjectively to create a sense of shared nationhood" (Schouls, 2003, p. 6). These shared bonds can be maintained and transplanted within urban centres.

[2] See also (Flanagan, 2000, p. 196; Warry, 2007, p. 44). Warry critiques this argument and argues that mainstream conservative views are examples of neoliberal thought. I focus primarily on Cairns because of his influence in Canadian politics beyond conservative circles.

[3] In addition to the methods of rebuilding nations, it is implied that nation-building currently exists in Canada's urban centres. A deconstruction of the term nation will be explored later on in the chapter. However, my assumption of nation-building in urban centres are based on two sources concerning how some Indigenous people maintain a connection to, and represent home communities (nationhood), within urban centres (Pitawanakwat, 2008, p. 168; Lawrence, 2004, p. 232).

[4] Within the larger Algonquian language family there is the Algonquin nation. The Algonquin nation's physical territory extends from Western Quebec and Eastern Ontario (Hessel, 1993; Matchewan, 1989; McGregor, 2004). The Algonquin traditional land base will be dealt with in greater detail in chapter four.

[5] For the purposes of this thesis, I use nation-building and nation reconstruction interchangeably.

[6] The complexity of Indigenous identity will be presented later in the chapter within the review of the literature.

[7] See also (Ridenour & Newman, 2008, p. 19).

[8] See also (Pitawanakwat, 2008, p. 163).

[9] See also (Alfred and Corntassel, 2005, p. 614; Silver et al. 2006, p. 145-146).

[10] I am influenced by Linda Tuhiwai Smith's writings on decolonization and research. In discussing creative ways to conduct research she writes one example of bringing "a theoretical approach to a problem and through their analyses have shown new ways of thinking about issues of concern to Indigenous peoples" (1999, p. 16).

[11] The resources I incorporated into this thesis, which were published before 1993, were used for either theoretical reasons or for vital texts on the limited literature on Algonquin people. Additionally, one source published in 2013 was unpublished during this research process in 2012. I obtained the unpublished version from Dr. Evelyn Peters in May 2012. The title of the text is *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation* which was edited by both Evelyn Peters and Chris Andersen.

[12] See (Alfred, 2009; Lawrence, 2004; Simpson, 2011; Sherman, 2008b; Palmater, 2011; Pitawanakwat, 2008). A more extensive list of authors is used in chapter two.

[13] I use the name Niigonwedom because of its use in 2010 when this chapter was published. His name is now Niigaanwewidam.

[14] Due to the scope of this thesis on Indigenous identities and nation-building in Canadian urban centres, I will not focus in detail on the complexity of treaty based identities. That being said, the Indigenous traditions tied to lands

for a nation may also include the treaties made between specific Indigenous nations and colonial governments. Also, the narratives of Indigenous nations within Canada will include treaties for many. Finally, it is important to acknowledge how Aboriginal people are members of equal and self-governing nations and this political status was not relinquished when treaties were made with the Crown (Turner, 2006, p. 85; Alfred, 2009, p. 82-83).

[15] This problem will be addressed in chapter two.

[16] See (Hessel, 1993; Lawrence, 2012; Matchewan, 1989; McGregor, 2004; Morrison, 2002; Ningewance, 2004; Sherman, 2008a; and Spielmann, 1998).

[17] See also (Norris and Clatworthy, 2003, p. 66).

[18] The National Chief was left unnamed by David Newhouse, but the dates lead me to believe that it was George Erasmus.

[19] See (Ashcroft et al., 2007; Borrows, 2010; Gonzales, 2001).

[20] This argument is from (Ashcroft et al., 2007; Garroutte, 2003; Sissons, 2005; Valaskakis, 2005). However, this view has exceptions. There are some cases of the British claiming superiority over the Irish and Ukraine. I thank Mike Reid for bringing this to my attention.

[21] The idea of binaries and imperial logic is drawn from (Ashcroft et al., 2007; Hall, 2003; Sissons, 2005).

[22] See (Alfred and Corntassel, 2005; Andersen, 2011; Garroutte, 2003; James, 2001; Lawrence, 2003; Lawrence, 2004; Palmater, 2011; Pitawanakwat, 2008; Ramirez, 2007; Simpson, 2011; Sherman, 2008b; Valaskakis, 2005).

[23] See (Andersen, 2000; Andersen 2011; Borrows, 2010; Davis, 2009; Fitzgerald, 2007; Garroutte, 2003; Hall, 2003; Jackson, 2002; James, 2001; Lawrence, 2003; Ramirez, 2007; RCAP, 1996a; Sissons, 2005; Valaskakis, 2005). The academics listed include Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Many of the academics could be influenced by cultural anthropology and/or their own Indigenous identity.

[24] See also (Borrows, 2010, p. 205; Valaskakis, 2005, p. 223).

[25] For this thesis, I use the term Métis as it is recognized in Canada – a distinct category of Aboriginal peoples. In the U.S., a person of mixed ancestry is legally either Indian or not Indian. I thank Dr. Julie Pelletier for pointing this out to me.

[26] The examples of Elders I include in this thesis are older Indigenous people who have an extensive amount of Indigenous cultural knowledge and integrity as human beings. However, this does not exclude young people from being recognized as Elders.

[27] This idea of the Light Skinned or White race is adopted in the use of prophecies shared by Algonquin Elder William Commanda. After his death, a remembrance of William Commanda's life work went national through CBC. In the newspaper's discussion of the wampum belts' historic contract of peaceful coexistence with the French and English, the story quoted William Commanda as saying "Besides that, they [people creating the contract] talked about the full colours of the people in the world. There were white people, red people, black people, the full colours of people" (Clibbon, 2011).

[28] This will be discussed in greater detail in chapter three.

---

[29] See also (Valaskakis, 2005, p. 248).

[30] See (Andersen, 2000, 2011; Anderson, 2000; Fitzgerald, 2007; Garroutte, 2003; Gonzales, 2001; Krouse, 1999; Lawrence, 2000; Lawrence, 2003; Lawrence, 2004; Lawrence, 2012; McCall, 2012; Mihesuah, 1998).

[31] Lawrence uses the terms mixed-race and mixed-blood interchangeably in her work to describe herself and others like her in urban centres. She critiques the notions of race, *blood* and *authenticity*, as oppressive standards used by "non-Native society" which divide people and work against traditional forms of membership rules. However, Lawrence utilizes racial terms to describe herself (mixed-raced/mixed-blood) which perpetuates the logic and use of those harmful creations (Lawrence, 2000, 2003, 2004).

[32] See (Asante, 2005; Fenelon, 1998; Gonzales, 1998; Mihesuah, 1998).

[33] These fears of Indigenous people are legitimate. Indigenous people in Canada and the US do rely on treaty relationships which are based on their legal categorization as Indigenous. If they cease to exist as a legally recognized entity because Canada or the US questions authenticity from a raced-based position, then these governments can declare the treaty relationship null and void. Once again, I thank Dr. Julie Pelletier for this insight.

[34] See (Andersen, 2000; Andersen 2011; Ashcroft et al., 2007; Borrows, 2010; Davis, 2009; Fitzgerald, 2007; Garroutte, 2003; Hall, 2003; Jackson, 2002; James, 2001; Lawrence, 2004; Ramirez, 2007; RCAP, 1996a; Simpson, 2011; Sissons, 2005; Sherman, 2008b; Valaskakis, 2005; Weaver, 2001).

[35] It is important to recognize that racism exists, and colonial histories should not be ignored or glossed over through a focus on cultural identity. With the understanding that racial differences exist because of social constructions and European domination, addressing cultural identities and privileging these forms of identities does not ignore the historical facts of colonization or racism.

[36] See also (Garroutte, 2003, p. 69).

[37] This could have consequences for the rights of Indigenous people. Niigonwedom Sinclair deals with the potential hazards of hybridity theories concerning Indigenous people in Canada in (Sinclair, 2010).

[38] See also (Hall, 1996, p. 110).

[39] Indigenous people have special status and rights because they are the original peoples of the land. *Difference* and *equality* in this context is based on rights to self-determination as peoples and it is expressed through political and legal negotiations of treaties. This sets Indigenous people apart from all other marginalized and minority groups. *Equality* without *difference* may encourage policies of assimilation as it has in Canada's past. For more on the complexity of this issue in political philosophy within Canada see (Alfred, 2009; Ignatieff, 2000; Turner, 2006).

[40] See also (Macklem, 2001, p. 55; Ramirez, 2007, p. 98).

[41] See (Borrows, 2010, p. 185; Champagne, 2005, p. 35; Darnell, 2011, p. 42; Fitzgerald, 2007, p. 223; Frideres, 2008, p. 325–26, quoted in Peters, 2010, p. 87; Jackson, 2002, p. 125; LaRocque, 2010, p. 158; Macklem, 2001, p. 48, 54; Patrick et al., 2010, p. 81; Ramirez, 2007, p. 136; Tully, 1995, p. 11; Womack, 1999, p. 31).

[42] See also (Alfred, 2009, p. 29; Garroutte, 2003, p. 74; Macklem, 2001, p. 71-72; Patrick et al., 2010, p. 81).

---

[43] The importance of land cannot be overstated for the concept of Indigeneity. The land holds all knowledge and the land speaks through humans. Humans are the land, learn from it, and use its language. "If 'cultural difference' has any meaning, it lies here" (LaRocque, 2010, p. 136).

[44] See also (Wagamese, 2003, p. 213-214).

[45] See also (Valaskakis, 2005, p. 114; Daes, 2001, p. 9).

[46] Ontology can be quite vague concerning the study of "what there is" or "what exists". I understand it in the context of human identity and purpose. Perhaps by highlighting Kincheloe's use of critical ontology we can better understand this term and how it relates to cultural identity and land. Critical ontology focuses on what being human is about, grounding the assumptions in difference, and questioning Western assumptions about humanity and our relationships to nature (2006, p. 181-182). His argument is that Indigenous ontology does not separate a person from her environment and the people around her to "live well" (p. 182).

[47] See also (Simpson, 2011, p. 17).

[48] See also (Calliou, 2005, p. 60; Justice, 2006, p. 7).

[49] See also (Berry, 1999, p. 4; Keeshig-Tobias, 2010, p. 317; Wagamese, 2003, p. 168).

[50] See also (Fitzgerald, 2007, p. 55).

[51] Stories of diaspora and re-establishing ties to kinship and nation will be discussed more thoroughly in the next chapter.

[52] See also (Andersen and Denis, 2003, p. 385).

[53] This issue will be addressed in the next chapter from a cultural framework.

[54] See also (Tully, 1995, p. 11).

[55] In this extreme view, cultures are constantly changing and therefore they are never present or fixed, nor will they exist in the future: cultures are basically imagined (Huddart, 2006, p. 148).

[56] Key examples Davis highlighted were Al-Qaeda within Islam and the Boxer Rebellion in China, which were reactionary in a violent manner towards *foreign interests* and fundamentalist in looking to their *glorified* past.

[57] See also (Laliberte, 2013, p. 154).

[58] I am using the plural for nationhood because of the distinct nations that exist for Indigenous peoples.

[59] Liberalism is a complex system of thought, but for the purposes of this thesis I focus on the concept of equality and how Canadians apply it to Indigenous people in Canada. For specific treatment of this topic see (Ignatieff, 2000; Cairns, 2000a; Kymlicka, 2009; Turner, 2006).

[60] See also (Andersen and Denis, 2003, p. 382).

---

[61] In the context of Indigenous affairs in Canada, the term nation was first asserted by the Dene (Zlotkin, 1983, p. 21; quoted in Andersen and Denis, 2003, p. 382).

[62] For examples, see (Macklem, 2001, p. 107; Kymlicka, 2009, p. 24; Andersen and Denis, 2003, p. 374, 382).

[63] National identity is constructed through interaction of territory and language, development of communications and technology, the growth of bureaucracies and education, and at times, is reactive — there is a defense against oppression from a dominant group; that initiates a movement, including the search for the collective memory of a people (Castells, 1997, p. 32).

[64] See also (Justice, 2006, p. 207).

[65] The national border (separating Mexico and the U.S.) has become a colonial marker accepted by some Indigenous people, mostly attributed to sharing scarce resources. Ramirez writes, "On one side of the border, Indigenous peoples from Mexico are defined as Indian when they know their tribal languages and cultures, and live on their ancestral lands; but once they cross the border they are viewed as Mexicans, not Indians" (2007, p. 185).

[66] For the term nation according to the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Peoples, Cobo wrote, "Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems (Cobo, 1987, p. 379; quoted in Lawrence, 2012, p. 2-3).

[67] Culturally speaking, kinship can take many forms. Community and leadership, grounded in Indigenous worldviews and national narratives, are needed to make judgments about healthy kinship, values, and practices. Gangs are new *sites* of kinship practices for urban Indigenous youth, but they are destructive to Indigeneity (Buddle, 2011, p. 172).

[68] See also (Poole, 2003, p. 272-274).

[69] Daniel Justice has argued that even the members who have limited knowledge of the nation but have kinship within their communities continue to have relationships through *absence*. To revitalize a specific Indigenous identity one must reconnect with those *bonds of kinship* (2006, p. 23).

[70] See also (Champagne, 2005, p. 8).

[71] Distinct nations have their own moral versions of how they ought to live as peoples. The good life requires participation and responsibilities from citizens in order to live well as a nation (Justice, 2006, p. 25).

[72] There are many moral communities that privilege internal matters over ones that exist externally. Specific family members have more responsibilities than others. Relationships allow us to understand that the concerns of some specific members (i.e., elders and children) will take priority over others (i.e., healthy and self-sufficient members) in some cases (Poole, 2003, p. 272).

[73] See also (Hall 1996, p.112).

[74] All communities do this according to Creek/Cherokee literary critic Craig Womack, who pointed out that Indigenous nationalism allows him some agency to speak as an Indigenous person. Instead of exclusion, it is

liberating for Indigenous people who have been prevented over many generations from having this agency. Ironically, it is the post-colonial terms that continue to control the agency and speech of Indigeneity (Weaver et al., 2006, p. 168).

[75] See also (Simpson, 2000, p. 120; Valaskakis, 2005, p. 213).

[76] Gail Valaskakis writes that Indigenous nations, from a historical, political, and legal standpoint "are social collectives, groups of Indians whose heritage is recognized by federal governments as culturally distinct, historically continuous, and politically separate on the basis of different decrees: treaties, land grants, statutes, executive or administrative orders, past practice, or current criteria" (2005, p. 232).

[77] This does not imply that the challenge will reenact the bloody nationalisms of the 20th century. Ronald Niezen argues that Indigenous people create a political and moral challenge to nation-states around the world. However, the global Indigenous rights movement, what Niezen names *indigenism*, differs from a nationalism that desires succession for three reasons: 1) Succession would absolve treaty obligations between Indigenous people and nation-states; 2) The international movement is a disincentive to succession – Indigenous people already belong to a global Indigenous community; and 3) It would be politically, economically, and culturally impractical to obtain a membership in the international community in other ways (2003, p. 204-205). See also Kymlicka (2009) for how Indigenous nations can exist in Canada without succumbing to the violence listed above.

[78] Indigenous people should not be viewed as minorities, because they are members of distinct nations listed in the previous note. The term minority in its political context implies a certain amount of marginalization, exclusion, and lack of voice. In this context, I use minority because Indigenous people have a limited voice against a majority of Canadians.

[79] See also (Asch, 2002, p. 73).

[80] See (Alfred, 2009, p.123).

[81] See also (Weaver et al., 2006, p. 123).

[82] Although there is a time and a place for fighting against external oppression, Womack wrote quite bluntly that complaining about white hegemony is easier than creating Indigenous knowledge (Weaver et al., 2006, p. 92).

[83] The term *traditional* in this context refers to all pre-nation-state societies in the work of Anderson (1991).

[84] See also (Armstrong and Lutz, 2010, p. 270).

[85] See also (Lawrence, 2012, p. 286-287).

[86] Examples include, "the creation of reserves, the forced relocation of Aboriginal communities, and the scattering of Aboriginal communities and families through residential schools and foster care" (McCall, 2012, p. 22).

[87] See also (Kim and McCall, 2012, p. 7; Lawrence, 2004, p. 203-204).

[88] Eduardo Mendieta writes that cities have "become places where the national is undone and reconstituted. This takes the form not only of the emergence of cosmopolitan civic cultures, but also the development of urban, legal, and political formations that short-circuit the national and nationalistic order" (2003, p. 411).

[89] In the previous chapter an Indigenous ontology was highlighted as an entire way of understanding the world and the role humans have in it through a relationship with land. These epistemological and ontological foundations will inevitably clash with Western notions of how to live well.

[90] See additional support by (Alcoff, 2003, p. 3; Howard and Proulx, 2011, p. 6; Lobo, 2001, p. 76; Sinclair, 2010, p. 249; Valaskakis, 2005, p. 240).

[91] Taiaiake Alfred addresses this issue of individual identity intertwined with a collective one. He writes, "[It] is impossible to understand an Indigenous reality by focusing on individuals or discrete aspects of culture outside of a community context. However knowledgeable and rooted the individual, one cannot be truly Indigenous without the support and inspiration, as well as the reprobation and stress, that a community provides" (2009, p. 14). See also (Nagel, 1995, p. 961; Woodward, 2000, p. 7-8).

[92] Strategic essentialism was introduced in chapter 2. For additional literature on Indigenous forms of strategic essentialism see (Alfred and Corntassel, 2005, p. 613; Andersen, 2013, p. 68; Jackson, 2002, p.165; Peters, Maaka, and Laliberte, 2009, p. 3, quoted in Laliberte, 2013, p. 156-57; Ramirez, 2007, p. 12; Restoule, 2000, p. 103; Simpson, 2011, p. 17).

[93] In chapter 2, it was stressed that peoples change, transform, and adapt to certain environments while maintaining an essence of cultural identity. The literature on strategic essentialism primarily stresses fluidity without sacrificing the very foundation people stand on.

[94] For example roughly 81 percent of Indigenous people living in Thunder Bay are Ojibwe while there are 35 different nations represented in Vancouver (Todd, 2003, p. 257).

[95] These authors also argue that self-administration in the cities as a legitimate form of Indigenous governance in urban centres risks promoting a type of integrationist vision of Indigenous people "chasing the urban dream" (Abele and Prince, 2007, p.186).

[96] Due to the purposes of this thesis I will not delve heavily into the horrible effects residential schools have had on Indigenous people. However, it cannot be stressed enough that these places essentially severed children from their families, cultures, nations, and themselves. It affected the specific child's chances of a healthy identity and an understanding of what it means to be human in the world. The severing process has contributed to addictions, language loss, parenting issues, etc. It has profound implications concerning Indigenous continuance. Residential schools are the antithesis of sacredness.

[97] See also (Andersen, 2013, p. 71-73; Wilson and Peters, 2005, p. 405).

[98] Duran and Duran applied post-traumatic stress disorder to the effects of colonialism for Indigenous people in the Americas. It includes the stages of shock, withdrawal, acceptance, and despair/anger, before the person hopefully addressing the traumatic experiences (1995, p. 40-42).

[99] See also (Peters and Lafond, 2013, p. 130).

[100] This can be subverted by creating safe spaces to rebuild Indigenous philosophies as well as re-establishing connections to land. This will be discussed more thoroughly towards the end of this chapter.

[101] See also (Cairns, 2000a, p. 125; Pitawanakwat, 2008, p. 166).

---

[102] Assimilation is more than *integrating* into new cultures and social structures. It involves the repressing of past identities while adding new narratives to the adopted identity, which does not replace the fundamental essence of the previous identity (Valaskakis, 2005, p. 216). Although integration involves learning to adapt to new environments it does not *force* a person to repress who they essentially are.

[103] See also (Peters, 2010, p. 89).

[104] See also (Belanger et al., 2003, quoted in Peters and Lafond, 2013, p. 127).

[105] Each urban centre in Canada is different for the living arrangements of Indigenous people and the forming of Indigenous communities (Environics, 2010, p. 51). For example, Winnipeg, which has a large concentration of urban Indigenous people in certain neighbourhoods is different than Toronto and Ottawa where urban Indigenous people are scattered throughout the city. The point of this argument is for certain *hubs* or safe spaces anywhere in cities to rebuild Indigeneity and nationhoods rather than reinforce *Indigenous-only* neighbourhoods which reflect segregated ghettos in North American cities.

[106] The Friendship Centres were created for Indigenous people moving to urban centres with the notion of maintaining Indigeneity. The Centres provide "many services to urban Aboriginal people across Canada and is a vital communication link to reaching urban Aboriginal people. Services are provided in many areas: Culture, Family, Youth, Sports and Recreation, Language, Justice, Housing, Health, Education, Employment, Economic Development and projects ranging from social activities to community building initiatives and special events" (National Association of Friendship Centres, para. 4).

[107] See also (Laliberte, 2013, p. 158).

[108] See also (Andersen, 2013, p. 79).

[109] The Métis want specific solutions to their issues whether rural or urban. The Pan-Aboriginal approach has been critiqued by the Métis because it fails to recognize their distinction (Weinstein, 2007, p. 176). Pan-Aboriginal approaches are considered unaccountable to the people and to the urban governing bodies tied to the Métis nation (p. 205). See also (Andersen, 2013, p. 77-78).

[110] See also (UATF, 2007, p. 173; Andersen, 2013, p. 72).

[111] See also (Laliberte, 2013, p. 155).

[112] See note 10 in Chapter one.

[113] When the Cherokee were forced off their lands into new spaces by the United States government, they were able to adapt to the new land they found themselves on. Their national and Indigenous identities continued (Justice, 2006, p. 226).

[114] Armand Ruffo, an Ojibway professor and poet, argued that an Indigenous revitalization movement happened in Canada precisely because of the tools and ideas that were available in Canadian urban centres. Friendship Centres, newspapers, writers' groups, etc., were all available for Indigenous people to utilize to begin addressing issues that mattered to them (2010, p. 176).

[115] See also (Wilson and Peters, 2005, p. 404; Weaver et al., 2006, p. 29).

[116] An example is in Edmonton, where the Bent Arrow Traditional Healing Society, because of the assumption that Indigenous identity has a fundamental connection to land, has purchased land which they use for cultural camps and

for ceremonial purposes (Vandervelde, 2011, p. 154). See additional support by (Simpson, 2011, p. 17; Darnell and Munguia, 2005, p. 186; Pitawanakwat, 2008, p. 167).

[117] Furthermore, on the characteristics of Indigenous identity, Newhouse writes, "an Aboriginal spiritual ethos, speaking an Aboriginal language, maintaining a connection with an ancestral territory and land, the presence of elders, the use of traditional values in daily life, a family centered life, and an active ceremonial life to reinforce traditional values and spirituality. These seem to me to be elements of a culture and a distinct way of life" (2011, p. 33).

[118] See additional support by (Andersen, 2013, p. 81; Berry, 1999, p. 26; Darnell, 2011, p. 46; Darnell and Munguia, 2005, p. 173; Gonzales, 2001, p. 179-80; Laliberte, 2013, p. 169, 176; Sissons, 2005, p. 58; Valaskakis, 2005, p. 246; UAPS, 2010, p. 50).

[119] Belonging to a nation need not imply physically living on a reserve; it is important to remember that reserves are not Indigenous constructions.

[120] See additional support by (Lawrence, 2004, p. 231; Gonzales, 2001, p. 179; Jackson, 2002, p. 150; UATF, 2007, p. 72-73).

[121] Status does not necessarily translate into cultural knowledge and kinship ties. On the topic of colonial logic and lack of participation within Indigenous nations Bonita Lawrence documented a popular term: *paper Indians*. She writes that paper Indians are "individuals who are legally recognized (on a piece of paper) as Algonquin because they are of proven Algonquin descent but who have no real affiliation with other Algonquins, no knowledge of their own culture or heritage, and no desire to learn about being Algonquin" (2012, p. 94). Perhaps the term should be paper Algonquins.

[122] See also (Environics, 2010, p. 42).

[123] See also (Berry, 1999, p. 22).

[124] This point was subtly raised in (Environics, 2010, p. 51; Peters and Lafond, 2013, p. 143; UAPS, 2010, p. 42).

[125] See also (Darnell, 2011, p. 47).

[126] Womack highlighted that Oklahoma state university is located within the heart of his Creek nation and could be deemed a center for educating Creeks from different parts of the nation, which will assist in strengthening the nation (Weaver et al., 2006, p. 101; 175 n10). See also (Straus and Valentino, 2001, p. 90).

[127] See also (Pitawanakwat, 2008, p. 168).

[128] An example of this is the obsession over employing Indigenous people within Canadian cities to support the Canadian nation and economy while ignoring Indigenous nation building goals. The discourse around Indigenous people in Canada is primarily focused on Canada's future and saving money.

[129] The name is based on Samuel de Champlain receiving a term in the Maliseet language to describe the group of allies (Algonquin) with the Montagnais (now Innu) and Maliseet peoples. The Innu and Maliseet nations were northeast of Algonquin territory. *Algonquin* on its own does not mean anything in French. So it is most reasonable to assume that we have been named something that sounds like the Maliseet term for *People who Dance* (Hessel, 1993, p. 13). Despite the foundation of the name, it is important to remember that the majority of Algonquin people presently use the term Algonquin alongside Anishinaabe.

---

[130] See note 15 in chapter one.

[131] Although past Chief Matchewan wrote this essay in 1989, he documents the historic narratives of a people and attachment to a specific place within Algonquin territory (Barriere Lake). This essay emphasizes the assertion of legitimate nationhood long before RCAP and the Oka Crisis. Chief Matchewan also highlighted the hypocrisy of the Quebecois and Canadian governments concerning care of the environment (1989, p. 162).

[132] Real Algonquiness does not imply being tied to reserves as well (Lawrence, 2012, p. 12). Bonita Lawrence documented how non-status Algonquins are left out of discussions on their land through notions of authenticity and the Indian Act (p. 115). If being Algonquin depends on living an invention from an imperial age and therefore perpetuating colonial logic then Algonquin nationhood may exist according to Canada's standards but it will not flourish through Indigenous worldviews and governance structures.

[133] I am writing in 1st-person plural for this chapter because of my own ties to the Algonquin Nation through Kitigan Zibi.

[134] There has been debate within the Quebec communities on whether or not the territory extends to Lake Superior (Richardson, 1994, p. 94). Although this traditional territory may be harder to argue for, it is certainly possible for Algonquin citizens and small bands, through similarities in language and custom, to have travelled far into what is declared Ojibwe territory to reach Lake Superior.

[135] As Daniel Justice aptly put it concerning youth, students, and citizens in general living away from their territories, "No matter how much you study, no matter how much you read, you have to go home, because that's where theory becomes story and moves into your bones" (2006, p. 208).

[136] The Oka Crisis can verify this argument, but most conflicts since the language of nationhood entered Indigenous affairs in Canada — less than 50 years ago — have been peaceful protests or confrontations which pale in comparison to the worst forms of nationalism found in the 20th century.

[137] I argue that Canadians should not have unreasonable fears which were discussed in chapter 3. However, Canadian nationalism and identity is clearly challenged.

[138] Much as Canadian citizens have to acknowledge the difference found in the Province of Quebec.

[139] One community named Barriere Lake has the right to have traditional governance structures as opposed to an Indian Act government based on outdated thinking forced upon them by Canada.

[140] For example, Canadians in Newfoundland have different styles of speech, live in different environments, and have a substantial amount of political differences from Albertans. Most Canadians would continue to support the solidarity between these people. Indeed, much of the views regarding unity have been constructed in little over a century.

[141] Anishinaabe in Western Quebec & Eastern Ontario are called Algonquin. The written language is influenced by French neighbours, but Algonquins distinguish themselves from the Ojibwe or any other nation within the Algonquian language family (Ningewance, 2004, p. xviii-xix; Spielmann, 1998, p. 7).

[142] Chief Greg Sarazin knew very little of his Algonquin identity and purpose during his childhood and adolescence, but found a safe space to rebuild his identity and nation by attending Trent University in Peterborough (Lawrence, 2012, p. 214). Trent University is on Ojibwe territory.

---

[143] One story documents how some ancestors of the people of Barriere Lake attempted to journey to the settlement near Maniwaki and never arrived because of small pox. Such experiences like this one encouraged some members of this region to be less receptive to "the outside world" (Richardson, 1994, p. 94)

[144] Former chief Harry Wawati said that Canada broke the Algonquin connection to the natural environment (Loumède, 2007). Algonquin *belonging* to this connection was stolen more specifically through forestry practices, damming, and settlement. Relationships, according to Wawati, will be "put right" when this belonging or connection is re-established by the Algonquin with the assistance of Canada. I believe his words imply that Canada should respect Algonquin self-determination and their political relationship with the Algonquin nation in the territory.

[145] See (Cairns, 2000a; Bogart, 2005; Abele and Prince, 2007).

[146] In Ottawa, Cree people are statistically represented as the highest population, followed by the Inuit (UATF, 2007b, p. 50). However, regardless of size, no other nation has stronger historical claims to the territory than the Algonquin nation. Selecting an urban Indigenous government based on the largest population or a host nation in the territory is an example of why urban governance is complex.

[147] Womack highlighted that Oklahoma State University is located within the Creek nation and could be a center for studying (Weaver et al., 2006, p. 175 n10). This can apply to Carleton University, the University of Ottawa, and Algonquin College in Ottawa.

References

Abele, F., and Prince, M. J. (2007). Constructing Political Spaces for Aboriginal Communities in Canada. In I. Peach (Ed.), *Constructing Tomorrow's Federalism: New Perspectives on Canadian Governance* (pp. 171-200). Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Absolon, K. and C. Willett. (2005). Putting Ourselves Forward: Location in Aboriginal Research. In L. Brown and S. Strega (Eds.), *Research as Resistance: Critical, Indigenous & Anti-Oppressive Approaches* (pp.97-126). Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.

Alcoff, L. M. (2003). Introduction: Identities: Modern and Postmodern. In L. M. Alcoff, and E. Mendieta (Eds.), *Identities: Race, Class, Gender, and Nationality* (pp. 1-8). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Alfred, T. (2009). *Peace, Power, Righteous: An Indigenous Manifesto* (2nd ed.). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, T. and J. Corntassel. (2005). Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism. *Government and Opposition, Politics of Identity Series No. 9:* 597-614.

Alfred, G.R. (1995). *Heeding the Voices of our Ancestors: Kahnawake Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Andersen, C. (2013). Urban Aboriginality as a Distinctive Identity, in Twelve Parts. In C. Andersen and E. J. Peters (Eds.), *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation* (pp. 64-95). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

—. (2011). Mixed Ancestry or Métis? In B. Hokowhitu, N. Kermoal, C. Andersen, A. Petersen, M. Reilly, I. Altamirano-Jiménez, and P. Rewi (Eds.), *Indigenous Identity and Resistance: Researching the Diversity of Knowledge* (pp. 23-36). Dunedin, NZ: Otago University Press.

—. (2000). The Formalization of Métis Identities in Canadian Provincial Courts. In F. Laliberte, P. Settee, J. B. Waldram, R. Innes, B. Macdougall, L. McBain and F. L. Barron (Eds.), *Expressions in Canadian Native Studies* (pp. 95- 115). Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Extension Press.

Andersen, C. and C. Denis. (2003). Urban native communities and the nation: before and after the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 40(4),* 373-90.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Verso.

Anderson, K. (2000). *A Recognition of Being: Reconstructing Native Womanhood*. Toronto: Sumach Press.

Armstrong, J., and Lutz, H. (2010). A Conversation Between Jeannette Armstrong and Hartmut Lutz. In P. DePasquale, R. Eigenbrod, and E. LaRocque (Eds.), *Across Cultures, Across Borders: Canadian Aboriginal and Native American Literature* (pp. 261-278). Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Asante, E. A. (2005). Negotiating Identity: Aboriginal Women and the Politics of Self-Government. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies 25(1),* 1-34.

Asch, M. (2002). Self-Government in the New Millennium. In J. Bird, L. Land, and M. MacAdam (Eds.), *Nation to Nation: Aboriginal Sovereignty and the Future of Canada* (pp. 65-73). Toronto: Public Justice Resource Centre and Irwin Publishing.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., and Tiffin, H. (2007). *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Battiste, M. and Youngblood Henderson, J. S. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge.* Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Ltd.

Benton-Banai, E. (2010). *The Mishomis Book: The Voice of the Ojibway*. University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1988).

Berry, J. W. (1999). Aboriginal Cultural Identity. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies 19(1),* 1-36.

Blaikie, N. (2010). *Designing Social Research: The Logic of Anticipation* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bogart, W. A. (2005). *Good Government? Good Citizens? : Courts, Politics, and Markets in a Changing Canada.* Vancouver: The University of British Columbia Press.

Borrows, J. (2010). *Canada's Indigenous Constitution*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

—. (2002). Recovering Canada: The resurgence of Indigenous Law. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Brooks, L. (2008). Digging at the Roots: Locating an Ethical, Native Criticism. In C. S. Womack, D. Justice, and C.B. Teuton (Eds.), *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective* (pp. 234-264). Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Bryman, A., Teevan, J.J., and E. Bell. (2009). *Social Research Methods* (2nd Canadian edition). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Buddle, K. (2011). Urban Aboriginal Gangs and Street Sociality in the Canadian West: Places, Performances, and Predicaments of Transition. In H. Howard, and C. Proulx (Eds.), *Aboriginal Peoples in Canadian Cities: Transformations and Continuities* (pp. 171-201). Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press.

Cairns, A. C. (2000a). *Citizens Plus: Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

—. (2000b). The End of Internal Empire: The Emerging Aboriginal Policy Agenda. In D. M. Hayne (ed.), *Governance in the 21st Century: Proceedings of a symposium held in November 1999 under the auspices of the Royal Society of Canada* (pp. 117-142). Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Series VI, Volume X. University of Toronto Press.

Calliou, B. (2005). The Culture of Leadership: North American Indigenous Leadership in a Changing Economy. In D. Champagne, K. J. Torjesen, and S. Steiner (Eds.), *Indigenous Peoples and the Modern State* (pp. 47-68). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Castells, M. (1997). T*he Power of Identity, The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Vol. II*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Champagne, D. (2005). Rethinking Native Relations with Contemporary Nation-States. In D. Champagne, K. J. Torjesen, and S. Steiner (Eds.), *Indigenous Peoples and the Modern State* (pp. 3-23). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Clibbon, J. (2011, August 3). Keeper of the Wampum: William Commanda, Algonquin Elder. *CBC News*. Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2011/08/03/f-william-commanda-algonquin-elder.html

Cobo, José Martínez. (1987). *Study of the Problem of Discrimination against Indigenous Populations* (UN Publication No. E.86. XIV.3, Vol. V.) New York: United Nations.

Cornell, S. and Kalt, J. P. (2007). Two Approaches to the Development of Native Nations: One Works, the Other Doesn't. In M. Jorgensen (Ed.), *Rebuilding Native Nations: Strategies for Governance and Development* (pp. 3-33). Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

Culture. (2012). In *Oxford Dictionaries Online*. Retrieved from http://oxforddictionaries.com /definition/english/culture

Darnell, R. (2011). Nomadic Legacies and contemporary Decision-Making Strategies Between Reserve and city. In H. Howard, and C. Proulx (Eds.), *Aboriginal Peoples in Canadian Cities: Transformations and Continuities* (pp. 39-68). Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press.

Darnell, R. and Munguia M. (2005). "Nomadic Legacies an Urban Algonquin Residence." In H.C. Wolfart (Ed.), *Papers of the Thirty-Sixth Algonquian Conference* (pp. 173–86). Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba.

Davis, W. (2009). *The Wayfinders: Why Ancient Wisdom Matters in the Modern World.* Toronto: House of Anansi Press.

Dhamoon, R. (2009). *Identity/Difference Politics: How Difference is Produced, and Why it Matters.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Duran, E. and Duran, B. (1995). *Native American Postcolonial Psychology*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Eagleton, T. (2000). *The Idea of Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Engle, K. (2010). *The Elusive Promise of Indigenous Development: Rights, Culture, Strategy*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Environics Institute. (2010). *Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study: Main Report*. Toronto: Environics Institute.

Fanon, F. (2004). *The Wretched of the Earth*. (R. Philcox, Trans.). New York, NY: Grove Press. (Original work published in 1961).

Fenelon, J. V. (1998). Discrimination and Indigenous Identity in Chicago's Native Community. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 22(4), 273-303.

Fitzgerald, K. (2007). *Beyond White Ethnicity: Developing a Sociological Understanding of Native American Identity Reclamation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Forbes, J. D. (2001). The Urban Tradition among Native Americans. In S. Lobo, and K. Peters (Eds.), *American Indians and the Urban Experience* (pp. 5-25). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Frideres, J. (2008). Aboriginal Identity in the Canadian Context. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies 28(2),* 313-342.

Garroutte, E. M. (2003). *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Gonzales, A. A. (2001). Urban (Trans)Formations: Changes in the Meaning and Use of American Indian Identity. In S. Lobo, and K. Peters (eds.), *American Indians and the Urban Experience* (pp. 169-185). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

—. (1998). The (Re)Articulation of American Indian Identity: Maintaining Boundaries and Regulating Access to Ethnically Tied Resources. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 22(4), 199-225.

Hall, S. (2003). New Ethnicities. In L. M. Alcoff, and E. Mendieta (Eds.), *Identities: Race, Class, Gender, and Nationality* (pp. 90-95). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. (Original work published 1996).

—. (1996). Cultural Identity and Disapora. In P. Mongia (Ed.), *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader* (pp. 110-121). London & New York: Arnold. (Original work published 1990).

Hanselmann, C. (2003). Ensuring the Urban Dream: Shared Responsibility and Effective Urban Aboriginal Voices. In D. Newhouse and E. Peters (Eds.), *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 167-177). Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative, Privy Council Office).

Helin, C. (2008). *Dances with Dependency: Out of Poverty Through Self-Reliance*. Woodland Hills, CA: Ravencrest Publishing.

Hessel, P. (1993). *The Algonkin Nation: the Algonkins of the Ottawa Valley: an Historical Outline*. Arnprior, Ontario: Kichesippi Books.

Holm, T, Pearson, J. D. and B. Chavis. (2003). Peoplehood: A Model for the Extension of Sovereignty in American Indian Studies. *Wicazo Sa Review 18(1):* 7-24.

Howard, H. A., and Proulx, C. (2011). Transformations and Continuities: An Introduction. In H. Howard, and C. Proulx (Eds.), *Aboriginal Peoples in Canadian Cities: Transformations and Continuities* (pp. 1-21). Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press.

Howard, H. (2011). The Friendship Centre: Native People and the Organization of Community in cities. In H. Howard, and C. Proulx (Eds.), *Aboriginal Peoples in Canadian Cities: Transformations and Continuities* (pp. 87-108). Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press.

Huddart, D. (2006). *Homi K. Bhabha*. New York: Routledge.

Ignatieff, M. (2000). *The Rights Revolution*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press.

Jaccoud, M., and Brassard, R. (2003). The Marginalization of Aboriginal Women in Montréal. In D. Newhouse and E. Peters (Eds.), *Not Strangers in these Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 131-145). Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Jackson, D. D. (2002). *Our Elders Lived It: American Indian Identity in the City*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

James, C. (2001). Cultural Change in Mistissini: Implications for Self-Determination and Cultural Survival. In C.H. Scott (Ed.), *Aboriginal Autonomy and Development in Northern Quebec and Labrador* (pp. 316-331). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Justice, D. H. (2010). A Relevant Resonance: Considering the Study of Indigenous National Literatures. In P. DePasquale, R. Eigenbrod, and E. LaRocque (Eds.), *Across Cultures, Across Borders: Canadian Aboriginal and Native American Literatures* (pp. 61-76). Peterborough: Broadview Press.

—. (2006). *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Keeshig-Tobias, L. (2010). Let's be our own Tricksters, Eh. In D. Reder and L. M. Morra (Eds.), *Troubling Tricksters: Revisioning Critical Conversations* (pp. 317-318). Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Kim, C. and McCall, S. (2012). Introduction. In C. Kim, S. McCall, and M. Baum Singer (Eds.), *Cultural Grammars of Nation, Diaspora, and Indigeneity in Canada* (pp. 1-18). Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Krouse, S. A. (1999). Kinship and Identity: Mixed Bloods in Urban Indian Communities. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal 23(2),* 73-89.

Kymlicka, W. (2009). Citizenship, Communities, and Identity in Canada. In J. Bickerton and A. G. Gagnon (Eds.), *Canadian Politics* (5th ed.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Laliberte, R. F. (2013). Being Métis: Exploring the Construction, Retention and Maintenance of Urban Métis Identity. In C. Andersen and E. J. Peters (Eds.), *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation* (pp. 153-183). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

LaRocque, E. (2010). *When the Other is Me: Native Resistance Discourse 1850-1990*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Lawrence, B. (2012). *Fractured Homeland: Federal Recognition and Algonquin Identity in Ontario.* Vancouver: The University of British Columbia.

—. (2004). *"Real" Indians and Others: Mixed-Blood Urban Native Peoples and Indigenous Nationhood*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

—. (2003). Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the
        United States: An Overview. *Hypatia vol. 18, 2:* 3-31.

—. (2000). Mixed-Race Urban Native People: Surviving a Legacy of Policies of
        Genocide. In F. Laliberte, P. Settee, J. B. Waldram, R. Innes, B. Macdougall, L. McBain
        and F. L. Barron (Eds.), *Expressions in Canadian Native Studies* (pp. 69-94). Saskatoon:
        University of Saskatchewan Extension Press.

Lee, D. (2010). Echoes of Impermanence: Kanehsatà:ke, Bimaadiziiwin and the Idea of Canada.
        In L. Simpson and K. Ladner (Eds.), *This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years Since the
        Blockades* (pp. 235-243). Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Lobo, S. (2001). Is Urban a Person or a Place?: Characteristics of Urban Indian Country. In S.
        Lobo, and K. Peters (Eds.), *American Indians and the Urban Experience* (pp. 73-84).
        Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Loumède, C. (Producer), & Desjardins, R., & Monderie, R. (Directors). (2007). *The Invisible
        Nation: The Story of the Algonquin* [Motion picture]. Canada: National Film Board of
        Canada.

Lucero, N.M. (2013). "Being Indian in the city": Generational differences in the negotiation of
        Native identity among urban-based American Indians. In C. Andersen and E. J. Peters
        (Eds.), *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation* (pp.
        261-291). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Macklem, P. (2001). *Indigenous Difference and the Constitution of Canada*. Toronto: University
        of Toronto Press.

Matchewan, J. (1989). Mitchikanibikonginik Algonquins North of the Ottawa: Our Long Battle
        to Create a Sustainable Future. In B. Richardson (Ed.), *Drumbeat: Anger and Renewal in
        Indian Country* (pp. 137-166). Toronto: Summerhill Press.

Maracle, L. (2010). Toward a National Literature: A Body of Writing. In P. DePasquale, R.
        Eigenbrod, and E. LaRocque (Eds.), *Across Cultures, Across Borders: Canadian
        Aboriginal and Native American Literature* (pp. 77-96). Peterborough: Broadview Press.

McCall, S. (2012). Diaspora and Nation in Métis Writing. In C. Kim, S. McCall, and M. Baum
        Singer (Eds.), *Cultural Grammars of Nation, Diaspora, and Indigeneity in Canada* (pp.
        21-41). Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

McGregor, S. (2004). *Since Time Immemorial: 'Our Story', The story of the Kitigan Zibi
        Anishinàbeg*. Maniwaki: Anishinabe Printing.

McKegney, S. (2007). *Magic Weapons: Aboriginal Writers Remaking Community after*

Residential School. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

McLeod, N. (2001). Coming Home Through Stories. In A. G. Ruffo (Ed.), *(Ad)dressing Our Words: Aboriginal Perspectives on Aboriginal Literatures* (pp. 17-36). Penticton: Theytus Books Ltd.

Mendieta, E. (2003). Afterword: Identities: Postcolonial and Global. In L. M. Alcoff, and E. Mendieta (Eds.), *Identities: Race, Class, Gender, and Nationality* (pp. 407-416). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Mihesuah, D. A. (1998). American Indian Identities: Issues of Individual Choices and Development. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal 22(2),* 193-226.

Morrison, K. M. (2002). *The Solidarity of Kin: Ethnohistory, Religious Studies, and the Algonkian – French Religious Encounter.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Nagel, J. (1995). American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Politics and the Resurgence of Identity. *American Sociological Review 60(6),* 947-965.

National Association of Friendship Centres. (2009). The Government's Duty to Consult Urban Aboriginal People. Retrieved from http://mail.nafc.ca/PDF/NAFC%20Duty%20to%20Consult%20-%20ENGLISH.pdf

Natural Resources Canada. (2008, January 2). Ottawa River: the Watershed. Retrieved from http://www.nrcan.gc.ca/earth-sciences/products-services/mapping-product/geoscape/ottawa/6040

Newhouse, D. (2011). Urban Life: Reflections of a Middle-Class Indian. In H. Howard, and C. Proulx (Eds.), *Aboriginal Peoples in Canadian Cities: Transformations and Continuities* (pp. 23-38). Waterloo: Laurier Press.

—. (2003). The Invisible Infrastructure: Urban Aboriginal Institutions and Organizations. In D. Newhouse and E. Peters (Eds.), *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 243-253). Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative, Privy Council Office.

—. (2000). From the Tribal to the Modern: The Development of Modern Aboriginal Societies. In F. Laliberte, P. Settee, J. B. Waldram, R. Innes, B. Macdougall, L. McBain and F. L. Barron (Eds.), *Expressions in Canadian Native Studies* (pp. 395-409). Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Extension Press.

Newhouse, D, and Peters, E. (2003). Introduction. In D. Newhouse and E. Peters (Eds.), *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 5-13). Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative, Privy Council Office).

Niezen, R. (2003). *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Ningewance, P. M. (2004). *Talking Gookom's Language: Learning Ojibwe*. Lac Seul: Mazinaate Press.

Norris, M. J., and Clatworthy, S. (2003). Aboriginal Mobility and Migration Within Urban Canada: Outcomes, Factors and Implications. In D. Newhouse and E. Peters (Eds.), *Not Strangers in these Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 51-78). Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Norris, M. J., and Jantzen, L. (2003). Aboriginal Languages in Canada's Urban Areas: Characteristics, Considerations and Implications. In D. Newhouse and E. Peters (Eds.), *Not Strangers in these Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 93-118). Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

O'Connor, H. & N. Gibson (2003). A Step-by-Step Guide to Qualitative Data Analysis. Pimatiziwin: *A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health*, 1 (1). Retrieved from http://www.pimatisiwin.com/uploads/1289566991.pdf

O'Leary, Z. (2004). *The Essential Guide to Doing Research.* London: Sage Publications.

Palmater, P.D. (2011). *Beyond Blood: Rethinking Indigenous Identity*. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing.

Patrick, D., Tomiak, J., Brown, L., Langille, H., and Vieru, M. (2010). "Regaining the childhood I should have had": The Transformation of Inuit Identities, Institutions, and Community in Ottawa. In H. Howard, and C. Proulx (Eds.), *Aboriginal Peoples in Canadian Cities: Transformations and Continuities* (pp. 69-85). Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press.

Peters, E. J. (2011). Aboriginal Public Policy in Urban Areas: An Introduction. In E. J. Peters (Ed.), *Urban Aboriginal Policy Making in Canadian Municipalities* (pp. 3-32). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

—. (2010). Emerging Themes in Academic Research in Urban Aboriginal Identities in Canada, 1996-2010. *Aboriginal Policy Studies, 1(1):* 78-105.

Peters, E. and Lafond, C. (2013). "I basically mostly stick with my own kind": First Nations Appropriation of Urban Space in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada. In C. Andersen and E. J. Peters (Eds.), *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation* (pp. 124-152). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Peters, E. J., R. Maaka, and R. Laliberte. (2009). *"I'm sweating with Cree culture not Saulteaux*

culture and there goes the beginning of Pan Indianism": Census categories and urban Aboriginal cultural identities. Invited presentation, Aboriginal Demography Workshop, University of Alberta, October 17.

Peters, E. and Wilson, K. (2005). "You Can Make a Place for it": Remapping Urban First Nations Spaces of Identity. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 23*: 395-413.

Pitawanakwat, B. (2008). Bimaadziwin Oodenaang: A Pathway to Urban Nishnaabe Resurgence. In L. Simpson (Ed.), *Lighting the Eighth Fire: The Liberation, Resurgence, and Protection of Indigenous Nations* (pp. 161-173). Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Poole, R. (2003). National Identity and Citizenship. In L. M. Alcoff, and E. Mendieta (Eds.), *Identities: Race, Class, Gender, and Nationality* (pp. 271-280). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Poster, M. (1989). *Critical Theory and Poststructuralism: In Search of a Context*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Ramirez, R. K. (2007). *Native Hubs: Culture, Community, and Belonging in Silicon Valley and Beyond*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

—. (1998). Healing Through Grief: Urban Indians Reimagining Culture and Community in San Jose, California. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 22(4), 305-333.

Restoule, J. (2000). Aboriginal Identity: The Need for Historical and Contextual Perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 24(2),* 102-112.

Richardson, B. (1994). *People of the Terra Nullius: Betrayal and Rebirth in Aboriginal Canada*. Vancouver, B.C.: Douglas and McIntyre.

Ridenour, C. S. and Newman, I. (2008). *Mixed Methods Research: Exploring the Interactive Continuum*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. (1996a). Chapter 3: Governance. In *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Restructuring the Relationship: Vol. 2* (pp.105-417). Ottawa: Canada Communications Group-Publishing.

—. (1996b). Chapter 7: Urban Perspectives. In *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Perspectives and Realities: Vol. 4* (pp. 519-621). Ottawa: Canada Communications Group-Publishing.

—. (1993). *Aboriginal Peoples in Urban Centres: Report of the National Round Table on Aboriginal Urban Issues.* Ottawa: Canada Communication Group-Publishing.

Ruffo, A.G. (2010). Where the Voice Was Coming From. In P. DePasquale, R. Eigenbrod, and E. LaRocque (Eds.), *Across Cultures, Across Borders: Canadian Aboriginal and Native American Literature* (pp.171-193). Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Said, E. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Schouls, T. (2003). *Shifting Boundaries: Aboriginal Identity, Pluralist Theory, and the Politics of Self-Government.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Sherman, P. (2010). Protecting Our Lands. In L. Simpson and K. Ladner (Eds.), *This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years Since the Blockades* (pp. 229-234). Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

—. (2008a). *Dishonour of the Crown: the Ontario Resources Regime in the Valley of the Kiji Sìbì.* Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

—. (2008b). The Friendship Wampum: Maintaining Traditional Practices in Our Contemporary Interactions in the Valley of the Kiji Sìbì. In L Simpson (Ed.), *Lighting the Eighth Fire: The Liberation, Resurgence, and Protection of Indigenous Nations* (pp. 111-125). Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Silver, J. et al. (2006). *In Their Own Voices – Building Aboriginal Communities*. Halifax: Fernwood.

Simpson, L. (2011). *Dancing on our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

—. (2008). Our Elder Brothers: The Lifeblood of Resurgence. In L. Simpson (Ed.), *Lighting the Eighth Fire: The Liberation, Resurgence, and Protection of Indigenous Nations* (pp. 73-87). Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

—. (2003). Toxic Contamination Undermining Indigenous Food Systems and Indigenous Sovereignty. *Pimatiziwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health, 1 (2),* 130.

Simpson, A. (2000). Paths Toward a Mohawk Nation: Narratives of Citizenship and Nationhood in Kahnawake. In D. Ivison, P. Patton, and W. Sanders (Eds.), *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (pp. 113-136). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, N. J. (2010). Tending to Ourselves: Hybridity and Native Literary Criticism. In P. DePasquale, R. Eigenbrod, and E. LaRocque (Eds.), *Across Cultures, Across Borders: Canadian Aboriginal and Native American Literature* (pp. 239-258). Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Sissons, J. (2005). *First Peoples: Indigenous Cultures and Their Futures.* London: Reaktion
    Books.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London:
    Zed Books Ltd.

Spielmann, R. (1998). *'You're so fat!': Exploring Ojibwe Discourse.* Toronto: University of
    Toronto Press.

Statistics Canada. (2012a). *Population and dwelling counts, for population centres, 2011 and
    2006 censuses.* Retrieved from
    http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/dp-pd/hlt-fst/pd-pl/Table-
    Tableau.cfm?LANG=Eng&T=801&PR=0&RPP=9999&SR=1&S=3&O=D

—. (2012b). *Aboriginal Peoples in Canada in 2006: Inuit, Métis and First Nations, 2006
    Census*.
    Retrieved from http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/as-sa/97-558/p3-
    eng.cfm.

Straus, T., and Valentino, D. (2001). Retribalization in Urban Indian Communities. In S. Lobo,
    and K. Peters (Eds.), *American Indians and the Urban Experience* (pp. 85-94). Walnut
    Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Todd, R. (2003). Urban Aboriginal Governance: Developments and Issues. In D. Newhouse and
    E. Peters (Eds.), *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 255-265).
    Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative, Privy Council Office).

Tully, J. (1995). *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. Cambridge:
    Cambridge University Press.

Turner, D. (2006). *This is Not a Peace Pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy*.
    Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Urban Aboriginal Task Force. (2007a). *Final Report*. Toronto: The Ontario Federation of Indian
    Friendship Centres.

Urban Aboriginal Task Force. (2007b*). Ottawa: Final Report*. Toronto: The Ontario Federation
    of Indian Friendship Centres.

Valaskakis, G. G. (2005). *Indian Country: Essays on Contemporary Native Culture*. Waterloo:
    Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Vandervelde, S.J. (2011). Urban Indigenous Governance Practices. In B. Hokowhitu, N.

Kermoal, C. Andersen, A. Petersen, M. Reilly, I. Altamirano-Jiménez, and P. Rewi (Eds.), *Indigenous Identity and Resistance: Researching the Diversity of Knowledge* (pp. 151-168). Dunedin, NZ: Otago University Press.

Vizenor, G. (1993). *Manifest Manners: Postindian Warriors of Survivance*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Wagamese, R. (2003). *For Joshua: an Ojibway Father Teaches his Son.* Toronto: Anchor Canada.

Warry, W. (2007). *Ending Denial: Understanding Aboriginal Issues*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Weaver, J., Womack, C. W., and Warrior, R. (2006). *American Indian Literary Nationalism.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Weaver, H, N. (2001). Indigenous Identity: What Is It and Who Really Has It? *American Indian Quarterly 25(2):* 240-255.

Weinstein, J. (2007). *Quiet Revolution West: The Rebirth of Métis Nationalism*. Calgary: Fifth House Ltd.

Whittles, M., and Patterson, T. (2009). Nápi and the City: Siksikaitsitapi Narratives Revisited. A. M. Timpson (Ed.), *First Nations, First Thoughts: the Impact of Indigenous Thought in Canada* (pp. 97-119). Vancouver: The University of British Columbia Press.

Williams, R. (2001). *The Long Revolution*. Peterborough: Broadview Press Ltd. (Original work published 1961).

Wilson, K. and E. J. Peters. 2005 "You can make a place for it." Remapping urban First Nations spaces of identity. *Society and Space* 23: 395-413.

Womack, R. (1999). *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Woodward, K. (2000). *Questioning Identity: Gender, Class, Nation*. K. Woodward (Ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Wotherspoon, T. (2003). Prospects for a New Middle Class Among Urban Aboriginal People. In D. Newhouse and E. Peters (Eds.), *Not Strangers in these Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 147-165). Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Appendix

Data Analysis: An Example of Codes, Categories, and Themes.

Research Questions	Responses	Categories	Codes
What forms of Indigenous identities exist within Canadian urban centres?	Race-based identities are imposed. Cultural identities are more accurate. Land, traditions should influence behavior. Urban Indigenous identities do exist. Decolonization of Indigenous identity and nationhood must happen.	-Adaptation -Belief systems -Behavior -Difference -Reconstruction -Nation-based -Racial -Cultural -Ethnic -Tribal -Pan-Indianism/ Indigenous -Land -Urban	-Peoplehood concept: languages, ceremonial cycles, land and sacred histories. -Foundations of resistance: strong families, grounded community, a connection to land, use of Indigenous language and storytelling, and spirituality. -Mino bimaadiziwin (the good life). -Indigenous centered identity and appropriation. -Hybridity. -Statehood /Nationhood difference. -Individual and collective identity. -Colonial identity/status -Membership -Boundaries -Epistemology -Traditions and values -Authenticity -Indigenousness -Retribalization -Omàmìwinini -Algonquin

| Is Indigenous identity strengthened or weakened in an urban context? | Yes and no. Yes through knowledge and communications. The influence of opportunities encourages better health, education, and employment. No for alienation, marginalization, and destruction to Indigenous ways of life. | -Interconnected political realities -Independence -Integration -Adaptation -Individualism -Decolonization -Self-sufficiency | -Networking among Indigenous peoples. -Cultural adaptation with maintenance of core beliefs. -Appropriating science, politics, and business practices. -Self-esteem and empowerment in the community development process. -Ceremony with the community. -Desire to be grounded with the community. -Renew traditional thinking. -Expose myths of colonization. -Living according to traditional values. -Freedom from Indian Act. -More Indigenous people participating in the Post-secondary education system. -Intellectual freedom and education -Indigenizing research. -Economically independent (individuals). -Subversive uses of technology. -Mobility/Migration

-Urbanization -Community -Cultural change -Cultural survival -Fluidity -Diaspora -Place

-**Problems:** Cultural alienation, cultural separation, and cultural identification abuse. -alienation from cultural change. -destruction of Indigenous connection to land. -Dominant economic systems and its effects on beliefs and behaviors. -Marginalization -Unsustainable development and the dangers.

-Static notions of culture |

Highlighted categories and codes were made prior to thesis approval. Non-highlighted categories and codes were included after the thesis proposal during the research process. The literature review process, with the highlighted categories and codes as assistance, led to the addition of more specific codes which inevitably improved the research. After gathering the information and answering the first two questions above, I was able to address my last question: *What are the implications for Algonquin nationhood?*