

BRIDGING THE PARALLAX GAP: SETTLER-COLONIALISM AND THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND RACIALIZED MIGRANTS IN CANADA

By

Jesse Root BSSC The University of Ottawa

A Major Research Paper
Presented to Ryerson University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In the Program of
Immigration and Settlement Studies

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2014

© Jesse Root 2014

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION FOR ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF A THESIS

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this major research paper. This is a true copy of the MRP, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this paper to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this MRP by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I understand that my MRP may be electronically available to the public.

BRIDGING THE PARALLAX GAP: SETTLER-COLONIALISM AND THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND RACIALIZED MIGRANTS IN CANADA

Jesse Root
Master of Arts, 2014
Immigration and Settlement Studies
Ryerson University

Abstract

I intend to expand the idea of the immigrant as settler, and establish on a theoretical basis that 'settlerism' is about an ideology of neo-colonialism, not about movement to a place that is not your own. In this way, there can be migrants who are allies with Indigenous peoples, who reject settler and neo-colonial ideologies at the same time, as there can be migrants who adopt consciously, or unconsciously, these oppressive ideologies. After establishing this theoretical framework, the remainder of this MRP presents case studies which profile some of the important work being done by organizations to build bridges between Indigenous and migrant communities in Canada and to decolonize relations among these groups which make up much of Canada's population. A brief discussion about the policies and other state tools used to separate these two communities with an analysis of why this is the case will also be included.

Key words:

Indigenous, migrant, racialized, settler, decolonize, dialogue, relationship, settler-colonialism, post-colonialism

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank first of all my supervisor Harald Bauder and second reader Hayden King for their continued support on this project by asking challenging questions and offering critical feedback on the work. Furthermore I would like to thank my family for their continued support in my education and their encouragement to follow my dreams.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this paper to all of those people and organizations who resist colonialism and white supremacy each day of their lives and struggle against systems that oppress. I write this paper in the hopes that non-racialized peoples like myself recognize that racism, xenophobia and colonialism are our problem and will see their important role in being allies in this work to dismantle and reconstruct a society which empowers all of its members.

Table of Contents

Author's Declaration.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
PART ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
PART TWO: KEY TERMS.....	7
PART THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMWORK.....	10
PART FOUR: METHODOLOGY.....	13
PART FIVE: CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE.....	15
PART SIX: CASE STUDIES.....	40
PART SEVEN: DISCUSSION.....	54
PART EIGHT: CONCLUSION	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION

In immigration and settlement research within the Canadian context there is much analysis about the ways in which immigrants integrate into the Canadian mosaic, what services they require and which federal state or non-governmental body is responsible for their delivery, as well as how they perform in the Canadian labour market. In all these cases, there is an acknowledgement that migrants to Canada have relationships to the state, and inevitably the citizens, and the systems, which the state functions to support. What is often missing, however, is an acknowledgement of the diverse populations that make up the state and how different communities within Canada might view migration and migrants themselves. This is particularly true of those peoples who have a different relationship to the state, and Canadian-ness namely Indigenous peoples. It is this relationship between racialized migrants and Indigenous peoples within the borders of what is commonly referred to as Canada that this paper will highlight, analyze and provide some helpful concepts to better understand.

Before I go much further in this endeavor it is important to disclose some important elements of the bias and my social position that impact my research and my worldview. First, I am a settler, which as will become clearer throughout this paper, means that my ancestors played an active role in a process of colonization which subjugated, attempted to erase the experience and identity of Indigenous peoples. This was carried out both formally, through legislation and residential schools, as well as informally through perpetuation of racist, xenophobic and claims

of cultural superiority and violence against Indigenous peoples who had inhabited this land before European contact. As a product of this experience, I hold responsibility for actively pursuing reconciliation, decolonization and being an ally to Indigenous peoples. Secondly, I am also not a racialized migrant to this country and therefore I have access to certain privileges based on my skin colour, and status in Canada that are not available to racialized groups. In this way, this project has been very difficult as I am writing this paper not knowing intimately the lived experience of either community about whom I am writing. Another element of the privilege is my access to education that allows me a forum to disseminate information such as that found in this paper. One of the major structural issues surrounding research of this type is that racialized, and Indigenous communities in Canada do not have the same access to formal educational institutions as me, and therefore don't have access in the same way to disseminate information about their experiences in their communities. Extreme care has been taken on my part to seek out sources and stories informed by Indigenous and racialized migrant peoples in order to use my privileged position to center and raise up these voices through this work. Surely, this was done imperfectly and I am happy to receive feedback and criticism to be a better ally and continue to decolonize my relationships, research and work. In saying that, my intention is not to speak for either Indigenous or migrant communities, but rather to speak for myself and from my experience to inform some key debates that are happening in small ways in different pockets within and without of academia. My hope is to inspire some change in state, and non-governmental institutions through highlighting concepts and initiatives that

will help to create decolonized systems based on mutual respect and understanding between racialized migrants and Indigenous peoples rather than those which separate and alienate them from one another and continue the legacy of colonization.

I came to an interest in this topic through a couple of key pieces, which allowed me to consider the questions around Indigenous and racialized migrants in Canada specifically. The first of these was Bridget Anderson's Book *Us and Them?: The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. In this book, Anderson develops some helpful analytical categories when we consider the relationship between migrants to the United Kingdom and those who also are criminalized and excluded from participation in what she calls the *Good Citizen* which has access to the Community of Value, or in other words a position of privilege and access to the benefits of the state and citizenship. She positions the good citizen in direct contrast to the *failed citizen* and the *non-citizen* and argues that the failed citizen and the non-citizen are intentionally separated from one another so as not to build solidarity between those who do not have access to the community of value, but they are also criminalized and illegalized because they don't represent the ideals of the state in terms of race, class, values, culture, work ethic and relationship to neo-liberal market ideologies. Therefore, they pose a threat to system which values white, educated, wealthy, hard-working, self-sufficient, English speaking members, which are characteristics, embodied in the *good citizen*. On the other hand, the failed citizen is a group of people within society who have formal citizenship, or some other status vis a vis the state but do not have access to the community of value because they

deviate from the above mentioned norms embodied in the good citizen. Finally, the non-citizen doesn't have any formal status within the state and are barred entry when possible through immigration controls, and when impossible are tolerated and given marginal rights, no access to the full benefits of the community of value. (Anderson, 2013)

In thinking about these categories, I attempted a similar exercise in order to apply these categories to the Canadian context. The result of this thought experiment was the realization that in many ways, because of their unique relationship to the state as well as because of the systemic legislative, social and political barriers erected to limit their participation and access to the *community of value* including high levels of incarceration, limited funding to their education as well as rules around land ownership and access to resources Indigenous peoples in Canada, in many ways embody the characteristics of Anderson's *failed citizen*. On the other hand, through strict immigration controls, temporary foreign work schemes, structural racism and other barriers, racialized immigrants seem to embody many of the characteristics of the *non-citizen* as described by Anderson. With these categories established, what became of most interest to me were the questions about why Indigenous communities and racialized migrant communities are separated, the reasons for this separation, and by extension what these relationships could look like if systemic barriers to positive relationship-building didn't exist. Finally, this was important to understanding why these relationships are foundational to the establishment of institutions and societies of respect and mutual understanding.

The second piece that inspired me to dive into a study of the migrant/Indigenous relationship in Canada was Harald Bauder's editorial *Closing the Immigration-Aboriginal Parallax Gap* which first describes the fact that discourses of immigrant and Indigenous issues are separated in academic discussions and further goes on to offer a goal of an aboriginal-immigration dialectic where there would be "an introduction of the aboriginal narrative into the contemporary immigration debate." (2011, p. 518) In thinking about this, I understood the importance of these discourses being in communication and informing one another. What also became evident is that the gap between these discourses was helpful to address, but it seemed to me that in filling the gap there was the danger in conflating the two discourses and therefore losing their unique and valuable elements. Along these lines, thinking about bridging the gap was a helpful metaphor because it allows for the passing of information over the bridge allowing for a dialogue, while at the same time acknowledging the unique elements, and the separate bodies of knowledge and experience are present on each side of the bridge.

The paper will be structured as follows. First, I will identify some key terms that are important to my argument which will include Indigenous, migrant, racialization, decolonization, and settler and solidarity to name a few. Next, I will outline the theoretical framework through which I will be making my argument, namely post-colonial theory. Next, I will outline my methodology and explain why this method was chosen for this specific research project. What follows will be a literature review outlining some of the important arguments within the anti-racist,

decolonization, Indigenous and immigration and settlement literature. The literature will also identify some specific holes in the literature, some of which will be addressed in my paper, and others will be identified as falling outside of the scope of this project but are valuable areas for further study. Next, I will profile five organizations that have actually operationalized programs or other initiatives to build decolonized relationships and reconciliation between Indigenous peoples in Canada. This will be done in order to both promote this work as important, but also to act as a model for work that should be expanded upon. Finally, I will tie this all together by providing some analysis linking the literature and academic work in this field, as well as the on the ground community-based work that is taking place across the country. I will conclude by reiterating my original argument and identifying areas for further research. This will be done to make the point that new, more complete understandings through formal education in schools as well as informally through the institutions of the media and the citizenship process, of what it means to be a settler, and the histories of Indigenous peoples in Canada, will enable decolonized relationships of mutual understanding and respect to be formed between racialized migrants and Indigenous peoples that could foster reconciliation.

PART TWO: KEY TERMS

It is important in this discussion to clearly outline the language that will be used and the definitions for that language. To begin, *Indigenous* will be used in reference to peoples typically referred to as Indian, Métis, First Nations, Inuit, Native or Aboriginal, which also recognizes the fact that they are the original peoples of a space (in this case the land we call Canada). This term is used intentionally and in the political context of colonialism to first establish that the land was taken from indigenous peoples in many cases violently, by white Western-European settler populations through the process of colonization. Secondly, it is used to challenge the colonial discourse of *Terra Nullis* that colonization happened on land that didn't have people, political organization or any discernable civilization on it, and therefore it wasn't previously "claimed".

Migrant will be used in reference to people who have moved to Canada from another place. Immigrant will not be used because it first presupposes that the intention is to gain some sort of legal status in Canada and further that the move is intended to be permanent. Migrant allows for a diversity of experiences to be included and broadens the definition to include those who resist state-centric and otherwise exclusive labels around the movement of people.

Racialization, and *racialized* are terms that recognize the social construction of the concept of 'race'. It speaks about a process by which people are defined by phenotypical elements of their identities and that these classifications categorize people into groups who then, as a result of being labeled as others, experience

different treatment including exclusion and discrimination. Furthermore racialization of the other in this paper will be looked at as a colonial process, which results in opposition to whiteness, therefore white people are not racialized, but participate in the process, from a position of power.

Decolonization is the process of breaking down colonial systems and discourses by posing a direct challenge to them as legitimate. Decolonization is about radically altering power structures, which disempower colonized peoples and empower them to live with dignity in a system, which values them as integral parts. Decolonization is not an end, but is rather a continual process, in this way we can describe actions working towards dismantling colonial systems as contributing to this process.

Reconciliation is based on the notion that there is first a problem in a relationship, in this case between indigenous peoples and Canada. Because of this problem, reconciliation is again a process about living in right relationship and settling the conflict. Taiaiake Alfred cautions against the discourse of reconciliation as also requiring restitution. He argues:

Reconciliation may be capable of moving us beyond the unpalatable stench of overt racism in public and social interactions. This would be an easy solution to the problem of colonialism for white people, and no doubt most would be satisfied with this obfuscation of colonial realities. But logically and morally, there is no escaping that the real and deeper problems of colonialism are a direct result of the theft of our lands, which cannot be addressed in any way other than through the return of those lands to us. (Alfred, Wasase: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom, 2005, pp. 166-67)

State is used throughout this paper in reference to the institutions and

systems which exist in Canada. The state has many actors including government who shape these institutions and systems formally through law, and informally through practice in order to control the peoples living within the state. In this way I conceptualize the state as having agency and influence and therefore is not a neutral or passive entity. Canada will also be defined as a settler-colonial state in that it has a history of violent colonialism, which continues to this day, and has a settler population who occupies the land.

While there is an entire section of the literature review section of this paper dedicated to the term *settler* and its contested definition, I will define it as those who use their privilege to disempower, or otherwise marginalize Indigenous peoples and therefore perpetuate ideologies of colonialism and white supremacy.

Finally, *Solidarity* is the notion that although an issue may not having a direct impact on a specific community with which one identifies, there is the necessity for one to support the actions of the marginalized community as a way to augment their voices and contribute to the movement for change that is being sought.

PART THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The difficulty with choosing a theoretical framework through which to complete this project was based on trying to find one that adequately captures both the race questions, as well as those of colonization. The framework that seemed most apt, yet still incomplete was post-colonial theory.

There are a few key critiques that are present within post-colonial thought which are particularly apt to this discussion, namely that it includes a grounding of post-colonial realities within and in response to the actions and continuing affects of formal colonization and imperialism. In other words post-colonialism “names the period of colonial rule together with its gradual weakening and demise...it analyses [colonialism’s] effects both in its heyday and during the period that follows the end of the literal, concrete colonial presence.” (Hiddleston, 2009, p. 4) What is important to note from this definition is that post- colonialism sees current realities in reference to the legacies of colonial imperialism, while at the same time leaving room to define contemporary realities and actions as colonial even though the literal concrete colonial presence has formally ended. Another contestation made by Hiddleston is that “the colonial project of course not only relies on the institution of a capitalist form of exploitation, but also a spread of a belief in white racial supremacy.” (p.12) The important element of this quotation is linking colonialism, with the concept of white racial supremacy. First, this allows us to begin to look at Indigenous communities and racialized migrant communities through the same lens in terms of the fact that they have both been considered non-white and therefore the

enemy when placed in relation to white supremacist ideologies including colonialism. At the same time however, it ensures that although both groups of peoples are marginalized by white supremacy but also recognizes their unique experiences within it. Therefore, a critique of colonialism, such as post-colonial theory has inherent in it a challenge to white supremacy and is a way to discursively, but carefully talk about Indigenous peoples and racialized migrants in a similar light without conflating the experiences or identities of those who make up these groups. Another conception of post-colonial theory that is instructive to this work is illustrated by David Jefferess who contends that: "Postcolonial studies constitutes a critical practice that seeks to deconstruct the antagonistic discourse of colonial knowledge and, at the very least gesture towards a liberatory praxis." (2008, p. 180) Here, the elements Hiddleston's notions that contemporary realities are based on colonial legacies is met with a challenge to deconstruct these realities through a liberatory praxis, which is about actions that liberate those oppressed by these colonial and neo-colonial systems. In this outlook the racialized migrant, and Indigenous communities in Canada, are active agents of resistance to oppression as opposed to simply reacting to oppression; this agency, Jefferess argues, leads to liberation. In this scenario, liberation from oppression is furthermore impossible without the resistance to it. In other words resistance is the practice that leads to the dream of liberation from the legacies of colonial oppressions that continue even though formal colonial authority has ceased. (p. 181) Furthermore, Jefferess speaks about postcolonial theory as being based on the notion of reconciliation, which is:

“derived from praxis, wherein thought is intensified through action.” (p. 185) This notion has also informed my methodology, which is explained in the next section,

So while some issues remain problematic and colonial about developing theoretical frameworks as they don’t adequately account for the diversity of the populations that they are used to research with, postcolonial theory provides some helpful notions to consider when talking about liberation and dignity for Indigenous and racialized migrant peoples; namely the focus on white supremacy, praxis, and basic contemporary realities in terms of ongoing colonial legacies.

PART FOUR: METHODOLOGY

In order to address both the academic and community based elements of Indigenous and racialized migrant relations in Canada, a mixed methodology was used which includes both a critical review of the literature as well as a case study component. This means that the way in which I have chosen to write this paper is using two specific sections. First, the thought or academic section where I outline the arguments made in the literature, and the practice section where I highlight some key organizations and programs which are attempting to create environments of learning, mutual respect, decolonization and reconciliation among migrant communities and Indigenous communities in Canada.

Next, in the literature review portion, because of the limited information dealing specifically with the relationship between racialized migrants and Indigenous peoples in Canada, the search terms that were used were intentionally broad and included the terms Indigenous, native, aboriginal, decolonization, post colonialism, anti racism, reconciliation, immigra* (to account for immigrant and immigration), migrant, racialized, and Canada. These terms were used in the Ryerson Library “search all” function, as well as more specifically in specific databases concerning both the literature on Indigenous peoples and immigration. They were also used in Google to account for the grey literature including government publications, and publications from non-governmental organizations and foundations. Finally, bibliographies of articles and books were scanned for relevant information on sources that would be helpful in completing the literature review. This exercise also helped identify the community organizations, which were

eventually chosen for the case studies that are presented in this paper. Furthermore, sources, which dealt with content that was outside of the Canadian context, were excluded. However, conceptual information that wasn't developed for the Canadian context, but was applicable to it was included.

The next section, the case studies profiles five key organizations who are currently working on, or carrying out programming, which attempts to encourage dialogue and understanding between Indigenous and racialized migrant clients. These include No one Is Illegal, Kairos: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives, Canadian Roots Exchange, The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, and The City of Vancouver. While this list is not exhaustive it provides a thorough sample which helps illustrate key practices and the importance of this kind of work. Information from these organizations was obtained through literature from websites and other publicly available documents including vision statements and strategic plans. A content analysis was completed to understand the programs, develop the frame of analysis and ultimately illustrate important concepts and specific strategies used to operationalize decolonized programming to build relationships of mutual understanding and respect between the two communities being studied.

PART FIVE: CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE

In Canada there are many different ethnic, racial, cultural, social and religious groups that make up what we call Canada. This literature review will focus on describing, but also analytically engaging with the material around two groups within Canada, namely Indigenous and racialized migrant peoples. These two groups are not often considered within the same discussions as separate and distinct communities, but there is a movement among some organizations, and within the academic literature to invite Indigenous peoples and migrants into conversation with each other to see where cooperation might be possible, and how this process of learning about and understanding each other could lead to a reconciliation based on mutual respect, understanding and dignity for both groups.

One of the most common and relevant themes to the subject of Indigenous and migrant relations in the Canadian context is that of multiculturalism. This policy has been lauded by supporters as an expression of the values of diversity and inclusion of everyone into Canadian society. Literature that makes reference to Indigenous and migrant relations in regards to multiculturalism, however, offers a powerful critique. Srikanth (2012), Abu-Laban (2001) and Bannerji (2000) articulate significant critiques about the ways in which migrants to Canada as well as Indigenous peoples have been treated under multiculturalism.

Srikanth narrates the story of the development of Canadian cultures and makes the argument that “Canadian multiculturalism was not an outcome of change in the mindset of the majority population, but the result of pragmatic considerations of the Canadian bureaucrats and policy- makers, who sought a new strategy to

manage diversities in the changed national and international context.” (2012 p.20)

This narrative is continued by Abu-Laban who makes the point that Government response throughout the 1960s and 1970s was to use Royal Commissions to address the needs of women, language minorities and Aboriginal peoples. These commissions, however, were based on liberal principles of equality as opposed to challenging the many systems of injustice that affected these peoples. The solution of multiculturalism, which came out of the Biculturalism and Bilingualism Commission, was one example of creating a homogenous solution to address the needs of a diverse community. (Abu-Laban, 2001) Expanding on this idea of the liberal and inequitable focus of Canadian multiculturalism, Gyepi-Garbrah, Walker and Garcea contend that: “Whitestreaming [read multiculturalism], a series of discourses centered on cultural neutrality, colour blindness and universal citizenship, provides mainstream societal institutions and people with a workable rationale for setting aside indigeneity.” (2013, p. 1799) What is explicit in this understanding of multiculturalism is an understanding of its basis in the larger white supremacist colonial project. Furthermore, these quotations are helpful in shedding some light on the necessity to understand Indigenous and racialized migrant experiences as both being impacted because of their racialization, which is explicitly positioned in subordination to whiteness. The point made by Srikanth regarding the pragmatic goals of multiculturalism is also affirmed by Abu-Laban who argues that “state response to redress [through multiculturalism] was about expediency rather than principle.” (Abu-Laban, 2001) These critiques of multiculturalism conceptualize Indigenous peoples and migrants within the same

category as minority ethnic groups for which it should account. While this is helpful in some respects, we cannot conflate the racialized migrant and Indigenous communities and by consequence losing the uniqueness and inherent differences in their experience.

Arguments on the other side of this debate, like those of Kymlicka in the piece *Finding our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*. Kymlicka (1998), differentiate between immigrant versus other non-Indigenous minorities in Canada and contends that “immigrants have chosen to come to Canada and therefore should integrate.” (p.35) and furthermore that indigenous peoples are considered a national minority similar to the French and English. Finally Kymlicka contends that because of this position as a national minority, indigenous peoples should be afforded special rights by the state. (Ibid) Dale Turner makes the following observations of Kymlicka’s work: “national minorities (including aboriginal peoples the English and the French) are the fundamentally privileged sovereign groups in Kymlicka’s multinational state... however for various reasons the national minorities relinquished or transferred certain powers to the larger political union.” (Turner, 2006, p. 64). What is problematic about placing these three very different actors within the category of national minorities who have access to privileged sovereignty is that it in some ways removes agency from indigenous peoples, and does not recognize the serious power imbalances between the English and French colonizer, and the Indigenous actor as colonized. Furthermore, when we consider these groups privileged national minorities in Canada, we also do not have room for conceptions of the racialized migrant, which leads to the conclusion made

by Kymlicka in which they are not privileged to maintain their culture, therefore they should integrate.

Lastly the analysis of Bannerji (2000) is helpful here and provides a more radical and perhaps historically accurate interpretation of multiculturalism and posits that multiculturalism rather than combatting the conflict in society among different peoples and celebrating diversity actually reinforces barriers between communities to ensure white supremacy. What is being suggested here is that Multiculturalism was not only a pragmatic step towards not addressing the systemic ways in which society was inaccessible to minority groups asserting their rights but it was also intentionally created others as minority groups to ensure British and French (white European) domination was protected. It is here that the intersections between anti-racism and decolonization, as well as white settler ideologies and neoliberalism become important specifically with reference to migrant and Indigenous communities and peoples in Canada.

The next debate in the literature is one about how the term “settler” should be defined specifically with respect to racialized peoples. This is instructive here when we are considering the ability of racialized migrants and Indigenous peoples to enter into relationships, as it sets the stage for potential areas of contention in the relationship building required for reconciliation to occur. While this section of the critical analysis of the literature will be highly theoretical in nature it is important to discuss the theoretical concepts, which permeate the literature and might inform any further work in the discipline. Dhamoon and Abu-Laban (2009) contend that:

“As well as a dialectical relationship between renationalization and othering, there is also a complex interaction between gender, race, and class dynamics. As such, not only is it useful to embrace work which considers processes of racialization, but it is also useful to address the manner in which race thinking interacts with other forms of difference and inequality.” (p.179)

What is important to understand from this argument is that the complexity of identity and defining groups’ relationships to one another we need to consider the intersections of other markers of difference such as race, class, gender among others. This is furthermore important when talking about what it means to be a settler, as settlers who identify differently in terms of the above-mentioned categories, according to Dhamoon and Abu-Laban, would have a different experience depending on their identity markers.

Lawrence and Dua (2005) echo this argument when they who argue that anti-racism, by ignoring the continued colonization of Indigenous peoples in Canada and also failing to integrate the intersectional analysis mentioned above, is actually supporting neo-colonial practices. Furthermore Lawrence and Dua nuance their analysis by making the points that anti-racist theory needs to center its analysis, especially in Canada, within the context of Indigenous sovereignty over Indigenous land. Secondly, they must place discourses of colonization central to the concepts of racism. Finally, they point to anti-racist activists as needing to find ways to carry out their work in ways that do not disempower, but rather supports Indigenous peoples in their struggle for self-determination and reconciliation. (p. 235) This argument is also supported by Smith who posits that:

Organising by people of colour was based on the notion of organising around shared victimhood. In this model, however, we see that we are not only

victims of white supremacy, but complicit in it as well. Our survival strategies and resistance to white supremacy are set by the system of white supremacy itself. What keeps us trapped within our particular pillars of white supremacy is that we are seduced by the prospect of being able to participate in the other pillars. (2012, p. 5)

Along the same lines as Lawrence and Dua racialized peoples, and their complicity in colonialism, is called into question as it is so insidious in the culture in which they are being socialized as “new Canadians” they are subject to falling into the benefits of adopting colonial mindsets and that this is problematic because they are then perpetuating white supremacist ideologies, but do not have the visual markers of this ideology, namely white skin colour. The argument of mutual victimhood is in this way only part of the story, and leaves out the impact of racialized peoples living on colonized lands.

A question that is asked by Hayden King in a report published out of a round-table on immigration and settlement held at Ryerson University was:

Is this tendency for bigotry [colonialism, oppression, xenophobia, and racism towards Indigenous peoples] exclusive to one colour of people; what about all the dismissive Black and Yellow people; or those Red and Brown peoples who advocate assimilation? (King, 2014).

Later on in the piece, he answers his question by quoting Indigenous scholar Taiaiake Alfred who argues that:

The enemy is not the white man in racial terms; it is a certain way of thinking. While this “way of thinking” in North America appears to manifest disproportionately in European Settlers, it’s not exclusive to them- it exists in all cultures all skin colours, in racialized peoples. For us, as Indigenous peoples it’s our own disconnection from each other, and from the land that leads us down this path.(2005, p. 102)

Within this line of thinking anyone, including red people could participate in the discriminatory actions of a settler. What is also a very important nuance here is the idea that red peoples, or Indigenous peoples espouse these ideologies when they are separated from themselves, their land and their cultures, all of which happened through the process of white supremacy and colonization. Here we can begin to understand being a settler as a more holistic concept based on an ideology or a “way of thinking” as outlined by Alfred. What is also clear, however, is that peoples can unlearn these ideologies. John Sutton Lutz identifies the ideology of power that Alfred and others allude to in the following way in terms of “the white problem”:

“having removed Aboriginal peoples from their resource base, labeled them as lazy or difficult employees, and relegated many of them to the bottom of the occupational scale, our treatment of them has become a standard by which, as Canadians, we measure ourselves. The poverty and attendant social problems on aboriginal reserves has been an international embarrassment for this country for over a century. It is repeatedly brought up by the press as a national scandal, a sobering reminder to Canadians who like to think of themselves as a “generous people” living in a “just society.” (2008, p. 297)

Henry Yu expands on this by defining the white dominance of Indigenous peoples through “land dispossession, residential schooling, immigrant exclusion, and racial discrimination in voting, housing, and employment” (2011, p. 301) as legacies which need to be dealt with in order to have reconciliation. What is important about the Lutz, and Yu quotations above is that, firstly, the problem is framed as a white problem as the direct connection to western European colonialism is the root of the ongoing issues and some of the ongoing benefits of white European settlers in Canada. What is further important here is that when it is framed as a white problem then we can provide the grounds on which to build

reconciliation with white settler populations. Furthermore, we can also begin to understand that reconciliation is a different and separate process from the reconciliation and relationship building required to create right relationship with racialized migrants who do not have the same relationship to the European colonial project as European settlers who benefit from white privilege do. These ideas will be expanded on further in the analysis section of this paper.

What is really central to this analysis, and is something I believe is very important is the way in which Lawrence and Dua as well as Abu-Laban are careful about not conflating the diverse stories and positions of Indigenous and migrant communities in Canada, and rather call for an integrated framework of respect and mutuality between the concepts of decolonization and anti-racism. To use the image of the Parallax Gap introduced by Bauder (2011) these authors seem to, rather than advocate filling the gap, use the image of a bridge to connect two distinct sides, which recognizes the value in connecting on the one side Indigenous peoples' and on the other migrant communities.

Another idea, which permeates the literature and is introduced above, is a more specific conversation about white supremacy. This conversation is based on the notion that, as mentioned above, Canada was conceived as a white-settler nation by Britain and France at the expense of Indigenous peoples. What is important to also note on this front is that Canada had also, until 1976 explicitly allowed for discrimination based on race in terms of denying non-white racial minorities entry to Canada in their immigration policy. (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010) Because of this fact, there are systemic barriers that are rooted in the history of white supremacy

through colonialism and nation building in Canada which limit the full inclusion of non-white populations, which is a characteristic that racialized migrants and Indigenous peoples in Canada both share. What is important to note here is the links between colonization of Canada, Canada's preference for white western European immigrants and the idea of white racial superiority and dominance.

This concept of normative whiteness is also explored using different terms throughout the literature. The language of settler, and what that means is contested ground, and requires some explanation. In Lawrence and Dua (2005) there is the suggestion made that migrants of colour point to their own racism in order to legitimize the stealing of and settling on Indigenous lands. In this argument, the concept of settler is challenged as an exclusively white phenomenon and racialized migrants are bunched into the otherwise white British/French category of settler. Walia (2013), Smith (2012), Sharma and Wright (2009) and Jafri (2012) construct the idea of the settler more as an ideology or worldview as opposed to the colour of one's skin, or being a migrant to colonized land. Smith constructs three pillars of white supremacy two of which talk specifically about Indigenous peoples and racialized migrants. The first of these is colonialism, which talks about the assimilation of Indigenous populations to claim land and resources. The second is orientalism, which justifies anti-immigrant rhetoric as the other is cast as a threat to the domination of the white settler population (p.68). Within this framework the settler ideology includes both an attempt to erase the other, and to ensure control over land and resources for economic and settlement purposes. This framework also does not talk much about the role of non-white settlement and settlers. This

question, however, is picked up by Sharma and Wright, Jafri and Walia. Whereas with Lawrence and Dua, there was the statement made that migrants of colour are *de facto* colonizers, Sharma and Wright (2009) contend that this divide between Indigenous peoples is furthered by the state using the colonial language of minority rights, which pit the interests of migrants and Indigenous peoples against each other. This analysis is expanded upon by Jafri who argues that racialized communities are complicit in some ways in terms of the formation of the settler-colonial state, but this does not mean they are necessarily privileged within it. This point is interesting because it acknowledges first that by being settlers migrants are contributing to the formation of the state which is being constructed on Indigenous territories and to their disadvantage, but also recognizes the disadvantages that they experience as racialized peoples in a white supremacist society. Finally, Walia challenges the idea that migration should be considered a form of settler-colonialism at all. She posits that “displacement and precarious migration are products of colonialism and capitalism and it would be a mistake to identify all those who migrate as those seeking to colonize” (p. 129). This idea that being a settler entails the element of intent to colonize is also supported by Smith, and to some extent by Jafri using his concept of complicity vs. privilege. In this quotation racialized migrants and Indigenous peoples are both displaced by systems of colonialism and capitalism and therefore assuming the intent to colonize is a dangerous categorization that makes relationship building between Indigenous peoples and racialized migrants difficult. This conclusion is supported further by the work of Phung (2011) who states:

“Relying on monolithic notions of the term “settler” runs the risk of reducing settler-Indigenous relations to overly simplistic binary models of thinking. If we lump all non-Indigenous people into a single category of settler, then do we risk erasing and subsuming the different histories and everyday experiences of settler privilege and marginalization from which white settlers and settlers of colour.” (p. 308)

This question is very complex and the lived out complexities of this relationship between migrants onto Indigenous lands, and the Indigenous peoples are equally so. In Madariaga-Vignudo (2012) in reference to a community where Indigenous peoples and African refugee migrants it is mentioned that the relationship between the two communities is both conflictual and compassionate. On the one hand, Indigenous peoples and the African refugees are in conflict over the scarce resources of public housing, for example, while also building relationship and empathy based on mutual marginalization.

Another discussion in the literature is about the importance of cities. We know that, on the one hand, migrants are settling mostly in cities, and on the other that many Indigenous peoples are moving to the cities. According to Statistics Canada in 2008 54 percent of Indigenous peoples live in cities. (Statistics Canada) In this lies both an opportunity for collaboration, learning and relationship building, but as well an opportunity for conflict and harm. To illustrate this Stanger-Ross (2008) contend that cities have historically been critical to the establishment of the colonial state and continue to be the key sites for the reproduction of colonial relations. It is further argued that: “The potential alliances and cultural exchange between Indigenous peoples and newcomers is greatest in cities” (Gyepi-Garbrah, Walker, & Garcea, 2013, p. 1801) Consequently, the fact that cities are the places

where exposure between Indigenous and racialized migrants to the other is highest; they are also the places in which many of the case studies that will be profiled later take place.

There is a significant body within the literature which provides a critique about the ways in which Indigenous peoples are portrayed in the education system, and generally through other methods of public education including the media, and the immigration system. In terms of the discussion within this paper, it is important to see racialized immigrants as distinct members within the larger society because, as mentioned above, they don't have the same relationship to colonialism, white supremacy and other systems, which seek to erase Indigenous identities. Much of the discussion in this section will be focused on the portrayal of Indigenous peoples, but it is important to see these as barriers in building relationships between racialized migrants and Indigenous peoples in Canada.

The main issues that are outlined within the education literature are the lack of consultation with Indigenous peoples about the educational content about them. Linked to that is the discourse and presentation of Indigenous peoples as historical artifacts without a contemporary contribution to society, biased information which portrays them as political deviants, savages and those who need to be civilized; and just a general lack of any information at all in the formal school curricula. (Haig Brown, 2007; Suleman, 2011; Francis, 2007) What is also important to recognize about this literature is that it cannot, nor should it be divorced from the colonial and white supremacist discussions above because education is a significantly powerful

means of ensuring whose story is told, how it is told, and wields immense power in ensuring colonial ideologies are taken up by the next generation of settlers including white and racialized peoples.

Stuart Hall, in his work *The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power* develops a strong argument around the power of discourse as it is used and perpetuated through state education systems in order to frame narratives and establish the “truth” in any given situation. Reflecting on Foucault’s work he argues, “The question of whether or not a discourse is true or false is less important than whether it is effective in practice.” (Hall, 2007, p. 58) In this way, we can establish that education through the media, citizenship processes and through formal school education are the means through which a discourse is perpetuated. Let’s now look at some reflections, which outline the critiques of the types of discourses established about Indigenous peoples through education.

First, to speak to the topic of lack of consultation of Indigenous peoples in creating the curricula which are being presented about them is addressed by Francis (2007), Suleman (2011) and Cole (2006). The consensus around this discussion is that consultation has not happened to develop information that Indigenous communities identify with. Francis (2007) calls the image that is produced through education, is that of the imaginary Indian and contends that: “Non-Native Canadians can hardly hope to work out a successful relationship with Native people who exist largely in fantasy” (p. 238). Suleman posits that “The information presented is frequently not from an Aboriginal Perspective and does not appear to have been

prepared with the input of Aboriginal Peoples.” (p. 20) This quotation affirms the construction of an imaginary subject in Indigenous peoples as presented in the education system by largely including non-Indigenous knowledges of and about aboriginal peoples. Furthermore it explicitly names the fact that Indigenous peoples don’t appear to be consulted. Cole (2006) looks to more of the structural ways in which teacher education and a lack of consultation in developing training programs. In his book, he sets up a narrative between two characters Coyote and Raven. This part of the dialogue is particularly instructive:

Coyote: Look at the huge numbers of nonaboriginal faculty teaching first nations this or Indigenous that at Canadian universities, it’s an epidemic, an infestation, a plague.

Raven: I wonder how many Muslims, how many Christians are teaching Jewish studies in Canadian Universities or vice versa... tell me where did the white people get their qualifications in ‘aboriginal’ education, ‘aboriginal’ studies.

Raven: Without Aboriginal people in control of all aspects of research and teaching about aboriginal peoples it will be just a continuation of the department of Indian Affairs model, the Indian Act.

Coyote: I’m getting to the end of my leash with these nonaboriginal people who design and implement aboriginal teacher education programs without seeking community input. They bring a few natives on board who go along with their ideas...my idea is there can be no aboriginal teacher training program unless it is initiated designed, taught and controlled by aboriginal people. (p. 316-317)

This rich dialogue provides much insight into the education system and some of the systemic issues found within it for aboriginal people. The first point that is important to take away is that Indigenous peoples are the experts of their own stories and should be the ones telling those stories. Secondly, any education system, including the one we have now, without this leadership from Indigenous peoples is

colonial and further subjugates Indigenous peoples.

Furthermore, in this colonial, white supremacist discourse about Indigenous peoples that they are both historical artifacts of Canadian history, and that they were and continue to be savages and political dissidents who require civilization. Suleman (2011) mentions that: "Information tends to focus more on the cultural aspects of Aboriginal peoples rather than examining the complexities of Aboriginal history or the current realities faced by aboriginal peoples in Canada." (p. 20). In a piece by Celia Haig Brown entitled *Resistance and Renewal: First Nations and Aboriginal Education in Canada* she quotes one of her students: "I have heard more about Native people with alcohol related issues who receive free tuition to university than I have heard what has happened to them." (2007, p. 169) This discourse which first makes Indigenous peoples seem like only a part of the past, and then when it does recognize them paints them as freeloading, alcoholics without the context of the trauma inflicted upon them by the Canadian state which is responsible for many of these behaviours is problematic in so many ways, but is part of the formal and informal education processes of Canada nonetheless.

Another way in which migrants are educated about Indigenous peoples is the process of immigrating and the process of obtaining Canadian citizenship. These systems are by and large shaped by misconstrued notions of who Indigenous peoples are and the ways in which they live in contemporary Canada, and the histories that shaped them. In order to become a citizen, candidates are required to complete a citizenship test. The government of Canada created a study guide for the

test entitled *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Canadian Citizenship*. In this 68-page guide, the word aboriginal is mentioned 62 times. Of these 62 times, some are in relation to the composition of the various categories of aboriginals in Canada outlining population percentages of Indian, Metis and Inuit populations. The rest of the times, they are represented in the Canadian History sections, which outline things such as mention in passing of Indian residential schools, when aboriginals were granted the right to vote and other such historical information. There is one mention of contemporary Indigenous ways of life in Canada, which reads: "In today's Canada, Aboriginal peoples enjoy renewed pride and confidence, and have made significant achievements in agriculture, the environment, business and the arts." (Citizenship and Immigration Canada , 2012, p. 10) Needless to say this affirms both the non-consultation and misrepresentation points made above and also affirms that immigrants to Canada are encouraged to adopt colonial understandings of Indigenous peoples making relationships of mutual understanding and trust exceedingly difficult.

Along the lines of a general lack of information about Indigenous peoples in formal and informal educational settings, is offered by Godlewska (2010), who contends that:

The omission of Aboriginal Peoples in much of the Canadian history curriculum represents British colonial policies engaged in creating a homogeneous society amongst French and English settlers and more recent newcomers without mentioning the impact of immigration policies on the country's Indigenous peoples. (p. 426)

Along the same lines, but through a lens of anti-racism Laurence and Dua 2005

argue:

Their [Indigenous peoples'] removal needs to be written into the histories of racist exclusion that peoples of colour faced—not in a cursory way, as in a meaningless generic statement that “First Nations were here before the settlers”—but with at least some specific information as to how the lands where people of colour settled were removed from the control of *specific* Indigenous nations. (p. 11)

To bring this argument full circle, we once again find ourselves with the insidious and ever-present discussion about white supremacy, and colonialism being to blame for a non-existent or poor relationship between Indigenous peoples and racialized migrants in Canada. This time, however, the argument that this ideology is perpetuated through state-sponsored and led formal and informal educational process which creates a discourse where Indigenous peoples, are portrayed in a poor light or erased completely. How can we expect, given this system, relationships to form between white settlers or migrants of colour, which are positive? To start to unpack this question the next section of the critical analysis of the literature will focus on the literature around the notion of political belonging, and what structural elements should be included when thinking about reconciliation, mutual trust and understanding.

When talking about who belongs in the community and who does not, Anna Stanley (2014), Harsha Walia (2014) and Bridget Anderson (2013) provide us with an almost unified voice of who, in settler colonial societies, belongs and is encouraged through state institutions to exist and who is not. What Stanley calls “the good, successful moral citizen” (p.3), and what Anderson describes as simply the “good citizen” are all based around capitalist, white, financially psychologically

and medically self-sufficient, and otherwise “contributing” members of society. This is what it means to belong, and when you fall outside of these norms you no longer belong in what Anderson (2014) would call the community of value. Stanley (2014) argues in fact that: “The very process of becoming a good, successful, moral, and respectable citizen with access to the resources of the state transforms newcomers into colonialists.” (p.3) What is important here is that the state produces criteria that values and prioritizes certain actions, and these actions actually encourage people to become colonialists. The discourse that is perpetuated by the state then actually transforms, or indoctrinates newcomers into continuing the legacy of domination over Indigenous peoples in order to belong.

In the literature, however, there are many, more helpful ways to conceptualize what it means to be part of communities, which account for power dynamics, do not require subjugation of anyone, offer spaces, which include diverse groups of people.

Already in this review, we have spoken about the issues around multiculturalism as a model of belonging. To contrast this model, however, Ghorayshi (2010) Fleras and Elliot (2002) and Sandercock (2009) offer interculturalism as an alternative to consider. Fleras and Elliot, and Sandercock posit that interculturalism, rather than simply talking about respectable coexistence, is about relationships between cultural groups which produce alternative hybrid notions of citizenship and belonging. Ghorayshi furthers this argument by suggesting that interculturalism is about “finding ways of addressing diversity and

difference that negate exclusion, discrimination, inequality and a fixed notion of Canadian identity.” (p.91) A few important challenges are raised here, namely that alternative notions of citizenship are possible through interculturalism, and furthermore that this citizenship does not necessarily need to be based on the colonial, and therefore white supremacist notions of the settler state.

This closed view of multicultural as opposed to intercultural political communities is based, as Coates (2005) argues, on the centrality of the nation state and national government as the frames through which Indigenous history is viewed. Furthermore, Abu-Laban (2001) warns that when the state is central to the discourse of what it means to be values within the polity “Minoritized groups demanding fairness and inclusion or autonomy will continue to target Canada’s national symbols and state institutions because they arose from the suppression of cultural diversity and from gross inequalities.” (p. 265) Furthermore, and more along the lines of the legal institutions and control mechanisms that exist within the state, even when talking about things such as Indigenous self-determination and self-government it is done through a colonial lens. Atleo (2010) posits that “The dominance of the legal approach to self determination has, over time, helped to produce a class of Aboriginal ‘citizens’ whose rights and identities have become defined solely in relation to the colonial state and its apparatus...political belonging is about being distinct” (p.24). What is being argued here is that Indigenous peoples want to assert their rights, which are inherent to them, not granted to them by the state, and any arrangement in which the state is granting rights to Indigenous peoples is paternalistic and colonial. A desirably political community of belonging is not then about granting of rights to Indigenous peoples, but rather about

respecting the power of people to assert their rights for themselves without risk of intervention. This same critique is leveled by Alfred who in his words states: “institutions and ideas that are the creation of the colonial relationship are not capable of ensuring our survival; this has been amply proven by the absolute failure of institutional and legalist strategies to protect our lands and our rights.” (2005, p. 24) Overall, the literature on political belonging seems to conclude that there need to be alternative forms of belonging that are conceived outside of the confines of the settler colonial state, respect self-determination and that respect and empower diversity.

When talking about political belonging, it is also important to consider the political community and its origins. In order to do this, conceptualizing the settler-colonial state and specifically what this means in the Canadian context is imperative.

Patrick Wolfe describes the insidious settler colonial mentality as follows:

Settler colonialism has both negative and positive dimensions. Negatively, it strives for the dissolution of native societies. Positively, it erects a new colonial society on the expropriated land base—as I put it, settler colonizers come to stay: invasion is a structure not an event. (2006, p. 388)

This quotation is vitally important especially in the context of the notion outlined in this paper of decolonization. Wolfe contends that settler colonialism, or the ideologies which seek to erase indigenous peoples are ongoing processes and a structural element of society, therefore decolonization must also be understood as a process which is continually striving to resist settler colonialism.

Another important element of settler colonialism is related to neo-liberal discourses of progress, self-sufficiency and civility. Audra Smith, in reflecting on indigenous historian Philip Deloria makes the following observation with reference to the colonial ideal:

This dream was one of indigenous pacification, containment and demobilization. In order to be actualized in the present, this dream requires that indigenous economic activities be watched, that there be a state-police presence in their communities and that Indians be passive in the face of this surveillance, regulation, scrutiny and possible intervention. (2008, p. 195)

This expands on Wolfe's assertions made above by mentioning the surveillance, regulation intervention and scrutiny that are essential to settler colonialism in order to ensure dominance and compliance to the rules set out by the dominant colonial way of life.

Because of the ways in which the state structures and institutions are influenced by settler colonialism another question that is importantly asked in this literature is: can state led initiatives including those such as the examples cited in the City of Vancouver case study actually act to decolonize the settler colonial state? Here again an understanding of decolonization is important. Sharma and Wright contend that:

Decolonization can be construed as a liberation of "nations," rather than as a liberation of people from social relations that are organized through their hierarchical placement within a ruthless, global competition for profits, whether private or public. When that happens, it loses its material moorings and becomes about gaining a particular group's power. (2008, p. 128)

The interesting dichotomy that is set up here is that in many ways, the unity that is part of the conception of the nation in indigenous thought is a liberatory space, whereas the nation in settler colonialism is an oppressive actor with agency which encourages assimilation, erasure of difference and compliance to norms which are defined by the colonial power to disempower others.

Finally, within the literature, there are multiple solutions that have been proposed in order set the ground for a bridge to be built to foster good relationship, mutual respect

and understanding between Indigenous peoples and racialized migrants in Canada.

The literature proposes three main areas for action. First, there is a higher-level academic exercise outlined by Abu-Laban (2001) who proposes the idea of a forum for a postcolonial future. Secondly, Coates (2005) offers a suggestion for an educational methodology around comparative history. Many other authors speak about the necessity for dialogue projects between Indigenous peoples and racialized migrants. In the next section, some of these initiatives will be presented as case studies. Finally, there are some methods proposed by Sehdev (2011) who advocates for treaty relations among racialized migrants and by Gyepi-Garbrah et al. (2013) who advocate for Indigenous organizations to take up educational programs to educate migrants about their histories and struggle.

Coates (2005) develops an idea that talking about histories of Indigenous peoples in well-structured and focused international conferences would “provide an opportunity to better understand the central dynamics of a vital relationship [between Indigenous peoples and other communities] in countries around the world, and allows scholars to learn directly from the historical developments affecting Indigenous peoples in many different regions.” (p.14) In this way there could be a best practices developed to understand these phenomenon, as well as the building of an intercultural body of literature to consult in how to build these relationships. Furthermore, Abu-Laban (2001) proposes a “forum for a post colonial future” this forum would be a broad societal dialogue made up of state actors and societal actors who would have a mandate to “hear grievances from the past and acknowledge, and apologize for, Canada’s creating past injustices. (p.271) This truth-telling and apologizing initiative would aim to, as the Truth

and Reconciliation Commission does for survivors and families of survivors of Canadian Indian Residential Schools, provide an opportunity for people to share their stories and to seek some redress.

While these largely high-level solutions could be helpful for some progress towards decolonizing relationships between Indigenous peoples and racialized migrants, what seems to be a stronger theme within the literature is the focus on community based dialogue projects. Kasparian (2010), Sutherland (2012), and Yu (2011) all share in their support for and value of dialogue between migrants and Indigenous peoples based on the notion that knowing one another, and the truths that are not commonly shared through education, or the media as mentioned above, is the best way to begin relationships aiming at reconciliation. What is important to add here, though, is that dialogue is also an important exercise in learning about oneself. As Alfred (2009) posits the logic of colonization is logic of disconnection and erasure of Indigenous peoples from their cultures, traditions and ultimately themselves. Dialogue also allows for self-reflection and knowing oneself, and offers then a challenge to colonial systems, which seek to destroy that knowledge. Furthermore, this notion of knowing oneself is essential to racialized migrants because a self-reflective dialogue around their new lives in Canada leads to the types of analysis that challenge state and media centered initiatives which seek to present untrue and misrepresenting stories about Indigenous peoples.

Finally, Sehdev (2011) offers a helpful narrative in which racialized migrants are encouraged to think about their relationship to Indigenous peoples in Canada in terms of treaties. They argue that: “we need to turn from an understanding of treaty as a historical artifact, based in European notions of rights and freedoms, and move

toward Aboriginal philosophies of treaty as a process of *making and keeping* good relations.” (p.273) Treaties in this sense are a constant and challenging process of negotiating power and ideas of superiority that the Canadian colonial system are based upon but ultimately work to build respect and trust which are essential elements of building positive and reconciliation based relationships.

Finally, Gyepi-Garbrah et al. (2013) offer an Indigenous-led, education-focused program geared towards educating non-aboriginal and migrant communities which is part of the operations of a settlement service organization in Winnipeg Canada. They argue that “it is important because it may permit modern cultural hybridity in ways that are led by the strength of Aboriginal cultures in ways that are not fixed in idyllic past or in negative modern misconceptions of ‘whitestream’ society.” (p.1799)

Overall, the literature on the topic about the relationship between Indigenous peoples in Canada and migrant peoples to Canada is complicated and broad based. The theoretical discussions particularly around the settler-colonial state, and the contentious discussion around the relationship between migrants as settlers on Indigenous lands, while at the same time being marginalized by the white supremacist state, are very interesting and require some further research. One thing that, I believe, this literature lacks, however, is a discussion about how the ideas actually get operationalized in the day-to-day relationships between Indigenous and racialized migrants in society more broadly. Perhaps more work (Srikanth, 2012) around studies, which profile, as the Madriaga-Vignudo (2012) study did, would

help bring to light how these hypothesized relationships are being lived out. The reality of the solution discussion in the literature is that we cannot say how successful these proposals will be. Furthermore, we cannot say if one solution above others, or a multi-faceted approach incorporating elements of these, or entirely new ideas are required to address this historically based systemic issue of broken relationships. The next section of the paper, however, will examine projects taken on by organizations that have explored some of these questions and put these ideas into practice.

PART SIX: CASE STUDIES

No One Is Illegal

In this section, I will outline the work of six different organizations that have through their operations made significant efforts in order to begin to build reconciled relationships between Indigenous peoples and migrants in Canada. The six organizations will be No One is Illegal, Kairos Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives, Canadian Roots Exchange, The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, and the City of Vancouver. These organizations were chosen not only because of their commitment to this work but also because they show the breadth and diversity of this work, as well as highlight some of the different approaches that have been taken in order to achieve the objectives that have been set out.

No one is Illegal (NOII), according to Harsha Walia, an organizer with the Vancouver Chapter of the organization is

Concurrently an ideological framework to counter border imperialism... and an extended network of grassroots migrant justice groups without any overarching centralization rooted in anticolonial, anti-capitalist, ecological justice, Indigenous self-determination, anti-occupation and antioppressive communities. (Walia, 2013, p. 98)

NOII is, according to this quotation, an organization that is interested in building community coalitions with like-minded organizations around shared priorities. What is also interesting about this description of the organization is the fact that while NOII identifies itself as a migrant justice organization but at the same time sees working with communities who are battling colonialism, capitalism and an affront on Indigenous self-determination as integral to their mandate of deconstructing borders and working for just societies for all. Walia, in a quotation

from an interview with the Halifax media co-op, explains NOII's intersectional analysis in this way:

"It is central to organize our movements in solidarity with Indigenous struggles and to understand that we cannot have any social or environmental justice movement that doesn't deal with the reality of settler colonialism because every system of oppression is organized, within Canada at least, around settler colonialism. (Walia, In Canada Every System of Oppression is Organized Around Settler Colonialism, 2014)

We can tie this idea into some of the theoretical concepts discussed earlier in the paper and identify the themes of colonialism and white supremacy as some of the themes through which NOII has established a broad mandate of working on issues of migration, borders and citizenship but also of Indigenous self-determination, anti-colonialism and anti-racism. On the Vancouver chapter website alone, there are 12 campaigns listed under their "Indigenous support" tab.

What is most powerful about this model of organizing around issues of social justice is that it seems to be a forum for any group facing marginalization due to systems of oppression inherent in settler societies such as Canada, to voice their issues, obtain some support and furthermore to feel part of a community that sees "your" issues as inherently relating to, and impacting "theirs". Especially in a system that seeks to separate peoples from one another and create differences amongst groups through the process of othering, NOII seems to be providing through their community-based model a significant and empowering challenge to the notion that relationships of trust, reconciliation and mutual respect can be fostered between Indigenous peoples and racialized migrants in Canada.

Kairos: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives

Kairos: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives is an ecumenical, membership based organizations which works on a broad range of social justice issues on behalf of 11 different church organizations including The Anglican Church of Canada, The Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace, Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, Canadian Religious Conference, Christian Reformed Church in North America, Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada, Mennonite Central Committee of Canada, The Presbyterian Church in Canada, Presbyterian World Service and Development, The Primate's World Relief and Development Fund, Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) and the United Church of Canada. In its membership Kairos has both organizations that represent entire denominations, such as the Anglican Church in Canada, but also has the official development organizations of denominations such as the Primate's World Relief and Development Fund as members. Furthermore, specifically with respect to their programming around Indigenous rights, Kairos is made up of many of the organizations who were responsible for running of residential schools as well as for aggressive and violent missionary conversions of Indigenous and non-Christian migrants of colour to North America.

In terms of their work, a board made up of the member organizations sets strategic priorities which are outlined most recently in a document entitled *Kairos Strategic Plan 2010-2015*. This document outlines specific intentions to work with both Indigenous and migrant communities in Canada using a rights-based

framework. It suggests that “By focusing our advocacy in Canada on the economic, social and cultural rights of Indigenous and migrant communities, Kairos contributes to the goal of a Canada without poverty.” (Kairos: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives , 2009, p. 7) The link here that is drawn between Indigenous and migrant communities generally is the economic and social barriers they face to inclusion, in other words their shared experience of marginalization in Canada. Another interesting element of the Kairos model, which is not necessarily represented in their policy, is the integration of these two pieces of work in the day-to-day operations of the organization. There is one staff person, in the organizational chart of the organization who is responsible for both the Indigenous and migrant justice portfolios of work who has the title: “Network and Indigenous/Migrant Relations/Movement Building Coordinator” (Kairos: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives). In this way, it is much more difficult to do this work in silos because the same individual is responsible for the program with respect to both communities, and can see the links and necessity in bringing these two groups together through the program work of the organization.

To give an example of one event that Kairos has done particularly well in this area that I was fortunate to be able to attend as a placement student, was an Indigenous migrant education night that was held in Edmonton, Alberta. First, the event began with an exercise called The Blanket Exercise in which participants, who were from both the Indigenous and migrant communities within Edmonton, were asked to stand on blankets, which represented Turtle Island, or North America. Throughout the course of the participatory exercise, participants are led through a

narrative of Canada's colonial history and the blanketed area gets smaller and smaller representing the land that Indigenous peoples were removed from through the process of colonization. The event followed with a representative from an Indigenous community as well as a racialized migrant community member offering reflections on the necessity of building relationships between racialized migrant and Indigenous communities. Some of the concerns raised by the Indigenous representative on the panel were around the effects of colonization in the present day and how the focus for Indigenous peoples is not relationship building and fostering connection, but rather on survival in broken communities. Harvey Eagle, the Indigenous representative also touched on the notion of what a good relationship between colonizer, settler, and colonized looks like and challenged the notion that there was ever a good relationship at all, and therefore advocated for a radically new and inclusive opportunity to build genuine good relationships. (Eagle, 2014) This was followed by a presentation in which the coordinator for Action for Healthy Communities, a settlement organization that had agreed to host the event, expressed her worry about the fact that newcomers don't know the stories of Indigenous peoples and therefore don't know how to be good neighbours despite their genuine intention to do so. She also lauded Kairos for organizing the event as a good educational first step for migrant communities to begin to understand Indigenous histories and histories of Canadian colonization from Indigenous perspectives. (Dumo, 2014) Overall, both the strategic mandate of Kairos as well as their staffing structure seem to lend well to be able to integrate programming and

resource development for education between Indigenous and migrant communities in Canada with the goal of mutual respect and decolonized relationships.

Canadian Roots Exchange

Canadian Roots Exchange is an education initiative for youth recognizing their unique position in creating change and building sustainable movements for reconciliation. It identifies that its work is “built on the hope that we can inspire a generation of leaders who will redefine and strengthen relationships between Canada's peoples.” (Canadian Roots Exchange n.d.) This focus on youth is focused then both on education, but also knowledge dissemination in that it is about developing leaders who are equipped to share their knowledge and model what decolonized relationships look like between settler and Indigenous peoples. Canadian Roots identifies five main goals in terms of the program design which include: building networks of solidarity, practicing what we preach, discovering positive realities, creating safe spaces for dialogue, including Indigenous worldviews in everyday thought and having fun together. These goals are reflective of the ways in which the program is structured around exposure-experiences and cross cultural community visits, storytelling and group facilitated debrief processes to understand what the experience was and what participants took away from them.

In terms of building networks for solidarity, this is based on a relational sense of knowing one another and understanding history from the peoples who experienced it. Canadian Roots suggests that: “As we learn about one another’s triumphs, struggles, challenges and opportunities, we commit ourselves to standing up together for a more equal and prosperous Canada.” (Canadian Roots Exchange

n.d.) The concept of solidarity as the focus of the program is well represented in this quotation and challenges participants to stand together, based on the call of those who experience oppression, to challenge it and support more fair and just communities through relationships based on mutual understanding and accurate histories.

The second goal around practicing what we preach is about taking guidance from the Indigenous and settler communities with whom Canadian Roots Exchange works, to ensure respect. It identifies the need to only go where they are invited, as well as to having Indigenous and newcomer leadership as ways that they ensure that this goal is central to their programming. This ensures genuine consultation and challenges colonial notions of white supremacy in terms of leadership, knowledge and powerlessness often faced by these communities within Canada.

The next goal of the organization is to discover positive realities about Indigenous peoples. This is a very important one when doing work around marginalization, and truth telling as these provide options to share contemporary stories of hope and resilience in the face of systems that disempower certain peoples. Canadian Roots challenges through this goal the colonial notions that Indigenous and racialized migrants need to be saved and/or civilized and also offers these communities an opportunity to learn about and celebrate their identities. This is a particularly powerful challenge to the education, media and immigration processes which seek to place Indigenous peoples as deviants, historical artefacts, and otherwise as needing state intervention to function as valuable and distinct members of society.

Whenever sensitive topics are discussed within a group of people it is important that Canadian Roots creates a safe space for dialogue to happen where participants feel both challenged by the information they are learning and sharing, but also that they are comfortable enough to have a positive learning experience. The fact that this notion of caring for participants, yet pushing the comfort boundaries, is central to the goals of the program, offers an opportunity for transformed, trust-based and respectful relationships to emerge.

The notion that Indigenous histories and worldviews are relevant to the contemporary political social and economic fabric of Canada is a radical notion that challenges colonial processes which seek to exclude them. The goal of the Canadian Roots Exchange to “fighting the myth held by too many Canadians that Indigenous knowledge is inapplicable or irrelevant to modern life” (Canadian Roots Exchange n.d.) is of utmost importance because these stories are not told through the education and other systems which rather support colonial and white supremacist ideologies and value this knowledge above Indigenous knowledge.

The education, dialogue and exposure elements of the Canadian Roots Exchange program as expressed through its statement of philosophy and goals seems to be a positive way in engaging youth in the process of learning about each other in a supportive environment. This program also is positive because it equips people through its leadership development focus in creating ambassadors for reconciliation and therefore ensures that the program has the opportunity to touch those who participate in it. Finally, the focus on youth builds sustainable movements for reconciliation, which is important to ensure long-term solutions based on mutual

respect and understanding in a colonial system. This is sorely needed in a system, which is based on separation of communities from one another coupled with an aggressive educational regime that spreads misinformation and false narratives of uncivilized peoples needing civilization about Indigenous peoples to both white settlers and racialized migrants.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) is an organization that has a very broad mandate, but for the purposes of this paper, I will be focusing on one specific part of it, and ways that programming around this element have taken place in the context of building relationships between Indigenous and racialized migrant populations. In the mandate document of the TRC the organization has the responsibility to “Promote awareness and public education of Canadians about the IRS [Indian Residential School] system and its impacts; and identify sources and create as complete an historical record as possible of the IRS system and legacy. The record shall be preserved and made accessible to the public for future study and use.” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada , p.

1) Here we can see very clearly that the intention of the organization is to educate Canadians about what happened in residential schools but also create a historical record that is shared for further learning. Over the course of the past year alone, the TRC itself through their national events, but also the individual commissioners have focused on the need for migrants to engage with the TRC process as they now are part of Canada and therefore have a role to play in the process.

At the TRC event that I was fortunate enough to attend in Edmonton Alberta in March, one of the most interesting elements was a cultural showcase in which migrants as well as Indigenous youth were asked to share a cultural art, dance or music display with those who were at the event and tuning in on the live webcast of the event. There were Indigenous youth who performed such cultural dances as the jingle dance and throat singing, but also a group of two racialized migrant brothers who rapped about their experience of migration, the hardships they faced in their home country, and also the struggles they faced here after migration on the basis of their race. This showed both a sense of solidarity among these Indigenous and migrant youth, that they were able to share the stage and their artistic expression of what it meant to be them; but also that there was room for relationships to be built among these communities through their cultural traditions and stories. The theme of knowing one another, which is similar to the focus of the Canadian Roots Exchange program seemed to be a very integral part of this part of the TRC programming and also showed not only an opportunity but a necessity for cultural and artistic elements of expression were important to the sharing of the individuals' stories.

The other two instances that will be highlighted were in a more workshop-style setting in which in the one case Commissioner Justice Murray Sinclair addressed the Canadian Council for Refugees plenary at their November 2013 fall consultation. The other was a workshop conducted with the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI) and their partners at an event entitled: *From Remembrance to Reconciliation*, which was also held in November 2013. What was

presented in both of these settings was similar and provided some of the context around the residential school project, some of the consequences of this brutal initiative and some of the ongoing intergenerational effects, which continue to colonize Indigenous peoples in Canada. Furthermore, and more specific to the topic at hand, was a challenge to the Canadian institutions which continue to colonize and assert white supremacist dominance over racialized peoples. Central to the discussion at the Canadian Council for Refugees was the fact that institutionally migrants were barred from the real histories of Indigenous peoples in Canada, including residential schools and that any relationship between migrants and Indigenous communities needed to be based on a common understanding of Indigenous peoples by migrant communities and that these histories were taught by Indigenous people from Indigenous perspectives. (Sinclair , 2013) At the OCASI event there was a focus on the civilizing mission that colonization put at its centre, in which white settlers perpetuated ideas of superiority to justify the colonization of Indigenous peoples and their lands. Furthermore there was a significant point made around the need to know yourself, and how that happens in communities and when your community is ignorant of your story. Furthermore this lack of knowing your own culture has detrimental affects on your sense of identity. Sinclair argued that “You do not learn who you are, you do not learn where you came from only from your parents. You learn it also from your extended family, from your neighbours, from the leaders in your community, from the heroes that your community addresses on your behalf, and from the reinforcement of those vales through the institutions in which the leaders of your community come from.” (Remembrance to

Reconciliation , 2013) What is important from this quotation specifically is that Justice Sinclair is both offering a scenario in which the best of times offers Indigenous peoples and the communities that surround them, which may or may not be made up of Indigenous peoples, the self-determination in shaping the identities of the members of the community in certain ways and based on certain cultural values and traditions. There is, however, in this quotation a sense of this process going terribly wrong, as is did in Canada, when paternalistic and intrusive colonial state institutions are the ones naming the heroes, values and cultural norms which are appropriate. This limits and even rejects entirely self-determination of the community and its members.

The positive part of the interventions of the TRC in migrant-centred community organizations is that Indigenous peoples are leading the dialogue and inviting migrants to listen and learn what is required for relationships to be formed with members of the Indigenous community in Canada. Furthermore, it is combatting again problematic education and providing an alternate discourse of Indigenous history and struggle with information that is sorely missing from both formal and informal methods of learning.

The City of Vancouver

The final case study is around the campaign of the municipal government of Vancouver in its attempt to both provide a forum for dialogue between what it terms “the original inhabitants, the First Nations; the urban aboriginal peoples who have come to Vancouver from other territories; and immigrants who are newcomers to Vancouver” (City of Vancouver , 2011, p. 5). The other project was the creation of

a guide outlining all the information that newcomers needed to know about Indigenous peoples in Canada and Vancouver which included information about aboriginal cultural teachings, aboriginal organizations in Vancouver and the work that they do, the Indian Act and Indian Residential Schools, some definitions of important concepts such as treaties, and finally a section on dispelling common myths about Indigenous people in Canada. (City of Vancouver , 2014)

In the report issued at the end of the dialogue project in the City of Vancouver, which had elements of dialogue between intergenerational members of migrant and Indigenous communities as well as intercultural exchanges to Indigenous friendship centres and reserves, there were some important recommendations made. These included the need for continued dialogue, the need for formal and informal education to centre the stories of the contemporary realities faced by Indigenous peoples, the value of cultural exchanges, the inclusion of the arts, culture and heritage, not only historical elements, to the education of migrants about Indigenous peoples. (City of Vancouver , 2011)

What is important about this initiative is that it was initiated by an elected assembly of settlers who held a specific amount of power and access to resources in order to produce, carry out the research in consultation with Indigenous communities, and disseminate the information broadly through city service centres and the city broadly. Furthermore the focus on public education and dispelling the myths about Indigenous peoples, as well as connecting newcomers to Indigenous service and programming locations allowed for newcomers to educate themselves about the issue. Finally, the dialogue project and their helpful recommendations

particularly around the need for accurate information about Indigenous peoples to be portrayed to migrants to Canada is vital given its relative availability through other state institutions including the education system, media and immigration and citizenship processes.

PART SEVEN: DISCUSSION

In terms of trying to identify some themes and conclusions that draw together the case study and literature review portions of this paper and tie it to the post-colonial methodology of praxis there are three points I would like to discuss. The first point is around the argument in the literature around the term settler, and what it means for white people who do not identify as migrants, with white people who identify as migrants, and with racialized people who identify as migrants. The important part of this point is to center the notion that was outlined in the literature that colonialism and notions of white supremacy are deeply interrelated and that, in the case of Canada at least; colonialism is inseparable from white supremacy. In the categories listed above, there are two of three who then have a greater access to power and privilege within Canadian society because of their connection to whiteness, namely white people who don't identify as migrants to Canada and white migrants to Canada. The group that, however, does not experience those same privileges afforded to white people are racialized migrants. This is not to say that oppressive, discriminatory and otherwise marginalizing actions and ideologies cannot take root in racialized migrants but simply that their relationship, because of their definition outside of white supremacy positions them differently in relation colonialism, and the ongoing erasure of Indigenous identities through institutional, social and other forces in settler- colonial Canada. What is also important to note here is the opportunity for relationships that are possible between Indigenous peoples and racialized migrants in Canada. On the one hand, Indigenous peoples face both the dispossession of land and resources inherent in colonialism, but also

experience the consequences of xenophobia and racism, which is a result of being positioned in opposition to white supremacy and superiority. That however is not the whole story, as it leaves out the context of the pressures that are in place to mold and shape racialized migrants, even through their own marginalization based on race. As discussed above, migrants through their participation in the immigration and citizenship processes, the formal education system and through the consumption of mainstream media are in many ways encouraged to adopt the colonial mentalities that dominate state discourses. In essence the state constructs racialized migrants as settlers through indoctrination of colonial discourses, which encourages the adoption of prejudicial views, and active, or passively discriminatory actions. In this way the act of being a settler is learned, and ideological and about much more than taking up physical space which has been colonized and may or may not be covered by treaties.

Given this information, perhaps we need to start thinking about settlerism, and not simply being a settler. Adopting the language of settlerism, particularly from the point of view of non-Indigenous peoples, allows us to do a couple of things. First, it allows us to broaden the definition of being a settler beyond a solely geographical concept and start thinking about it in terms of a system that is based on the domination of Indigenous peoples that is insidious to the settler-colonial state and is expressed through its actions, institutions and structures. In this way, it is more of an ideology, or a system of belief. What is inherent in this proposition is that in essence anyone, including racialized migrants whether by their own volition or because of the barriers erected by the state to separated Indigenous stories and

realities from public discourses, can practice settlerism. Furthermore these actions, regardless of who performs them dehumanize, erase and contribute to the ongoing colonization of Indigenous peoples in Canada. We need to complicate this idea further though because as it stands it still presumes the conflation of white settler, and racialized migrant populations in terms of their relationship to Indigenous peoples.

It was mentioned above that colonialism and white supremacy are intricately linked and that talking about the concepts separately is one of the ways in which Indigenous and racialized migrant communities are alienated from one another. However, It seems wrong to then conflate a community, which benefits from both colonialism and white supremacy as settlers do, with a community who may benefit from colonialism but still be positioned in opposition to white supremacy, which is the experience of racialized migrants in Canada. Settlerism then as a concept needs to incorporate the fact that racialized migrants and Indigenous peoples in Canada share a common system because of their status as not-white. What is interesting about this is that whiteness, regardless of its relationship to western European colonization of Canada, is connected to colonialism.

I believe it is helpful to think of settlerism because when something is positioned as an ideology or as a world-view, it also suggests that there is another option, an alternative that allows for resistance. Particular to this point is the fact that these ideologies are taught, and therefore are learned, which allows for the option of unlearning and adopting of more inclusive and less violent world-views

that do not have colonialism at their center. The content of these new ideologies then, is where I will turn next.

Secondly, what seems clear about the creation of new ideologies, is that who is the producer of the knowledge and who gets to say which knowledge is truth has a tremendous bearing on who will be included and excluded and even erased. With this understanding in mind what is clear if our expectation is to decolonize relationships between Indigenous peoples in Canada and racialized migrants to Canada, Indigenous peoples need to be solely in charge of the production of knowledge and stories that are being told about their communities. This means that institutions including the education system, the media, and the immigration and citizenship processes need to be radically altered to make central the leadership of, and self-determination for Indigenous peoples central. Colonial thinkers don't know, and cannot possibly be trusted with Indigenous stories and histories, nor can institutions created by an inherently colonial settler state such as Canada. This reminds me of the old adage that you cannot use the master's tools to deconstruct the master's house. Giving Indigenous peoples the spaces to self-define and teach their discourses provides a radical challenge to the ability of the state to define and shape the ideas of new immigrants to Canada. In this way migrants then would be able to resist the institutions that perpetuate these untruths.

The final part of this analysis is around the question of dialogue projects and what comes next. It seems, at least through some of the literature and case studies, that a dialogue model is the way that has captured much of the imagination of organizations that have carried out work with Indigenous peoples and migrants to

Canada. In the examples of Kairos, the Canadian Roots Exchange, and the City of Vancouver dialogue projects were at least one of the primary focuses of the programming work of the organization. What is important to recognize here is that what is required to decolonize Canada, and the relationships between different groups living within the geographical space, is a comprehensive project of reform, and therefore requires comprehensive action. In this way, I think the most helpful and powerful model is that which is exhibited by No One Is Illegal. In case of NOII, as mentioned above, they center their analysis in an intersectional analysis which includes colonialism, anti-racism, anti-capitalism Indigenous self-determination, and anti-occupation and encourages holistic solutions that resist colonial tactics of compartmentalizing issues and therefore people. Furthermore their focus on coalition work with like-minded organizations led by the very communities most affected by colonial, white supremacist settler ideologies, allows for the community to determine the needs and priorities of their engagement in issues and initiatives. In this way, a community can define the solution and tactics that work best for them and relationships of power in this context are then decolonized. While this system seems like the best option, Hayden King still offers some important warnings that may arise out of coalition work with Indigenous peoples using the model such as that used by NOII. He cautions that

“If our allies go home without recognizing their responsibilities (challenging colonial frameworks in institution, economy and society generally in an effort to end colonization) the conditions that produce our struggles will remain and recycle. Indigenous communities will continue to be marginalized so others may benefit.” (2014, p. 12)

There is an important reminder here that decolonization and coalition work which challenges colonialism in solidarity with Indigenous peoples is ongoing and doesn't simply end with the end of a campaign, or when a specific goal has been reached. It rather involves ongoing work to dismantle colonial views, which have been ingrained in people through the settler colonial state, as well as active work to challenge others to identify and work to correct settlerism within themselves.

PART EIGHT: CONCLUSION

This study attempted to offer a thoughtful presentation of the academic, grey and government literature as well as case studies of organizations that are doing important work of building decolonized relationships between Indigenous peoples in Canada and racialized migrants to Canada. Furthermore it sought to offer and highlight some work being done by organizations, and outline areas for further work within this field both at the academic and grassroots levels. What became clear throughout was that there is a desperate need for truth from the Indigenous perspective to be shared. Decolonization it seems happens both when we collectively as white settlers as well as new migrants to Canada understand truly the histories of the lands which we occupy and our positions in relation to a notion of white supremacist colonization which persistently rears its ugly head through the institutions of the state. Taiaiake Alfred (2009) contends that colonialism is a project that is based on the notion of the perpetuation of disconnection, which is radically challenged, by notions of relational and interconnected worldviews held by Indigenous peoples. In this way, connecting with ourselves, our true histories, and understanding these histories in relation to one another is a form of resistance to colonialism and the organization institutions and structures of the settler-colonial state, which is Canada. It is actions of resistance like this that I believe will begin to build the bridge across the parallax gap that is apparent in the immigration discourse as outlined by Bauder (2011) and will also begin to build the bridges between the relational gap that exists between Indigenous peoples and racialized immigrants because of the ideology of settlerism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu-Laban, J. (2001). The Future and the Legacy: Globalization and the Canadian Settler State. *Journal of Canadian Studies* , 262-276.

Alfred, T. (2009). *Peace, Power, and Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, T. (2005). *Wasase: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Peterborough: Broadview Press .

Anderson, B. (2013). *Us and Them?: The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Atleo, C. (2010). From Indigenous Nationhood to Neo-Liberal Aboriginal Economic Development: Charting the Evolution of Indigenous Settler Relations in Canada. *Canadian Social Economy Hub* .

Bannerji, H. (2000). *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Bauder, H. (2011). Closing the Immigration-Aboriginal Parallax Gap. *Geoforum* , 517-519.

Bauder, H. (2011). Closing the Immigration-Aboriginal Parallax Gap. *Geoforum* , 42 (5), 517-519.

Canadian Roots Exchange . (n.d.). *Our Philosophy* . Retrieved June 22, 2014 , from

Canadian Roots Exchange : <http://canadianroots.ca/en/our-philosophy/>

Citizenship and Immigration Canada . (2012). *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship Study Guide*. Ottawa: Government of Canada .

City of Vancouver . (2014). *First Peoples: A Guide for Newcomers* . Vancouver : City of Vancouver .

City of Vancouver . (2011). *Vancouver Dialogues: First Nations, Urban Aboriginal, and Immigrant Communities* . Vancouver : Social Policy: City of Vancouver .

Coates, K. (2005). Learning from Others: Comparative History and the Study of Indigenous-Newcomer Relations . *Native Studies Review* , 3-14.

Cole, P. (2006). *Cyote and Raven Go Canoeing: Coming Home to the Village* . McGill-Queens University Press.

- Dhamoon, R., & Abu-Laban, Y. (2009). Dangerous (Internal) Foreigners and Nation Building: The Case of Canada . *International Political Science Review* , 163-183.
- Dumo, S. (2014, March 26). Indigenous/ Migrant Education Night . (S. Dumo, Interviewer)
- Eagle, H. (2014, March 26). Indigenous/Migrant Education Night . (S. Duomo, Interviewer)
- Fleras, A., & Elliot, J. (2002). *Engaging Diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada*. Totonto: Nelson Thompson Learning .
- Francis, D. (2007). The Imaginary Indian: The image of the Indian in Canadian Culture . In T. Das Gupta, C. E. James, R. C. Maaka, G.-E. Galabuzi, & C. Andersen, *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings* (pp. 234-239). Toronto : Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Ghorayshi, P. (2010). Diversity and Interculturalism: Learning from Winnipeg's Inner City . *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* , 89-104.
- Godlewska, A., Moore, J., & Bednasek, C. (2010). Cultivating Ignorance of Aboriginal Realities . *Canadian Geographer* , 417-440.
- Gyepi-Garbrah, J., Walker, R., & Garcea, J. (2013). Indigeneity, Immigrant Newcomers and Interculturalism in Winnipeg Canada. *Urban Studies* , 1795-1811.
- Haig-Brown, C. (2007). Resistance and Renewal: First Nations and Aboriginal Education in Canada . In T. Das Gupta, C. E. James, R. C. Maaka, G.-E. Galabuzi, & C. Andersen, *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings* (pp. 168-178). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Hall, S. (2007). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power . In T. Das Gupta, C. E. James, R. C. Maaka, G.-E. Galabuzi, & C. Andersen, *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings* (pp. 56-60). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Hiddleston, J. (2009). *Understanding Postcolonialism*. Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- Jafri, B. (2012, March 21). *Privilege vs. Complicity: People of Colour and Settler Colonialism* . Retrieved February 28, 2014, from Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences : <http://ideas-idees.ca/fr/blog.privilege-vs-complicity-people-of-colour-and-settler-colonialismx>
- Jefferess, D. (2008). *Postcolonial Resistance: Culture, Liberation and Transformation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Kairos: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives . (n.d.). *Contact* . Retrieved June 22, 2014, from Kairos: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives : <http://www.kairoscanada.org/contact/>
- Kairos: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives . (2009). *Kairos Strategic Plan: 2010-2015*. Toronto.
- Kasparian, S. (2010). *Aboriginal Peoples: Canada's First Welcoming Community. Where do Aboriginal Immigrant Relations Stand Today?*
- Kelley, N., & Trebilcock, M. (2010). *The Making of the Mosaic: A History of Canadian Immigration Policy* . Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- King, H. (2014). Intervention- Addressing the Indigenous-Immigration "Parallax Gap". *Ryerson Conference on Immigration and Settlement*. Toronto: Antipodefoundation.org.
- Kymlicka, W. (1998). *Finding our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada* . Don Mills : Oxford University Press.
- Lawrence, B., & Dua, E. (2005). Decolonizing Anti-Racism . *Social Justice* , 32 (4), 120-143.
- Lutz, J. S. (2008). *Makuk*. Vancouver : UBC Press.
- Madriaga-Vigundo, L. (2012). Refugee-Aboriginal Relations: A study of a Canadian Inner City . *Masters Abstracts International* .
- Phung, M. (2011). Are People of Colour Settlers Too? . In A. H. Foundation, *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation Through the Lens of Cultural Diversity* (pp. 291-298). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation .
- Sinclair, M. (Performer). (2013). Remembrance to Reconciliation . Toronto , Ontario , Canada .
- Sandercock, L. (2009). Towards a Cosmopolitan Urbanism: From Theory to Practice. In L. Sandercock, & G. Attili, *Where Strangers Become Neighbours: Integrating Immigrants in Vancouver Canada* (pp. 193-229). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Sehdev, R. K. (2011). People of Colour in Treaty. In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagne, *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation Through the Lens of Cultural Diversity* (pp. 265-274). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation .
- Sharma, N., & Wright, C. (2008). Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States. *Social Justice* , 120-138.

- Sharma, N., & Wright, C. (2009). Docolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States . *Social Justice* , 120-138.
- Simpson, A. (2008). Subjects of Sovereignty: Indigeneity, the Revenue Rule and Juridics of Failed Consent. *Transdisciplinary Conflict of Laws* .
- Sinclair , M. (Performer). (2013 , November 28). Kitchener , Ontario , Canada .
- Smith, A. (2012). Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, White Supremacy. In D. M. HoSang, L. Oneka, & L. Pulido, *Racial Formation in the Twenty-First Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Srikanth, H. (2012). Multiculturalism and the Aboriginal Peoples in Canada . *Economic and Political Weekly* .
- Stanger-Ross, J. (2008). Municipal Colonialism in Vancouver: City Planning and Conflict over Indian Reserves . *The Canadian Historical Review* , 541-580.
- Stanley, A. (2014). *Intervention- Addressinh the Indigenous-Immigration Parallax Gap*. Toronto: Antipode Foundation .
- Statistics Canada. (2008). *Aboriginal Peoples in Canada in 2006: Inuit, Metis, and First Nations, 2006 Census*. Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- Suleman, Z. (2011). *Vancouver Dialogues: First Nations, Urban Aboriginal and Immigrant Communities* . Vancouver : Social Policy: City of Vancouver .
- Sutherland, J. (2012). *Doorways to Home Indigenou/Newcomer Neighbourhood Dialogues*.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada . (n.d.). *Schedule N: Mandate of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* . Retrieved June 22, 2014 , from Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada : http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/pdfs/SCHEDULE_N_EN.pdf
- Turner, D. (2006). *This is not a Peace Pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy* . Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Walia, H. (2014, February 22). In Canada Every System of Oppression is Organized Around Settler Colonialism. (C. Hadley, Interviewer) Halifax Media Co-op.
- Walia, H. (2013). *Undoing Border Imperialism* . Edinburgh: AK Press.
- Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native . *Journal of Genocide Research* , 387-409.

Yu, H. (2011). Nurturing Dialogues between First Nations, Urban Aboriginal, and Immigrant Communities in Vancouver . In A. H. Foundation, *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation Through the Lens of Cultural Diversity* (pp. 301-308). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.