"CITIZENS MINUS?:"
URBAN ABORIGINAL SELF-DETERMINATION AND CO-PRODUCTION IN
THE CITY OF CALGARY

KATHERINE A. DEKRUYF
Bachelor of Arts, University of Lethbridge, 2014

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
of the University of Lethbridge
In Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Native American Studies
University of Lethbridge
LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA, CANADA

© Katherine Dekruyf, 2017

"CITIZENS MINUS?:" URBAN ABORIGINAL SELF-DETERMINATION AND CO-PRODUCTION IN THE CITY OF CALGARY

KATHERINE A. DEKRUYF

Date of Defense: April 24, 2017

Dr. Yale Belanger Thesis Supervisor	Professor	Ph.D.
Dr. Ryan Walker Thesis Examination Committee Member	Professor	Ph.D.
Dr. Ivan Townshend Thesis Examination Committee Member	Professor	Ph.D.
Dr. Harold Jansen Chair, Thesis Examination Committee	Professor	Ph.D.

Abstract

Urban Aboriginal communities continue to seek greater influence in municipal planning and policy-development processes. Co-production has been proposed as a viable means to develop appropriate policies in full, equal, and reciprocal partnership between urban Aboriginal communities and cities. This thesis explores how a lack of consensus over the meaning of urban Aboriginal self-determination influences co-production's utility, and addresses how the related concepts of citizenship and the politics of recognition have led to co-production's limited success. Twenty-eight interviews were conducted with municipal leadership, Aboriginal organizations, and Aboriginal residents in the City of Calgary. A case study of the July 2015 Paskapoo Slopes negotiations in Calgary and Mayor Nenshi's *Year of Reconciliation* proclamation are then explored within this context.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my graduate committee for their guidance in the writing of this thesis. Special thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Yale Belanger, for believing in me and also for his unwavering support and encouragement during the difficult times. Also special thanks to Dr. Ryan Walker and Dr. Ivan Townshend for their patience and support, and also for their helpful and insightful comments throughout this project. Without the support of my committee this thesis would not be possible. I would like the thank the faculty of the Native Studies and Political Science departments at the University of Lethbridge for sharing their knowledge and inspiring me throughout my undergraduate and graduate journey. Thank you to my family for their love and support. Lastly I would like to express my sincere gratitude for the participants who lent their voices to this important research. This project was supported by a SSHRC research grant.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

Introduction

Urban Aboriginal community development in Canada has received significant scholarly attention in recent decades. Despite such thought-provoking discussions, many Indigenous people residing in urban centres continue to experience diminished quality of life standards than other residents, even if it tends to be "marginally better than it is for permanent residents of First Nations communities" (Dinsdale, White, & Hanselmann, 2011, p. xiii). Urban Aboriginal people still often struggle with various aspects of the urban experience, including securing employment, accessing various social programs and services, and attaining affordable housing (Newhouse & Peters, 2003). It is now accepted that one key reason for the increasing urbanization of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples during the past thirty years is the limited opportunities, poverty, and lack of housing on reserves (United Nations, 2007). Yet as other scholars have suggested, increased Aboriginal urbanization cannot solely be attributed to reserve migration (Guimond, 2003) as reserves themselves have had equally and at times more significant net population gains over the years (Norris & Clatworthy, 2011). Statistics Canada's 2011 National Household Survey Aboriginal Population Profile indicated that 56% of Aboriginal people lived in cities, and most resided in one of five large metropolitan areas: Winnipeg, Edmonton, Vancouver, Calgary, and Toronto. Of these five cities, Calgary ranked fifth with 33,375 people identifying as Aboriginal (Statistics Canada, 2011a). These growing urban Aboriginal populations continue to suffer from a "lack of resources needed either to ease their transition or to promote their permanency" (Belanger, 2013, p. 70). A lack of federal resources that failed to respond to emerging urban Aboriginal

concerns was and remains a key concern, thus contributing to the sluggish nature of urban Aboriginal community development. Part of the problem is however also due to provincial governments' historic reluctance to contribute to Aboriginal policy formulation. This has a trickle-down effect in that urban Aboriginal people find it difficult to procure provincial-Aboriginal and municipal funding arrangements, the latter of which are then "left to create policies to provide for the needs of urban Aboriginal people" despite the fact that they often lack the "capacity to do so adequately" (Hanselmann, 2001, p. 10).

In response to critics demanding improved urban Aboriginal services, several strategies have been developed to mitigate these disparities. The most popular and well-known response was the Urban Aboriginal Strategy (UAS). Developed in 1997, it was committed to help facilitate partnerships between "willing provinces and municipalities [to] address the disproportionate socio-economic hardship experiences within the urban Aboriginal population" (Walker, 2005, p. 404). It was a well-meaning strategy that all the same further complicated an already unwieldy "jurisdictional maze" that led to the "current patchwork of short-term, overlapping, and inefficient urban Aboriginal programs and policies" (Andersen & Strachan, 2011, p. 127; also Graham & Peters, 2002). The urban Aboriginal population arguably demands better representation and access to programs and resources. This is not an exclusively federal or provincial concern, for municipalities must also improve their respective responses to the urban Aboriginal community. Urban and rural municipalities, as Walker (2008a) suggests, can focus on urban Aboriginal identities as a municipal asset thus mitigating program costs for urban Aboriginal peoples.

Although most urban and rural municipalities nationally have yet to formally engage urban Aboriginal populations in policy discussions or formulation, several promising outcomes suggest that improving municipal-urban Aboriginal interface is possible. Co-production is among the more promising models. Co-production is an approach to municipal-Aboriginal policy engagement that seeks to increase Aboriginal input into local policy-making and planning processes (Belanger & Walker, 2009; Walker & Belanger, 2013). It "is a type of policy generation and implementation process where actors outside of the government apparatus are involved in the creation of policy, instead of only its implementation." Co-production has been described as "[g]overnment and community-based actors work[ing] together from problem or issue identification, to priority setting through to programs and services, and onwards" (Belanger & Walker, 2009, p. 120). Rather than simply providing a means of usefully integrating the urban Aboriginal voice into policy-making discussions thus improving Aboriginal consultation, co-production has been promoted as a means of ensuring Aboriginal peoples can contribute in an equitable fashion to municipal policies and city planning. Co-production scholars assert that "policy and programs co-produced with Aboriginal communities have better outcomes" (Walker, Moore, & Linklater, 2011, p. 164). They further suggest that cities need to establish planning processes that are transactive, so that "mutual learning [can] occur about the aspirations of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples" (Belanger & Walker, 2009, p. 119).

Moving toward improved municipal-urban Aboriginal interface is essential if not for the fact that Indigenous peoples remain invisible in urban planning and policy development practices (Belanger & Dekruyf, 2017). Libby Porter (2013) asserts that "planning as a system [can become] ideological and oppressive in post-colonial contexts."

3

To navigate through this, it is necessary to reject simple "incorporation" models. Coexistence in cities means there must be "mutual recognition of multiple life-worlds, multiple cultural expressions of human-environment relationships and their managements" (p. 303). Therefore, an underlying principle of co-production is the need to acknowledge the Aboriginal right of self-determination (Walker, 2008a). The literature to date concludes that co-production is an acceptable interactive policy-making process due to the fact that urban Aboriginal peoples are self-determining, and as such, that they have the right to participate in the formulation of policies impacting their lives. As the literature to date suggests, however, prior to the full recognition of the urban Aboriginal right to self-determination, co-production is apt to fail.

Indigenous self-determination remains a vague and fluid concept which causes a great deal of confusion for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people alike (Peters, 1995; Mörkenstam, 2015). This already abstract concept becomes even more intangible when it is applied to an urban Aboriginal population, as most Canadians (politicians included) have been unable to appreciate how a people lacking a sovereign land base can be self-determining (Andersen & Denis, 2003). Another reason is that non-Aboriginal perceptions of self-determination tend to focus exclusively on First Nation communities as the central governing body, and in turn the needs and aspirations of the urban Aboriginal community are overlooked. This is problematic considering that most Aboriginal people (over 56%, as noted) live in urban areas, and while many demonstrate strong ties to a reserve community (Environics, 2010), the majority of these populations are non-status and/or Métis, and have loose or diminished ties to their communities of origin. Another concern is that while Canada may have recognized the Aboriginal inherent right to self-government through the *The Government of Canada's Approach to*

Implementation of the Inherent Right and the Negotiation of Aboriginal Self-Government

(1995 - hereinafter Inherent Rights Policy), it has likewise failed to fully endorse the

existence of an Indigenous right to self-determination. As I discuss in this thesis, self-

government and self-determination are unique albeit complex concepts that people often

conflate (Walker, 2008b).

But what does this mean on the ground to co-production proponents? Considering

the latter is a foundational principle of co-production, and has yet to be formally

implemented in Canada, is it possible to successfully promote co-production as the

solution to existing urban Aboriginal disparities that can be traced to poorly-developed

federal policies? Do Aboriginal peoples have an inherent right to self-government, or do

city leaders see this as solely applying to rural reserve communities? Can co-production

between municipal officials and urban Aboriginal peoples occur if, as posited, all

involved parties do not agree on what Indigenous self-determination is or could mean?

What could co-production begin to look like on the ground? And if its terms are to be

negotiated in each specific instance, is it even possible to speak about co-production in

universal language? It is with several of these ideas in mind that this thesis explores how

the concept of self-determination influences what co-production means and how this

impacts relationship building between municipal governments and urban Aboriginal

people. Specifically, this thesis explores how the concept of Aboriginal self-determination

influences the meaning of co-production in the City of Calgary. I argue that until all

stakeholders involved in urban planning can reconcile the meaning of self-determination,

co-production is implausible.

Literature Review

As should be evident by now Aboriginal self-government is a fluid and indeterminate concept that has yet to be fully explored in the urban context. The literature on Aboriginal self-government dates to the 1970s and has exposed various models and approaches to securing local autonomy and improved levels of local management, coordination, and program development and delivery. It is not as well developed within the urban setting notwithstanding the fact that the movement—and thus urban Aboriginal permanency—dates to the 1950s (Newhouse, 2003). Recently scholars have been discussing urban Aboriginal populations within the context of urbanism rather than focusing strictly on the process of ongoing urbanization (Newhouse, 2011; Newhouse & FitzMaurice, 2012; Gyepi-Garbrah, Walker, & Garcea, 2014; Walker, Berdahl, Lashta, Newhouse & Belanger, 2017). While this scholarship recognizes the existence of modern Aboriginal societies, politicians (federal, provincial, and municipal), and the public at large (including Aboriginal peoples) tend to refer to highly mobile and churning populations that have yet to find a home in the city (Norris & Clatworthy, 2003). Therefore urban Aboriginal populations are still in a process of reclaiming cities as their traditional homelands and as sites where they possess rights of self-determination.

What urban Aboriginal self-government might look like or mean in a municipal context remains inconclusive. Belanger (2013) has argued that the federal court in *Canada v. Misquadis* (2002) legally recognized the off-reserve Aboriginal population as a political community that was "self-organized, self-determining, and distinct," and "analogous to a reserve community" (p. 69). This case concluded that urban Aboriginal communities are authentic and real, and hold the same rights as a reserve community. For the most part, however, scholars and politicians tend to embrace various models to help them conceptualize what urban Aboriginal self-government means. For example, the

'community-of-interest' model "is characteri[z]ed by a set of self-governing Aboriginal institutions in sectors such as housing, health, education, justice to name a few, and can also include the development of umbrella organi[z]ations that represent the interests of these institutions collectively as well as the urban Aboriginal population that they serve" (Walker, 2005, p. 397-98). Other models might reflect an Aboriginal community heavily concentrated in a particular area of the city, or might be extra-territorial in the sense that Aboriginal residents might be governed or choose to be governed by a neighbouring land-based community (Wherrett & Brown, 1995). The use of these models is contextual due to regional and cultural variances between cities and Aboriginal peoples. Some cities for instance may count several neighbouring reserve communities; one particular community or group of people may dominate some, while others may have a healthy mix of First Nations, Métis, non-status, and Inuit from across the country.

Further confounding our understanding of the meaning of urban Aboriginal self-government is that most discussants tend to conflate self-government with self-determination. For example, where Aboriginal self-government is characterized as governments designed, established, and administered by Native people, they emerge in their contemporary form as negotiated arrangements (treaty or otherwise) that recognize First Nations control over local affairs in areas such as health care, child welfare, education, housing, and economic development. It is a right delegated by Ottawa through the Inherent Rights Policy. Self-determination on the other hand reflects what the United Nations articulated in its Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a right to "freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development" (UN General Assembly, 2007, p. 4). This includes local

"autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs" (Article 4).[1]

In this setting self-government and self-determination are two unique concepts, albeit rarely clearly presented by those employing the concepts. This should act as a warning to co-production scholars and municipal/Aboriginal officials' seeking to establish political engagement strategies. One of the key concerns is that irrespective of the Indigenous right to self-determination as a key element of co-production, municipal officials are less likely to accept urban Aboriginal peoples as comprising a political community. Symbolic recognition results, which does little to promote urban Aboriginal community development or improve political outcomes. According to Coulthard (2014), such forms of political recognition by settler colonial governments are little more than forms of neocolonialism. The interim report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission studying the impacts of residential schools called upon Canadian governments to "fully adopt and implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as the framework for reconciliation" (TRC, 2015, p. 325). Although Alberta has endorsed the UNDRIP, and the City of Calgary announced a *Year of Reconciliation*, Coulthard is critical that these and similar acts are little more than moments of symbolic recognition that are ineffectual. How far this will push municipal officials to recognizing urban Aboriginal peoples as self-determining political bodies has yet to be seen.

Although it is not yet clear how and to what extent municipal officials will come to recognize Aboriginal self-determination, or what form it may take, Alcantara and Nelles (2016) are optimistic about the future of Indigenous-local partnerships. They argue

---

[1] On September 13, 2007, the UNDRIP was passed by the United Nations General Assembly, after which in November 2010 Canada endorsed (but has yet to formally ratify) its provisions.

that municipal-Aboriginal relationships and partnerships vary in scope from joint-management and "business-oriented transactions" to relationship-building efforts, decolonization pacts and approaches to interface, and capacity-building methods. Their primary conclusion is that despite the growing number of agreements we still do not know how best to facilitate relationships. Their research is unfortunately of limited value in that they do not fully evaluate the outcomes of these partnerships, although they invite scholars to produce empirically informed research to fill this gap in our knowledge— something this thesis in part endeavors to accomplish.

There are examples of cities that can claim measured success working with urban Aboriginal peoples. As an example, Belanger and Walker (2009) discuss former Winnipeg's attempt to improve the urban Aboriginal quality of life through two strategies: Plan Winnipeg 2020 and Municipal Aboriginal Pathways (MAP). This co-production initiative was largely unsuccessful due to the fact that municipal authorities defined the agenda concerning what they believed mattered for Aboriginal peoples rather than mutually seeking to identify moments of interest convergence that "reflect the intersection of urban Aboriginal interests with municipalities" (Walker & Belanger, 2013, p. 197). Reflecting the city-centric focus was the fact that Mayor Glen Murray was mandated to clean up Winnipeg's inner city, hosting the North American Indigenous Games, and deal with Winnipeg's retiring workforce. Meanwhile Winnipeg's Aboriginal community leadership sought improved socio-economic conditions, respect, and mutual political recognition. The outcome demonstrated that Winnipeg's municipal leadership did not recognize urban Aboriginal self-determination and autonomy. Rather, they sought only to accommodate urban Aboriginal concerns so long as they aligned with the interests and needs of non-Aboriginal society in Winnipeg. Existing co-production literature

demonstrates that while some city officials seek to better incorporate Aboriginality into city-planning and policy-making regimes, success continues to elude most.

Walker, Moore, and Linklater's (2011) study of co-production in Winnipeg, Thompson, Brandon, and Swan River, Manitoba, examined some policy fields ranging from Aboriginal justice to social housing. They found that "governments are not really co-producing policy with Aboriginal communities at all: they are simply striking broad-based advisory "tables," with lots of "voices," to assist with the implementation of government policy that has been derived from agenda-setting onwards (until the implementation stage) without input from Aboriginal communities" (p. 193). One might conclude from this work that municipal governments do not see the urban Aboriginal community as a legitimate, self-governing, political entity they should engage in full and equal partnership. Rather, municipalities are simply paying 'lip-service,' and arguably for their own benefit. As Andersen and Denis (2003) note, however, settler governments tend to privilege a political community that "is delineated by drawing a territorial boundary around it" (qtd. in Walker, Moore, & Linklater, 2011, p. 164). Municipal officials would then likely find it difficult to conceive of an urban Aboriginal political community due to a lack of formal boundaries, thereby making co-production based on the principle of self-determination elusive. Belanger and Dekruyf (2017) come to similar conclusion based on their recent research demonstrating an inability of municipal and economic leaders to acknowledge the self-determining capacity of the city's urban Aboriginal community, or their citizenship. As neither self-determining nations nor citizens, urban Aboriginal peoples do not deserve official political or economic responses to their concerns. This reinforces the importance of the First Nations, which are considered responsible for urban Aboriginal peoples. In this setting First Nations leaders are seen as ultimately failing in

their oversight responsibilities. Aboriginal nationhood and more importantly self-determination is therefore something that is nested exclusively with First Nations.

Clearly an important first step to improving municipal-urban Aboriginal interface is to implement Aboriginal self-determination. However, co-production cannot occur in an environment where municipal officials refuse to acknowledge what the U.N. and the aforementioned Misquadis case both identified as formal political communities. Here a dialogue surfaces concerning authenticity, in particular as it relates to whom is able to speak for whom. Andersen (2013) suggests that "[i]dentity as being, essence, or sameness offers a sense of community and a point of solidarity, while offering the dignity of historical grounding" (p. 49). Aboriginal people are however often characterized—and increasingly identify themselves—in terms of their connection to the land. Yet even though cities are situated on traditional homelands they tend to be considered less authentically cultural or important political centres than reserves. The work of Belanger & Lindstrom (2016) highlights the impact of this fragmentation process and how over time a "hierarchy of residence" develops, which is the process of "privileging one site over another" within a larger traditional homeland (p. 24). In this case, the physical boundaries and divisions that colonial governments imposed on Native people through the reserve system continue to inform Aboriginal socio-political development that leads to the evolution of an authentic versus less authentic approach to Aboriginal issues.

Attempts have been made to ease the burden for those trying to conceptualize urban Aboriginal peoples as self-determining political agents. Will Kymlicka's (1995) analysis of multiculturalism in Canada identified two distinct groups of ethnocultural minorities in Canada: national minorities (like the Québecois and Indigenous peoples) and other ethnic groups. This analysis unfortunately fails to consider the cosmopolitan

11

nature of a large (and increasingly, mid-sized) urban centre replete with multiple ethnic

groups and ethnocultural minorities, which leads to a form of analysis paralysis in that

municipal authorities may be reluctant to privilege one group of people over another and

thus ignore all concerned (Belanger & Dekruyf, 2017). Referring back to the dynamics of

'authenticity' and the evolution of 'hierarchy of residence,' many Aboriginal peoples in

cities believe that their authentic Aboriginal identity remains "back home" in their reserve

communities. Consequently, those who were born and raised on the reserve, and those

who were born and raised in the city are increasingly seen as two distinct groups of

Aboriginal people, and this creates confusion for municipal officials seeking to

accommodate their needs. Therefore, the needs of the 'status-blind' multicultural urban

Aboriginal community remains dependent on a variety of forces ranging from municipal

officials, First Nations leaders and elders and band members, and members of the local

urban Aboriginal community.

It must be noted that Aboriginal peoples tend to resist any formulation that would

diminish their self-proclaimed powers of self-determination. Abele and Prince (2008) for

one suggest that such an arrangement could possibly lead to a "negotiated form of dual

citizenship," and that Aboriginal people in Canada ought to be a third order of

government (p. 160). Alan Cairns however warns that urban Aboriginals "will not live in

a third order of government, their membership and participation in the provincial and

Canadian communities will be their primary citizen relationship to the political order"

(2000, p. 110). Co-production scholars have likewise tended to gloss over this issue,

which demands attention.

When discussing urban Aboriginal issues one must remain aware of the complex

jurisdictional issues. The urban Aboriginal community is a group of Indians according to

the British North America (BNA) Act of 1867, and as such is considered by provincial and municipal officials to be a federal responsibility under S. 91(24). Federal officials have countered that Indians living off-reserve, especially those who are non-status and living in the city are now provincial and municipal citizens, and as such privy to access each jurisdictions' respective programs and resources. Hence, they no longer need direct federal funding. As the debate unfolds urban Aboriginal people watch as resources are frozen or are incrementally released as the powers that be debate responsibility. The lack of urban Aboriginal funding has been a constant source of frustration. Urban Aboriginal organizations receive most of their funding through the Urban Aboriginal Strategy (UAS), yet recent federal funding cuts forced several Aboriginal organizations to shut down. A good example of this is the Calgary Urban Aboriginal Initiative (CUAI), which played an important role in the political representation of Calgary's urban Aboriginal community. It was forced to shut down in December 2015. The tenuous nature of remaining funding arrangements challenges organizational stability and undermines self-governing aspirations, something Walker noted in his critique of the UAS in regards to homelessness in Winnipeg: "[t]he UAS is not based on the evolving Aboriginal rights of self-determination and self-government that are central to contemporary Aboriginality […] rather, it seeks only to address the urgent 'problem' of Aboriginal poverty, essentially managing this margin of society in pursuit of greater social cohesion" (p. 410). This notion portrays urban Aboriginals as a "deficit community" (Ponting & Voyageur, 2001) rather than focusing on cultural strengthening and awareness.

There are three themes that emerge from the literature. One, there is a geographic component to Aboriginal self-government/self-determination that must be considered. Two, urban Aboriginal people have yet to effectively articulate their organizational

13

structure and if they are an organized group of self-determining political agents: the cosmopolitan nature of large urban centres has frequently led them to align their political interests with their home First Nations. Three, urban Aboriginal residents are perceived as being under the jurisdiction of the federal government, resulting in a normative understanding developing that underestimates or outright denies their potential self-determination and allows provinces and municipalities to declaim any responsibility for helping to improve their collective well-being. As the co-production literature has suggested, implementing Indigenous self-determination has been offered as the key to developing successful relationships. As will be discussed in chapters three, four and five, the idea of self-determination is a common discussion point for urban Aboriginal leaders and the City of Calgary Mayor, but what does self-determination specifically mean to urban Aboriginal and municipal leaders seeking to improve political relationships? Currently there is no 'status-blind' approach to urban Aboriginal issues in the City of Calgary, which undermines co-production intended to benefit a diverse urban Aboriginal community. Yet as co-production scholars, the Canadian courts, and the United Nations all confirm urban Aboriginal people are a distinct political community. But what is the reality on the ground? This thesis will explore this question within the co-production framework that emphasizes urban Aboriginal self-determination as its foundational principle. This work is needed to establish a basis for those seeking to elaborate on the co-production process; or the literature exploring co-production between municipal officials and urban Aboriginal leaders.

Methodology

Newhouse and FitzMaurice (2012) have argued that research concerning urban Aboriginal issues is often "dominated by the underlying notion of an "Indian problem," a

notion that suggests that Aboriginal peoples are problems to be dealt with through the development of policy and programs by governments." It is therefore crucial to ensure research is framed in such a way that it is grounded "in an Aboriginal world view and philosophy and offers an alternative to the discourse of problems/deficits" (p. ix). Tuhiwai-Smith (1999) argues in *Decolonizing Methodologies*, "[m]any researchers, academics and project workers may see the benefits of their particular research projects as serving the greater good 'for mankind,' or serving a specific emancipatory goal for an oppressed community" (p. 2). While these intentions may be virtuous, researchers conducting qualitative research in Aboriginal communities must remain mindful of their own positions, worldviews, and values in relation to "the Other." Furthermore, researchers should not simply assume that they themselves "embody this ideal and are natural representatives of it when they work with other communities" (ibid).

According to Kovach (2009), "Indigenous methodologies prompt Western traditions to engage in reflexive self-study, to consider a research paradigm outside the Western tradition that offers a systematic approach to understanding the world. It calls for the non-Indigenous scholar to adjourn disbelief and, in the pause, consider alternative possibilities" (p. 29). Reflexivity is necessary in every aspect of qualitative inquiry, and is absolutely crucial to conduct ethical research in the urban Aboriginal population as an 'outsider.' Kovach asserts that "[i]nfringement on Indigenous communities by Western research is not localized to one specific research methodology or its procedures, and analysis as to why it happens varies" (p. 142). In regards to ethical procedures, "[a] neo-liberal standpoint suggests ethical misconduct is a predicament of researchers having a lack of cultural knowledge but good intentions, while a critical analysis points to a power

15

dynamic sustained by societal and institutional structures that allow the privileged to take, take, and take" (ibid).

Fieldwork

The research took place in Calgary, Alberta from April to August, 2015. Qualitative interviewing was the key method employed for this research, and a total of 28 individuals were interviewed. According to McCracken (1988), "[f]or certain descriptive and analytic purposes, no instrument of inquiry is more revealing" (p. 9). This method is designed to elicit responses from human subjects, which requires some level of intimacy. Consequently important ethical considerations are raised as they relate to interviewing people deemed 'vulnerable' or 'marginalized.' Each stage of the research process from start to finish requires mindfulness and reflexive exercise on the part of the researcher, and especially when that research is being conducted with First Nations individuals.

Personal interviews were conducted with seven municipal officials, which included the mayor and six city councillors. There are a total of 14 district wards in the City of Calgary, and the councillor for each ward was contacted individually. Each interview was initially designed to be an hour in length, and for most an hour was scheduled. However, interviews ranged from 20 to 30 minutes due to their busy schedules, with the exception of two councillors who agreed to be interviewed for approximately 45 minutes. All participants were male. There were only two female councillors both of whom declined to be interviewed. Scheduling was completed by the ward's executive assistant, and the initial letter of contact, consent form, and questions were emailed to them prior to the interview. Interviews were conducted in participants' City Hall offices. The questions asked sought to expose potential sites of policy and

planning co-production between City Hall and urban Aboriginal organizational

leadership. Was there a rationale for either including or excluding Aboriginal concerns in

city planning processes? What are the barriers to relationship-building? Did they think

they are doing an effective job at meeting the needs and aspirations of Aboriginal

residents? What did they do to demonstrate the importance of Aboriginal histories and

cultures in the City of Calgary? How might processes be improved to promote a more

"Indigenous-inclusive" city?

Similarly, personal interviews were conducted with five Aboriginal organizational

leaders, which includes both political and administrative actors. The Métis Association

and the Friendship Centre were contacted but neither responded. One of the key

participants was the issues strategist for the Calgary Aboriginal Urban Affairs Committee,

the main political body who works with City Hall, and another was the last director of the

Calgary Urban Aboriginal Initiative before it closed in December 2015. The three other

participants were prominent Aboriginal and Métis community leaders. All participants

were part of the main body of well-known Aboriginal leadership in the City of Calgary,

and each referred me to the next individual I should speak with. Of the five individuals,

only one was male. Interviews were held in participant offices or workplace boardrooms.

Questions were similar in nature to those posed to municipal officials.

Lastly, 16 personal interviews were conducted with Aboriginal residents. The ages

ranged from their early-20s to over 65 years. Some had been living in Calgary for one to

two years, and others over 30 years. Of the 16 interviews, half identified as being from

one of the three Blackfoot reserves (Kainai, Piikani, or Siksika). Of the other half, there

were Cree, Dene, Saultaux, or Métis individuals. None of the participants came from the

two other Treaty 7 Nations (Stoney or Tsuu T'ina), which are in the closest proximity to

the City of Calgary. Of the 16 interviews, only five were male. Recruitment posters were sent out to Aboriginal organizations, institutions, and post-secondary Native Student Centres. Most of the participants were recruited using word-of-mouth and snowball sampling techniques. At the end of each interview I would ask if they had any friends or relatives who would consider participating in the study.

Interviews were approximately one hour in duration, and participants received a $40 stipend as compensation for their time. Interviews with Aboriginal residents took place either in their homes, or in a public space like a coffee shop or a park. The questions I asked focused on the experiences of Aboriginal people living in Calgary, and sought to identify their expectations of what an "Indigenous inclusive" city might look like. Have they experienced racism, discrimination, or stigmatization of being an Aboriginal person living in Calgary? Is the municipality responding to their cultural and spiritual needs in a good way? Do they participate in municipal political processes? What do they perceive as some of the barriers to having a good life in the city?

Transcription and Data Analysis

Interviews with all participants were digitally recorded and transcribed by a research assistant. Several scholars and academics have come to recognize the importance of the data collection and transcription processes of a research project, and have both critiqued and proposed various methods. Oliver, Serovich & Mason (2005) stated that "[i]t is not uncommon for transcription to be presented as a behind-the-scenes aspect of data management rather than as an object of study in its own right" (p. 1273). They argue that "transcription is a pivotal aspect of qualitative inquiry [as it can] powerfully affect the way participants are understood, the information they share, and the conclusions

drawn" (p. 1273). While these ideas are important to consider, Poland (1995) states that "lavishing attention on issues of transcription quality should not overshadow other issues of trustworthiness in qualitative research, including those pertaining to the nature of the interviews themselves (rapport, focus, fit with project aims)" (p. 295).

Data analysis followed transcription. Concepts and themes that emerged in the dialogue were identified inductively through coding using NVivo10 software. Denzin (1994) raises the issue of "legitimation" which "centers on matter of epistemology" (p. 320). To wit, how one's writing "makes claims for its own authority" can be problematic in the field of Indigenous research, particularly when the researcher is not Indigenous. Representation in my own research project is crucial, as my own interpretations from the interviews with Aboriginal people do not truly reflect an Indigenous perspective, despite my background in Native Studies. There are issues involved "in presenting lived experience and the point of view of the Other" (ibid., p. 338). By positioning myself as a non-Indigenous person, "I am claiming a genealogical, cultural, and political set of experiences" starkly different from an Indigenous persons' set of experiences. (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999, p. 12).

Mauthner and Doucet (2003) make suggestions to account for reflexivity in qualitative data analysis that highlight reflexivity "at the data analysis and interpretation stages of research, and in doing so to illustrate the inseparability of epistemology, ontology and research practice" (p. 424). They state that researchers "are still offered little guidance on how to identify, articulate and take account of the range of influences shaping their research at the data analysis stage" (p. 425). Their article focuses on the "voice-cent[e]red method," and how it encapsulates "relational ontological and epistemological assumptions about subjects and subjectivities" (p. 423). The method they

19

advocate "recognizes the importance of social context - material, ideological and discursive - as critical backdrops to research respondents' voiced experiences" (p. 423). The most compelling notion to keep in mind as a non-Indigenous researcher is awareness of where I am situated within the research, and what my purpose for doing the research is. According to Kovach (2009), "self-location means cultural identification," and in regards to Indigenous research, and is necessary in order to "build reciprocity, rapport and trust between the researchers and researched" (p. 110). Therefore, locating one's self within the research context is crucial to conduct ethical qualitative inquiry in any Aboriginal community.

Thesis Overview

The second chapter presents the setting: it offers a historical overview of the pre and post-contact periods in the Calgary/Southern Alberta region to ensure the reader understands the effect of competing ways of understanding the environment, and how these ideas continue to influence evident in terms of physical, political, and social separation. The third and fourth chapters offer the empirical analyses. The third chapter takes the interview findings to understand citizenship within the context of co-production in order to interpret the multiple understandings that interviewees have about where urban Aboriginal people fit in the urban landscape. The fourth chapter focuses on the politics of recognition, and provides a case study of the recent Paskapoo Slopes negotiations and the *Year of Reconciliation* proclamation in Calgary in order to understand the dimensions of colonialism in an urban setting, and how this problematizes co-production. The concluding chapter summarizes the findings and provides recommendations on how municipalities can move forward more effectively.

Chapter Two: The Setting, The People

Introduction

Calgary provides for an interesting case study of co-production and municipal-Aboriginal relations as the region is unique not only in regards to all large cities across Canada (e.g., Vancouver, Toronto or Montreal) but also amongst Canadian prairie cities like Winnipeg, Edmonton, and Saskatoon. It is a city that embraces its frontier, western heritage, and is also widely heralded as the epicenter of the Canadian energy sector. As a politically and economically distinct city with a relatively low population of Aboriginal residents compared to other cities (2.8 percent of the total population as of 2011), Calgary nevertheless is an important site to explore local government responses to the needs of and its approach to collaborating with Aboriginal people.

Cities are important sites where mutually-beneficial relationships can and should develop between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples. As co-production scholars emphasize, municipalities have an important role to play in mitigating the socioeconomic disparities that exist between their Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal residents. Yet cities unfortunately are also, as noted by Stanger-Ross (2008), "vital instruments of colonization [and] symbols of conquest" (p. 543). Calgary in this case is no exception. Historically, respectful protocols of interaction were established when two distinct groups of people came together. However, as time progressed and Aboriginal people became an obstacle to growth and development, which led to their "Othering" which persists to this day. Where once Aboriginal peoples may have been considered "separated outsiders" they are now to some extent "integrated," but "outsiders" nevertheless. This "outsider"

mentality that persists is a key discussion point in later chapters, so this chapter will set the foundation.

In doing so it will provide a historical and statistical background of Aboriginal people in Calgary and the surrounding area in order to get a sense of the socio-political dynamics influencing the interview participants. It will also demonstrate colonization's profound impact of Indigenous political economies on the Canadian plains. As settlement increased in the Calgary region by the early 1900s foreign ideas of urbanism came to dominant in a region that was majority Indigenous to that point. In the post-treaty period (after 1877), reserves had emerged as separate spaces where Indians could be educated in European customs, values and traditions the hope being that they may ultimately one day transition into urban areas and become good citizens.

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the pre- and early contact environment on the Northwestern plains. This was a period when colonization had not yet impacted Indigenous traditional ways of life, and where creation and relationships with the land guided local economic, and political, and social processes. Next, I briefly discuss what is perhaps one of the most troubling periods for the Niitsitapi (Blackfoot) people: the last half of the 19th century: an era characterized by the whiskey trade, rampant epidemic diseases, the gradual disappearance of the buffalo on which the Niitsitapi's livelihood depended on, and finally, the arrival of the permanent North West Mounted Police in 1874. This section will show that after the signing of Treaty Seven in 1877, Indians (as they were understood) came to be viewed as obstacles to western advancement and settlement and not treaty partners worthy of equal rights as sovereign nations. As towns and cities permanently developed Indigenous peoples were

increasingly deemed as too uncivilized to live alongside settlers in developing urban areas.

From here follows a discussion about the historic development of the Canadian west and the introduction of settlers in the late-1800s. This era brought new ideas about economics, which stressed concentrating indigenous populations to open up access to resources. As a result, by the early 1900s, you were either a civilized white individual living in the town/city, or you were uncivilized Indians, conquered and living on the reserve. Most importantly, an idea developed that you could not be both. During this time, Calgary was becoming a regional hub and slowly evolving into the Alberta's economic centre. Calgary at this time was also becoming a regional transportation hub (both North-South and East-West) leading to rapidly growing settler populations. Interestingly, it is during this time when Calgary ultimately adopts an identity as "Cowtown," which crystallized during the Calgary Stampede's evolution in the early 1900s. This highlights a moment where Aboriginal participation in civic endeavours was simultaneously embraced and frowned upon. I will use the Calgary Stampede as a case study to illustrate how the Indian-white dichotomy in Calgary became formally embedded locally.

Finally, this chapter turns to a more contemporary context by offering a statistical profile of Calgary's Indigenous population and a discussion of how Calgary, as a modern, metropolitan city, continues to struggle when dealing with urban Aboriginal people. The overarching idea that I want to emphasize is the need to trace "the power maintaining the political, economic, social, and cultural marginalization of Aboriginal people in Canadian society" (Furniss, 1999, p. 11). Relationships between Indigenous peoples and Canadian society are inscribed historically in state ideologies, institutions, and policies. Using Edward Said's theoretical framework, Furniss asserts, "Canada persists as a colonial

(rather than 'postcolonial') society whose culture remains deeply imprinted by the legacy of colonialism" (ibid). At this point there is little doubt that a dominant culture continues to create policies on behalf of Aboriginal peoples who live in the city. This chapter helps to shed some light on how this influences co-production, urban Aboriginal self-determination, citizenship, and recognition.

History of Indigenous People in the Calgary (Southern Alberta) Region

Calgary is sited in the northern region of the lands the Niitsitapi have called home for millennia. It is now considered home to over 33,000 First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people. The city is known by many names to several diverse groups of Aboriginal people which indicate Calgary's geographic location at the confluence of the Elbow and Bow rivers in Southern Alberta. The Blackfoot-speaking people call Calgary "Moh-kíns-tsis," or "elbow many houses" (Wilcox, 2015). Calgary's closest neighbour, the Sarcee (Tsuut'ina First Nation) people refer to the city as "Kootsisaw," or "meeting of the waters" (Reeves, 1975). As noted above, the southern Alberta region is Treaty seven territory, which includes Siksika (Blackfoot proper), Kainai (Blood), Piikani (North Peigan), Tsuu T'ina (Sarcee), and Stoney (Bearspaw, Chiniki, and Wesley) First Nations. It is also regarded as Blackfoot traditional territory[2] which before Euroamerican settlers arrived, was frequented and inhabited by several diverse communities of Indigenous peoples (Binnema, 2004). While Calgary is situated on traditional Blackfoot lands, it is important to note that "mixing, merging, and amalgamation among cultural groups" was normal, and it was not unusual to witness "combined encampments" of Cree-Sarcee, Sarcee-Blood, or Siksika-Assiniboine groups (ibid., p. 13).

---

[2] Members of the Blackfoot Confederacy include Kainai Nation (Blood), Siksika Nation (Blackfoot), and Piikani Nation (North and South Peigan). South Peigan are Montana "Blackfeet."

Historically, trade and peace alliances were formed between tribes, thus fur traders "had to fit themselves into a pre-existing Aboriginal trading system" (Miller, 2009, p. 32). Consequently, all nations and peoples interacting had to adjust to the appropriate regional protocols and standards in order to integrate themselves into existing kinship networks. Doing so in this manner was important to Indigenous peoples because peaceful relations and establishing intertribal kinship was essential to maintaining trade relationships, as it was important to know whether the person was "a friendly person… or a potentially dangerous stranger" (ibid., p. 7). This outlook differed slightly from later European perspectives of trade relationships according to James Dempsey, who noted "trade and the subsequent profit was an end within itself while for Natives, trade was a step in establishing and perpetuating social and political relations with individuals and groups" (qtd. in Smyth, 2001, p. 35).

As Binnema suggests, it is crucial to appreciate the fact that prior to the arrival of settlers, Indigenous peoples were "complex organized societies," and not in any way "primitive" or "simple," and that band societies differed from Western societies in several ways (2004, p. 12). Unlike fur traders, and later Euro-Canadian settlers, all of which were extremely disruptive, local protocols dominated and offered diplomatic stability for the regional Indigenous peoples. Arguably, like most Indigenous peoples, the Niitsitapi's traditional political economy was informed by creation. That is through their connection to the land, they developed heightened ecological knowledge through intuitive observation which helped them to survive and sustain their communities. According to Leroy Little Bear, a respected Kainai scholar, the importance of land in Indigenous epistemologies is as follows:

> The land is a very important referent in the Native American mind. Events, patterns, cycles, and happenings are readily observed on and from the land. Animal migrations, cycles of plant life, seasons, and cosmic movements are detected from particular spatial locations… Each tribal territory has its sacred sites, and its particular environmental and ecological combinations resulting in particular relational networks. All of this happens on the Earth; hence, the sacredness of the Earth in the Native American mind. The Earth is so sacred that it is referred to as "Mother," the source of life. (Cajete, 2000, p. xi)

Native communities were keenly aware that their livelihood was sometimes subject to unpredictable natural events. In anticipation of the unknown, they had to be able to adapt to their environment. However, as discussed in the next section, initial European contact led to extended contact, and as such had a devastating impact upon their communities. This led to Indigenous peoples gradually losing control over their traditional territories. Once a permanent colonial presence had moved into what is now southern Alberta, Indigenous mobility and connection with these sacred sites became increasingly more restricted, and once respectful protocols of interactions were ignored and replaced by new ideas about political economy.

Establishing a Permanent Colonial Presence

The question of when first contact occurred between the Niitsitapi people and Euro-Americans still remains unanswered. Accounts from Blackfoot elders suggest that they had direct trading alliances with fur traders beginning in the 1600s (Hildebrandt, Carter, & First Rider, 1996), but it is well-documented that the Niitsitapi and their allies had direct contact and trade relationships with the North West Company and Hudson's Bay Company for at least a century (early 1780s) before Treaty seven was signed in 1877 (Smyth, 2001). The contact with fur traders during this period at least allowed for Indigenous peoples to "maintain a high degree of autonomy" (Kennedy, 2014), but the dynamics would shift in the 1870s. The arrival of the NWMP in the summer of 1874 to

the southern Alberta region was not simply a benevolent move to bring the whiskey trade

under control, to establish law and order, and to pave the way for future settlement. It was

also an occupying force sent to ensure Canadian government authority thus establishing

sovereignty in the west. Fort Calgary originated as a result of a federal desire to establish

a network of posts in "Indian Territory" to ensure "the physical presence in government

authority" as well as to provide "a focal point for social and economic activity" (Foran &

Cavell, 1978, p. 12).

The years leading up to the signing of Treaty 7 on September 22, 1877, were

devastating for the Niitsitapi. There were epidemics of smallpox and measles, an influx of

alcohol as a result of the whiskey trade[3], and the buffalo population's depletion. The

Indian Act, initially drafted and consolidated in 1876, "reflected the government's

preoccupation with land management, First Nations membership and local government,

and the ultimate goal of assimilation" (Hurley & Gordon, 2009). After the treaty signing,

the five nations had their reserve sites surveyed. The First Nations who accepted the

treaty believed they would continue to have full use of the territory that had always

sustained them, and "[m]ost of them assumed that they could continue to live as they

always had and that they would share the land with the whites" (Hildebrandt et al., 1996,

p. 137).

According to Battell-Lowman and Barker (2015), one of the three main pillars of

settler colonialism, first stated by anthropologist Patrick Wolfe, is that "invasion is a

structure not an event." That is:

> Invasion is not the moment that the foreign army sweeps into the area; it continues
> until the occupying force leaves. In Canada, invasion did not finish at the moment

---

[3] For more information on the impact of the Whiskey trade on plains communities see Hugh Dempsey's
Firewater.

when Indigenous lands were first occupied or appropriated by Euroamericans. Rather, it continues to happen because the social, political, and economic structures built by the invading people endure. (p. 25)

To summarize, this section emphasized how templating European political and economic ideas over Native processes eventually won out, and how these ideas remain prevalent today. As we move deeper into the discussion on the development of Calgary as a large urban centre in the next section, we will see how European worldviews came to overshadow Native worldviews, and how Native peoples' efforts to maintain their lifestyles became futile.

Calgary's Development and Aboriginal Urbanization

In the years following the treaty, Indigenous peoples were kept on the fringes of the newly evolving western Canadian society. Indians were forced to stay on the reserves until deemed civilized enough to enjoy the rights of full citizenship. An exception occurred if they were brought into the city "when they had legitimate business to conduct" (Dempsey, 2008, p. 48). The Pass System was enacted in 1885 (though never legislated in the House of Commons) and granted Indian agents full control over who could come and go from the reserve. This system was not only aimed at keeping 'uncivilized' Indians out of towns and away from white settlers, but it limited their communications thus keeping them from physically meeting. Arguably, this was an effort to halt military and political mobilization. Ultimately, Indians who were caught off-reserve without a pass were incarcerated (Williams, 2015).

Calgary: City Characteristics and Demographics

Calgary's population grew rapidly in the early 20th century, transforming it into a truly urban landscape before the First World War. According to Melnyk (1985), "the most rapid rate of growth was experienced between 1909 and 1919 [where] the city more

than doubled its population" (p. 21). In 1913, according to the Dominion Census, there were 80,851 people in Calgary, with roughly 1,000 people migrating each month. During WWI Calgary experienced a severe population drop, which rebounded after WWII (ibid). The same trends were experienced as the population steadily increased, when in the years following the Second World War, Calgary's economy was dominated by the oil and gas industry, a "globally oriented business" where "Calgary's petroleum corporations export to and have their own drilling and exploration operations in regions around the world" (Wood, 2003b, p. 464). In more recent years, Calgary's economy has further diversified.

As of 2011, Calgary's census metropolitan area (CMA) had a total population of 1, 214, 839 people; a 12.6 percent increase from 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2011b). By both population and area, Calgary is currently Alberta's largest city, but is closely followed by Edmonton. It should also be noted that Calgary's CMA includes the Tsuu T'ina Nation (Tsuu T'ina Nation 145). Calgary is often characterized as more spread out than most large Canadian cities covering a large land mass with low density. Of Calgary's total population, 337,420 (28.1 percent) people were members of a visible minority, and the top three groups included South Asian, Chinese, and Filipino (ibid). While other Canadian cities boast more significant immigrant populations, like Toronto or Vancouver, Calgary's growing immigrant population has led City officials to place more emphasis on promoting Calgary as a diverse and inclusive city.

Calgary Aboriginal Urbanization

Aboriginal peoples began migrating to urban centres in larger numbers in the mid-1950s. Friendship Centres were established in response to this influx, to "assist those Aboriginal people moving from reserves and rural areas to urban centres" (Newhouse, 2003, p. 246). However, it wasn't until the 1970s that Friendship Centres really became a

prominent feature assisting migrating Aboriginal peoples with front-line service delivery. Calgary's urban Aboriginal population grew significantly in the 1970s, and in 1979, the Native Urban Affairs Committee was established to represent Aboriginal issues and concerns. In 1987, the Committee's name was changed to the Calgary Aboriginal Urban Affairs Committee (City of Calgary, 2016). In 2011 Calgary had a population of about 33,375 Aboriginal people, representing about 2.8 percent of the total population. Of the single Aboriginal identity responses, 10,170 people identified as a Registered or Treaty Indian, 4, 460 were not a Registered or Treaty Indian, 17,040 (51.1 percent of Aboriginal population) were Métis, and 240 identified as Inuit. Edmonton has a much more significant urban Aboriginal population (61,765), about 5 percent of the total population, which ranks second nationally following Winnipeg. According to the NHS Aboriginal Population Profile (2011), some Indigenous language groups include (in descending order): Blackfoot (520), Cree languages (350), Ojibway (50), and Stoney (45). The Cree population in Calgary is significant. The 2006 data of the Calgary CMA shows slightly different statistics, which are also worth noting. According to the City of Calgary Social Planning and Policy Division's fact sheet on Aboriginal people in Calgary, language groups include: Cree (560), Blackfoot (370), Siouan languages (Dakota/Sioux) (95), Inuktitut (75), Ojibway (65), Dene (25), Chipewyan (10), and Nisga'a (10) (City of Calgary, p. 2).

The Calgary-specific portion of the Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study (UAPS) noted that for most (70 percent) Aboriginal people who were surveyed, the city is "home," even if they are the first generation of their family to live in the city. However a significant number (60 percent) remain connected to their "communities of origin" (Environics, 2010, p. 9). The UAPS also indicated that the majority of respondents (75

percent) believe that they are viewed in negative ways by their non-Aboriginal cohabitants. Many feel there are negative stereotypes about addiction problems, laziness, lack of intelligence, and poverty (ibid).

A Word on the Quality of Statistics

Though the NHS shows that the Aboriginal population in Calgary is 33,375 people, a spokesperson for the Calgary Urban Aboriginal Initiative stated it is more likely closer to 50,000 people (Komarnicki, 2012, Jan, 12). The NHS survey is voluntary, so certain population groups, including Aboriginal persons and low-income households, are less likely to respond to these surveys than the general population, resulting in a non-response bias in the data. Therefore, survey results may not necessarily reflect the characteristics of the population.

Calgary Stampede

The Calgary Stampede has had a profound influence on the formation of Calgary's identity. It originated as an annual fall fair formed by the Calgary and District Agricultural Society in 1886 (Dempsey, 2008, p. 48), and is one of several high-profile Canadian events and showcases that regularly brings Indigenous peoples out from the shadows and into the public eye (Radforth, 2003). At the end of the 1800s there were tens of thousands of "officially-designated Indians" inhabiting Canada, and at this point non-Natives had little to no exposure to them as they were sequestered on reserves, "isolated from the main centres of population" (Francis, 1992, p. 15). Yet Indians would become an integral component of the annual Calgary Stampede festivities to the point where credited Stampede founder Guy Weadick risked incarceration by defying Indian Act laws in 1914 to bring First Nations people into town to participate (Dempsey, 2008).

Why the Stampede committee decided it was important to integrate Aboriginal peoples into its operations remains a mystery, but this case study argues that it began a process of historicizing the Indian, which becomes an important discussion point in later chapters. Furthermore, the Stampede offers us a way of symbolically discussing the distance between these two distinct groups of people and the unwritten norms that have evolved over time. There is a historical precedent that continues to inform the present colonial relationship that exists between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples. So the purpose of this brief case study then is to discuss First Nations' participation in the Calgary Stampede and the different viewpoints on what that participation means. Has it ever been perceived as a way of fostering equal partnerships between First Nations and the city, or does it perpetuate colonialism through historicizing indigenous culture? How has the nature of that involvement shifted over time? As the purpose of this thesis is to explore the idea of urban Aboriginal self-determination and co-production, these are important questions to consider. In addition to setting the stage for later discussions, it also helps to elaborate on the issues confronting City Hall, urban Aboriginal leaders and residents, and others who are trying to determine precisely how to affect recognition and integration of Aboriginal voices into policy decisions and ongoing community operations.

Like other major North American "destination events," such as the Olympics, or Québec's Winter Carnival, the Stampede is of significant economic worth to the City of Calgary. Foran (2008) states "co-operation between the city … and the Stampede was rooted in the belief that the latter benefited the former commercially" (p. 152). Because Calgary's economy was primarily based on the agricultural and livestock industry, the Stampede drew outside attention to Calgary as a major distribution centre (ibid., p. 149). Though Calgary has since added "oil and natural gas extraction, tourism, and high-

technology activity to its economic portfolio," the Stampede remains an important symbol

of Calgary culture. The Stampede has always and continues to heavily exploit the

"cowboys" and "Indians" paradigm. This dichotomy is not unique to Calgary, but is

common to stampede-like events across the country. Furniss (1999) for one discussed

similar dynamics at the William's Lake annual Stampede to illustrate colonialism and the

"frontier myth." Like Calgary, in William's Lake:

> Aboriginal people, as Indians, were viewed as an essential component of the
> stampede festivities … Indians added "colour and variety" to the event; they were
> spectacles of curiosity, of exotic interest, that enhanced and completed the town's
> festive portrait of Western identity and culture. (p. 169-170)

Guy Weadick himself saw Indians as "colourful and positive assets" to the Calgary

Stampede, and when the Indian Act was amended in 1914 requiring official permission

from Indian agents for western Indians to appear in "aboriginal costume in any dance,

show, exhibition, stampede or pageant," he sought ways to get around the new law or

ignored it entirely (Dempsey, 2008, p. 58). Stampede organizers were often at odds with

the federal government over their racist, exclusionary politics, so most did what they

could to ensure their continued participation. But the main question here is why was it so

important that Indigenous people participate? In truth, it was arguably not important to

everyone, as First Nations participation in fairs was controversial. While many embraced

and supported their involvement, others aggressively campaigned against it. For instance,

the inspector of Indian Agencies for Alberta, J.A. Markle, thought that Indians should be

"busy haying or working in their fields" during the times when fairs were held. He "saw

the events as an encouragement for Indians to retain old customs which, in his opinion,

had no place in the new world which the government had laid out for them" (ibid., p. 51).

On the other hand, Reverend John McDougall, a Methodist missionary on the Stoney

Reserve, "not only endorsed the idea of Indians going to Calgary, but also visited the various reserves to encourage them to go" (ibid., p. 52).

While most non-Aboriginal people supported Indian involvement, it was more due to an appreciation of their colourful regalia and their dances, but it was an artificial setting in which Indians were not permitted to evolve or modernize. The essence of the Stampede is a celebration of the old frontier where Indians had already been conquered. As such Indians were still supposed to live on reserves, and townsfolk who had rights to the city lived this experience each year would exist alongside First Nations for a few days during the festivities. At the end of the day, Indians would return to the reserve with no rights to the city or citizenship. Therefore the Stampede represents an important moment that demonstrates how these two groups of people understand their respective place in society.

There are different viewpoints on Aboriginal participation in the Stampede. Most historians assert that there are positive and negative elements to Aboriginal participation in public spectacles and performances. For instance, in Radforth's (2003) discussion on Native performance during royal visits, he states that these opportunities "not only provided an occasion for state officials and other non-Aboriginal people to appropriate and display Indians but was also an opportunity for Native people themselves to claim public attention, affirm their own loyalism and cultural integrity, and demand redress of political grievances" (p. 1). It also "provided reassurance of the ties of First Nations with the monarchy" (ibid). One of the main issues Radforth identifies, is that state officials were unsure of how to portray Aboriginal peoples: as savage Indians in traditional dress, or in ways that demonstrated their "adaptation to the colonial world around them" (ibid). How non-Aboriginals decide they want to portray Aboriginal culture became the key issue, which makes it apparent that First Nations people were unable to decide for

34

themselves how they wanted to be portrayed. According to Francis (1992), Indian participation was strictly monitored; ultimately it was the dominant society who "set … the agenda." If Indian representatives were to "convey an overtly political message" then they would not "receive … a platform at all" (p. 142-143).

While many scholars argue that rodeos are racist, oppressive, and dichotomizing, others like Kelm (2011) assert that they have been sites of Aboriginal peoples' agency. In particular, she argues that "many Aboriginal people participated [in rodeos] because they found value in doing so," and events like the Stampede can actually be viewed as contact zones "where Aboriginal and settler communities converged" in positive ways (p. 25-26). Furthermore, in the case of the Calgary Stampede at a time where the government was discouraging Indian participation, their participation could be considered a political act of defiance. However we must not neglect the potential consequences of First Nations inclusion. More recently the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympics demonstrated such consequences namely that committees such as VANOC (the Vancouver Olympic Committee) often act in their own "self-interest and self-preservation" while appearing benevolent in their actions to negotiate with politically dominant First Nations on certain land bases; in this case, in Squamish and Whistler. However this was merely an attempt to thwart any potential threats so that Vancouver could host the games (Bourgeois, 2009, p. 42).

As Francis (1992) states, "Indian images [are] used to represent what non-Natives think about Indians… they are appropriated by non-Natives as meaningful symbols of their own culture" (p. 172). In this case, First Nations people become historical remnants of what people patronizing the Stampede want Indians to be (and ultimately remain). Just as in the early 1900s, the people who attend the Stampede today want to see First Nations

people and embrace the Indians they want to see. Non-Natives appreciate the image of the "noble savage" and thus continue to utilize these stereotypical images to convey "bravery, physical prowess, and natural virtue" (ibid., p. 176). In modern times although dominant society might be slowly becoming more aware of their cultural appropriation, we still see warrior costumes in stores, and warrior clad red-skinned figures representing sports teams. This is interesting for as Francis suggests "[s]ince the beginning of the country, non-Native Canadians have wanted Indians to transform themselves into Whites, to assimilate into the mainstream," yet we continue to value these historical figures as symbols of our history. This is an important idea that will be discussed further in later chapters: that dominant society continues to identify Indigenous peoples as a disappeared people of a more romantic era. Today, Calgarians will venture into downtown Calgary and criticize Aboriginal people, denying that they are neighbours or ironically a corrupted version of their past selves, and ultimately out of place in the city. Yet each year they continue to visit the Indian Village and appreciate who they once were. As it currently stands however Aboriginal peoples remain outsiders of modernity and do not belong in the city.

This case study used the Calgary Stampede to suggest that how Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples continue to interact appears to have changed very little. As will be discussed below, Aboriginal participation in the Stampede is symbolically important because it shows that while Indians may be important to Calgary's history, urban Aboriginal people are less so. Non-Aboriginal people should however be aware of how they are portraying Aboriginal people. More importantly, we must ask whether we are historicizing and using this romantic image to further our own interests. And in 2017 are non-Aboriginal politicians and Calgary citizens still setting this cultural agenda? In doing

so are we perpetuating colonialism? As Radforth (2003), Bourgeois (2009), Furniss (1999), and Kelm (2011) have highlighted, there are varying perspectives on the meaning of Aboriginal participation in this setting. While Indigenous people may see participation as an opportunity to advance their political agendas and doing what they need to do to ensure their voice and presence, this case study of the Calgary Stampede shows that it does not necessarily mean that it has evolved to an equal partnership between First Nations people and the city.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to set the context for my discussion in the next two chapters by providing a historical and statistical background for the research site. Calgary is unique in comparison to other Canadian cities as it is a large metropolitan centre that champions its frontier history and where the romanticized noble savage remains symbolically important to its civic identity. As will be discussed further this image has evolved into a general belief that First Nations people do not really belong in the modern cityscape; nor are they true citizens. These ideas are evolved in chapter three on urban Aboriginal citizenship. In chapter four, which discusses the politics of recognition, we see that city leaders remain reluctant to engage the urban Aboriginal community. But they also believe that token gestures marking Calgary's historic relationship with First Nations people are significant tributes to the contemporary urban Aboriginal community. These actions I argue perpetuate colonialism thus impeding co-production and undermining urban Aboriginal self-determination. It would appear that decolonization of cities must occur first before co-production can become a reality. This chapter illustrates that decolonization is slowly evolving, but that city leaders and residents continue to see First Nations people in a stereotypical fashion that freezes them

in a historical past. In this setting, they cannot become contemporary political actors

worthy of political engagement. As Lowman-Battell and Barker (2015) state:

> Decolonization is a transformative process, one that cannot be fully revealed or understood until it is practiced, and even then, it will comprise a shifting and moving set of goals, always responding to the needs of Indigenous communities and the *ruthless re-applications of colonial power and domination.* (p. 112, emphasis mine)

As each year passes, Calgarians remain oblivious to the fact that they continue to restrict

Aboriginal identity from evolving or progressing. Non-Aboriginal people still have a

ways to go, and need to be aware of history's important lessons so they can rightfully

accept urban Aboriginal people as their neighbours and co-contributors to the community.

Chapter Three: Urban Aboriginal Citizenship

> *Our birth, lives, and deaths on this site have brought us into citizenship with the land. We participate in its renewal, have responsibility for its continuation, and grieve for its losses.*

> –John Borrows, *Recovering Canada*

Introduction

Canadian citizens and governments have long attempted to reconcile the meaning of Aboriginal citizenship. As confusing as this may be for politicians and Canadians to comprehend, Aboriginal peoples likewise are often perplexed as to what urban Aboriginal citizenship represents, and how this helps or undermines their attempts to fit into the municipal social and political landscape. Aboriginal citizenship also confounds municipal leaders who are increasingly confronted with urban Aboriginal demands for greater political representation. As noted by Walker (2006, p. 392), in this setting "the pursuit of Aboriginal citizenship [is] understood predominantly [as] the right of self-determination, [and it intersects] with social citizenship at the urban scale." Urban Aboriginal citizenship then is simultaneously understood as both social citizenship and the right to self-determination, the latter of which will demand that municipalities better respond to Aboriginal appeals for input into local policy making (co-production). In this chapter, citizenship is utilized to help us better comprehend how municipal officials, urban Aboriginal leadership, and urban Aboriginal residents in Calgary identify with their community and forge ideas of belonging. It further assists us in framing how the concepts of urban Aboriginal self-government and self-determination are likewise understood.

In this chapter I argue that prior to developing a general consensus on the meaning of self-determination, the current formulation of co-production is not the best avenue to

foster municipal-urban Aboriginal relationships. Several key questions ground this chapter's analysis. How do urban Aboriginal people frame their understanding of citizenship and thus self-determination? How do municipal officials likewise understand urban Aboriginal citizenship and do they believe the city should respond to urban Aboriginal demands for co-production of policy-development and planning? Finally, what role do urban Aboriginal organizations see themselves playing in this drive for urban Aboriginal self-determining authority?

Aboriginal Citizenship

Since the 1970s, Canada has slowly and incrementally altered its understanding of its relationship with, and the legal and constitution foundations related to Aboriginal peoples. These shifts reveal a long history of ongoing re-interpretation and reflection of the role of Aboriginal peoples in Canada's history and ongoing evolution. Countless court decisions, constitutional reforms, royal commissions, and inquiries confirm this trend. Several notable examples include:

> - the Hawthorn Report's recommendations suggesting the Canadian government
> formally acknowledge Aboriginal peoples as Citizens Plus;
> - the White Paper of 1969 seeking to legislatively eliminate 'Indian' status,
> treaties and reserves and the determined response of Aboriginal leaders;
> - the Calder case of 1973 acknowledging the existence of Aboriginal title;
> - the recognition and entrenchment of Aboriginal and treaty rights under section
> 35 of the Canadian Constitution (1982);
> - the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples of 1996 acknowledging
> Aboriginal people as self-determining political nations; and,
> - the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada in 2015 reaffirming the
> need to engage Aboriginal people in a nation-to-nation relationship.

The constant re-interpretation of who Aboriginal people are from a legal and constitutional standpoint has resulted in their slow evolution from a group targeted for

legislative termination in the 1969 White Paper to a people recognized as imbued with self-government rights in the Constitution Act, 1982 (Belanger & Newhouse, 2008). Métis and Inuit people are now officially recognized by Canadian courts as Aboriginal peoples under section 91(24) of the Constitution. More recently and importantly for our purposes, in April of 2016, the Supreme Court of Canada in *Daniels v. Canada* (2016) recognized the rights of non-status and off-reserve Aboriginal populations to be a federal responsibility thus allowing these populations to negotiate access to programs and services, as well as their rights as Indigenous people.

The same processes occur in the urban Aboriginal community as it reinvents itself. No longer considered a group of reserve emigrants, the urban Aboriginal community is now well-established and operating its own institutions and organizations since the initial urban migrations began in the 1940s (Newhouse, 2003). Their presence "is no longer simply the result of individual trajectories, it is also the result of collective and institutional initiatives" (Desbiens, Lévesque & Comat, 2016, p. 74). Friendship Centres, for example, are important institutions that assist with service delivery and improving social capital that in turn has led to the exercise of urban Aboriginal self-determination. In sum, cities are more than core gathering places, and social supports have evolved into more than agencies servicing Aboriginal populations (Newhouse, 2003; Walker & Barcham, 2010; Ouart, 2013, Desbiens et al, 2016). As previously noted, there are many urban Aboriginal individuals who now consider the city to be home (Newhouse, 2011; Peters & Andersen, 2013).

It is within this setting that ideas about citizenship develop. Citizenship according to Isin and Wood (1999) is "both a set of practices (cultural, symbolic and economic) and a bundle of rights and duties (civil, political and social) that define an individual's

membership in a polity" (p. 4). Citizenship as a concept is also about a sense of "belonging" in either a community or nation, and can be considered as both a choice and externally imposed on individuals. The authors state that it is essential to "recognize both aspects of citizenship—as practice and as status—while also recognizing that without the latter modern individuals cannot hold civil, political and social rights" (ibid).

For these reasons citizenship has been utilized in discourses about minority social justice (Wood, 2003a), and for more than two decades has been a prevalent theme in discourses about Aboriginal peoples (Kymlicka, 1995). According to Walker and Barcham (2010), "[t]he very concept of citizenship in liberal democratic countries has been critiqued for some of its incompatibilities with the aspirations of Indigenous peoples." They further state that "[t]he sanctity of individual rights—so central to the state-society (citizenship) compact—is notably Eurocentric … [i]t diminishes the importance placed by Indigenous peoples on the sustainable reproduction of relationships to community and kinship, land, culture, and spirituality" (p. 315; also Alfred, 2005). Aboriginal notions of citizenship are in sharp contrast to liberal-democratic state definitions of social citizenship, where citizenship is granted to those who demonstrate "commitment to defined values and culture" (Poelzer & Coates, 2015, p. 211). These values are shaped and determined by the hegemonic power, that is, the Canadian state.

The epigraph at the start of this chapter cited John Borrows, a prominent Anishinabek legal scholar, and confirms the prevalent belief that Indigenous notions of citizenship are 'land-centered.' That is, cities are colonial constructions situated on lands that Indigenous peoples have historically held dominion. Referring back to chapter two, the City of Calgary is located within what is the heart of traditional Blackfoot territory. Yet we find that political constructions such as 'city' and 'reserve' play an important role

in how one understands a personal sense of belonging. The land, according to Borrows (2002), should not be confined to reserve boundaries—cities in this sense also occupy traditional lands and one's sense of citizenship should embrace these dynamics. Moreover, one's sense of citizenship should not be confined to the reserve, but rather the traditional territory in its entirety. The problem is that there are numerous forces influencing what citizenship means in these settings. As an example, Belanger and Lindstrom's study of Niitsitapi homelessness found that "[t]he reserve materialize[d] as the last remaining symbol of a traditional homeland" (2016, p. 177). As Borrows notes, however, "[t]he Anishinabek world is bigger than the First Nation, reserve, or settlement. Approximately half of the Anishinabek population lives outside these boundaries … traditional lands and relationships extend beyond them" (2002, p. 141). Like Borrows, Indigenous scholars maintain that Aboriginal identities, and Aboriginal citizenship, cannot and should not be contained within these colonial borders. As stated by Leroy Little Bear, "[t]he Earth cannot be separated from the actual being of Indians. The Earth is where the continuous and/or repetitive process of creation occurs" (Little Bear, 2000, p. 78). Therefore we find that Aboriginal notions of citizenship can be multiple and fluid.

Wood (2003b) employs Bryan Turner's foundational definition of citizenship to contextualize her examination of the negotiations surrounding the Calgary ring road debate dating to the 1970s between Calgary and the Tsuu T'ina Nation. Turner defines citizenship as "that set of practices (juridical, political, economic and cultural) which define a person as a competent member of society and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups" (Turner, 1992, p. 2). This definition, she adds, indicates that "[p]ractices which exclude or degrade a group will directly impact their material well-being … hav[ing] as its own consequence a diminished capacity to

43

participate" (Wood, 2003b, p. 464). Exclusion based on cultural difference and perceived cultural inferiority is a notable aspect of Canada's historical past. The Indian Act of 1876 for one promoted separation by means of encouraging assimilation; the goal being citizenship based on a set of criteria to determine when an 'Indian' achieved a threshold of civilization. Derived from the Gradual Civilization Act of 1857, and the Gradual Enfranchisement Act of 1868, the Indian Act initiated a practice of establishing territorial limitations of Indigenous identities (Desbiens et al., 2016).

While the Indian Act sought to strip Aboriginal peoples of their identity, treaties were likewise utilized to dispossess Aboriginal people of their lands (Hildebrandt et al, 2006; Miller, 2009). Initially, treaties were compacts establishing peace relations between allies, but when Indians refused to withdraw from their lands, they were framed as physical and ideological barriers to westward expansion. Quickly negotiated treaties were no longer pacts between political contemporaries, but rather came to be recognized by Canadian officials as land agreements (i.e., tools of territorial dispossession). But the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (United Nations, 1969) defines a treaty as "an international agreement concluded between states in written form and governed by international law." Therefore, by engaging Aboriginal peoples in treaties it has been argued that the government acknowledged their sovereignty by observing this nation-to-nation relationship. According to Henderson, the "gentle invitation" of Canadian citizenship has undermined treaty federalism, and by promoting federal citizenship on "sui generis Aboriginal orders," the government is disparaging Aboriginal and treaty rights in the constitution (2002, p. 416). Aboriginal citizenship was, according to Henderson, initially conceived as a means of eliminating Aboriginal claims to self-government and self-determining authority.

44

Similarly, the 1969 White Paper sought to deny Indigenous notions of citizenship by advocating for a universalized form of citizenship in which Aboriginal people would not be considered distinct from other Canadians, once again disregarding treaty citizenship (Henderson, 2002; Alcantara and Nelles, 2016). The White Paper reflects Canada's belief in individual rights, whereby "equality demands the like treatment of individual citizens through the provision of a uniform set of rights, liberties, and entitlements" (Dick, 2011, p. 19). Furthermore, it "centres on the common identity all share within a nation-state framework, the entitlements and responsibilities this confers, and shared practices it reproduces" (Walker & Barcham, 2010, p. 315). In his desire to create "a society based on individual freedom and reduced social inequality" (Poelzer & Coates, 2015, p. 18), Prime Minister Trudeau reinforced the Indian Act belief that an 'Indian' could not be a Canadian citizen and a member of a First Nations community simultaneously. The belief in Aboriginal citizenship based on kinship and a connection to land, and an identity as a distinct people, was rejected. It also disallowed the Hawthorn Report's endorsement of Citizens Plus, which is accepting Aboriginal distinctness as "not an exit of Aboriginal peoples to independent statehood."

The Trudeau government and subsequent provincial governments refused to acknowledge the Canada-Aboriginal relationship of coexistence that includes some element of common belonging and allegiance to a single polity" in lieu of promoting assimilation and homogeneous citizenship (Cairns, 2000, p. 28). Kymlicka as well frames Indigenous peoples as "minority nations" who, while worthy of additional rights "in the name of cultural preservation… ultimately have to reconcile to the reality of Canadian sovereignty; that is, to be subsumed within the Canadian state" (Lowman-Battell & Barker, 2015, p. 5). However, scholars such as Taiaiake Alfred (2005; 2009) reject the

45

notion that Aboriginal peoples should subscribe to Canadian citizenship within the nation-state's framework even though "multiple identities are both possible and desirable, and … they can and should include one of several possible Aboriginal identities and an identity as a Canadian" (Cairns, 2000, p. 109).

To summarize, the literature has illustrated that Canada has gradually moved towards respecting and acknowledging the duality of Aboriginal citizenship. What I've shown also is that over the span of approximately 13 years, the Canadian government went from the desire to assimilate Indigenous people with the White Paper of 1969 to recognizing their distinctness and their inherent Aboriginal and treaty rights, which includes the right to self-government. However, Canadians and Aboriginal peoples are still struggling with what citizenship and self-determination means and how these two notions intersect. Aboriginal peoples' sense of territorial citizenship (kinship with creation) was challenged by the onset of Canadian settlement and colonialism. The ensuing pressures of Canadian settlement would in the end lead to the land being fragmented into enclaves of belonging, resulting in Aboriginal people second-guessing their sense of citizenship. This aids the state, which relies on historic approaches to citizenship that promotes a singular Canadian identity embracing all ethnic groups, and which cannot privilege one group over another. This has a trickle-down effect at the municipal level, where an Aboriginal person is considered a reserve resident until they assimilate and accept Canadian citizenship. Only after Aboriginal peoples move into cities and disappear into the populace are they considered citizens with equal rights. This part in part why as I argue municipal officials have such difficulty perceiving urban Aboriginal peoples as citizens and potentially self-determining: they are at once reserve members and common Canadian citizens lacking Citizen's Plus rights. Therefore, the

46

inherent duality of Aboriginal citizenship is a significant barrier to co-production. The following sections will test this conclusion.

Findings

The following sections will highlight the key findings from interviews with municipal officials, Aboriginal organizational leaders, and Aboriginal residents in the City of Calgary. As noted in the introduction 16 Aboriginal residents participated in this research. Half (eight) of the participants self-identified as being from one of the three Blackfoot nations in Canada, and the other half self-identified as coming from elsewhere (i.e., Cree from Saskatchewan, Dene from Northern Alberta, Métis, etc.). Each individual varied in age and length of residency in the city. Seven municipal officials were interviewed, which included the mayor and six city councillors, as were five individuals from local Aboriginal political and administrative organizations. Sections will then be divided according to the most prevalent themes discerned in the interviews.

Aboriginal Residents

Intergroup Differences

It is common for non-regional Aboriginal individuals to respectfully identify Calgary as Blackfoot territory and Treaty 7 lands. However, being outsiders has consequently led many urban Aboriginal residents to feel socially and politically excluded from what is perceived as regional Blackfoot politics. The feeling of non-belonging of Salteaux from Saskatchewan, for example, led many to conclude that this was in part a reason for their poor urban living experience. Aboriginal organizations that could have been utilized to aid in their transition to the city were considered inaccessible or unresponsive. As one research participant stated, "I'm constantly reminded that this is

Treaty seven area and that I'm not Blackfoot … and there are things that are designed for Blackfoot people, and if you're not Blackfoot, you sort of don't have a say."

This alienation was not exclusive to organizations and service delivery agencies for many participants did not feel that a collective sense of community existed amongst Aboriginal people in Calgary. In a political sense, one participant suggested that they would rather remain involved or allied with their home community because "I'm not from here so what difference could I make? It's already embedded in me that I don't have a voice here." Several participants felt that Calgary was relatively unique in comparison to other large urban centres they had previously lived. One participant who had lived in Toronto for several years stated that as a "Native … it doesn't matter which res[erve] you're from" but that "if we could learn how to unite all our nations it would be great." In the Calgary context, participants were also cognizant of historic regional Cree-Blackfoot animosities to a degree that one participant concluded "if you're Cree and you're walking into a Blackfoot Nation right away there's a stigma in that."

Calgary is a cosmopolitan environment where Blackfoot individuals make up under half of what is a diverse urban Aboriginal community. Interestingly, the majority of the population is Métis in terms of status. Yet Indigenous peoples considered 'outsiders' who are new to the territory are confronted with historic ideas of citizenship that are grounded by Blackfoot values. Primarily Blackfoot people run local organizations with Blackfoot names and the mayor regularly identifies Calgary as sited in the heart of Blackfoot territory. In doing so, local Aboriginal and municipal leaders are suggesting to a dynamic urban Aboriginal population that Blackfoot heritage is essential to being recognized as an authentic Aboriginal resident. This notion was most clearly highlighted by one participant who stated, "I'm actually quite proud of Mayor Nenshi [when he

states] 'this is Treaty seven area' and he can say a few Blackfoot words … But I think when you're from a different culture … I think sometimes if there's a job available and it's between me and another Blackfoot person … I probably would lose." In effect this means that when the mayor makes his proclamation and in turn declares his ongoing respect for members of the Blackfoot nation, he is inadvertently alienating a large proportion of the urban Aboriginal population while privileging what is a demographic minority that is also seeking local participatory co-production rights.

Reserve Identity

As suggested above the non-Blackfoot Aboriginal research participants indicated that they felt more connected to their home reserve communities than to Calgary or its urban Aboriginal community. Many of the Blackfoot participants likewise indicated that they also felt more socially and politically connected to their neighboring First Nation community. The reserve, to this particular respondent sample, remains an important cultural site integral to their sense of identity. The city was in turn not viewed as a culturally important centre but rather was a space of opportunity: a place to find work or to obtain an education. Most however indicated that they one day would return to the reserve. For most the city does not adequately meet their identified cultural needs, and in fact is portrayed as a colonial site that endangers cultural values and ways of life. As explained by one participant:

> Having programs like dancing and drumming and bead[ing] … is really important for our children to be exposed to and take part in because that will build that sense of pride and identity in them … I think it's very important because we need those things to understand who we are and to understand where we come from. A lot of our kids are growing up in the city and never going to their reserve and never being exposed to their culture and traditions … I want my daughter to be close to that and know her identity as a Blackfoot woman.

This individual noted that they along with many other parents continue to take their children back to the reserve to participate in cultural activities and ceremonies like the Sundance.

For many the reserve is considered home based on kinship ties (their family members still live there). As one participant stated:

> Whenever I introduce myself [I say] I'm from the reserve. That's where all my family is, that's where were from, it will always be home. Even though I'm not there, I'm always there weekend; holidays … and I know I'll move back home.

Once again the city is not considered a place of belonging, or as Borrows (2015) would suggest, an important site of creation. Rather, it is deemed a colonial space housing the skills and education Aboriginal people desire; or those they have been told they must acquire to succeed. Home in this case is where their family is (even if family members also live in the city). Any extended family still living on the reserve represents proof of extended kinship ties and an existing connection to something culturally more significant than could be achieved living in the city.

Fluidity of movement has regularly been written about for decades. It has been described as churn, or "return migration." This is a negative way of framing the regular movement of reserve people to cities, who then move back to reserves after failing to succeed. Churn does not explain fully why urban Aboriginal peoples do not consider the city to be located in traditional lands; or see the city as part of a foreign cultural territory; and why the reserve—another colonial construction—retains such a powerful cultural significance. Guimond (2003) and Norris and Clatworthy (2003) have highlighted the obscurity, or "fuzziness" of Aboriginal identity and Aboriginal "boundaries" that inform and have resulted in changes in self-identification patterns. Non-Aboriginal peoples tend to perceive this as a negative trait due to Aboriginal peoples perceived inability to

formally adapt and become permanent urban citizens, even if they have attained a sense of urban permanency. Movement from the city back to the reserve for ceremonies and family visits is nevertheless a means of reconnecting with family and strengthening kinship ties suggesting. It does suggest that kinship has become a one-way phenomenon: one travels from the city to the reserve to improve upon their cultural grounding, whereas movement from reserves to the city is a means of escaping impoverishment as individuals search out educational and economic opportunities. The question is, in this setting can Blackfoot individuals attain a sense of urban belonging, and as such municipal citizenship?

Unlike the 'outsider' urban Aboriginal individuals who consider Calgary to be part of traditional Blackfoot territory, it is interesting to note that the locals (Blackfoot individuals) don't necessarily view the city in the same way. That is, while they might identify the city as a historically important element of their traditional lands, they also tend to see it as a corrupted site of colonization that is neglectful of Blackfoot values. In this setting, a largely non-Native population is situated on a portion of Blackfoot territory which embraces political beliefs and institutions that do not reflect Blackfoot values. Like their Aboriginal 'outsider' counterparts, cities are also seen as part of the larger colonial project of expansion that allowed settlers to import foreign values into Blackfoot territory. As a result, reserves are increasingly viewed as the true home and where citizenship and culture is nested. They represent a repository of culture within a traditional territory that is becoming less recognizable. While the reserve may be viewed as the last vestige of culture and identity for Aboriginal people, it is as previously mentioned a colonial device that has come to represent a small territorial identity pocket of a larger landscape that Aboriginal people increasingly perceive diminishing claims.

Calgary residents strongly agreed with the statement "City Hall should work closely with First Nations reserves in our region to plan for future growth and development." Thus is appears that participants continue to identify themselves as reserve ex-patriates living in the city. This echoes Belanger and Lindstrom's (2016) findings in which participants believed that their home reserves willingly abandoned members who choose to emigrate. One participant concluded that their home reserve community should have done more to aid in their transition to the city: "I think that chief and council needs to be more supportive of community members moving to the city [and that] they should somehow allocate funds for people living in the city." This suggests that reserve emigrés, even those second and third generation urban Aboriginal peoples, still consider the band council responsible for their well-being and that it should improve upon what is deemed a lack of support to assist them with their urban lifestyle. In doing so, participants identified the reserve as a culture site that is integral to the development and maintenance of their identity, but also as a site of governance where the band councils they ally themselves with can continue to represent them. Implicitly then, the Blackfoot participants see themselves as band members rather than municipal citizens at this time.

Calgary residents also were more likely to disagree with the statement, "City Hall should have an advisory committee of local Aboriginal leaders and residents to consult with on municipal affairs." Therefore for Calgary residents working with the regional First Nations, including some Indigenous peoples in the discussion is deemed sufficient. The reserve is in this context considered to be the site from where urban Aboriginal citizenship begins and ends. Ultimately, there is a sense of alienation among urban Aboriginal peoples driven by the logic that the choice of urban residency unfortunately means that they are unable to live in what would be considered the more authentic

traditional site within a larger traditional territory. This emerges as an important determinant of citizenship.

Racism, Discrimination, and Stereotyping

The previous two sections indicate that urban Aboriginal people originating from outside Blackfoot territory feel alienated due to their inability to participate in local politics. Local institutions are considered non-representative of their needs, which the research participants suggested compels them to re-invent who they are if they are to access urban Aboriginal programs and services to improve their well-being. Blackfoot participants likewise suggested that by living in the city, they feel dislocated from kinship ties and their culture housed in reserve communities. The city is not considered an essential part of their traditional territory, but rather is a more akin to a corrupted site that is close enough to home to maintain tradition and kinship ties. Aboriginal peoples then are forced to reside where mainstream institutions do not adequately represent their needs, and they are forced to adjust in order to improve their well-being. This impractical situation results in all urban Aboriginal residents' sense of alienation, which is further exacerbated by the racism, discrimination, and stereotyping regularly experienced in some form.

To this point the discussion has focused on urban Aboriginal perceptions of territory and the role this is playing concerning their sense of urban belonging. Non-Aboriginal peoples also play an important social and political role in influencing this sense of belonging (see Lashta, Berdahl & Walker, 2016). As an example, many non-Aboriginal Canadians continue to see pathological behavior as inherent to Aboriginal culture. Stereotypes such as this are difficult to overcome, and even by showcasing Aboriginal culture, heritage, and identity (i.e., positive stereotypes) they have been unable

to successfully challenge embedded social beliefs in Aboriginal deficit. In fact, with the exception of the Calgary Stampede, where for one-week every year Aboriginal culture is visibly on display and embraces Aboriginal inclusiveness pathology remains dominant. City events promoting Aboriginal identity were nevertheless cited by both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal participants as central to educating and promoting social awareness and understanding.

Aboriginal participants highlighted numerous stereotypes that are used to both distinguish and keep them at arm's length from the non-Aboriginal population. The majority of these individuals concluded that this is indicative of an internalization of colonial beliefs in Aboriginal deficit. This leads individuals to consider themselves to be less educated and not as readily employable. For many, regularly visiting the reserve is a means of combating these feelings of alienation where upon returning their newly acquired education or employment skills cast them as elite individuals. Yet these individuals indicated that they have to confront attitudes amongst reserve residents that suggest they have willingly abandoned the community for the city. One reserve participant stated, "the main thing is that we are [considered] uneducated … we're unprofessional, we don't know how to think in a broad sense, of course there's the alcoholism and drugs that we do. [They] just think we're ignorant, and that we're all from the reserve, and we don't know things." Another participant noted that it was difficult to find employment in the city: "Because they know I'm … Native … they think that I won't show up for work." Some of these stereotypes have a direct impact on participants' daily lives, for as another participant stated, "going to a jewelry store … [means] getting followed around in a store because you're Aboriginal. It's interesting, you get stereotyped … non-stop."

Most participants cited NIMBYism (not-in-my-backyard) as a major issue. In most cases individuals interviewed considered NIMBY a normative aspect of living in Calgary. NIMBY is a social phenomenon that can be described as a mentality that "nonmarket housing residents [have a] negative social character [and whose] presence will lead to … disruption of community harmony and safety" (Fiske, Belanger & Gregory, 2010, p. 71). Furthermore, this variety of racism that is masked as a form of community development or community building is so widespread that it was cited as a deterrent for many Aboriginal people who may consider moving into a nearby city to pursue their education or seek employment. It should be noted that non-Aboriginal beliefs about the pathological Indian is eventually internalized by Aboriginal peoples themselves. As one participant stated, "Sometimes I want to get drunk and then it feels like oh you're just a drunk Indian." This demonstrates the impact these various forms of alienation and social attitudes have and how they can lead to negative feelings manifesting to a point that self-destructive behaviors emerge.

What the interview data suggest is that among the sample of urban Aboriginal people I spoke with, Calgary is considered a corrupted site that is neither traditional land nor a place where one feels welcome. The city is merely a place where the necessary jobs and education lie. In contemporary Calgary society (generalizable to the Canadian context), avoiding obtaining an education or securing employment can be personally debilitating. Pursuing these outcomes however does not lead to belonging or a sense of urban Aboriginal citizenship from developing. The identified sense of alienation is prominent as are mainstream beliefs in the deficit associated with mobility, which is associated with the Aboriginal inability to adapt. What occurs is that living in the city does not resonate Blackfoot values, it does not assist non-Blackfoot urban Aboriginal

peoples secure a sense of belonging or participation with either the Treaty 7 populations or non-Aboriginal residents, all of which intensifies a hostile environment characterized by experiences of racism and discrimination. As Borrows (2016) would conclude, urban Aboriginal peoples are "damned if [they] move, and damned if [they] don't" (p. 29). All of these factors have a negative effect on citizenship, which in turn has a debilitating impact on self-determining capacity of urban Aboriginal communities.

Municipal Officials

Citizen Equality

It has now been established that urban Aboriginal peoples in Calgary experience notable alienation. Interestingly, City Council members emphasizing the importance of maintaining an image of inclusiveness are unaware of this. Yet they strongly believe in and support building inclusive cities and neighbourhoods, where every citizen "has the ability to live a great life." But they are reluctant to privilege Aboriginal people in fear of overshadowing the responsibility they have towards all of their citizens, a fear clearly articulated by one councillor:

> We build partnerships with absolutely everybody. So it's not only feasible, it's a requirement, and it's a must! Should this one be up and above all of the others? The reason I state it in that manner [is] because when we look at the homeless foundation, we look at whether it's the gay community, or whether we look at any community, that partnership has to be exceptional. And if you don't build those partnerships then you're defeating the purpose and if you eliminate one sector of society then you're defeating the purpose as well so the inclusiveness has to be there across the board.

Here the inclusiveness desired by city officials does not necessarily mean devising programs to help elevate Aboriginal people located lower on the socio-economic scale, and as such have a lesser quality of life. To do so would be treating an ethnic group of citizens differently from non-Aboriginal citizens not privy to the same privileges—all

56

citizens should be treated equally and be endowed with the same rights. Aboriginal

people however are deprived by Indian Act sanctions that continue to undermine their

collective ability to improve their standard of living. Yet from the point of view of the

councillors interviewed prioritizing Aboriginal needs violates the city's image of

"inclusiveness," while bordering on practicing race-based rights. A similar finding was

articulated in Belanger and Dekruyf's (2017) previous study in Lethbridge, Alberta where

any mention of race-based rights or privileges generated a considerably negative

response. This was further emphasized by councillor in that study who responded with

"should the city be getting involved in housing for Aboriginal members? No. Because we

get involved in housing for those who need housing [and] if they're a part of that that's

perfectly fine."

On the surface, it appears as though the city councillors consider Aboriginal

people to be citizens in one sense, but digging a little deeper they are still considered

outsiders, or at best temporary residents. This is an interesting paradox identified by other

research (e.g., Belanger and Dekruyf, 2017): you cannot be a municipal citizen because

you are considered a reserve member, and that is where your political affiliations lie. That

Aboriginal people are frequently denied the same multiple forms of citizenship other

Canadians take for granted (i.e., provincial citizen, federal citizen) is therefore not

unusual, and is evident in city councillor responses. When they are not defined as

residents, urban Aboriginal people are likewise not recognized as possessing distinctive

rights of self-determination in a municipal context.

Reserve Identity

Citizenship and individual equality are considered analogous concepts, and

municipal beliefs about citizenship intensify when confronted by urban Aboriginal

individuals seeking to have their citizenship, and its associated rights acknowledged. The most common city councillor response to these requests was that authentic Aboriginal identities and rights of self-determination are nested within reserve communities. What the respondents were indicating was that the right of self-government is confined to the residents of a reserve, and that this unique status did not leave the reserve (was not portable). So, while Aboriginal self-government may exist, it cannot exist in the city, for it is linked with an Aboriginal identity that remains confined to reserves. City councillors therefore were somewhat conflicted when asked to consider urban Aboriginal self-government from individuals whom they acknowledge to be reserve members and not municipal citizens. From this perspective, Aboriginal peoples may have existing rights of self-determination, but not in the city. Additionally, their citizenship is with a reserve that does not extend to the city. Therefore, they ultimately cannot become municipal citizens fore they are reserve citizens. In this setting city councillors do not easily accept the existence of municipal urban Aboriginal citizenship. Yet they proclaim Calgary sits on traditional Blackfoot land—which should ostensibly remain a site of identity and self-determination, at least according to this logic. Thus it appears that the duality of urban Aboriginal identities as both citizens and self-governing entities can never meet in the city.

An important theme becomes evident: separation of interests. This is however not surprising when we reflect on the purpose of the Indian Act, which was to define who Indians were in law with the goal of integrating them upon becoming civilized. The reserves likewise were established to physically separate Indians to prepare them for this eventual assimilation (while ironically removing them from the bad influence of the white communities they were supposed to assimilate into). The legal and physical separation led

to a form of policy separation that continues to envision "Indians, and lands reserved for the Indians" as unique political communities. These ideas were evident in interviews with city officials who stated that their political energy ought to be directed at improving relationships with First Nations. More to the point, contrary to the court's thinking in Misquadis, which identified the urban Aboriginal community as imbued with the same self-governing rights as a reserve, one participant stated:

> The reserve has so much potential. And I really believe that is the leadership. You're sitting on such a good asset and potential. It can be so much more. It was great when I saw the casino there. I said I should have done that a long time ago. You have the asset. Why can't you build a business park in there? You have the ability to build a business park. Work with the city. Don't be seen as a guest. Work together.

A couple of key ideas are evident in this statement. First, it indicates that 150 year old ideas about Indians in need of separation prior to assimilating, continues to resonate with present-day politicians. Second, this leads us to question whether it is reasonable to promote Calgary as part of traditional Blackfoot territory as city councillors attest. This statement indicates that municipal officials, by acknowledging the reserve as the legitimate political community, are therefore not recognizing the city as a site of Aboriginal political and economic authority. Moreover, if urban Aboriginal self-government is not possible in a region that local officials identify as traditional Indigenous lands, where Aboriginal citizenship is reluctantly acknowledged, and authentic Indigenous identities remain nested in reserves, are such proclamations tokenistic? Not only were Aboriginal peoples portrayed in the interview responses as inherently rural, reserve dwellers, one must ask how long an Aboriginal person has to reside in the city before he/she is no longer considered an outsider. Ultimately, municipal officials are overlooking the importance of building partnerships with urban Aboriginal

peoples at a time when urban Aboriginal communities are seeking greater input in local planning and policy-making processes.

City councillors are uncertain of urban Aboriginal people's status. But as one participant stated, "we continue to work on areas of common interest with the Treaty 7 nations around us but the other thing we have to remember is that dealing with the nations doesn't always address the urban Aboriginal population because they may not have any relationship with those nations. And I think that's an area that we're still doing a lot of work on." Thus the city is fairly restricted in that it works with Treaty 7 nations such as Siksika-exclusive service organizations, or the Tsuu T'ina Nation. Councillors suggest that this is due to Blackfoot or Treaty 7 nation-run organizations being more active and engaged with the city, and is thus attributable to a lack of visibility. This further amplifies the alienation 'outsider' Aboriginal residents feel. It also deflects the responsibility away from the city councillors—the onus for improving engagement and demonstrating an ability to communicate now falls to the urban Aboriginal community.

As was highlighted above, the urban Aboriginal population—whether from homes outside Blackfoot territory or those from Treaty 7 nations—do not consider that they are part of a political community within Calgary. The City of Calgary officials we spoke with also do not consider the urban Aboriginal population as possessing the necessary attributes of a political community. Urban Aboriginal people are a collectivity of individuals who remain politically attached to reserves where true self-government and potential for self-determination resides. Hence, there is no real belief in the need for or the realization of urban aboriginal self-government or self-determination. This leads us to conclude that co-production as it is currently formulated—as a conduit for relationship building—cannot be effective in this environment.

60

Aboriginal Organizational Leadership

The third group interviewed was representatives of Aboriginal organizations, who are often caught in the middle trying to reconcile the perspectives of city officials and Aboriginal residents while also attempting to create a distinctly urban Aboriginal self-governing presence. Among this group there were many similar findings to Aboriginal residents interviewed. However, because the individuals within this particular category work within multiple organizations (several in a service delivery capacity), the respondents had less difficulty navigating the political system, discovered a greater sense of community, and notably experienced less racism. Due to steady employment their standard of living was higher. While these Aboriginal professionals may retain ties to their home communities, they all identified Calgary as home and as municipal citizens, because they were contributing to the betterment of the community. These observations are important among a group I will identify as Aboriginal professionals. At the same time these individuals tend to be among the least critical about the lack of urban Aboriginal political representation while less frequently identifying experiences of discrimination and racism (both personally experienced and witnessed). Despite some of these concerns the Aboriginal professionals identify the city as welcoming. While it would appear that socioeconomic standing plays a role, so too does the active role that urban Aboriginal professionals adopt in community development as compared with urban Aboriginal residents who are simply trying to survive the city.

The Importance of a Governance Hub

There was an expressed need for a status-blind community hub to promote urban Aboriginal identities, where all urban Aboriginal people can go to find a sense of community, engage in cultural activities, and find resources for housing, employment,

and health. Once these essential services and needs are met then individuals will have the stability needed to pursue citizenship. Most professionals stated however that their organizations are targeted—they tend to focus on those with specific social needs such as housing, poverty, or addictions, while largely catering to Blackfoot needs by hosting specific cultural activities and offering spiritual guidance with Blackfoot elders. This tends to amplify the separation and alienation 'outsider' Aboriginal people experience, further challenging their sense of citizenship. Several participants stated that while some outside Aboriginal individuals consent to see a Blackfoot elder, or engage in Blackfoot ceremonies or activities, others are refusing to pursue these opportunities because they cannot relate to Blackfoot culture. These issues are not limited to organizations, for the main committee (CAUAC) that advises the city "tends to reflect a very Blackfoot perspective." This reinforces the perceived alienation, which at this point we can conclude is seemingly built into our collective notion of Aboriginal citizenship.

It is important to recall that Calgary is a cosmopolitan community with a variety of Aboriginal identities represented. Referring back to some of the important statistics on languages spoken in the city of Calgary, Cree is a more commonly spoken language in Calgary than Blackfoot: 560 speakers to 370 speakers respectively as indicated by Calgary's 2006 CMA. Also, the majority of the population is Métis. Nevertheless, non-regional Aboriginal peoples have a difficult time finding a place where their cultural and social needs can be met, and this is highlighted by one participant:

> Nobody has been able to tap into bringing all those storied places together and part of it is because culture, right? The Stoney's don't necessarily get on with the Blackfoot and the Blackfoot don't necessarily get on with the Stoney's. And Tsuu T'ina don't get along with anybody type of thing. It makes for very segregated places whereas in Edmonton you have those centralized places that people get together, or in Vancouver, or Toronto or wherever. Here it's a little bit more difficult.

62

This illustrates why participants believe that a cohesive, status-blind organization is needed. Alienation and separation is shaped by local Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal attitudes as one participant stated: "when I talk with somebody who's Blackfoot … Tsuu T'ina ... they make it very clear that, 'Look, you're not from here.' So you learn pretty quickly that 'okay, I'm not from here.' But what happens is that now you have an Aboriginal strata." This echoes what the Aboriginal informants conveyed earlier: that non-regional Aboriginal peoples in the city who don't have a voice experience social and political exclusion.

Yet Calgary, they say, has "a lot of different hubs." Hence it would appear that there are various agencies and service available to help provide the stability needed to enhance one's sense of citizenship. For some time the primary hub was the Calgary Urban Aboriginal Initiative (CUAI), which has since shut down its operations (in December 2015) due to a lack of funding. CUAI, as one participant stated, created "a home for ongoing discussion and coordinated action." CUAI provided "space and time for all those organizations that do direct client service delivery are doing the hands-on work to come together at one collective table to have those discussions that you may need to talk about what's still missing, to talk about what's working great, to share resources, to talk about, you know how do we partner on hosting such-and-such event." Since CUAI has since shut down, most participants agreed that Aboriginal Friendship Centres have become integral to this type of work. The professionals consider the local Friendship Centre as a type of hub that should have a higher political profile in Calgary. As one participant stated:

Everybody looks towards Aboriginal Friendship Centres for that kind of activity. And I think the Calgary Aboriginal Friendship Centre has had its ups and downs. I don't know what their focus is on currently but I think people always see Aboriginal Friendship Centres as the hub of activity no matter what city you go to. You'd always want to hook up with an Aboriginal Friendship Centre because you meet other Aboriginal people there. You look for resources, whatever. I think locally we're kind of struggling in terms of a hub of Aboriginal people.

Friendship Centres for the last six decades have assisted with Aboriginal urbanization, and in that time have become vital service-delivery agents and urban social networking hubs. Friendship Centres are essential for the development of social capital, which would suggest that an inactive or ineffective Friendship Centre could negatively impact citizenship developing—that is an ineffective Friendship Center would deny urban Aboriginal people a coherent self-governing entity representing their needs.

According to Alcantara and Nelles (2016), a key underlying issue is one of community capital, which can be loosely interpreted as an "in this together" type of mentality that "blurs … jurisdictional boundaries to unite these groups of residents of a unique and shared—if politically fragmented—territorial space" (p. 45). While they use this term to describe shared civic identity between Aboriginal communities and local governments, it can also be used to describe relationships between various Indigenous groups. In this instance, it would appear that the politically fragmented urban Aboriginal community is lacking community capital, and that this has had a negative impact on local perceptions (Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) of citizenship and the community's capacity to form a unified political front. Alcantara and Nelles (2016) affirmed, "the presence of strong community capital creates the necessary space for all other factors to line up to produce cooperation" (p. 141). This also reflects back to the literature on Friendship Centres and how they are key facilitators of co-production (Ouart, 2013).

As one participant summarized, there is "the dynamic of people from Siksika not really trusting people from Tsuu T'ina, and the Tsuu T'ina not trusting people from Piikani or elsewhere. So you have a number of dynamics happening and compound that with an environment of suspicion makes it for people who want to cooperate and coordinate very difficult." What is also apparent is that the federal government needs to play a more central role in municipal urban Aboriginal development by continuing to fund urban Aboriginal organizations. The lack of funding has negatively impacted urban Aboriginal organizations, and this has compromised community unity/capital. Once again, the centrality of self-government and self-determination to co-production suggests that the latter will be difficult to pursue prior to local urban Aboriginal stability occurring. More importantly, prior to city councilors witnessing stability occurring they will likely continue to portray the urban Aboriginal population as non-citizens as poorly organized and as such not ready for multi-level government arrangements such as co-production.

The Funding Problem

A cohesive, centralized hub was offered as a means of helping to foster urban Aboriginal self-government and improve local ideas related to citizenship. Yet it does not appear that federal funding will be forthcoming. As one participant highlighted, "the continued Conservative government federally and Conservative government provincially has led Aboriginal agencies and organizations to modify and adjust their strategies and their funding to get money and to exist. And what that's created is a very siloed community, a very isolated community." This isolation was particularly evident after CUAI closed its doors. In response, one participant stated, government funding regimes are simply "not practical." Things have shifted politically since this research was conducted. There is now a Liberal federal government (October 2015) and an NDP

provincial government (May 2015). But the fact remains that Aboriginal agencies continue to have to modify their strategies depending on which government is in power, and this compromises the development of self-government and the programming that could provide the stability needed for individuals to become a more active part of the Calgary community thus enhancing their citizenship claims.

Walker (2008) has argued that in such cases municipalities can and should work with urban Aboriginal communities. The resulting improvement to urban Aboriginal social and political outcomes would benefit all involved. The city councillors interviewed would unfortunately consider this to be a form of privileging the urban Aboriginal. The professionals we interviewed were more interested in preserving their autonomy and funding arrangements and did not pressure municipal officials in this regard. What is evident is the alienation that is created by federal and provincial funding, and its ultimate impact on co-production's potential. When you factor in the competitive funding model to all of the above cited concerns, working together cohesively becomes very difficult in an urban context.

Conclusion

In this chapter I explored Walker and Barcham's (2010) contention that Aboriginal citizenship and self-determination are associated concepts. Until it is fully understood how "the inherent right of Indigenous self-determination factors into the common citizenship of a nation-state," co-production seems unlikely. I used the interview responses from three groups of individuals in order to determine how urban Aboriginal people are seen by non-Aboriginal peoples, specifically their citizenship, and also how Aboriginal peoples themselves interpret their own sense of belonging.

There are several important trends that become evident with these findings from the interviews with Calgary's municipal officials, Aboriginal residents, and Aboriginal organizational leaders, and at this point it is important to highlight some of the key similarities and differences amongst three groups in regards to citizenship and self-determination. One is that neither the city nor Aboriginal residents see Aboriginal citizenship as existing in the city, for urban Aboriginal peoples' allegiance, citizenship, and membership are nested with First Nations communities. Aboriginal residents have internalized these beliefs of separation, and it is clear that municipal officials embrace the idea that reserves are the authentic sites of Aboriginal self-government and self-determination. Similarly, Aboriginal people see reserves as the last vestiges of their culture and traditions. They continue to ally themselves with band governments they see as responsible for ensuring that they have the right tools to lead a good life in the city, but ultimately this separation subtly reinforces the colonial notion that cities are places for the civilized, and the reserve for the uncivilized. And until Aboriginal residents are deemed civilized enough by municipal officials (i.e., having a steady job, getting an education), they will not be considered municipal citizens. Thus emerges a belief in Aboriginal organizations as a form of self-administering bodies assisting with urban Aboriginal assimilation, by helping urban Aboriginal people better adapt to their urban environment and keep up with non-Aboriginal citizens.

The reserve then is described as an important cultural site that Aboriginal city-dwellers can visit to re-familiarize themselves with their traditions. Conversely the city is a corrupted site that Aboriginal people utilize to escape an impoverished lifestyle either through education or employment. Therefore, there is a belief in the foreign nature of the city for all three groups: city leaders see Aboriginal citizenship and identity nested in

reserve communities, and urban Aboriginal residents see the city as a service centre rather than a home, deviating from what was found in the Environics (2010) study. Although Aboriginal leaders recognize residents' views, they insist that the urban environment can be considered home for Indigenous people. Consequently, they are less concerned as their focus remains on the survival of their organizations which are needed to foster a sense of community. Of the three categories, only the organizations consider the city a unique environment open to all, albeit in grave need of an improved interface to ensure Aboriginal voices are included in municipal decision-making. CAUAC as the main advisory body to council represents the leadership, and is perhaps the most important conduit for realizing self-determination in Calgary. Community capital in Calgary is lacking, and the reasons were best summarized by one participant:

> It's … a cascading effect of death by a thousand cuts … It can't be addressed by one thing. In a way it's a culmination of funding. It's a culmination of bringing people together. It's a culmination of creating siloes. It's a culmination of distrust and discontent. And you combine all those things together and you get what you have here in Calgary which is very little.

Therefore, it is not specifically an issue of territory and kinship, which were the primary themes to emerge from the interviews with residents and municipal officials. It also comes down to state support to help urban Aboriginal communities rebuild and ultimately flourish. Yet Aboriginal organizations that see it as their role to drive urban Aboriginal self-determination are concerned insofar as the city might not feel compelled to respond to their concerns and engage the organizations or the urban Aboriginal community.

While the city acknowledges that urban Aboriginal peoples have been impacted by residential schools, racism, discrimination, dispossession, lack of education and employment opportunities, they still are not fully acknowledged as municipal citizens.

However, the findings also demonstrate that there is a strong sense of Blackfoot citizenship developing in the City of Calgary which is informed by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous perspectives. City leaders strongly emphasized Calgary's situation on Blackfoot traditional territory, and while this may alienate a large proportion of Indigenous people who reside in Calgary, it shows a positive development in that a new understanding of what urban Aboriginal municipal citizenship means is slowly evolving. Nevertheless, these findings show that city leaders consider Indigenous people to be under the jurisdiction and responsibility of band councils. The reason why municipal officials consider them to be band members and not municipal residents with the associated rights is because urban Aboriginal people are imbued with Aboriginal and treaty rights unavailable to mainstream Canadians. Once again it seems that urban Aboriginal people cannot be Citizen's Plus—that is, Canadian citizens imbued with treaty and Aboriginal rights. And your choice of residency reflects this decision. This lack of recognition of municipal citizenship also stems from the fact that for the city to provide them with additional rights would be seen as supplementing benefits that mainstream Canadians do not have, thus would be considered special treatment or race-based rights. Therefore, proclamations that Calgary is traditionally Blackfoot homeland appear to contradict the city's actions.

Or do they? While this chapter showed that Aboriginal people are considered non-citizens in their homeland, in 2014 the Mayor issued a proclamation titled *The Year of Reconciliation* in Calgary where there appears to be a moment where the city recognized the urban Aboriginal community as (perhaps) self-determining nations. While not explicitly recognizing citizenship, this is an important moment that in the end compelled the city to invite Aboriginal peoples to the negotiation table to discuss the development of

the Paskapoo Slopes. In the next chapter I question whether such proclamations are tokenistic by examining whether this brief moment of co-production is indeed a moment of relationship building. Is this a substantive event suggesting further moments of co-production? Or is it a onetime occurrence? If urban Aboriginal self-government is not a reality in Calgary, as authentic Indigenous identities are contained to reserves, and Aboriginal citizenship is not fully acknowledged in a city local officials identify as occupying traditional Indigenous lands, then this proclamation as a form of political recognition needs to be tested.

Chapter Four: The Politics of Recognition

> *The dispossession that originally displaced Indigenous peoples from their traditional territories either onto reserves or disproportionately into the inner cities of Canada's major urban centers is now serving to displace Indigenous populations from the urban spaces they have increasingly come to call home.*
>
> –Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin White Masks*

Introduction

The previous chapter's analysis of citizenship demonstrated a lack of recognition of a self-determining urban Aboriginal community that resulted from a failure to acknowledge urban Aboriginal citizenship. Both outcomes challenge the substance of court decisions and the UNDRIP, which contend that urban Aboriginal communities possess a right of self-government and concurrent rights of citizenship. In all, 'outsider' Aboriginal people, Aboriginal people living in their homeland, municipal officials, and the leaders of Aboriginal organizations have been unable to reconcile their visions of what Aboriginal citizenship means within Calgary. In response, these individuals default to dominant ideas of citizenship, and this means that Aboriginal peoples are expected to become members of the larger political community. As Kymlicka (1995) has identified, there is a need to recognize what he describes as the inherent diversity of modern liberal democracies, and that every citizen must conform to certain ideas and codes of citizenship if they are to contribute to the larger community, thus earning equal treatment. But as the previous chapter also noted, alternative ideas of citizenship exist that are influenced by Blackfoot values that pressure both Blackfoot and non-Blackfoot individuals, which can lead to a sense of alienation developing. This lack of clarity influences an Aboriginal sense of belonging, sense of identity, and ultimately how social, economic and political needs are both represented and met.

The previous chapter emphasized citizenship and self-determination's geographic element (Andersen & Denis, 2003), while also suggesting the fact that land continues to play an essential role from all perspectives involved. The city demands land to expand and maintain its economic growth, a process that has alienated Aboriginal people living in a city that was and according to First Nations and municipal leaders remains a central part of their traditional homeland. Somewhere in the middle, Aboriginal organizations envision the city as a home to Aboriginal peoples. In this setting, partnerships—both existing and potential—develop on Niitsitapi land; a site that is also claimed by Calgary officials. As Calgary's municipal boundaries continue to expand, land will likely become more of a central concern, perpetuating historical trends. Dating to the 1970s, for instance, Calgary officials seeking completion of the ring road in the city's southwest corner sought access to Tsuu T'ina lands (Wood, 2003b). Four decades of intermittent and at times contentious negotiations resulted before the province intervened to demand a final resolution. Whereas the Tsuu T'ina leadership argued that they had sovereign control over their lands, and as such were not compelled to negotiate let alone give up their land, municipal officials responded that reserves lacked political and economic authority over their territory.

Despite what could be considered a win for the Tsuu T'ina, urban Aboriginal people seeking to enhance their political standing find themselves in a difficult position. Where First Nations leaders are considered self-governing, and in possession of their internal resources (and with the duty to consult decisions *perhaps* resources located on traditional lands not confined to reserves), urban Aboriginal people are not considered self-governing; nor do they have access to many urban resources. As reserve ex-patriots or temporary residents who have yet to attain economic and social stability, city officials

72

and its residents frame them as not yet deserving of full and equal political participation. Despite these conclusions, during the study period an interesting event occurred that suggests the potential for an attitudinal shift. As discussed in greater detail below, a moment of co-production occurred after urban Aboriginal leaders identified developer-owned land west of the Calgary Olympic Park as an important cultural site. They asked the city to freeze development after which Calgary Aboriginal Urban Affairs Committee (CAUAC) members were invited to provide city officials input on land-use planning for the proposed Paskapoo Slopes. Several reasons have been offered to help explain why the City of Calgary ultimately decided to negotiate with the urban Aboriginal community, which are the focus of this chapter. The central catalyst was, however, Mayor Naheed Nenshi's approach to inclusivity and social justice, specifically his proclamation identifying 2014-2015 as *The Year of Reconciliation*. This chapter will explore several important questions, which include: Why did the city recognize these specific claims at this time? Did this recognition of urban Aboriginal claims undermine or advance Aboriginal title, self-determination, and sovereignty?

Case Study Context: Paskapoo Slopes

Trinity Development Group Inc. (est. 1992) is a large commercial real-estate business that specializes in three domains of real estate development: urban mixed-use centres, community centres, and large format centres. In 2012, they purchased 260 acres of the East Lands from WinSport—a not-for-profit organization that owns and operates Canada Olympic Park (COP)—after Calgary City Council voted down WinSport's development plan and subsequent refusal to purchase (WinSport Canada, 2012). Trinity announced plans to build an urban ski village informally referred to as Calgary's Whistler on 100 acres of land, a plan similar to WinSport's initial proposal thus leading us to

question why, after City Council voted against that proposal, they changed their mind. After WinSport had already invested close to $3 million in research and studies on the development area why did City Council now agree to allow Trinity to Develop at this moment in time?

With their development on 100 acres of land, Trinity in turn agreed to donate 160 acres of the land to the City of Calgary to establish a protected regional park. Trinity's construction goal was to offer a "blend of retail shops, office space and homes [on] the foot of the Paskapoo Slopes" (Markusoff, 2014). From the beginning, the developers faced plenty of local opposition, which included urban Aboriginal community members. As one research participant noted, "one of our biggest projects right now is land-use planning on Paskapoo Slopes, and … that has become a huge partnership between our First Nations community, between our staff here at the city, and with the developers." Blackfoot elders for one opposed the development on the basis that the land was "a major buffalo pound, a buffalo kill site" that they wanted to see protected.

In response city planners invited the elders to become involved, as well as CAUAC members. This led to a new proposal being approved by the Calgary Planning Commission in July 2015 that restricted development to one-third of the area with the remaining two-thirds designated for a new regional park (CBC News, 2015). Notably Mayor Naheed Nenshi and two other councillors voted against the application, even though all agreed that "The Paskapoo Slopes are a very special area and we should do everything to protect them. I don't think this plan does enough to do that." The Mayor, speaking to the press, articulated his reasoning for voting against the proposal was because he felt that the project application needed to be "sent back to the drawing board" after 16 amendments had already been made to protect the environment. After hearing

responses from fellow council members he stated, "I realize many of them felt this was as good as it could get … I happen to disagree, but I understand why they feel that way" (ibid). Several Calgary citizens, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, voiced their opinions at the hearing stating that they didn't "want to see any development on the Paskapoo Slopes site [due to] the cultural and archaeological significance of the greenspace" (ibid).

Following the new proposal, collaboration continued as City officials and Blackfoot elders met to discuss the new community's potential names. The proposed Blackfoot name (Aiss ka pooma) was deemed too difficult for non-Aboriginal Calgarian's to pronounce. The next choice was Medicine Hill, which everyone agreed upon but only after a tense council vote (Fletcher, 2016). One councillor in particular noted the need to balance "practicality" with respect for the Blackfoot people, and s/he voted for the commission's recommendation that Blackfoot words be used to name four streets. Another outwardly rejected this stating that "[t]his is going beyond politically-correct [and] it's totally against the policy that names be easily pronounced" (Kaufmann, 2016).

Eventually the city decided to go along with Trinity's development plan this time around as the city's concerns were "addressed in a more robust manner" despite the fact that the issues were slightly different for some area representatives. In 2012 after the project initially failed concerns were mainly focused on "environmental impact on the slopes, and traffic problems" which would cause significant congestion on highway one and Sarcee Trail. According to another councillor, the development "has to be world class because it's a gateway to the city for tourists." So Trinity altered its development plans to reflect a more "pedestrian-friendly, more mixed-use, and with elements such as a movie theatre and main retail street to lure visitors." According to this article, these changes in

75

the development were necessary to reflect Calgary's "walk-to-work, walk-to-shopping ideals" that city councillors and planners envision for the city. While it is assumed that the urban Aboriginal community had some say in the rezoning approval by city council, this article does not mention how their concerns influenced city council's decision. Ultimately this tense council decision seems to run contrary to this chapter's message that the city is willing to accommodate co-production. The next section will elaborate on why co-production might have occurred at this moment.

The Catalyst for Co-production: The Calgary Proclamation of Reconciliation

As is evident in the preceding narrative, City of Calgary officials were reluctant to engage urban Aboriginal leaders. With this in mind, the main question I am interested in pursuing in this chapter is: why did the mayor and city council suddenly recognize the urban Aboriginal community's grievance, especially when, as the previous chapter shows, Aboriginal peoples are considered neither citizens nor self-determining bodies; and whose political leadership is located outside the city in reserve communities?

The Mayor's proclamation is a good starting point to help set some of these issues in context. The proclamation was published as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) hearings were coming to an end. The TRC (est. 2008) was implemented to study the impacts of the residential schools, and in doing so travelled to many cities in Canada, maintaining a high media profile while releasing its findings intermittently. Closely following its progress, Mayor Nenshi attended its final meeting after which the City of Calgary developed and issued its proclamation (see APPENDIX A). While the proclamation is a positive development, it is confounding as it challenges chapter three's findings. That is, while the proclamation seeks an improved urban Aboriginal-municipal relationship, it also challenges the prevailing belief that urban Aboriginal people are not

residents, and that by engaging the urban Aboriginal community, city councillors may be promoting race-based rights and privileging one ethnic group over another. That said, what message was conveyed by Mayor Nenshi and the City of Calgary's proclamation?

The proclamation begins by recounting the Story of Moh'kinsstis, which states "before there was a place we call Calgary, the First Peoples were stewards of this land. At the confluence of the two rivers, the lifeblood of our city, our cultures converged and our story began." It appears that city officials' accept that cultural convergence has occurred and the coexistence of two distinct communities—urban Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal. It also implies the permanency of both of these communities. While this passage does not outwardly acknowledge Aboriginal citizenship, it could be argued that it does recognize Aboriginal nationhood. For example, the first article acknowledges that two nations are living side-by-side, which reflects Henderson's (1994) contention that Treaty 7's key signatories continue to share the land as equal political partners. Article two then identifies the unique nature of Aboriginal culture that the first European settlers refused to honour. Instead, they actively sought to isolate this culture from the children through enforced residential school attendance and other policies. City leaders accept that their predecessors' actions hurt the region's Aboriginal peoples, as did the residential schools. But they recognize that the process of assimilation is not an exclusively historic issue, and that non-Aboriginal peoples have engaged in additional methods that continue to harm Aboriginal cultural continuity. One example is the creation of reserves, which were the landing site for entire communities displaced from their larger territories, which occurred to make way for settlements that would become towns and cities, such as Calgary.

The proclamation then recognizes that this history and the ongoing influence of contemporary policies negatively affects Aboriginal people in Calgary, which in turn

means that the City of Calgary is experiencing comparable negative impacts. The proclamation in turn helps clarify this issue by conceding that "Canada has been denied the benefit of the contribution of First Nations to our collective history" and that "our story cannot be complete without listening to this voice." Reconciliation is presented as an opportunity for us to advance with a greater understanding of the historical impacts that have shaped the experiences of Aboriginal people to date." The fifth paragraph expands on this by suggesting that:

> … the City of Calgary will use the lessons of reconciliation to continue the work we have started through the Listening Circles of the Calgary Urban Aboriginal Initiatives, the Calgary Aboriginal Urban Affairs Committee, the imagineCalgary Plan, and the Calgary Poverty Reduction Initiative to ensure that our Aboriginal population has a meaningful role within our community, as full and equal *participants* in our city's quality of life. (emphasis mine)

While the chosen language of 'participants' was never discussed during the interviews, and it does not appear in the city's public relations materials, it is interesting to note that urban Aboriginal peoples were not framed as partners.

City officials clearly acknowledge the ongoing impact of Indian policies on urban Aboriginal-municipal coexistence and how this has resulted in ongoing tensions and frustration. Implicitly, the proclamation admits that failing to recognize Aboriginal land title is influential, and this may help to explain why this particular city council expressed a willingness to discuss the Paskapoo Slopes concerns. The elders' actions were well-timed in this instance. With ideas such as reconciliation and the TRC's findings gaining popular acclaim, and with the proclamation in the works, the city was compelled to respond in an effort to avoid perpetuating the past wrongs they acknowledge occurred. Furthermore, these ideas helped to guide how the relationship between the mayor and the elders would evolve. For example, the proclamation legitimized the urban Aboriginal

community's grievance while forcing the mayor and council to reflect on past policies and local actions, and to determine better responses to mitigate the effects. As noted by the proclamation, "it is essential that Calgarians of every culture and tradition walk on a shared path paved with opportunity, recognizing that we are connected to each other and to this place, where our collective spirit generates enough for all." Thus, the proclamation is extremely important because it informs city officials on the need to reflect on the source of the grievance, and to recognize that colonialism is not a historic outcome, but rather it is a contemporary reality perpetuated through policy. It is not a way of righting "the wrongs of the past, but is the start of our journey, together."

Discussion

Reflecting on chapter three's findings, co-production of planning in relation to the Paskapoo Slopes was a difficult proposition for Calgary officials. Arguably, *The Year of Reconciliation* proclamation provided a framework which helped to guide interactions, even if it did little to clarify urban Aboriginal peoples' standing (i.e., are they citizens; are they self-determining?). Perhaps more importantly, the negotiations represented a moment of political recognition which briefly elevated the urban Aboriginal community to the status of political equals. The city's actions hint at the urban Aboriginal community's self-governing ability, which could lead to future moments of co-production. So, while the proclamation fails to specifically identify the urban Aboriginal community as possessing citizenship rights in one way, it has opened up several new avenues of political participation in another. Therefore, it could be argued that co-production as a concept is contained within the proclamation.

But what does this moment of recognition mean to Calgary's urban Aboriginal community? Recognition politics are one of the main features of the postsocialist era

dating to 1989, according to Nancy Fraser (1997), where a rise of "identity politics" had resulted in "[c]laims for the recognition of group difference." For the most part in this recent period that took root after the Canadian Multiculturalism Act was enacted in 1988, these claims have at times "eclips[ed] claims for social equality" (p. 2). Taylor argues that recognition is now a vital part of contemporary politics, which benefits "minority or 'subaltern' groups" (1994, p. 25), including Indigenous peoples. Recognition theorists like Taylor and Fraser argue that recognition shapes, forms, and determines an individual or collective's sense of identity and the values bestowed upon them. According to Eisenberg (2014) the objective of minority struggles for recognition

> … is to improve the genuine equality of people by illuminating that groups can be treated unjustly when important dimensions of their identities—their language, religion, customs, attachment to territory, and so on—are not recognized or treated with respect by the state and its public institutions. (p. 293)

However, theorists such as Glen Coulthard contend that struggles for recognition are at odds with struggles for self-determination.

Recognition has in recent years become an important issue in relation to Aboriginal self-determination discussions. Coulthard has led the way in this regard and has claimed that state recognition of Aboriginal peoples represents little more than a neo-colonial means of maintaining state hegemony. His work is in part based on that of philosopher Charles Taylor, who asserts that:

> … our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves. (1994, p. 25)

So recognition is vital in one sense if the urban Aboriginal community is to take advantage of and to lobby for political opportunities. Yet, a lack of recognition is also

debilitating for until the state acknowledges urban Aboriginal political legitimacy they remain politically incapable to act. As Taylor states, "Nonrecognition or *mis*recognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being" (ibid). Taylor refers to women as an example where some feminists argue that patriarchal societies have caused women "to adopt a depreciatory image of themselves" thus internalizing "a picture of their own inferiority" (ibid). This has a tremendously negative impact on subaltern groups in the sense that they may not take advantage of future opportunities to assert themselves.

Building on these ideas in relation to Aboriginal people, Fanon has noted that recognition is made difficult because "Europeans have projected an image of the colonized as somehow inferior, 'uncivilized,' and through the force of conquest have been able to impose this image on the conquered" (ibid., p. 33). Though the language of uncivilized is rarely used these days, stereotypes are still employed when discussing urban Aboriginal peoples. For example, Aboriginal people tend to be pathologized as mentioned in my introduction. That is, they are considered more susceptible to alcohol and drug abuse; they fail at school or at securing housing. Over time, "colonized populations tend to internalize the derogatory images imposed on them by their colonial masters" (Coulthard, 2014, p. 32), and these processes are evident in Calgary. Chapter three in particular noted that Aboriginal residents have internalized these stereotypes. Non-Aboriginal beliefs about the pathological Indian reveal that misrecognition can lead to poor socio-economic outcomes for urban Aboriginal peoples, and that it also influences their potential political impact while placing the final say in the hands of the colonizer as to whether or not urban Aboriginal people are considered legitimate political bodies, and as such, worthy of interaction and influence. To this point, it would appear that the urban

81

Aboriginal community was recognized as legitimate within the context of the Paskapoo Slopes discussion. But they were not considered citizens per se nor were they considered as possessing the powers of self-determination. This form of limited recognition, which will be discussed in greater detail below, nevertheless provided avenues to co-production that previously were unavailable to the urban Aboriginal community.

This led to a second question: why is this moment of recognition valuable to the City of Calgary? Some scholars have suggested that accepting outside recognition of one's political legitimacy can be utilized as a political tool (Levy & Szenaider, 2006). Arguably from an urban Aboriginal perspective, even though the recognition is limited, it could become an important political strategy for gaining access to political leaders, and will inevitably lead to improved local capacity and social capital. There is also much to gain from a City of Calgary perspective. The proclamation and subsequent Paskapoo Slopes negotiations proved that the city is living up to its mandate to improve Aboriginal inclusion. So, recognition that legitimizes urban Aboriginal political leaders can also lead to co-production and greater cultural and interpersonal understanding. On the other hand, leaders are also acutely aware that at this moment they are not in a position to recognize all Aboriginal grievances, or to pursue co-production. This is a difficult prospect for municipal leaders because despite their desires for Aboriginal inclusion, the proclamation did not propose how to facilitate such inclusion. Furthermore, Aboriginal protests and blockades have become much more high profile in the media in recent years, which remains a constant threat to municipal politicians unprepared to respond to urban Aboriginal demands. A case in point is the Idle No More movement that caught Canada's attention in 2012. In an interview with an Aboriginal leader, they stated that they think that the responded the way it did out of "fear … I think because on the non-Aboriginal

side and maybe city staff there's always assumptions … I think one of the fears are 'okay, those Aboriginal people are going to protest on Paskapoo Slopes,' which has not happened at all … so it's always [a] fear-based" reaction.

Recognition is a potent act impacting urban Aboriginal peoples in that it can lead to improved political influence. Coming to an understanding of what recognition means also forces municipalities to re-conceptualize their relationships with the Aboriginal community (Cairns, 2000). Using Coulthard's work and Mayor Nenshi's proclamation as a catalyst to analyze and assess this important form of recognition, the following sections explore how recognition is evolving in Calgary and how this is serving (or undermining) attempts at co-production. On a final note, this research was conducted at an important transformational time for the City of Calgary. A few years ago, the proclamation did not exist, so no catalyst existed to help frame, discuss and better understand recognition and what it means in the city and its role in co-production.

The Politics of Recognition

Coulthard notes that Canada has demonstrated an "unprecedented degree of recognition" of Aboriginal "cultural" rights, "aboriginal and treaty rights," and finally the "inherent right to self-government." It would therefore appear "that 'recognition' has emerged as the dominant expression of self-determination within the Aboriginal rights movement in Canada" (2014, p. 2). Despite the impressive levels of recognition, Coulthard sees this as problematic because "instead of ushering in an era of peaceful coexistence grounded on the idea of reciprocity and mutual recognition, the politics of recognition in its contemporary liberal form promises to reproduce the very configuration of colonialist, racist, patriarchal state power that Indigenous peoples' demands for recognition have historically sought to transcend" (p. 3). What then is the nature of

Calgary's recognition of the urban Aboriginal community in the Paskapoo Slopes affair? And is this a positive development for the urban Aboriginal community? Can this potentially lead to improved interaction in the form of co-production? Or is it simply a way of appeasing the urban Aboriginal community's concerns? Is there any substance in this recognition or is it merely symbolic? The next sections will elaborate on Coulthard's critiques so we can answer these questions.

Land and Territoriality

As Calgary grows and expands its municipal boundaries, land remains an all-important resource for municipal development demands property that contains First Nations sacred sites. Land is therefore an area of mutual interest for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, and this will demand land-based negotiations and agreements in the near future. Alcantara and Nelles (2016) have noted, municipal-Indigenous agreements are becoming more common. In their work cataloguing 332 similar agreements across Canada they classified them into the following categories: relationship building, decolonization, and capacity-building type agreements. What is rare are agreements that emphasize land sharing, or municipal recognition of ongoing Aboriginal interest in the urban landscape beyond capacity building and economic development. City councillors interviewed were aware of this issue:

> [I]n general planning terms our First Nations are not always considered but we're coming off a massive- you're interviewing me on a Friday and we spent the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in a public hearing of council that was focused on the Paskapoo Slopes, also a name that reflects our First Nations heritage. And a conversation about the development of those slopes was heavily influenced by the understanding that it was a sacred space.

This statement illustrates how attuned city council members are to the fact that Calgary is situated on Blackfoot traditional territory. Considering the longstanding regional

occupation, it also suggests that provisions are required to integrate these concerns into municipal planning regimes.

With this historic occupancy and ongoing desire to govern the traditional/urban landscape, Porter (2013) questions why "Indigenous interests and rights remain much less visible in urban planning and policy practice … than in the fields of natural resource management and environmental planning" (p. 284). Focusing her work in Melbourne, Australia, it like Calgary is "a massively sprawling, relatively wealthy, lively city, with a rapidly growing population putting further pressure on the peri-urban area" and "until 2006, urban land-use planning … was utterly disengaged and radically silent on Indigenous interests in the space that Melbourne occupies" (p. 286). Similar to Calgary's CAUAC, Melbourne has Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAP) that were appointed in 2006 according to the newly enacted Aboriginal Heritage Act to act as a "statutory consultee on the cultural heritage implications of new developments in their recognized area, and have the power to substantially reshape or even limit urban development where they find that Indigenous cultural heritage values are threatened" (p. 288). This urban Aboriginal presence however has not yet expanded its degree of influence:

> [S]uch recognition is of an extremely limited type, as if Indigenous culture and interests are anachronistic: frozen in a pre-colonial time, and entirely unrelated to property rights, governance, and law. There is little scope for properly recognizing contemporary cultural associations, and no possibility for reconstituting a full recognition of the coexistence of an Indigenous domain about place and its governance alongside the non-Indigenous planning system. (ibid)

There are important similarities between Melbourne and Calgary. For instance, Calgary's incorporation of Aboriginal voice in the Paskapoo Slopes development does not extend much beyond that of consultation, which some would argue is little more than a form of tokenism. Such a limited form of recognition leads to little more than providing advice

regarding naming streets and ensuring a small patch of land remains a dedicated site

within the larger development. From a municipal perspective, the fact that Aboriginal

voice has been included is however deemed an important step:

> The place names, the street names, are all going to be worked in conjunction with
> First Nations elders to sort of tie the character of that place deeply into the very
> relevant First Nations heritage of the site ... in terms of the importance to a city
> like Calgary especially in the era of … city building that we're in … it's not an
> insignificant tribute.

As previously noted, the commission's original recommendation of using a Blackfoot

word was strongly opposed, so anglicized words were instead chosen.

This lack of extended recognition is as Coulthard argues "settler-colonialism's

specific, irreducible element" (p. 7). He further suggests that Canada is no different from

other settler-colonial powers in the sense that:

> [C]olonial domination continues to be structurally committed to maintain—
> through force, fraud, and more recently, so-called "negotiations"—*ongoing state
> access to the land and resources* that contradictorily provide the material and
> spiritual sustenance of Indigenous societies on the one hand, and the *foundation of
> colonial-state formation, settlement, and capitalist development of the other.* (p. 7;
> emphasis mine)

Dispossession of Indigenous lands therefore remains a continuous process for colonial

governments, and developers reared according to the need to acquire resources for local

expansion. Though part of a larger traditional territory, the Indigenous lands—both in the

form of a reserve or an urban centre—are claimed, and as such are now considered owned

by the municipality. That is why integrating Aboriginal voice into planning is presented

as "not an insignificant tribute": it is considered an invitation to outsiders to have their

voices integrated into a planning process to which other outsiders must remain simple

observers. The paradox of identifying Calgary as traditional Blackfoot territory is not

reconciled in this situation as municipal officials consider their underlying interest in the

land as taking precedence over all historical claims. As Daigle (2016, p. 9) describes it, "recognition-based strategies are founded on and materially reproduce colonial imaginaries of territory that continue to inflict violence on Indigenous legal and governance orders while facilitating the economic and political sovereignty of Canada" (p. 267). This according to Coulthard is a contemporary, forceful method employed to acquire Indigenous lands under the guise of co-production which in turn allows colonial worldviews to prevail.

An important theme that becomes evident is that Aboriginal people are not considered to be contemporary communities nor are they considered modern (Newhouse 2001; 2009). Rather, they are communities with important histories and cultures that demand (according to municipal officials) recognition and protection, but at the same time, they have little to offer to the larger non-Aboriginal community beyond colour for Stampede events. This in turn leads to municipal officials' refusal to acknowledge Indigenous citizenship, which leads to an interesting feedback loop. That is, Indigenous peoples are framed as historical, virtuous stewards of the land that Calgary now sits upon, a process Francis (1992) describes as constructing "the imaginary Indian." Over time, a process of corruption—not of contemporary Calgarians' doing—came to harm these honorable and noble peoples whom, in their inability to achieve modernity, chose to remain rural peoples sequestered to reserves. This is where the culture, language, society, and politics remain housed. Therefore, any attempts by Aboriginal peoples to modernize by moving to the city will ultimately fail. In fact, Indigenous peoples should be considered anti-capitalist, which in turn translates into their ongoing evolution as non-urban peoples.

Once again the history of the noble Indian projected by municipal officials freezes Indigenous peoples historically while offering them little opportunity to evolve into contemporary urban citizens. Their inherent inability to protect their lands (through military resistance or effective negotiations) is also a historic event, and as such plays a limited role in municipal engagement of Aboriginal interests. While the proclamation suggests that colonial histories must be respected to a degree, freezing of Indigenous peoples in a historical past renders them non-contemporary people. This means that the proclamation can only go so far in recognizing modern Aboriginal claims. Calgary officials embracing both colonialism (process and ideology) and noble Indian culture (people) view each as historic. Each one continues to influence how officials choose to portray and interact with Aboriginal peoples, the caveat being that these histories are of limited contemporary concern. The issues of today must take precedence, and why including Indigenous voice into street naming is considered a significant tribute.

Reconciliation

One of the key themes informing the proclamation's development was that of reconciliation. Interviews with most participants cited the TRC as a critical influence, which led city officials to devise an approach based on social justice and recognition. Municipal officials described the TRC's emphasis on of rebuilding relationships with Aboriginal peoples, integrating Aboriginal voices, and promoting residential school awareness as important. But, as the previous discussion suggests and as Coulthard (2014, p. 127) concludes, the TRC "temporally situates the harms of colonialism in the past and focuses the bulk of its reconciliatory efforts on repairing the injurious legacy left in the wake of this history. Indigenous subjects are the primary objects of repair, not the colonial relationship." In this case, is the co-production evident in the Paskapoo Slopes

narrative something that will persist? Or is it, as Coulthard would suggest, a singular moment when city officials sought to repair the *historic* Indigenous-municipal relationship without giving much thought to the contemporary Indigenous-municipal relationship?

It is important to note that the colonial relationship itself is not addressed via the politics of recognition. Coulthard (p. 17) describes colonialism as a structural force that is embedded in non-Aboriginal institutions that dominate, even when attempts at recognition and accommodation occur. In such cases the recognition and accommodation being sought "usually end up being determined by and in the interests of the hegemonic partner in the relationship." More troubling is that this limited process of recognition leads to "subaltern populations" developing what Franz Fanon describes as a "psycho-affective" attachment to these "structurally circumscribed modes of recognition" (in Coulthard, 2014, p. 17-18). That is urban Aboriginal peoples internalize what can be described as the essentialist, racist, derogatory images that the hegemonic power (as represented by municipal officials) bestow upon them. The onus then falls upon urban Aboriginal peoples to "self-actualize" and properly assert their self-determining capacity.

A point of contention has developed amongst scholars as to whether Aboriginal peoples should incorporate themselves within the dominant society, or try to separate and return to pre-contact forms of governance and inter-nation diplomacy (e.g., Simpson, 2011). The writings of John Borrows, Dale Turner (2006), and David Newhouse, for example, emphasize the importance of "promot[ing] change from within," a position Coulthard and Taiaiake Alfred oppose. Alfred in particular argues that one must embrace "the principles embedded in traditional cultures" as opposed to accommodating "western cultural values and [the] acceptance of integration into the larger political and economic

system" (Alfred, 2009, p. 28). Aboriginal organizational leadership, it would appear, falls into this latter category, for during the interviews participants expressed appreciation at the city's willingness to accept their collective voice as an ad-hoc advisory body to council. Most were also satisfied with the perceived degree of inclusion. Interestingly, CAUAC is the main hub of Aboriginal leadership that works with the City of Calgary, and Aboriginal residents were not aware of this committee. It is "one of 80 boards and commissions at the City of Calgary [that] reports to council [and] it "follow[s] a model set out by [the] city clerk's [office] that [they] have to abide by." Nevertheless, both Aboriginal leaders and municipal officials in the interviews deemed participation in the form of committees an effective interface model. This however runs contrary to the Aboriginal residents' belief that their needs were not adequately represented either by the city or by Aboriginal organizations. Aboriginal residents as reflected in one participant's claim that "tokenism is not enough" appears to support Coulthard and Alfred's position.

Many Aboriginal residents did point out that under Mayor Nenshi positive changes are occurring in Calgary, and that his approach was far more progressive than that of previous mayors, specifically as it relates recognizing and being respectful of Aboriginal rights and claims. For most participants however, this is not enough progress. Residents in particular were highly critical of what they portrayed as the City of Calgary's tokenistic model that leaves little room for dialogue. As one participant stated, the City of Calgary may have put in a "little site put … for Aboriginal people," but as soon as the "big ceremony" ends "it's gone, like there's nothing after that." One councillor confirmed that urban Aboriginal people are often an afterthought, while also admitting "it often feels a little bit more token than anything else … I know we're trying to get better at it, but I don't think that we do it very well."

In such settings "colonial powers will only recognize the collective rights and identities of Indigenous peoples insofar as this recognition does not throw into question the background legal, political, and economic framework of the colonial relationship itself" (Coulthard 2014, p. 41). Therefore, the state is unlikely to relinquish its authority, which as discussed is grounded by ongoing efforts to undermine Aboriginal sovereignty. This tension is difficult to alleviate, and as such will not allow Indigenous peoples to evolve into or be considered full and equal partners. In a recent study in Saskatoon exploring similar question, the authors concluded that "[t]he City controlled all consultative functions, including their format and the subsequent analysis and consolidation of data into its official planning documents" (Fawcett, Walker, & Greene, 2015). This confirms Coulthard's notion that recognition as a format and framework continues to be determined by non-Indigenous actors. Yet the co-production literature asserts that Indigenous communities must be a part of "every stage of the planning process" (ibid). As one Calgary city councillor stated:

> I think oftentimes our engagement—and my background is in community engagement—it needs to be thoughtful and it needs to be from the very very beginning to the very very end … and I think oftentimes we're good at it from about halfway through to the end, but [were] not having those conversations very, very early.

These ideas imply that as noble as municipal officials intentions are reconciliation is not being fully realized. Aboriginal people in this instance are invited to the table as just another "stakeholder" (Walker, Moore, & Linklater, 2011) that one councillor suggested can "come and bless the plaque" when all is said and done.

Conclusion

One key question results from this analysis: Is no recognition of urban Aboriginal self-government/self-determination more problematic than the existing forms of recognition that perpetuate colonial attitudes Coulthard critiques (e.g., Inherent Rights Policy of 1995)? This discussion demonstrated that there are some important ideas to consider from Coulthard's work. This case study in Calgary illustrated that there is a unique system of power relations that continues to dispossess Indigenous peoples of their traditional lands in the city. For one, there appears to be a strong disconnect between Aboriginal leaders and "rank-and-file" Aboriginal residents. Residents do not see their leaders as adequately representing them, and Aboriginal leaders for the most part expressed that the city has done well to recognize them and ensure their inclusion. Residents on the other hand see it as mere symbolic, tokenistic gestures. In the case of the Paskapoo Slopes, the municipal-urban Aboriginal interface didn't extend far beyond consultation, and Aboriginal peoples appear to be little more than stakeholders with an invested interest in the land in question.

Another important finding in this case study emphasizes that recognition politics confines Aboriginal people in a frozen historical past. As Porter (2013) identified:

> While one can find respectful and nicely worded statements of recognition of an Indigenous past in some planning documents, they are always written either in the preface or on the inside cover, a token of recognition towards what is seen as an anachronistic and backwards culture. (p. 286)

Aboriginal incorporation in the Paskapoo Slopes debates appears to have been limited to place-naming and ensuring that in the future visitors can respect and understand the Blackfoot history of the site as a buffalo hunting ground. They are not considered a contemporary people but their history is important to the civic identity. Accordingly, the

city will engage them insofar as their history and cultures are protected and preserved. Therefore "protection, civilization, and assimilation" (Tobias, 1976) remain important government goals governments strive to achieve with Indigenous people. These ideas were strongly reflected in this analysis, as Aboriginal people are still being portrayed as frozen, historical figures that governments agree to protect. The belief system that "Indians [are] incapable of dealing with persons of European ancestry without being exploited" remains (Tobias, 1976, p. 39). This language of protection was not only evident in the Paskapoo Slopes negotiations, but it appears in the Calgary *Year of Reconciliation* proclamation. There is little evidence to suggest that Aboriginal people have "modernized" enough (Newhouse, 2009) to be considered to be occupying an equal playing field with municipal governments and developers. Hence, old colonial ideas are still present while perhaps not as vivid.

The proclamation demonstrates that the City of Calgary has progressed substantially in recent years in terms of recognizing Aboriginal grievances even if old colonial ideas inform this response. However, as this study has shown, it is one thing to have a proclamation as a sort of gesture it is also incredibly important to institutionalize. Aboriginal leaders noted that an Aboriginal Inclusion Policy is being developed by CAUAC as a part of their 10-year strategic plan which is another important step that Walker and Belanger (2013) have previously noted: proclamations have incredible symbolic importance as they have the potential to "launch … a new era of co-operati[on]" between municipalities and Aboriginal residents. Co-production has yet to be fully realized, and a follow-up accord would perhaps be a useful way to institutionalize such proclamations. The proclamation symbolically is important, but the practical importance of a proclamation "is related to the fact that sector-specific and service-specific

agreements will be harder to reach and manage in the absence of strong relationship-building" (p. 201). That said, it appears that the proclamation in Calgary has yet to evolve into something more substantive. While it is certainly informing city leaders, it needs to be taken one step further in order to realize urban Aboriginal self-determination in Calgary.

Porter and Barry (2015) found that in urban planning practice, the discourse of recognition utilized by the dominant power sets boundaries and limitations in the sense that there are "predetermined categories of urban planning" where Indigenous people can take part. Furthermore they state that:

> … when planning expands its boundaries to accommodate Indigenous interests, but does so on the unquestioned expectation that they must fit into established ways of knowing and acting, it demonstrates a persistent failure to come to the table with Indigenous peoples on terms that are *themselves up for negotiation*. (p. 37)

Therefore the existing framework of planning and recognition itself can have a silencing effect on Aboriginal stakeholders. The dominant power (i.e., city hall) through its practice and discourses of recognition continues to establish its own influence and does not want to compromise it. It becomes clear here that the process of urban planning itself has yet to be transformed in the City of Calgary.

The hegemonic power (the city) will not relinquish enough control to make Aboriginal participation any more substantial. As Coulthard suggests, recognition politics are little more than tokenistic gestures that pacify minority groups including Indigenous peoples that do not address the oppressive nature of the colonial relationship itself. Therefore, it appears that at this moment the city is not fully realizing the urban Aboriginal community as a self-determining group of people. As such, co-production cannot fully occur in this setting as long as the politics of recognition play a role. The

94

proclamation itself is a stand-alone document, and the case study of the Paskapoo Slopes indicates little more than tokenism and optics of an Indigenous-inclusive city.

As I have now shown with this case study, Calgary still has a long way to go before co-production is fully realized. The nature of this form of recognition is positive for the urban Aboriginal community as it ensures that city leaders are considering these issues at the very least. As I will discuss further in the conclusion, the proclamation is only a small step in the right direction. While improved interaction is a welcome and positive development if it is based on a false premise that continues to ignore colonial foundations it will continue to negatively impact urban Aboriginal communities.

Chapter Five: Summary and Conclusion

I embarked on this project with one key question in mind: how do varying conceptions of Aboriginal self-determination and citizenship impact the formation of co-production between municipal governments and urban Aboriginal communities? While Canadian governments (federal, provincial and most recently local) appear to have come a long way in regards to recognizing the inherent right of self-government, they continue to struggle to comprehend the essence of self-determination. As the latter is a foundational principle of co-production, I found it essential to question whether it is possible to promote co-production as universal language in the absence of this larger understanding by all involved parties as to what self-determination means. As I have demonstrated in chapters three and four, there is still much to consider in this regard. To answer this question, I sought to gain the perspectives from three particular categories of individuals to get a sense of the barriers to better engagement between the city and the urban Aboriginal community and its leaders, and the barriers for Aboriginal residents seeking to live a good life in the city. How do the individuals from each of these social categories perceive their community, and what are their perceptions of Aboriginal citizenship and self-determination? To meet this objective, I interviewed six city councillors including the mayor, five local Aboriginal leaders, and 16 residents who varied in age and length of residency in the City of Calgary.

Chapter three focused on how municipal officials, Aboriginal leaders and residents are confounded by the concept of urban Aboriginal citizenship. It revealed that citizenship has evolved primarily in response to Canadian norms. Aboriginal people have had to reinvent themselves. To some extent they were compelled to change, but have also successfully adapted themselves to the changing environment. Nevertheless, it has

informed new understandings of who they are. Aboriginal people have indeed made significant contributions to Canadian society, and in many respects have integrated themselves quite successfully (Newhouse, Voyageur, & Beavon, 2005; Coulthard, 2014). However, as I noted in chapter four, scholars like Coulthard or Alfred (2009) also find this a contentious outcome due to the fact that integration frequently demands individuals and communities of individuals reproduce colonial structures of power that legitimize white domination. With this in mind, chapter three emphasized that Aboriginal notions of citizenship sharply contrast with the liberal notions of citizenship Canada embraces, and which generally requires adherence to a social contract and is not land-centered as is the case with most Aboriginal political philosophies. From a non-Aboriginal perspective, citizenship is nested in reserve communities and non-transferable according to a colonial understanding.

Chapter three concluded that neither municipal officials nor Aboriginal residents see Aboriginal citizenship as something that exists in the city as citizenship is framed by colonial boundaries. To be a municipal citizen, Aboriginal people must reside within city limits and contribute to the community in an equitable fashion. However, they will never be quite recognized as citizens as long as forms of Aboriginal citizenship and identity are a product of their home reserve communities (i.e., the authentic homelands). This echoes Belanger and Lindstrom's (2016, p. 177) findings demonstrating that a hierarchy of residence has developed, where favouring the reserve as "the last remaining symbol of a traditional homeland … encourages Creation's ongoing dissolution." Their study confirmed that Aboriginal people perceive the city as a hostile site thus making it "difficult to find a place to call home." The findings in chapter three demonstrate constraints on fluidity of citizenship or residency, despite the fact that Aboriginal peoples

historically believed in the need for movement within their homelands. Canadian Indian policy did not endorse such movement, and in fact penalized people for doing so. On the reserve, Aboriginal people are Indians, and off the reserve, they are Canadian citizens—in theory at least. In Calgary these two identities rarely come together as Aboriginal people are not afforded multiple identities. Furthermore, Aboriginal residents in cities continue to regard the reserve as a vestige of culture and traditions they must visit regularly if they are to maintain traditions as the city does not meet their cultural needs. On a final note, they also view band governments as responsible for ensuring their smooth transition to the cityscape and believe that they have failed to do so. Unfortunately, as Belanger and Lindstrom have pointed out, residents believe that band governments willingly abandon their people once they leave the reserve, and upon their return are considered outsiders. Therefore, they feel alienated and lose their sense of belonging there. This in turn leads to a situation where urban Aboriginal residents do not and are not considered municipal citizens (even in their traditional homelands). At the same time they lack a connection to reserve communities non-Aboriginal people insist their identity rest within.

Citizenship from a non-Aboriginal perspective is about assimilation leading to inclusion; from an Aboriginal perspective it is traditionally offered as the connection to territory. For all three groups of individuals interviewed, the city is a foreign place for Indigenous peoples. A paradox is evident in that while city officials continue to proclaim that the land Calgary is situated on remains traditional Blackfoot territory, they do not consider Aboriginal people to be municipal citizens. One of the key ideas here is that city leaders do not see Aboriginal people as being "at home" in the city. Rather they are transitory reserve dwellers that temporarily occupy space within municipal boundaries in an effort to better themselves and achieve a certain economic and social threshold that

may lead to formal recognition of their citizenship. The fragmentation of Aboriginal identity and how it influences how we understand urban Aboriginal citizenship is troubling and was evident in each interview. City leaders can proclaim Calgary as Blackfoot territory in one breath and ignore urban Aboriginal demands for co-production in the next, which attests to the fact that political recognition is troubling and difficult to reconcile. As it stands, Aboriginal citizenship exists outside of the city exclusively on reserves—even though the whole region is traditional Indigenous land. So, despite living in traditional Blackfoot territory, transporting rights that should include citizenship in the cityscape remains a significant hurdle to belonging and co-production.

Though Aboriginal residents and Aboriginal political leaders agree that the city can feel foreign, Aboriginal organization leaders nevertheless see that it is possible for Calgary to become a permanent home for Indigenous people regardless of their cultural affiliation. They also see it as their role to ensure Aboriginal residents can attain a sense of urban belonging. However, they are often constrained financially due to their continued reliance on federal and provincial funding. This leads to organizational discord, disunity, and diminished community capital as they all compete in the same pool of funds. Aboriginal leaders in this setting see themselves as crucial elements in the drive for urban Aboriginal self-determination. Yet they too are unsure of what this means. Perhaps more importantly, Aboriginal residents struggling against racism, discrimination, lack of education, and employment do not see the organizations as adequately representing their needs. The city is an incredibly hostile environment, yet sympathetic municipal leaders are unable to provide additional benefits for fear of being seen practicing race-based rights thus compromising the equality of all citizens embracing liberal forms of citizenship.

The reality of what is occurring in Calgary challenges the substance of various government policies and court decisions (such as Misquadis) that have elevated urban Aboriginal communities to the status of authentic political communities with the same rights as reserve communities. As was evident in the interviews most people still cannot comprehend what this means in an urban setting. Referring back to co-production, which has been promoted as a means to integrate Aboriginal voices into local policy-making and city planning regimes, it becomes evident why it has met with limited success: Aboriginal people remain little more than stakeholders as opposed to full, equal and self-determining partners as co-production intended. The literature suggests that self-determination and citizenship are one and the same, and for co-production or coexistence to occur, there needs to be, as Porter (2013) states, "mutual recognition of multiple life-worlds" (p. 303). In other words, self-determination as a foundational principle of co-production will mean little until we can begin to establish common definitions.

While this study's findings strongly suggest that co-production cannot function in this environment, there was nevertheless a moment of co-production when the city leaders invited urban Aboriginal leaders to the table to discuss the development of the Paskapoo Slopes on the east side of Canada Olympic Park. On the surface it appeared to be a significant moment where urban Aboriginal voices were being formally integrated into a city planning initiative. This forced me to ask why this occurred at this specific moment and what it meant? I chose to analyze this moment using Coulthard's framework critiquing the politics of recognition. This chapter highlighted some of the main critiques associated with recognition and Coulthard's work leads the discussion.

What was evident is that all interview participants accepted that Aboriginal self-determination has a geographic component and that it is historically informed. In this case

even though city officials proclaim Calgary to be Blackfoot territory and First Nations leaders and urban Aboriginal people claim the city as part of their traditional territory, city leaders do not believe these claims are of contemporary significance. Rather, all such claims are historic. Calgary officials acknowledge the impact of colonial attitudes on Indigenous peoples. They also in the interviews suggested that reparations might be due through a structured reconciliation process. But what was evident is that any claims to the city are no longer relevant for several reasons. For one, by signing Treaty 7 the Blackfoot extinguished their right to the land. The reserves created as an element of the treaty are where the existing Aboriginal rights are contained. In all history is just that—past events of little contemporary significance.

But it is not just the claims being framed as historic that are troubling—it is how city officials situate Blackfoot people in this context that is equally disconcerting. As descendants of a once self-determining people, the proclamation indicated that city leaders believed that they are owed an apology for what was lost during Canada's colonial period. However the emphasis here is on the word 'lost' as all off-reserve Aboriginal rights, including claims to off-reserve lands were resolved long ago. Municipal leaders proclaim that this land is indeed Blackfoot territory, yet it is land that was legally obtained and developed in a fashion that may have been harmful to Indigenous people historically, but could be of benefit to their descendants should they choose to assimilate instead of revisiting a history that cannot be changed.

As was also noted in chapter three, not all Aboriginal people in Calgary are Blackfoot, and as a result non-regional Aboriginal people experience alienation to an even larger degree. For many, the city may be a part of a larger traditional territory, but for an equal number of Aboriginal people outside of Blackfoot territory Calgary is viewed

as a foreign and often hostile land. In this setting non-regional Aboriginal people are also not considered citizens but they are also ignored by Aboriginal agencies focused on helping urban Blackfoot residents. So while chapter three concluded that citizenship and self-determination are problematic concepts, chapter four emphasizes how the politics of recognition can be harmful in that it divides urban Aboriginal people in various ways that all compromise urban Aboriginal political productivity, connections to the city and urban Aboriginal organizations, and even connections to home communities internal and external to Blackfoot territory. Here the contentious politics of recognition are damaging in that they reproduce the colonial relationship. Despite all of the city leaders' discussion about reconciliation and the UNDRIP's potential, it appear that most are unable to envision contemporary Aboriginal people as able to pursue self-determination in the city.

Dispossession of Indigenous lands is ongoing as the interviews demonstrated. Therefore, it is common to see municipal governments debating over natural resources and land management rather than ensuring Aboriginal voice in planning and policy-making processes (Porter, 2013). This leads, as Coulthard has argued, to Canadian governments dispossessing Indigenous peoples of their lands through negotiations. As chapter four noted, Calgary officials utilized recognition and negotiations as instruments of territorial dispossession. The Paskapoo Slopes negotiations might represent a brief moment of co-production, but it did not result in joint-management over the space. Instead, it resulted in Blackfoot elders being allowed to name the location (in English translation) and four streets, which appears to be a token gesture that city leaders believed significant. This outcome once again demonstrates that Aboriginal people are considered frozen in a historical past and lacking a valid claim to it in the modern world.

Negotiations between municipalities and First Nations are often tenuous, as suggested by Calgary's ring road negotiations (Wood, 2003b). The tensions that were created between the city and Tsuu T'ina First Nation arguably led to a poor foundation from which to build future discussions. As Alcantara and Nelles (2016) note, a history of polarizing events can be difficult to overcome and that histories retain a powerful influence on how co-production unfolds. The Paskapoo Slopes negotiations were unique in that they occurred with urban Aboriginal leadership and not regional Chiefs and Councils. This seems to go counter the belief that urban Aboriginal people cannot in fact be considered a political community located outside the reserve; or that the band councils are the legitimate regional Indigenous governing bodies. The city's significant attempt to improve relations with the urban Aboriginal community was informed by the recent *Year of Reconciliation* proclamation. The proclamation is notable in its recognition of the damaging aspects of colonialism. Yet the actions of city officials in many ways help to perpetuate the very processes they themselves condemned in the proclamation. Embedded colonial beliefs remain evident in that city officials refuse to fully acknowledge the land in question as an important to ongoing Blackfoot identity. Nor is it considered an active element of Blackfoot sovereignty. It is located within the city limits, and all claims to ongoing ownership were extinguished according to Canada's understanding of Treaty 7. The proclamation was an incredibly important moment, but old ideas and attitudes still prevail.

It is difficult to accept that co-existence is evident or that co-production is possible in Calgary, despite everyone's desire to engage with one another more effectively. Those indigenous peoples involved are not contemporary political actors, for a group lacking a land base cannot be considered equal. As such, city councillors seek to engage First

Nations leaders, but not urban Aboriginal peoples who are band responsibilities. The moment of co-production identified was a means of defusing a growing movement to reclaim some traditional land within the city, land that had historic relevance to the urban Aboriginal community and regional First Nations communities. Therefore inviting urban elders to the table to help name some streets was deemed acceptable. It was for the people of Calgary also an assertion of their right to the city thus reinforcing the idea that Aboriginal peoples who abdicated their rights though treaty do not have contemporary claims—they gave up their right to self-govern upon signing Treaty 7. The associated land that became Calgary was no longer Blackfoot territory in a contemporary sense. Historically it may have been, but in the post-treaty period it was no longer Indigenous land. The treaty also fragmented Blackfoot territory into "white" space (the majority of the land in question) and "Indian" space, that being the reserves. As such Aboriginal occupation in the city did not and is not sensible; hence the incommensurability of Aboriginal people and the city.

The proclamation was nevertheless an important moment of social criticism of colonialism and its role it Calgary's growth. It did not however acknowledge colonialism to be a modern process; or that similar ideas or processes persist. The proclamation also speaks to inclusion without providing a roadmap to ensure said inclusion. It views the colonial actions of Canada as horrifying without acknowledging that ongoing impact of neo-colonial politics. This is Coulthard's main contention—the politics of recognition ultimately fails Aboriginal people and their desire for self-determination. In this case, Calgary's proclamation does little to address the modern colonial relationship, which suggests colonialism is a historic and dormant process. Yet city leaders who readily acknowledge Calgary's physical location in Niitsitapi traditional territory have yet to

fully reconcile this paradox. On the surface, it even appears that city officials still accept a basic form of traditional land ownership despite municipal existence. This does not translate into contemporary Indigenous off-reserve land ownership or even the recognition that Niitsitapi people believe they can still play a role in regional territorial governance as Treaty 7 suggests. That is because the Niitsitapi who governed their once vast homeland no longer exist, at least from municipal perspectives. Their descendants live on their negotiated reserves where they remain by all accounts self-determining. They have however been separated into two peoples: noble historic communities, and modern ignoble collectivities or rural self-governing peoples that have yet to master urban living. The urban land base must therefore be protected and preserved, for to do otherwise is to risk its misuse and deterioration, reflecting "the cold rationality of market principles" which are inherent in state and developer mindsets (Coulthard, 2014, p. 13).

The one question I have yet to answer is why municipal officials choose to engage Aboriginal people at this specific point in time after refusing to engage them over similar issues in the past. I would argue that it was a moment of interest convergence that produced the negotiations. First posited by the late Dr. Derrick Bell, interest convergence suggests that racial justice can occur only when it benefits the hegemonic power. As an example, Belanger and Walker (2009) explored attempts by the Winnipeg Mayor's office "to draw Aboriginal people to the table as partners in civic development" (p. 129). Aboriginal leaders did not support his policies as they did not resonate with them, because "[h]is proposed era of cooperation relied on a model whereby the Mayor and council guided policy development according to their interpretation of the needs and desires of the municipal Aboriginal community" (ibid). Belanger and Walker note that attempts to engage and negotiate occurred only when "Aboriginal concerns reflected

mainstream society's needs" (ibid). In the Paskapoo Slopes case the city's response corresponded to a need to ensure development of the contested land. Recent events such as Idle No More or the Truth and Reconciliation Commission were likely influential—as one Aboriginal leader stated, city responses tend to be "fear-based" And reactionary. This is yet one more consideration in the move toward forging the groundwork leading to co-production becoming a reality.

Moving Forward?

It appears that there are several issues to address if there is any hope for co-production in Calgary. Arguably, co-production itself must be mutually devised. Recent literature has shown that there has been widespread support from cities to engage reconciliation and to "strengthen municipal-Indigenous governance, with little reason to fear public opposition." However, it requires "more public stewardship and discussion" and civic leaders have had the opportunity to take the initiative with "new institutional structures" and "progressive strategic policy" (Walker et al. 2017). Referring to existing academic writing about municipal-Aboriginal co-production, there must also be a co-generated understanding of what self-determination means. This thesis has shown that there are several factors showing how and why urban Aboriginal self-determination has been undermined despite that Canada proclaims itself in an age of reconciliation. Because self-determination is a foundational principle of co-production, the lack of mutual understanding regarding Aboriginal self-determination's meaning is impactful and will continue to influence how co-production will unfold. Furthermore, recognition of such rights has ramifications as Coulthard (2014) has suggested. Specifically, he is concerned that "the optics created by these grand gestures of recognition and reconciliation suggests to the dominant society that [Indigenous people] no longer have a legitimate ground to

106

stand on in expressing [their] grievances" (2014, p. 155-56). In other words, Calgary's

Year of Reconciliation proclamation has more of a silencing effect on Indigenous people,

a claim that was validated with the Paskapoo Slopes discussions where Indigenous

peoples had a rather small, token role. However Aboriginal leaders were satisfied with the

outcome thus leading to Coulthard's next point:

> The optics of recognition and reconciliation can also have a colonial impact on
> Indigenous subjects … settler-colonial rule is a form of *governmentality*: a
> relatively diffuse set of governing relations that operate through a circumscribed
> mode of recognition that structurally ensures continued access to Indigenous
> peoples' lands and resources by producing neocolonial subjectivities that coopt
> Indigenous people into becoming instruments of their own dispossession. (p. 156)

It should however also be noted that the proclamation does represent a positive step, and

with this analysis I do not wish to neglect the agency of Aboriginal leaders in Calgary.

These are simply ideas that must be taken into consideration for true co-production to

become a genuine reality.

Ideas about separation are historic but embedded in legislation and as such

difficult to overcome. Why? Because it reflects mainstream beliefs about who Indians are

and because it is a reminder of the poor treatment that Canadian governments have

inflicted on Aboriginal people through colonization. While as Mercer (2003) points out

"there have been some important symbolic gains for Indigenous people … in many ways,

they are still significantly disadvantaged and remain 'citizens without rights'" (p. 434)—

hence Mercer's use of the term "citizens minus," which this thesis employs to describe

urban Indigenous people. While Aboriginal people in Canada were accorded the right to

vote in 1960, within the Calgary context they are still not really considered citizens. This

in itself demands additional research, specifically what steps municipal officials see urban

Aboriginal peoples taking to become citizens. As Mercer points out, this separation is still

107

evident, and "we must never lose sight of the fact that they are still a dispossessed people … who suffer continuing disadvantage and discrimination in an otherwise affluent society" (ibid., p. 436).

The Paskapoo Slopes case was a moment of co-production that wasn't driven by anything substantive. Rather, it appears to have been a moment of interest convergence: Aboriginal people have a vested interest in the protection of the land that coincided with municipal interests. Co-production therefore is only viable when the city's interests are at stake, but in turn can this really be called co-production? Another foundational element of co-production is trust, and if trust doesn't exist between Aboriginal residents, leaders and municipal officials then co-production falls apart at that moment in time. But ultimately, if our understandings of self-determination are different, are our understandings of co-production also different? This is why a universal understanding of self-determination is needed: co-production depends on it.

Finally, despite the above conclusions it is worthwhile noting that there appears to be an evolution taking place whereby both municipal leaders and Indigenous peoples are beginning to conceptualize a unique notion of urban Blackfoot citizenship; an idea that demands further research. Though it seems to challenge my primary conclusions, it is an interesting idea to consider because as chapter two notes, within Indigenous philosophies, it is considered normative for Indigenous peoples to adapt to their emerging contexts and changing environments (Binnema, 2004). In reality, this is something that all cultures must confront when they relocate to a new place, city, or country, regardless of where they come from. For Blackfoot people, this notion predates colonial invasion when movement was necessary in response to various environmental circumstances (i.e., when animal populations depleted, when ecological contexts were compromised by fire or

drought, etc.). This is just a more contemporary form of adaptation that allowed the

Blackfoot people to survive and flourish within 'Napi's Land.' However, as I have also

discussed this emerging idea of Blackfoot citizenship is not without consequences, as it

has the potential to alienate a large proportion of Indigenous people who call Calgary

home. Especially for Indigenous peoples whose oral histories demonstrate ties to the

Calgary city and region.

References

Abele, F., & Prince, M. J. (2008). The Future of Fiscal Federalism: Funding Regimes for Aboriginal Self-Government. In Y. D. Belanger (Ed.), *Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada: Current Trends and Issues* (3rd ed., pp. 158-171). Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Limited.

Alcantara, C., & Nelles, J. (2016). *A Quiet Evolution: The Emergence of Indigenous-Local Intergovernmental Partnerships in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

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

Alfred, T. (2009). *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto* (2nd ed.). Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.

Andersen, C., & Denis, C. (2003). Urban Natives and the Nation: Before and After the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. *The Canadian Review of Sociology*, 40(4), 373-390.

Andersen, C., & Strachan, J. (2011). Urban Aboriginal Programming in a Coordination Vacuum: The Alberta (Dis)Advantage. In E. J. Peters (Ed.), *Urban Aboriginal Policy Making in Canadian Municipalities* (pp. 127-159). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Andersen, C. (2013). Urban Aboriginality as a Distinct Identity, in Twelve Parts. In E. Peters & C. Andersen (Eds.), *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation* (pp. 46-68). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Battell-Lowman, E., & Barker, A. J. (2015). *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Belanger, Y. D., & Newhouse, D. R. (2008). Reconciling Solitudes: A Critical Analysis of the Self-Government Ideal. In Y. D. Belanger (Ed.), *Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada: Current Trends and Issues* (3rd ed., pp. 1-19). Saskatoon: Purich Publishing.

Belanger, Y., & Walker, R. (2009). Interest Convergence and Co-production of Plans: An Examination of Winnipeg's 'Aboriginal Pathways'. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 18(1), 118-139.

Belanger, Y. D. (2013). Breaching Reserve Boundaries: Canada v. Misquadis and the Legal Creation of the Urban Aboriginal Community. In E. Peters & C. Andersen (Eds.), *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation* (pp. 69-87). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Belanger, Y. D., & Lindstrom, G. (2016). "All We Need Is Our Land": Exploring Southern Alberta Indigenous Homelessness. In E. J. Peters & J. Christensen (Eds.), *Indigenous Homelessness: Perspectives from Canada, Australia, and New Zealand*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Belanger, Y. D., & Dekruyf, K. A. (2017) "Neither Citizen nor Nation": Urban Aboriginal (In)visibility and Co-production in a Midsized Southern Alberta City. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies*. XXXVII, 1.

Binnema, T. (2004). *Common and Contested Ground: A Human and Environmental History of the Northwestern Plains*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Borrows, J. (2002). *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Borrows, J. (2016). *Freedom and Indigenous Constitutionalism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bourgeois, R. (2009). Deceptive Inclusion: The 2010 Vancouver Olympics and Violence Against First Nations People. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 27(2/3), 39-44.

Cairns, A. (2000). *Citizens Plus: Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Cajete, G. (2000). *Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence*. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers. City of Calgary.

City of Calgary. (2010). *Facts about Aboriginal Persons in Calgary*. The City of Calgary: Community & Neighbourhood Services, Social Policy & Planning Division. https://www.calgary.ca/CSPS/CNS/Pages/First-Nations-Metis-and-Inuit-Peoples/First-Nations-Metis-Inuit-Peoples.aspx

City of Calgary. (2016). Calgary Aboriginal Urban Affairs Committee. Retrieved July 10, 2016, from http://www.calgary.ca/CSPS/CNS/Pages/First-Nations-Metis-and-Inuit-Peoples/Calgary-Aboriginal-Urban-Affairs-Committee/Calgary-Aboriginal-Urban-Affairs-Committee.aspx

Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Daigle, M. (2016). Awawanenitakik: The spatial politics of recognition and relational geographies of Indigenous self-determination. *The Canadian Geographer*, 60(2), 259-269.

Daniels v. Canada (Indian Affairs and Northern Development). (2016). SCC 12, [2016] 1 S.C.R. 99.

Dempsey, H. A. (2002). *Firewater: The impact of the whisky trade on the Blackfoot nation*. Calgary: Fifth House Publishers

Dempsey, H. (2008). The Indians and the Stampede. In M. Foran (Ed.), *Icon, Brand, Myth: The Calgary Stampede* (pp. 47-72). AU Press.

Denzin, N.K. (1994). The Art and Politics of Interpretation. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Desbiens, C., Lévesque, C., & Comat, I. (2016). "Inventing New Places": Urban Aboriginal Visibility and the Co-Construction of Citizenship in Val-d'Or (Québec). *City & Society*, 28(1), 74-98.

Dick, C. (2011). *The Perils of Identity: Group Rights and the Politics of Intragroup Difference.* Toronto, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dinsdale, P., White, J., & Hanselmann, C. (2011). Foreword. In P. Dinsdale, J. White, & C. Hanselmann (Eds.), *Urban Aboriginal Communities in Canada: Complexities, Challenges, Opportunities* (pp. vii-xii). Toronto, Canada: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.

Eisenberg, A. (2014). Self-Determination versus Recognition: Lessons and Conclusions. In A. Eisenberg, J. Webber, G. Coulthard, & A. Boisselle (Eds.), *Recognition versus Self-Determination: Dilemmas of Emancipatory Politics* (pp. 293-306). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Environics Institute (2010). *Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study: Main Report*. Toronto: Environics Institute.

Fawcett, R. B., Walker, R., & Greene, J. (2015). Indigenizing City Planning Processes in Saskatoon, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 24(2), 158-175.

Fiske, J., Belanger, Y. D., & Gregory, D. (2010). Outsiders in Their Homeland: Discursive Construction of Aboriginal Women and Citizenship. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 34(3), 71-92.

Fletcher, R. (2016, March 7). Medicine Hill, not Aiss ka pooma, selected as new community name. *CBC News Calgary*. Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/paskapoo-slopes-medicine-hill-aiss-ka-pooma-1.3479084

Foran, M., & Cavell, E. (1978). *Calgary: An Illustrated History*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.

Foran, M. (2008). More Than Partners: The Calgary Stampede and the City of Calgary. In M. Foran (Ed.), *Icon, Brand, Myth: The Calgary Stampede* (pp. 147-174). AU Press.

Francis, D. (1992). *The imaginary Indian: The image of the Indian in Canadian culture*. Vancouver, B.C: Arsenal Pulp Press.

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York: Routledge.

Furniss, E. (1999). *The Burden of History: Colonialism and the Frontier Myth in a Rural Canadian Community*. Toronto, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Graham, K.A.H., & Peters, E.J. (2002). *Aboriginal Communities and Urban Sustainability*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Network.

Guimond, E. (2003). Fuzzy Definitions and Population Explosion: Changing Identities of Aboriginal Groups in Canada. In David Newhouse and Evelyn Peters (eds). *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples*. pp. 35-49. Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Gyepi-Garbrah, J., Walker, R., & Garcea, J. (2014). Indigeneity, Immigrant Newcomers and Interculturalism in Winnipeg, Canada. *Urban Studies*, 51(9), 1795-1811.

Hanselmann, C. (2001). *Urban Aboriginal People in Western Canada: Realities and Policies*. Calgary, Canada: Canada West Foundation.

Henderson, J.Y. (1994). Empowering Treaty Federalism. *Saskatchewan Law Review,* 58, 241-329.

Henderson, J.Y. (2002). Sui generis and treaty citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 6(4), 415-440.

Hildebrandt, W., Carter, S., & First Rider, D. (1996). *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty 7*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hurley, M. C., & Gordon, R. C. (2009). *The Indian Act*. Parliamentary Information and Research Service. Retrieved from http://www.lop.parl.gc.ca/content/lop/ResearchPublications/prb0912-e.pdf

Isin, E. F., & Wood, P. K. (1999). *Citizenship and Identity*. London: Sage Publications.

Kaufmann, B. (2016, March 4). 'Beyond politically correct': Tug of war erupts over difficult-to-pronounce Blackfoot street names. *Calgary Herald*. Retrieved from http://calgaryherald.com/news/local-news/beyond-politically-correct-tug-of-war-erupts-over-difficult-to-pronounce-blackfoot-street-names

Kelm, M. (2011). *A Wilder West: Rodeo in Western Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Kennedy, M. (2014). A map and partial manuscript of Blackfoot country. *Alberta History*, 62(3).

Komarnicki, J. (2012, January 12). City lacks 'one-stop shop' for native resources. Calgary Herald, p. B2. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstream.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lashta, E., Berdahl, L., & Walker, R. (2016). Interpersonal contact and attitudes towards indigenous peoples in Canada's prairie cities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(7), 1242-1260.

Levy, D., & Sznaider, N. (2006). *The Holocaust and memory in the global age*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Little Bear, L. (2000). Jagged Worldviews Colliding. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision* (pp. 77-85). Toronto, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Markusoff, J. (2014, June 25). Developer pitches 'Whistler Village' concept for Paskapoo Slopes. *Calgary Herald*. Retrieved from http://calgaryherald.com/news/local-news/developer-pitches-whistler-village-concept-for-paskapoo-slopes

Mauthner, N., & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive Accounts and Accounts of Reflexivity in Qualitative Data Analysis. *Sociology*, 413-431.

McCracken, G. (1988). *The Long Interview. Qualitative Research Methods Series*, Vol. 13. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications. 41-52.

Melnyk, B. P. (1985). *Calgary Builds: The Emergence of an Urban Landscape, 1905-1914*. United States.: Alberta Culture/Canadian Plains Research Center.

Mercer, D. (2003). 'Citizens minus'?: indigenous Australians and the citizenship question. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(4), 421-445.

Miller, J. R. (2009). *Compact, Contract, Covenant: Aboriginal Treaty-Making in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mörkenstam, U. (2015). Recognition as if sovereigns? A procedural understanding of indigenous self-determination. *Citizenship Studies*, 19(6-7), 634-648.

Newhouse, D. R. (2001). Resistance is Futile: Aboriginal Peoples Meet the Borg of Capitalism. *The Journal of Aboriginal Economic Development*, 2(1), 75-82.

Newhouse, D. (2003). The Invisible Infrastructure: Urban Aboriginal Institutions and Organizations. In D. Newhouse & E. Peters (Eds.), *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples.* pp. 243-254. Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Newhouse, D. R., Voyageur, C. J., & Beavon, D. (2005). *Hidden in Plain Sight: Contributions of Aboriginal People to Canadian Identity and Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Newhouse, D. (2009). Modern Aboriginal Economies: Capitalism with a Red Face. In R. B. Anderson & R. M. Bone (Eds.), *Natural Resources and Aboriginal Peoples in Canada: Readings, Cases, and Commentary* (2nd ed., pp. 107-116). Concord, ON: Captus Press.

Newhouse, D. R. (2011). Urban Life: Reflections of a Middle Class Indian. In H. A. Howard & C. Proulx (Eds.), *Aboriginal Peoples in Canadian Cities: Transformations and Continuities* (pp. 23-38). Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Newhouse, D., & FitzMaurice, K. (2012). Introduction. In D. Newhouse, K. Fitzmaurice, T. McGuire-Adams, & D. Jetté (Eds.), *Well-Being in the Urban Aboriginal Community: Fostering Biimaadiziwin, a National Research Conference on Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. ix-xxi). Toronto, Canada: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.

Newhouse, D., & Peters, E. (Eds.). (2003). *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples*. Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Norris, M J., & Clatworthy, S. (2003). "Aboriginal Mobility and Migration within Urban Canada: Outcomes, Factors and Implications." In David Newhouse and Evelyn Peters (eds) *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples*. pp. 51-78. Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Norris, M. J., & Clatworthy, S. (2011). Urbanization and Migration Patterns of Aboriginal Populations in Canada: A Half Century in Review (1951-2006). *Aboriginal Policy Studies*, 1(1), 13-77.

Oliver, D. G., Serovich, J. M., & Mason, T. L. (2005, December). Constraints and Opportunities with Interview Transcription: Towards Reflection in Qualitative Research. *Social Forces*, 84(2), 1273-1289.

Ouart, P. (2013). Laying the Groundwork for Co-Production: The Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre, 1968-82. In E. Peters & C. Andersen (Eds.), *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation* (pp. 132-150). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Paskapoo Slopes development passes first hurdle at city hall. (2015, July 22). *CBC News*. Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/paskapoo-slopes-development-passes-first-hurdle-at-city-hall-1.3164446

Peters, E. (1995). Demographics of Aboriginal People in Urban Areas. In E. J. Peters (Ed.), *Aboriginal Self-Government in Urban Areas: Proceedings of a Workshop May 25 and 26, 1994* (pp. 3-24). Kingston: Queen's University: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations.

Peters, E., & Andersen, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Poelzer, G., & Coates, K. S. (2015). *From Treaty Peoples to Treaty Nation: A Road Map for All Canadians.* Toronto, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Poland, B. D. (1995). Transcription Quality as an Aspect of Rigor in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(3), 290-310.

Ponting, J. R., & Voyageur, C. J. (2001). Challenging the Deficit Paradigm: Grounds for Optimism Among First Nations in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, XXI(2), 275-307.

Porter, L. (2013). Coexistence in Cities: The Challenge of Indigenous Urban Planning in the Twenty-First Century. In R. Walker, T. Jojola, & D. Natcher (Eds.), *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning* (pp. 283-310). Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Porter, L., & Barry, J. (2015). Bounded Recognition: Urban Planning and the Textual Mediation of Indigenous Rights in Canada and Australia. *Critical Policy Studies*, 9(1), 22-40.

Radforth, I. (2003). Performance, politics, and representation: Aboriginal people and the 1860 royal tour of Canada. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 84(1), 1-32.

Reeves, B.O.K. (1975). 'Kootsisaw': Calgary Before the Canadians. In A. Rasporich & H. Klassen (Eds.), *Frontier Calgary: Town, City and Region, 1875-1914* (p. 20). Calgary: University of Calgary Press.

Simpson, L. (2011). *Dancing On Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Smyth, D. (2001). *The Niitsitapi Trade: Euroamericans and the Blackfoot-Speaking Peoples, to the Mid-1830s* (Master's thesis).

Stanger-Ross, J. (2008). Municipal Colonialism in Vancouver: City Planning and the Conflict over Indian Reserves, 1928-1950s. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 89(4), 541-580.

Statistics Canada. (2011a). *NHS Focus on Geography Series. Calgary, CMA*. Demographic characteristics of Aboriginal people. Last updated April 13, 2016. http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/fogs-spg/Pages/FOG.cfm?lang=E&level=3&GeoCode=825

Statistics Canada (2011b) *Focus on Geography Series, 2011 Census*. Census Metropolitan Area of Calgary, Alberta. Lated updated September 21, 2016. http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-cma-eng.cfm?LANG=Eng&GK=CMA&GC=825

Taylor, C. (1994). The Politics of Recognition. In C. Taylor & A. Gutmann (Eds.), *Multiculturalism* (pp. 25-73). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tobias, J. L. (1976). Protection, Civilization, Assimilation: An Outline History of Canada's Indian Policy. *Western Journal of Anthropology*, 6(2).

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. July 23, 2015.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York, NY: Zed Books Ltd.

Turner, B. S. (Ed.). (1992). *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: Sage Publications.

Turner, D. (2006). *This Is Not a Peace Pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

United Nations. (1969). *Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties*. http://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/1_1_1969.pdf

United Nations. (2007). Fact Sheet: Urban Indigenous Peoples and Migration: Challenges and Opportunities. In *United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues: Sixth Session May 14-25, 2007*. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/6_session_factsheet2.pdf

UN General Assembly. (2007) *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: resolution / adopted by the General Assembly*. 2 October 2007, A/RES/61/295.

Walker, R. C. (2005). Social Cohesion? A Critical Review of the Urban Aboriginal Strategy and its Application to Address Homelessness in Winnipeg. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, XXV(2), 395-416.

Walker, R. C. (2006). Searching for Aboriginal/Indigenous self-determination: Urban citizenship in the Winnipeg low-cost housing sector. *Environment and Planning A*, 38(12), 2345-2363.

Walker, R. C. (2008a). Improving the Interface between Urban Municipalities and Aboriginal Communities. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 17(1), 20-36.

Walker, R. C. (2008b). Aboriginal Self-determination and Social Housing in Urban Canada: A Story of Convergence and Divergence. *Urban Studies*, 45(1), 185-205.

Walker, R., & Barcham, M. (2010). Indigenous-inclusive citizenship: the city and social housing in Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. *Environment and Planning A*, 42, 314-331.

Walker, R., Moore, J., & Linklater, M. (2011). More than Stakeholders, Voices and Tables: Towards Co-Production of Urban Aboriginal Policy in Manitoba. In E. J. Peters (Ed.), *Urban Aboriginal Policy Making in Canadian Municipalities* (pp. 160-201). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Walker, R., & Belanger, Y. (2013). Aboriginality and Planning in Canada's Large Prairie Cities. In R. Walker, T. Jojola, & D. Natcher (Eds.), *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning* (pp. 193- 216). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Walker, R., Berdahl, L., Lashta, E., Newhouse, D., & Belanger, Y. (2017). Public Attitudes towards Indigeneity in Canadian Prairie Urbanism. *Canadian Geographer - Le Géographe canadien* 61(2): 212-223.

Wherrett, J., & Brown, D. (1995). Models for Aboriginal Government in Urban Areas. In E. J. Peters (Ed.), *Aboriginal Self-Government in Urban Areas: Proceedings of a Workshop May 25 and 26, 1994* (pp. 83-110). Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University.

Wilcox, M. (2015, December 3). *7 names for Calgary before it became Calgary*. CBC News. Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/calgary-names-elbow-1.3345967

Williams, A. (Director). Cardinal, T. (Narrator). (2015). *The Pass System* [A Documentary Film]. Toronto: Tamarack Productions

WinSport Canada. (2012, Jul 31). WinSport Canada shocked and disappointed with council decision [Press release]. Retrieved from http://www.winsport.ca/files/WinSport%20disappointed%20with%20Council%20decision.pdf

Wood, P. K. (2003a). Aboriginal/indigenous citizenship: an introduction. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(4), 371-378.

Wood, P. K. (2003b). A road runs through it: Aboriginal citizenship at the edge of urban development. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(4), 463-473.

Appendix A: City of Calgary: Year of Reconciliation Proclamation

Proclamation

Whereas: The Story of Moh'kinsstis says that before there was the place we call Calgary, the First Peoples were stewards of this land. At the confluence of two rivers, the lifeblood of our city, our cultures converged and our story began;

Whereas: The first European settlers did not honour the unique culture of our Aboriginal ancestors. Aboriginal people were isolated from their traditional and spiritual ways. This is exemplified by the many thousands of Aboriginal children who were forcibly removed from their homes and taken to residential schools, but is also evident in many other examples of disenfranchisement;

Whereas: The effects of government policies toward Aboriginal peoples have had a tremendously negative impact on our city and country. Canada has been denied the benefit of the contribution of First Nations to our collective history. Our story cannot be complete without listening to this voice;

Whereas: Reconciliation is an opportunity for us to advance with a greater understanding of the historical impacts that have shaped the experiences of Aboriginal people to date. It will not right the wrongs of the past, but is the start of our journey, together;

Whereas: The City of Calgary will use the lessons of reconciliation to continue the work we have started through the Listening Circles of the Calgary Urban Aboriginal Initiative, the Calgary Aboriginal Urban Affairs Committee, the imagineCalgary Plan, and the Calgary Poverty Reduction Initiative to ensure that our Aboriginal population has a meaningful role within our community, as full and equal participants in our city's quality of life;

Whereas: It is essential that Calgarians of every culture and tradition walk on a shared path paved with opportunity, recognizing that we are connected to each other and to this place, where our collective spirit generates enough for all.

On behalf of City Council and the citizens of Calgary,
I hereby proclaim March 27, 2014 – March 27, 2015 as:

The Year of Reconciliation

[signed]
Naheed K. Nenshi
Mayor

This proclamation was also supported with letters from Tourism Calgary, Calgary Stampede, and Calgary Economic Development.