

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITIES IN SELF-DETERMINATION

A REPORT
ON THE FIRST NATIONAL POLICY CONFERENCE
OF
THE CANADIAN INDIAN/NATIVE STUDIES ASSOCIATION
TRENT UNIVERSITY
PETERBOROUGH, ONTARIO
NOVEMBER 1, 2, 3, 1985

Brian Fox-Wagoosh
Administrative Assistant
Canadian Council For Native Business

Donald Jackson
Social Sciences Division
Algoma University College

November 11, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	The Canadian Indian/Native Studies Association (CINSA)	1
2.	First CINSA National Policy Conference	1
3.	Summary of Sessions Attended	
3.1.	Culturally-Based Curriculum Development	2
3.2.	University Support of Community-Economic Development	6
3.3.	Law and Self-Determination	9
3.4.	Community Development-Aspects of Self-Determination	12
3.5.	The Role of Universities in Self-Determination	16
4.	Appendices	
4.1	CINSA Brochure	
4.2.	CINSA Conference Agenda	
4.3.	R. Leavitt, Paper	
4.4.	S. Lockhart/D. McCaskill, Paper	
4.5.	E. Johnson, Paper	
4.6.	Recommendations from Presenters	

1. The Canadian Indian/Native Studies Association (CINSA)

In 1982 at a meeting held at Brandon University, people involved in Indian and Native Studies programs at Universities and Colleges throughout Canada agreed upon the idea of forming a national Indian/Native Studies Association to facilitate the sharing of ideas and the representation of common concerns.

The following year the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College hosted another conference where the national body of the organization was formalized into a steering Committee that was instructed to draw up a set of by-laws.

A year later a follow-up conference was held at the University of Lethbridge. The by-laws were presented. And thus, in 1984 the Canadian Indian/Native Studies Association (CINSA) became a reality.

The main objectives of the Association are to:

- (1) Provide encouragement and support for the professional development of personnel and programs.
- (2) Foster communication through meetings, conferences, and symposia.
- (3) Promote research and publication.
- (4) Establish liaison with national, regional, and local educational associations and Indian/Native communities.
- (5) Promote immediate and long-range concerns of departments and programs.

[See Appendix 1 for a detailed CINSA brochure]

2. The First CINSA National Policy Conference, Nov. 1985

The First CINSA National Policy Conference was held at Trent University, November 1-3, 1985. The Conference, the theme of which was "The Role of Universities in Self-Determination", provided a forum for regional groups to present their views on the relationship of education to Native self-government. The papers, briefs, and summaries presented, and the discussions held, are to become the basis of guidelines which will assist the Association in developing recommendations to be presented to Canada's Universities. It is hoped that this will assist in promoting the development of a National approach to determining and serving the educational needs of the Native Peoples.

[See Appendix 2 for the CINSA Conference Schedule. The summaries provided below are based upon notes taken during the Conference. Typescripts are not yet available for most of the papers given.]

3. Summary of Sessions Attended

3.1. Period I, Session 1 (Friday Nov. 1)

CULTURALLY-BASED CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

"In-Service Development Perspectives by Quebec's Universities and Community Educational Development: The Algonquin Case"

Francoise Larose

Native Teacher Training Program

Quebec

Francoise Larose has been working with the Native Teacher Training Program in the northern villages of Quebec. The program he is presently teaching involves four hinterland Native communities great distances apart. He is concerned with resolving the problems associated with developing decentralized community-based education programs.

At the time of the negotiations between the peoples of the James Bay region and the Province of Quebec over the James Bay Projects, Quebec was faced with a double challenge in regard to its relationship with the northern Native communities. It was also a time in which the Federal Government was delegating partial responsibility for Native education to the provinces. The Province was faced with the problem of how to provide community-based services to communities that were themselves faced with rapid changes being imposed from the outside.

Many of the communities were isolated and lived a lifestyle based on the "trapline". The Federal residential education they had been receiving was strongly assimilationist in content and form. The curriculum was based on material often irrelevant to the peoples' concerns and depicted them as an insignificant and dying "folk-cult". The language of instruction was English and French. The Algonquin or Cree mother tongue was deemed a poor third in priority. The findings of the James Bay Inquiry demonstrated unequivocally that profound changes were needed and needed quickly.

One result was that in 1971 the universities of Quebec moved to implement a Native Teacher Training Program. The initial work was done by McGill and control was gradually transferred to Laval and the University of Quebec at Chicoutimi. The Province simultaneously undertook to remove or revise textbooks containing offensive or inaccurate material and commenced a program of "Nationalization" of the curriculum.

The Native Teacher Training Program has been operating for 10 years now, training Native teachers and teacher's aids for the Provincial system. At the same time Native Bands have accepted the principles of Indian Control of Indian Education. The Program has not had the success hoped for, however, and this has adverse effects especially in the context of the need to implement Native control. Only 5 Native teachers have been produced

though many more enter the program. Structures in Quebec have remained far too rigid to foster and sustain Native commitment and interest. They see little or no light at the end of tunnel. Specifically:

1) Natives face a difficult time gaining a foothold in a system with Province-wide seniority codes at a time of system stagnation and decline. Non-Natives are already entrenched in Native schools and the general retrenchment stifles opportunity for change and renewal.

2) With the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs transferring budget and management responsibilities to Bands, Native communities cannot afford to send skilled members far away for as long as four years while they are needed to fulfil immediate tasks in their communities that are facing pressing problems.

3) "Competency" as a criterion of acceptance into the program from communities which produce very few high school graduates discourages many. And those who do make the commitment often can't imagine success. Self-confidence is low.

4) Those with sufficient skills and commitment are usually older and have families and responsibilities at home. Their strong sense of community and the many years of study they must spend far away from their families and community in alien and even hostile environments involve them in great hardship. Regular transit home is financially if not physically impossible.

5) Increasing pressure from Non-Natives and provincial authorities who argue that it is not economic to have programs for a few people discourage and deflect the energies of those who are committed to succeed. Lack of awareness among Non-Natives is a very serious problem. Natives are often treated as "folkish" and their programmes are not taken seriously. Some white educators even go so far as to say that its alright to give history and geography in a Native way, but "serious" subjects like biology, physics and chemistry can only be given in a white way. This attitude is so pervasive that many Non-Native educators regard Native teachers simply as aids whose task is to ease the transition to complete assimilation.

Ways must be found to deal with these problems. There is a need for a division of labour in Native education that can bring educational services to reserves so that the educated can remain in their communities where they are needed most. Orientation services for Native students should be provided in Provincial schools at an early level and maintained right through. Nativization should go beyond changing a few sections of a few textbooks and include administration, and procedures -- the way things are done and the way life is lived by Native people -- methods as well as content. Programs and educators should not treat Native culture as folklore if educated Natives are to be able to fit into their Bands and communities in a really knowledgeable way. Language survival is crucial and programs that are

relevant to the issues Native communities face are needed, such as economic development under Band control and recuperation of land rights, within the overall logic and dynamic of self-determination and self-government.

* * * * *

"Confronting Language Ambivalence and Language Death: The Role of
of the University in Native Communities."

Robert M. Leavitt

Micmac-Maliseet Institute

University of New Brunswick

[See Appendix 3 for a copy of this paper]

Robert Leavitt is a Non-Native Maliseet-Passamaquoddy language teacher at the Micmac-Maliseet Institute of the U.N.B. He is presently involved in teaching in The Educational Leadership Development Program designed to train present and potential school board members and administrators. The program was made possible through a grant of the Donner Canadian Foundation.

The Program was developed so that school board members and others would be better prepared to deal with issues of curricula, educational policy, reserve/provincial school relations, and related legal and administrative matters. The emphasis involves learning to 'see' in a Native way so that educational services to Native people will involve reciprocal cross-cultural exchange rather than the traditional one-way flow. The role of the universities in fostering such a dualistic vision is special.

Teachers don't often see Native students as fluent speakers of their own languages and Native language programs are often regarded as irrelevant. "Why teach it if it's not used in the home?" etc. However, there is a relation between language and culture which is important for us to understand as educators if we are to treat questions involving Native languages and Native programmes properly.

In the Maratimes the two spoken Native languages are Micmac and Maliseet. Most fluent speakers are over 30 but in almost every school where Natives attend in the Maratimes there is language program. This is important, because even if the language is spoken by only a few it remain a source of ideas and an understanding of different ways. And the decline of a language though unfortunate does not lead to a loss of all that it conveys. This is apparent in the experience of teachers of Native students or those who work with Native communities.

For example, Native people don't think about time in units like pencils. The words for time are usually verbs not nouns and they refer to the sequence of events rather than duration. The first borrowed words are time words (ie. schedules). This is also true of words about the physical environment. The word for field is usually a verb and not a noun in Micmac which is to say that physical space is very directional and that people see

themselves as part of the environment. This is different from Non-Natives.

Language is crucial to dignity and self-worth and how subtle and important this is really comes home to those who have learned through language or language-related experiences to "see the world in another way". It is a "nerve-shattering" experience. Our sense of space, both physical and social, is an essential part of our identity.

The experience of seeing things in another way is like being positive on a stretch of road that you are heading Westward toward Toronto. Your mind is locked-shut in the Westbound lane and you quite literally cannot image that you are heading east. By a chance clue you discover that you are, in fact, bound eastward. You must pull over and stop thinking just to re-orient yourself. This is what I went through in learning Maliseet-Passamoquoddy in regard to my assumptions about how the world works. It is so different. And this is what the Native speaker goes through in learning English.

For a Native community to switch from its mother tongue is traumatic since language is a part of its orientation in the world. When Indian kids go through this they find it hard to communicate with grandparents, and it is the case therefore that real social and physical space is being lost. They must adjust to the object language of the whiteman away from their own process orientation. However, though they use French and English "loan" words, most often the indigenous grammar survives. It is the grammar that seems crucial to the structuring of experience.

Because of this, language loss which seems inexorable may be reversible. For it doesn't happen overnight that language is lost. And it may not be difficult to relearn as long as the basic orientation structure, essential to identity, has not been lost.

The real challenge then is to retain the Native language while learning the new language -- English or French -- so that a capacity to "see doubly" is developed. The ability to see each world from each point of view would be to see without prejudice the possibilities of each -- like the man who dances and sings traditional songs, knows the oral traditions, visits the elders and learns from them, while at the same time he efficiently administers a million-dollar health program with true foresight for the well-being of the reserve.

In order to accomplish this Native people do not want a watered-down program but they do want some accomodation. The school system should adopt to the students. We in the universities must learn from those who see doubly what this unstated perspective on the Native language is. We must take Native communities seriously. Native languages are a non-renewable resource and they offer us a different paradigm with special knowledges about the environment, geography, and much

else besides.

We are seeing an explosion of Native language materials, teaching guides, aids etc. We should be advocating the learning of Native language not only for its own sake, but also for the insight it gives into English and our own orientation. Understanding what the Native language holds is crucial to our building cohesive and stable communities.

Universities should help Native communities establish and operate Native language programs and repositories. They should train Native people and others to use these for research and for pleasure. They should study what is involved in the Native/Non-Native transition or interface and facilitate strategies for "seeing doubly". And universities should train educators to work with Native communities on the basis of their strengths. [See Appendix for recommendations].

3.2. Period II, Session 2 (Friday, Nov. 1)

UNIVERSITY SUPPORT OF COMMUNITY-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

"Enhancing Local Planning Skills for Native Self-Reliance:
Genesis and Structure of the 'Dene' Gondie Study."
"Dene Gondie - Report in Joint Research Project on Norman Wells"
William Rees and P. Boothroyd
School of Community and Regional Planning
University of British Columbia/Dene Nation

The University of British Columbia's School of Community and Regional Planning was invited to assist to support Dene Bands in negotiating their claims in relation to Norman Wells part of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Project. Norman Wells contracted the University to initiate studies to determine the impact of resource development on the regional communities and to make recommendations that would ease the adjustment process.

Research was based on a co-operative model in which no single aspect of the study was taken for granted. Very few generalizations could be made since the researchers had never dealt with the Native culture of the Mackenzie Delta region nor was there much documented material on the culture of the area.

Researchers were trained to take an active part in establishing rapport with the Native people in the community. This co-operative /partnership model was considered as the best way of achieving some form of consensus on developing approaches that would anticipate the probable areas of concern for the Native communities. Theoretical expectations were left at the door-step because Native people often considered the researcher an expert which tempted him to speak before being sufficiently familiar with the situation. Therefore it was wise to operate on the assumption of inadequate knowledge. Researchers are advised to become familiar with the community, the Native point of view

and the socio-political context before proposing an actual project.

The Partnership model worked well. Native people and the Bands had the right to comment on reporting prior to publication of study findings. In an area never before studied researchers had to think small in order to build up an understanding capable of even posing the problems. Formalized agreements with partner organizations were useful so that roles and responsibilities for all involved could be clearly delineated and expectations clearly understood. Tentative suggestions were put forward along with invitations to Native co-workers to do the same. The use of project meetings as training media assisted in developing Native skills and expertise. It was quickly realized that when working with Native communities it is necessary to operate in an open as possible way with invitations to all Band leaders and workers to attend planning and progress sessions.

These observations should assist university people who are contemplating a research-oriented relationship with a Native community or organization. We essentially advocate the use of the research process as a human-resource and confidence-building mechanism and as an alternative co-operative partnership model for socio-economic development. This model seems best suited for such "communities".

* * * * *

"University Roles in Community Economic Development -- Trent University's Experiences and Plans" and
"Towards an Integrated, Community-Based, Partnership Model of Native Development and Training: A Case Study in Process"

Alexander Lockhart

Department of Sociology

Don McCaskill

Department of Native Studies

Trent University

[See Appendix for a copy of the second paper]

The experience of Trent University in providing academic and research support for Native development needs over the past ten years in various communities in Southern Ontario, the Central Plains, Northwest British Columbia, and the Western Arctic, underscores the need for university recognition of the unique nature of Native socio-economic development needs in two key "process" areas. Firstly, there is a need for academic recognition of the special character of Native development requirements for community-based non-dependent models. And secondly, there is a need for academic Native-training programmes which involve Native trainees in such alternative models which allow them to retain strong links with their original communities.

The general reasons for these are that Native development models must have a strong spiritual base since "individual-

ism" among Natives is a "community-based" individualism. This is very different from the isolated and competitive individualism of the non-Natives who maintain few if any ties to their communities of ancestral origin and whose sense of family, community, and the past is consequently very different.

Because of this, the co-operative partnership model of University/Native relations is the only way that the university can succeed in establishing a mutually beneficial relationship with the Native community and through the community with its individual members. The result is that the university must be prepared to unlearn as well as to learn if it wishes to "access the Native program and data base" as it were. This sharing of power with the "client" is often anathema to universities and their personnel, especially to boards and administrations since it is perceived as involving "risk". However, if the university wishes to "access" the Native community it must recognize the risk involved on the part of the Native community. The university must be prepared for its part to run these risks too. The community-based partnership model seems the only way.

Paternalism, both in theory and practice, must be rejected in favour of equity between the Native and non-Native knowledge frameworks and the fostering of a sense of joint ownership of the research and knowledge-determining process. Academic recognition of this need in mainstream areas beyond Native Studies departments is slow in coming and consequently Native trainees have difficulty integrating their technical expertise with their communities and with their cultural traditions. Interdisciplinary programmes are very helpful. Mainstream academia must adapt its thinking to Native needs. Arguments about academic freedom are often used to defend the "conventional wisdom" which itself is often little less than the uncritical acceptance of established intellectual prejudice. The 'arms-length' relationship must be replaced by a partnership model which may be established more readily as some efforts of academia itself have been instrumental in removing older and more untenable forms of repression and may contain a self-critical dimension which assist mainstream departments in taking positive steps.

In community development the Native sense of community wholism leads to a preference for social continuity and geographic stability over the economic opportunism characteristic of non-Native "development" or boom, bust, and move-on hinterland development philosophy. (ie. human development vs. economic development models). The problem is how to measure "human development" with mainstream economic yardsticks. Benefits and "Profits" are not necessarily identical.

Conventional, discipline-bound academia mitigates against wholistic knowledge needs and the development of the community-based partnership model. The status-distance of university faculty which isolate them from wider social involvements, and the vestiges of an elite tradition with its rites of passage, mitigate against such action-research and action-learning models.

Bureaucratic fragmentation, especially in larger universities exacerbates the problem.

Trent has tried to transcend its difficulties through a co-operative and inter-disciplinary "consortium" approach, but hitherto has been unsuccessful in gaining the necessary level of co-operation largely because of bureaucratic inertia and outmoded funding criteria. Institutional inertia both in academia and government is still based on the desire to assimilate or iso-late Native development despite the growing acceptance of the concept of Native self-determination. Indeed, the prevailing academic ideology remains co-optive in relation to the Native peoples and "Native Studies" faces the profound problem of "ghettoization". Native Studies must integrate mainstream knowledge sources into the co-operative community development model so that the knowledge can travel both ways. Mainstream "Western culture" is in desperate need of revitalization and renewal and the Nation's universities should meet the Native people half-way, not only for the good of the Native people but for their own renaissance.

3.3. Period III, Session 1 (Sat. Nov. 2)

LAW AND SELF-DETERMINATION

D. Auger
Colborne and Kelly Law Firm
Thunder Bay

Mr. Auger described the problems faced by Native people and Band representatives in court proceedings and offered advice on how to handle the process of giving testimony in an efficient and effective manner. The main emphasis was placed upon developing a solid lawyer-client relationship and holding to a pre-arranged strategy in the courtroom. Voluntarism and spontaneity in testimony usually created difficulties. Judges are accomodating and individuals ought not to feel intimidated. The presentation was a short textbook account of how to "appear" in court.

* * * * *

"First Nations' Jurisdiction: Education and the Impact of
Canadian Government Policies in Indian Education"

Chris Printup
Education Department
Assembly of First Nations

A survey of mainstream Canadian interpretations of the history of Native/Canadian relations suggests a myopia that beggars description amongst Euro-Canadian academia. Events are often regarded as having just happened or happened arbitrarily when Native forces have been crucial. For reasons that are unacknowledged the Native fact itself is unacknowledged. There are glaring examples of this which indicate the kind of biases

that are built into what passes as "knowledge".

The pattern of unacknowledged "absence" of Native society as an ongoing and determining historical force is set in interpretations of the first British act dealing with relations between the two Nations, the Royal Proclamation of 1763, and with few exceptions, is followed consistently thereafter.

The fact is that the Royal Proclamation of 1763-64 did not follow simply from the foresight of the British Crown but that it was an international diplomatic response on the part of the British to the successful military campaign of Chief Pontiac and others to drive the British out of the Great Lakes area because of conflicting Native/colonial economic interests. The Confederacy of Anishnabek bands that met the British at Niagara knew as little about the class nature of European structures just as much as the Europeans misunderstood the nature of Indian life. However, the conflicts that arose from different ways of using the land and that led to the Crown's agreeing to respect aboriginal title and rights ("This is the way it is going to be") were one thing, that England had a parliamentary system in which the Crown was rapidly becoming a mere figurehead and whose will and understanding of agreements changed with changes in ministries was quite another, and of course, was not mentioned in the Proclamation.

Thus, for example, in 1867 with the British North America Act, the new Dominion parliament claimed the right to make laws in relation to the First Nations. Yet from 1763 to 1867 there was no conquest of Indian peoples nor surrender by the Indian peoples, but laws were passed which locked-up anyone who argued for Indian rights, rights already acknowledged in the Proclamation.

The fact is that there were and are two sovereignties and two different legal systems sharing the same territory. And yet, here again, interpretations were biased. According to common law doctrine, the principles of continuity and ius gentium, inherited by the British from Roman times, determined that the laws of even conquered peoples should be left intact. In 1608 Lord Coke, in a case involving a Scottish landlord's claim to his land, judged that the conquest of Scotland did not extinguish Scottish land tenure since, as he put it, the Scots were Christians like the English. By Blackstone's day the religious assumption was replaced by the view that the conquered just had to be agricultural for their laws to command respect. The view, though changing, still overlooked the fact that every society, regardless of religion or mode of production, has its own legal system. The Native Nations did have and still have their legal systems too.

Indians have jurisdiction in education. We know what is best for our children especially when Canadian government policies are based on racism and assimilationism. This has not yet occurred to educators who seem amazed at the high dropout

rate of Native students after grade 8, the age at which students realize that they are Native and that the education they receive under Federal and Provincial governments instills false values -- values which are directly contrary to those held by Indians as Indians. With no control or input from Indians, laws which are archaic and inappropriate continue to be applied with catastrophic consequences for Native communities and Native families. This shatters the world of the Native peoples and does so without justification since Indian nations have never been conquered nor have they agreed to assimilation.

Clearly there is a need for our own high schools, colleges, and universities, that stress our own beliefs. It is clear that other people's beliefs are not going to work! Indian people are determined to survive the next 500 years as Indian people.

In the context of these needs for Indian education we are hard pressed to understand decisions like those which award a \$1 billion retroactive tax-break to Dome and \$250 million to Petrofina. What about the Native people. How are we to accept these anomalies? What are the social objectives behind such policies if not land grabs and ignoring rights?

Canadian governments' policies in respect of Indian education are based upon a theory which is fundamentally oppressive of First Nations' rights and the well-being of Indian communities. Indian control is an inherent right of First Nations, and universities should assist Indian communities in defending their rights by raising the awareness of all people regarding Native self-government, by assisting Native educators in developing control of post-secondary institutions, and through developing programmes which assist the First Nations in retaining their traditional laws and institutions.

Intellectual liberty for Native people as Native people is the foundation of our self-determination and self-government.

Discussion: An interesting discussion followed this presentation which raised some important issues.

Elders are not acknowledged by mainstream academia as experts yet they are experts. Indeed, academics are always running to them to learn themselves. Just because the knowledge is developed and maintained orally should not demean its status as knowledge. The system leaves out the real experts in favour of those experts who are tied to its own survival mechanisms. For example, the forest industry has destroyed the country and the experts plant trees. There's nothing in the law that says the replanted trees have to grow. And of course, they don't grow.

The Nielson Report is the "buffalo jump" of the '80s. In the Report there is a review, an inventory, of Native culture and

education programmes, made to see where cuts can be made. The approach is clinical and Natives should reject collaborating in such clinical approaches (the using of lawyers, the courts etc). On the contrary, the people must be mobilized. The people are the army. The courts should only be used as one part of an overall mobilization strategy. "Free trade", for example, what do they mean, if not that they want to trade freely in other peoples' resources? -- Indian resources. Thus the approach must not be clinical but must be overall.

Another myth that must be dispelled is the myth that legislative power on reserves comes from outside the band. It doesn't come from anywhere else but the band itself. In this regard the maintenance of our sovereign title is crucial because education must be set up and paid for. This can not be done if they define our title. Unilateral Indian government -- recognize us or fight us -- may be the only way.

We have made it through the system this far. Indians go where other Indians go. We must provide the example.

3.4. Period IV, Session 3 (Sat. Nov. 2)

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT-ASPECTS OF SELF-DETERMINATION

"Native Studies in the National Association of
Native Friendship Centres"

Ray Hatfield

National Association of Native Friendship Centres
Ottawa

Short Introduction by Lorraine Thomas:

The Native friendship centre is a prime example of community development. There are 101 such centres in Canada which grew out of the need to serve Native people in the urban context by providing "urban" and "transient" services. Services provided include programmes in education, culture, social services, economic development, housing, justice, and recreation. They aim at promoting the dignity and retaining the culture of Native people in an off-reserve setting by working with all Native peoples.

Mr. Hatfield outlined the efforts of Indian Friendship Centres in relation to Native studies programmes. In some cases courses have been taken to reserve communities on an outreach basis. In his case a drive of 1-1 1/2 hours to reach people with a programme at the community level is not uncommon. Institutions and governments should be encouraged to provide funding for cross-cultural initiatives at the local level.

A serious problem in programme development and delivery especially in regard to co-operation with universities has involved the conflict of traditional and academic methods of

teaching, especially the problem of accessing spiritual leaders and community elders.

* * * * *

"Determination of Indian Band Membership:
An Examination of Political Will"
Morris Manyfingers, Jr.
Saskatchewan Indian Federated College

As a Plains Indian and member of the Blackfoot Nation, Mr. Manyfingers noted that he was out of his element and not used to seeing so many Ojibway, Six Nations, and trees!

The criteria of "Indianness" has become a problem and under the terms of Bill C-31, revision of the Indian Act, many Indians would be excluded. This has led to the need for Indian Nations to maintain their concept of aboriginal citizenship. And on this basis Band determination of Indian membership involves three basic principles: self-determination; culture; and racial preservation. Through Bill C-31 it has been estimated that 24,000 Native people would lose their status through the Bill's discriminatory clauses and to this would be added a loss of status for 52,000 children.

There is a profound difference between Indian and Canadian Government views regarding citizenship. As "foreign" nations in the context of settler governments' policies, Native Bands have had to develop means of citizenship preservation. The Navajo Tribal Code, for example, defines membership strictly in terms of ancestry.

The issue of the right to "personhood", involved in the question of citizenship, includes the right to associate with a group. Can one gain citizenship without being a member of that Nation? The Canadian Government's view that it would arbitrarily and unilaterally assign individuals to Bands violates the commitment of Native peoples to their own traditions of the extended family, strong ties with elders, and fundamental belief in collective rights, not to mention the behaviour and customs, traditions and religious ceremonies of the group. Can the rights and responsibilities of Indians be extended to non-Indians? And would non-Indian Governments uphold these laws? For example, can non-Indians be protected by Indian religious and spiritual laws in their use of peyote and eagle feathers? Will the criteria be complexion, conviction, behaviour? After all, to whites, what is a Metis but 'a light-coloured Indian'? Is this true?

Bill C-31 raises complex questions. The main point is that Native policy on these questions must be based on the three principles of self-determination, culture, and racial preservation. The philosophic and operational premises regarding these will have to be decided by Bands in their policy for First Nations' Control of Band Membership.

* * * * *

"Community Development and Employment"
Michael Roy (replaces Gail Mason)
Union of Ontario Indians Anishnabek Nation

The traditional economy of hunting, fishing, gathering, and agriculture have been basic to Indian culture for centuries prior to and after European contact. It formed the basis of our relationship with the land and the ceremonies we still treasure. Recently however, Indian communities in Southern Ontario especially have been changing into bedroom communities as Native people have been increasingly forced to rely on the non-Native controlled economy for employment. Must the Native leave his community to improve his life?

Many barriers to economic development by and for Indians on Indian land and with Indian resources have been erected that have forced Indians to rely on the public sector of the Canadian Government. The Indian Act prevents Indian land from being developed in co-operation with others as is done in foreign countries with development contracts. This has discouraged development of a strong internal Native economy and Native commercial development of other markets, as well as Indian entrepreneurial structures and skills. Indians have become essentially employees of government. We have been prevented from developing on the basis of self-reliance. We have no capital because we never have had capital. Bands have been discouraged both individually and collectively from developing their own economic potential.

Now with the Canadian economy having developed and the Native economy stifled, the off-reserve Indian population is growing and may soon outnumber the on-reserve population as Natives seek employment in what has become the mainstream economy. Ironically, at the same time, off-reserve housing and primary and secondary school support programmes have been cancelled. Quiet acceptance of such events will not continue, especially now that many off-reserve people are urban, professional, and organization employees who have gained an understanding of what their people are facing.

There are some avenues open for co-operative development, however, and these should be advanced to the fullest. Not just Native co-ops, but the Native Economic Development Fund and the Canadian Council for Native Business can be vehicles in Native economic development. We now need an information system to parallel these so that Natives may individually, co-operatively, and collectively, make use of these programs.

The important considerations in developing programmes of economic growth involve knowing what resources and initiatives exist in each Native community and how particular programmes can meet the needs of communities. Community development must remain in the hands of Indians, however. There is no future in non-Indian control. Native people are increasingly competent in the technicalities of community development and management, and their

skills must be employed. The success of a project will be perceived in terms of accessibility, sufficiency, and appropriateness. The project should be operated under Indian authority, designed specifically for the community or communities and reflect the fundamentals of Indian culture -- ie. be self-reliant and socially responsible.

Economic and community development must be meshed. The Canadian economy is largely capitalist, while the history of Native people is linked to co-operative development and an unsullied relationship with the land. The challenge is to find a way to develop the economic potential of the Native communities so as to provide what they want while simultaneously retaining traditional values.

Discussion followed in which serious questions regarding economic development models were raised.

A profound threat to Native communities is the pressure Bands are presently under to turn reserves into municipalities. The combination of Bill C-31 with the economic development incentives offered through "municipalization" amounts to racial and social engineering of Native communities by Indian and Northern Affairs in the interests of the Canadian nation's development not the Native Nations' development. Native Studies should criticize these eugenic policies and the genetic engineering of communities.

Municipalization will lead to the alienation of reserve lands. But land should be inalienable. One generation cannot give away the next generation's land base. At the heart of the municipalization scheme is the Federal policy to warehouse Indian communities and play them off against each other so as to be able to trade them off cheaply. Federal initiatives are still assimilationist. They would have Bands tax their own members and charge user fees for access to the land. Native studies has been soft on policy analysis of this kind.

In terms of Native/non-Native co-operation, are non-Natives worthy of an association with Native Peoples? Surely it is a privilege and requires an apprenticeship. For example, York University is trying to develop Native Studies programmes and is looking for Native educators. Native leaders and elders qualify as Native teachers but they are not accredited. Is it not assimilationist for universities to say "Come on our terms"?

Native Studies is only one department. What Native input is there in other areas, especially areas like social work where Indians have such a personal stake, not to mention areas that study the environment and the land, people and culture.

To say that Indians don't have capital because they never have had capital misses the point unless it is understood that

capital is not a thing but a class-relation. Natives are co-operators and there are many avenues for co-operative development which will allow us to maintain our traditions of community and respect for the land. We want our people and our land to be part of a whole. We don't want a relationship with the earth or amongst ourselves that is contradictory or destructive.

3.5. Sunday, Nov. 3.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITIES IN SELF-DETERMINATION

CINSA Plenary Meeting and General Discussion

The main theme of the conference has been how the universities can play a role in self-determination. Many areas and topics have been covered. What are some main concerns?

The people are the key supporters for the role of the universities. Bridges must be built between the universities and the Native communities. Most especially the universities must assist in reducing the ignorance of the non-Native people. This is perhaps the most crucial way that they can help Native self-government.

The question is, "What are the universities prepared to do to change their ways of thinking and teaching?"

"How do we judge qualifications? And who judges?"

Credit should be given for practica. Clearly there is a need for requirements and compromises. York (Environmental Studies, Native Theme area) works on a mix of courses and practica. Others should do this too. Credit could be given for experience or courses could involve an element of working in the community.

There is a need for investigation into Native Law (ie. sacred objects etc.). Research and writing on Native law (Saddle Lake and U.S. Tribal Justice System, for example) should be encouraged.

Accreditation is a serious problem. How are standards to apply? The role of Elders and traditional teaching especially must be looked at. Saskatchewan uses adjunct professors. Could there not be a reciprocity between honorary degrees and honorary chiefs? The main point is to get these resource people into the programmes somehow. An Elders Institute emphasizing oral traditions may help alter the continued foreign training of Indian children and students.

The need for a Native Archives and a Native Historical Society is great, as are the development of mechanism for joint Native/Canadian control.

The contradictions of white mainstream society are driving

people to alternatives. Natives represent that alternative in the North American context. If universities recognize Native elders as scholars this might assist non-Native as well as Native students in developing or maintaining their perspectives. Where appropriate each institution should be encouraged to assist in establishing an aboriginal historical society and an elders' institute.

Universities should be encouraged to co-operate with Native people and Native communities in finding solutions to problems as they arise in their settings and circumstances. The rapid development of Indian governments presents a challenge to universities to provide meaningful programs to Native students and an awareness of the principles and issues involved to non-Natives.

A resolution from the Conference should be sent to each university in Canada urging them to seek co-operate with Native communities and seek ways to better meet their responsibilities in relation to serving the educational needs of the Peoples of the First Nations.



Association
Sibirica
Canaquim

(204) 281-8122
Kegonah Saskatchewan S4E 0V3
University of Regina
College West Building
Room 15A