

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN RACIALIZED IMMIGRANTS AND INDIGENOUS
PEOPLES IN CANADA: A LITERATURE REVIEW

by

Melissa May Ling Chung, BA, The University of Winnipeg, 2010

A Major Research Paper
presented to Ryerson University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in the Program of
Immigration and Settlement Studies

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2012

© Melissa Chung 2012

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION FOR ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF A THESIS

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

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

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

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

Melissa Chung

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN RACIALIZED IMMIGRANTS AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN CANADA: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Melissa May Ling Chung
Master of Arts, 2012
Immigration and Settlement Studies
Ryerson University

ABSTRACT

This literature review assesses the current status of Indigenous and racialized newcomer relations in Canada and provides recommendations for future research, government policy, and grassroots organizing. In Canada, as is other “white settler-societies”, there is a strict separation between two intersecting debates surrounding identity, citizenship, and belonging—one revolves around the immigrant experience and the other around Indigenous peoples. To break down the barriers separating these two debates, this paper will explore what the nature of the relationship is between immigrants and Indigenous peoples through a review of the literature using postcolonial and decolonized anti-racist frameworks. This literature review attempts to contribute to the unsettling of insider/outsider, minority/majority, Indigenous/settler, and black/white binaries, which are pervasive within the racialized and colonized Canadian society, and build dialogue and cross-cultural collaboration in anti-racist activism and scholarship.

Key words:

Indigenous, immigrant, interminority relations, interculturalism, decolonizing anti-racism

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Grace-Edward Galabuzi, for showing great enthusiasm and support of my research ideas well before I began graduate studies at Ryerson University. If not for Dr. Galabuzi I do not believe that this project would have come to fruition. I would also like to extend my gratitude to my second reader Dr. Lynn Lavallee. Dr. Lavallee supported me by challenging me to think about my research questions from different perspectives, which helped me grow academically and personally. She has been a great mentor. Much thanks also goes to Dr. Cyndy Baskin for taking a sincere interest in my research and for being so willing to meet with me.

A special thanks goes to my partner Eldon. He supported me through all my ups and all my downs in any possible way he could. I am so grateful for his patience and love. I would also like to thank all my friends and family who provided me encouragement and reassurance when I needed it. I am greatly indebted to you all.

Finally, I would like to thank my Mom and my Papa for always believing in me, for always being proud of me, and for always showing me unconditional love.

DEDICATION

For my Big Sister Bev, who without her continuous support throughout the years I am not sure that I would be where I am today. Thank you for believing in me. Rest in peace.

Table of Contents

Author’s Declaration.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
PART ONE: THE AUTHOR’S STORY.....	1
PART TWO: INTRODUCTION.....	5
PART THREE: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND IMMIGRANTS IN CANADA.....	9
PART FOUR: COLONIALISM, POST-COLONIALISM, & “DECOLONISING ANTI- RACISM”—THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	14
PART FIVE: RESEARCH METHODS.....	18
PART SIX: LITERATURE REVIEW FINDINGS.....	19
Theme 1: Historical Relations.....	20
Theme 2: Indigenous Peoples and Refugee-ed Experiences of Displacement.....	25
Theme 3: Racism and Prejudice Between Indigenous People and Newcomers.....	27
Theme 4: Indigenous Perspective on Immigration and Multiculturalism.....	33
Theme 5: Immigrant Perspectives on Indigeneity.....	37
Theme 6: Governmental Initiatives for Relationship Building.....	42
Theme 7: Aboriginal Organization Initiatives for Relationship Building.....	45
Theme 8: Collaboration Through Art and Culture.....	48
PART SEVEN: DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS.....	51
PART EIGHT: CONCLUSION.....	54
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	56

PART ONE: THE AUTHOR'S STORY

My name is Melissa May Ling Chung. My father came to Canada in the 1980s as an international student from Hong Kong, whereas my mother was born in rural Manitoba to Scottish-Métis¹ parents. My father moved back to Hong Kong when I was a toddler, and although he had visited me during the first few summers after leaving, I have been visiting him in Hong Kong since the age of six. This living arrangement can be described as an “astronaut family,” common amongst Hong Kong immigrants during that time period. The father would return to Hong Kong usually for better economic opportunities, while still supporting his family back in Canada. My situation was unique given that my mother was not Chinese, but Métis. Being of mixed-heritage—a Métis person from the Red River Valley and a second-generation Chinese Canadian—has given me an interesting perspective on issues surrounding identity, culture, and belonging in Canada of Indigenous people and of immigrants, albeit a complicated one.

I have always felt that I’ve lived two parallel lives during my childhood years. One life, the life with my mother, was at times difficult and unstable. We relocated often within Manitoba, and therefore we were disconnected from our family and the communities we lived in. For various reasons my mother was unable to work and was forced to rely on government subsidy, which made it difficult to ensure that all of our needs were met. Despite everything, my mother always showed me unconditional love, compassion for others, and resiliency. Because of my childhood, I often feel that I can relate to Aboriginal² people more than anyone else. Aboriginal

¹ The Métis are one of three distinct Aboriginal peoples of Canada and are recognized in the Constitution Act, 1982.

² Aboriginal people are all Indigenous people of Canada, which include Status and non-status Indians, Métis, and Inuit.

people are extraordinarily resilient considering all of the difficulties that they may face. And I am very proud of that.

My other life, the life with my father, was a privileged one. Since I was six, I have been travelling to Hong Kong and Amsterdam to visit with my father, aunts, uncles, cousins, and grandparents. I was able to experience many different cultures at a young age. I always felt very loved by my father, but also felt disconnected culturally. He never taught me how to speak Cantonese, and aside from the month or two that I would spend with him every other summer, I had no other contact with Chinese people. He would attempt to instill pride in me of my Chinese heritage, but I nevertheless felt like an outsider, even an imposter.

Despite feeling disconnected from Chinese culture, I learned from a young age that if I identified as being Chinese people would likely perceive me more positively. Once I was aware of the racism and prejudice against Aboriginal people that exists in Canada, I internalized feelings of shame of my Aboriginal ancestry. In her discussion, Cameron (2011) states, “ghosts allude to the presence of that which has been excluded, marginalized, and expelled; although themselves immaterial and spectral, they gesture towards to materiality of colonized and abject bodies” (p. 143). I feel as though my feelings of shame are my ghosts, and that to move forward I must acknowledge and reclaim my Aboriginal identity and find a way to understand myself as a colonized body but also as one implicated in colonization processes.

My mother told me that my father held various prejudices against Aboriginal people in Canada, and that he acquired the stereotypes before he came as an international student. This stuck with me, and during my undergraduate program at the University of Winnipeg I began to notice that some of my friends who were international students also held prejudices against Aboriginal people. I would often sit in on racist discussions and sit quietly without defending

Aboriginal people, my people. My friends were not aware of my Aboriginal ancestry, so I suppose they felt comfortable discussing such topics with me around.

When I applied to the Immigration and Settlement Studies program at Ryerson University, I knew that I wanted my research to focus on Aboriginal-Newcomer relations. I felt that my experience of “living two separate lives” was also relevant to the separation of Aboriginal and immigration debates in the political, policy, and academic realms and that this research focus would allow me the opportunity to reclaim my Aboriginal identity. The orientation session was the first time in my life I had introduced myself as being Chinese and Métis. It was incredibly liberating, but I also felt a sense of uneasiness that my colleagues may treat me differently. Indeed, during one of the first classes when we discussed first contact between European colonizers and Aboriginal peoples in Canada, some classmates looked to me for the answers, which I did not have. This program has been a journey for me in seeking answers and a better understanding of myself as a mixed Aboriginal and Chinese person and this research project has been an opportunity for me to reconcile these identities.

The reason that I include this short autobiography as the introduction to this research project is because of the importance of storytelling for Indigenous people, and research is indeed a form of storytelling. An Indigenous research paradigm views research as ceremony. Wilson (2009) states, “The purpose of any ceremony is to build stronger relationships or bridge the distance between our cosmos and us. The research that we do as Indigenous people is a ceremony that allows us a raised level of consciousness and insight into our world” (p. 137). He also quotes the phrase, “if research doesn’t change you as a person, then you haven’t done it right” (Wilson, 2009, p. 135). This research project addresses a particular social phenomenon, but it also reflects my own personal struggles with reconciling two intersecting identities—one

half Indigenous, and the other half immigrant—and how this shapes my Canadian identity. My hope is that through the research process I will gain a broader understanding academically as well personally.

PART TWO: INTRODUCTION

In Canada, as in other “white settler-societies” including Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, there have been two distinct public and intellectual debates concerning the significance of descent, culture, and belonging (Curthoys, 2000). Curthoys describes the first debate as revolving around the cleavage between Indigenous³ and non-Indigenous peoples, with particular emphasis on the status of Indigenous claims stemming from a history of colonization and “is about land, health, heritage, housing, intellectual property, identity, education, ‘stolen children’, and much else as well” (2000, p. 21). The second debate revolves around the immigrant, and his or her challenge to Canadian society at large. Curthoys argues that it focuses on the “non-British immigrant and the notion of multiculturalism, and is about cultural diversity, ethnic politics, and immigration policy” (2000, p. 21)⁴.

Bauder (2011) has conceptualized the separation of immigration and Indigenous discourses as a parallax gap—the representation of “of two closely linked perspectives between which no neutral common ground is possible” (Zizek, 2006, quoted in Bauder, 2011). While a parallax gap is a concept applied in physics, Bauder suggests that it is a useful term that can

³ This is used as an umbrella term to encompass a variety of peoples. Shaw, Herman, and Dobbs (2006) refer to Indigenous peoples as “groups with ancestral and often spiritual ties to particular land, and whose ancestors held that land prior to colonization by outside powers, and whose nations remain submerged within the states created by those powers” (p. 268). Many Aboriginal peoples identify with their cultural community of origin rather than the legal categories established by the Canadian state. It is not possible to recognise all Aboriginal groups in Canada in this literature review, so despite the pitfalls of using an umbrella term, “Indigenous” appears to be the most suitable. Indigenous will primarily be used throughout the discussion and is a fitting term given that while this literature review focuses on Indigenous peoples of Canada and newcomers to Canada I also acknowledge that this may be an important discussion for Indigenous peoples and diasporic/displaced/(im)migrant peoples globally. Indeed, “Indigenous” has gained popularity primarily due to the transnational networks that provide a common platform of articulation (Nair, 2006).

⁴ Indeed, in this literature “immigrant” refers to racialized immigrants, both first- and second-generation.

pertain to immigration and Aboriginal issues as they are intimately connected historically (p. 517). Bauder suggests that the omission of Indigenous narratives with regards to immigration is because “immigration is a necessary aspect of the national imagination in settler societies” (p.517). National identity formation involves first welcoming newcomers as immigrants then integrating them into Canadian society; Indigenous peoples in Canada have no place in the national imagination of a settler society (Bauder, 2011). Indeed, a recognition of Indigenous peoples prior to the formation of the settler society would “wreak havoc on the national identity as an immigration country in which belonging is defined in political, not ethnic terms . . . [therefore], a settler nation must deny the ethnic principle of territorial belonging” (Bauder, 2011, p. 517).

In many instances when both Indigenous peoples and immigrants are included in the same dialogue or study, the discussion revolves around comparing and/or contrasting experiences of marginalization and exclusion within Canadian society through analysis of health outcomes (for example: Higginbottom et al., 2011), urban settlement patterns (Peters & Starchenko, 2005), access to affordable housing (Carter & Osborne, 2009), labour market outcomes (Kuhn & Sweetman, 2002), or educational outcomes (Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, 2008). Indeed, there has been a tendency in academia, public discourse, and government policy to “make Aboriginals [sic] immigrants too” (Bohacker & Iacovetta, 2009) by treating Indigenous peoples as another minority group to be assimilated and absorbed into the mainstream.

A way to bridge the gap between these two distinct debates is recognise that both colonization and racialization “exist in Canada’s history and present an unacknowledged continuity that defines its dominant and structural social, economic, political, and cultural

orders” (Wallis, Sunseri, & Galabuzi, 2010, p. 1). In a recent volume titled *Colonialism and Racism in Canada* editors Wallis, Sunseri, and Galabuzi point out that Canada, despite global recognition as a multicultural nation and as leader in diversity management, is in fact steeped in a complex history of “structural hierarchies of racial inequality and attempts to erase its Indigenous reality” (2010, p. 1). Canadian society emerged through colonialism that involved the rationalization of a new colonial economic, social, and political order. This was forced upon the Indigenous nations whose land was “legally” characterized as people-less through the deployment of the concept of *Terra Nullius* by the British and the French monarchies (Wallis, Sunseri, & Galabuzi, 2010). This involved the construction of Indigenous peoples as the inferior “Other” and as other people of colour immigrated to Canada, they were subjected to unequal treatment and were constructed as inferior “races” as well. Further, many racialized newcomers came to Canada as a result of European colonization due to enormous global shifts of populations. Both colonizers and colonized people moved: colonized people as slaves, indentured labourers, domestic servants, travellers and traders. Colonization and racialization could be “one point of juncture from which to build an honest dialogue and form solidarity” (Wallis, Sunseri, & Galabuzi, 2010, p. 3).

Wallis, Sunseri, and Galabuzi (2010) highlight that there are numerous groups in Canada that are focusing on their own specific issues—for example, land claims for Indigenous peoples, racial profiling against Muslims and others, redress for the Asian Head Tax victims etc.—and suggest that while this work is important, it can be further advanced through coalition building across various groups and communities. The editors argue that Indigenous and racialized communities must recognise this classic divide-and-conquer strategy that those in power use to divide them. What the editors do not address is whether or not there are strides being taken

between Indigenous and racialized communities with regards to building alliances, and if not, what is prohibiting these groups from doing so and what is the appropriate approach for building these relationships.

The aim of this literature review is not to further generalize between Indigenous peoples and immigrants vis-à-vis mainstream society, but to focus horizontally by addressing the following question: What does the current literature tell us about the relationships between immigrants and other racialized groups and Indigenous peoples in Canada? I also endeavour to address why this question is important in the early 21st Century Canada. This question will be approached by reviewing various works, including peer-reviewed journals, non-profit organization publications, government documents, documentaries, master's theses, and books.

This paper is organized into eight sections. I begin with Part I and Part II above. Part III provides a brief discussion on the history, current issues, and trends regarding Canadian immigration and Indigenous peoples in Canada. Part IV presents the theoretical framework from which this topic is approached. Part V presents the research methods and limitations of the paper. Part VI consists of the literature review findings, and is organized by eight themes. Part VII offers discussion and recommendations for research, policy, and grassroots organizing, followed by Part VIII—the conclusion.

PART THREE: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND IMMIGRANTS IN CANADA

Canada portrays itself as an enlightened nation, while simultaneously downplaying institutionalized racism, immigrant restrictions, and its history of colonization (Bohacker & Iacovetta, 2009). It is important for the intent of this project to first provide a discussion on the history of the relationship between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian state and to proceed with a discussion on the history of Canadian immigration. In this section I provide a brief description of these groups in Canada as way to conceptualize the importance of cross-cultural collaboration in the 21st century.

In the early years of the formation of the Canadian state, it was largely assumed by governments that Indigenous people would disappear. Indeed, the colonizers took and continue to take great strides to “obliterate the collective memories and the current presence of Aboriginal people” (Haig-Brown, 2007, p. 168). The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples was appointed in 1991 to help restore justice to the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada, and the final report was made public in November 1996. Volume one of the report offers a historical overview of the relationship, and highlights that the period from 1800 to the 1969 White Paper of the Trudeau Government was a period of displacement and assimilation (Thornton, 2001, p. 11).

The historical context of the RCAP concluded that the Canadian Government undermined Indigenous institutions and lives through the use of various instruments and actions, particularly: the Indian Act, creation of residential schools, relocation of Aboriginal communities and the loss of land (Thornton, 2001). An integral part of this history is the Indian Act of 1876, which is a Canadian federal law that governs Indian status, bands, and reserve lands. The Indian Act has been highly invasive and paternalistic towards Indigenous peoples and Lawrence (2003)

argues as being, “much more than a body of laws that for over a century have controlled every aspect of Indian life. As a regulatory regime, the *Indian Act* provides ways of understanding Native identity, organizing a conceptual framework that has shaped contemporary Native life in ways that are now so familiar as to almost seem ‘natural’” (p. 3).

The residential school system was given special attention by the RCAP as “not only were Aboriginal communities distressed by the separation of children from their communities, native languages and heritage, but the tragedy was worsened by the existence of physical and sexual abuse that has become evident in some parts of this sordid system” (Thornton, 2001, p. 13). An estimated 125,000 children passed through approximately eighty residential schools in Canada (Thornton, 2001). This process of removing Indigenous children from their families has been conceptualized as that of cultural genocide. A narrow definition of genocide restricts the act to various forms of killing, whereas a broader conception incorporates various ways in which groups can be eliminated including the destruction of culture and physical environment (van Krieken, 2004). Indeed, this was the intent of the residential school system. In 2008, Prime Minister Stephen Harper made a public apology for the role the government had played in the aggressive assimilation of Indigenous children through these church-run and government supported residential schools. This apology, however, has been criticized for not taking substantive steps at rectifying these injustices.

The reserve system is similar to the residential school system and allowed the government to designate land to be occupied by Indigenous people. It also was a mechanism for government to further social, political, and economic control of the occupants (Thornton, 2001). Aspects of this policy existed prior to Confederation and the *Indian Act* and were part of the colonial mandate to “civilize” Indigenous peoples through the introduction to agriculture,

sedentary life and Christianity. It was, however, codified in the nineteenth century under the Confederated Government of Canada (Thornton, 2001).

Treaty making, unlike the residential school system and the reserve system, was not dominated by colonists and the Canadian Government, “but was a process with a long Aboriginal history” (Thornton, 2001, p. 15). Beginning in 1701, the British Crown entered into treaties with Indigenous peoples in Canada to encourage peaceful relations and alliances. Retzlaff (2008) highlights that treaty making between the Crown and Indigenous people were made on an assumed nation-to-nation basis and therefore place Indigenous peoples as distinct nations within Canada. Despite recognition of treaty rights in the Constitution Act, 1982 the legacy of British institutions and colonial doctrine shape how the legal system views and interprets Indigenous treaty rights, which results in systemic biases that situate Indigenous peoples at a definite disadvantage (Asch, 1998).

According to the 2006 Canadian census, the number of people who identified themselves as Aboriginal, First Nations, Métis, or Inuit, surpassed the one million mark, reaching 1,172,790. This accounts for nearly 4% of the total population of Canada. In addition, Indigenous people in Canada are increasingly urban as 54% of the population lives in urban areas (Statistics Canada, 2006). Furthermore, Indigenous people in Canada remain exposed to significant socioeconomic inequality and exclusion and studies consistently show that there are substantial disparities between their wellbeing and that of the general Canadian public.

The Canadian government has also had a long and dark history with immigration policy. Kelley and Trebilcock (2010) highlight the history of injustices made by the Canadian government in the implementation of immigration policies, including, “the progressive exclusion of most Asian and black immigrants beginning in the first decade of the twentieth century,

sweeping use of deportation powers for political and ideological purposes after the First World War, the refusal to accept Jewish refugees before and during the Second World War, thereby consigning many to the Holocaust, and the massive internment of Japanese Canadians during the Second World War” (p. 470-1).

Contemporarily, there has been an upward trend in annual immigration rates since the 1990s and between 2000 and 2008 more than 1.6 million immigrants came to Canada, indicating an average admission rate of 240,000 people annually. This represents approximately 1 percent of the existing population. In addition, the number of people coming from non-traditional source countries (i.e. Western European then later Eastern European countries) continued to grow. In the 1990 about 50 percent of newcomers came from Asia and the Middle East; this increased to 58 percent by 2006 with China (15 percent) and India (12 percent) representing the largest source countries. Simultaneously, the percentage of Europeans immigrating to Canada continued declining from 25 percent in 1990 to about 16 percent in 2007 (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010).

Due to increased racialized immigration, Galabuzi argues, “Canadian society is becoming more ‘bottom heavy’ with economically marginalized racialized peoples conjuring up images of a form of persistent separate existence even as racialized and non-racialized people share common urban space” (2011, p. 76). This is characterized by a racialized income gap reaching double-digits; chronic levels of unemployment; disproportionate representation in the criminal justice system; the limiting of the free movement of Muslim, Arab, and Asian communities in the post-9/11 era; and lack of political representation (Galabuzi, 2011).

The deterioration of material and sociocultural conditions of racialized people in Canada represents one of three events that signal the “descent into crisis for the multicultural regime” (Galabuzi, 2011, p. 59). Together with two other events—the elitist reconsideration of major

aspects of the multiculturalism regime, such as “reasonable accommodation” and the reassertion of Orientalism manifested in the “war on terror”—the multiculturalism regime is losing legitimacy as a way of managing diversity in a liberal democratic society (Galabuzi, 2011). Galabuzi reasserts, “These circumstances provide a space for counter-hegemonic action that can take advantage of the loss of elite legitimacy for the multiculturalism regime, with the potential to make substantive claims against the Canadian state based on the material realities of racialized people” (2011, p. 82). Part of the unsettling of dominant relations, I believe, is to build stronger cross-cultural relations. Given that Indigenous people have remained outside of multicultural discourse, an important way forward for racialized and Indigenous people is to recognize what divides them and what brings them together. This will be addressed in the next section.

PART FOUR: COLONIALISM, POST-COLONIALISM, AND “DECOLONISING ANTI-RACISM”—THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

While colonialism can be defined as the conquest and control of other people’s land and goods, Green (2003) elaborates by stating, “Colonization . . . is also about the appropriation of others’ political authority, cultural self-determination, economic capacity, and strategic location” (p. 52). Further, modern colonialism established entrenched hierarchies of subjects and knowledges. These can be characterized through the binaries of the colonizer and the colonized, the Occidental and the Oriental, the civilized and the primitive, and the developed and the underdeveloped (Prakash, 1994). The act of colonialism did not occur in a uniform process in different parts of the world; however, in all instances it locked the original inhabitants and the newcomers into the most traumatic and complex relationships in human history (Loomba, 1998).

According to Bahri (1996) “postcolonial literally refers to that which follows colonization; [however], the term has come to be used more loosely to refer to the chapter of history following World War II, whether or not such a period accommodates the still colonized, the neocolonized, or the always colonized” (quoted in Shaw et al., 2006, p. 271). One of the goals of postcolonial theory is to decentre and unsettle ‘Western’ authority over knowledge therefore requiring Western theory and scholarship to acknowledge ‘the other’ and fully incorporate differences into the broader body of intellectual theory (Shaw et al., 2006). Indeed, the concept of “resistance” necessitates the primary framework for the critical project of postcolonialism (Jefferess, 2008), which allows for the recovering of the voice and subjectivity of racialized and colonized peoples, bodies, and nations and involves the unsettling and challenging of the colonial binaries.

Shaw, Herman, and Dobbs (2006) argue that the contributions of postcolonial scholarship that have greatly influenced the field of postcolonial studies have the potential to restructure the political positioning of studying Indigeneity, though Lawrence and Dua (2005) argue, “critical race and postcolonial scholars have systematically excluded on-going colonization from the ways in which racism is articulated. This has erased the presence of Aboriginal peoples and their ongoing struggles for decolonization, precluding a more sophisticated analysis of migration, diasporic identities, and diasporic counter-cultures” (p. 130). While some scholars have taken the need to bring ongoing colonization into antiracist and postcolonial theory, Lawrence and Dua are concerned that these strides place decolonization struggles within a ‘cultural’ pluralist framework; therefore, Indigenous struggles become one component of a larger anti-racist struggle. The authors’ argue, “such pluralism, while utopian in intent, marginalizes decolonization struggles and continues to obscure the complex ways in which people of color have participated in projects of settlement” (2005, p. 131). Lawrence and Dua assert that ongoing decolonization struggles must be foundational in conceptualizations and understandings of racism, racial subjectivities, and antiracism.

Phung (2011) highlights that the work of Lawrence and Dua forces us to critically examine how racialized people and immigrants are complicit in the colonization of Indigenous people in Canada, an issue that is most often considered a white settler-Indigenous issue. Phung, though agreeing with Lawrence and Dua’s argument, asks “If people of colour are settlers, then are they settlers in the same way that the French and British were originally the settlers in Canada? And what does being a settler mean?” (2011, p. 292). Sharma (2011) contends that scholars and activists who argue that all who are not Indigenous—which include refugees, migrant workers, and those who came due to their own experiences of colonization—are settler-

colonizers conflate and confuse the processes of migration with those of colonization. This, Sharma argues, reproduces colonial state practices of distinguishing and differentiating between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. A product of this reasoning is that the colonization of migrants is wholly rejected as a basis for a collective sense of “we-ness” (2011, p. 99).

Through the logics of white supremacy, Smith (2010) argues that we must look at how “settlers” are differentiated through white supremacy. The notion of “white privilege” can be conceptualized as the multitude of way in which people who are identified as “white” accrue countless and unrecognized advantages in their day-to-day lives. “White supremacy” on the other hand, is seen to relate “to the operation of forces that saturate the everyday, mundane actions and policies that shape the world in the interests of white people” (Gillborn, 2006, p. 320). Smith (2010) argues that there are three pillars to white supremacy in the United States—that is slaveability/anti-black racism, which anchors capitalism; genocide, which anchors colonialism; and orientalism, which anchors war. Though the pillars of white supremacy may not be as overt in Canada, this can be attributed to a multicultural discourse that masks the way Canada is structured through colonization and racialization.

Smith states that under the old but dominant model of anti-racism, organizing by racialized people was based on the notion of a shared victimhood; however, not only are people of colour victims of white supremacy, they are also complicit in it. Smith highlights that what keeps people of colour trapped within particular pillars of white supremacy is that there is the possibility to participate in the other pillars. With regards to the second pillar, all non-Indigenous people are promised the ability to join the colonial project of reaping the benefits of settling on Indigenous lands. This suggests that Smith agrees that racialized newcomers are complicit in the colonial project. In Smith’s analysis, the pillars appear to be non-intersecting, as she does not

address how forms of resistance may unsettle these pillars. For example, for some, resistance within postcolonial theory only signifies the failure of colonial power to be total, which can be partially indebted to hybridity—a condition that Smith does not address in her analysis. Her analysis, however, provides conceptual starting point from which to understand how white supremacy functions within Western pluralist societies.

The only way forward for building political, social, and other collaborative relationships between Indigenous peoples and newcomers in Canada is for activists, academics, and others to attempt to breakdown pillars of white supremacy and approach relationship building through a decolonized anti-racist framework. Lawrence and Dua (2005) argue that anti-racism theory is contributing to contemporary colonial agendas: first, by the failure to recognise on-going colonization in the Americas, and second, by not integrating “an understanding of Canada as a colonialist state into anti-racist frameworks” (p. 4). In order to decolonize anti-racism, Lawrence and Dua suggest that there is a need for scholarship that challenges the practices of segregation and endeavors to explore the complex histories of interactions between racialized people and Indigenous peoples. Though newcomers are not “settlers” in the same sense as the historical British and French settlers, they must recognise their complicity in the settler-state formation. On the other hand, without seeing Canada as both a settler-state and white supremacist, all “settlers” become morally undifferentiated (Smith, 2010, p. 8). Increased intercultural dialogue is needed to address implicatedness and promote understanding of common experiences of colonization and racialization so that horizontal intersubjective relationships can be encouraged among the oppressed and the colonized.

PART FIVE: RESEARCH METHODS & LIMITATIONS

The objective of this literature review is to assess the current body of knowledge on the nature of Indigenous and racialized newcomer/immigrant relationships. Given that this topic of study falls outside of mainstream dialogues and discourses surrounding immigration and Indigenous people in Canada, there is a limited amount of literature available to analyze. Due to this, various forms of literature are incorporated, including: peer-reviewed articles, non-published articles, master's theses, government documents, non-profit organization publications, books, and chapters of books. Relevant sources were located by searching various databases, including EBSCOhost, Google Scholar, the Ryerson University search engine and a general Google search. Checking references at the end of pertinent articles also provided a number of useful leads. The key words used in searching for articles were interculturalism, interminority, race relations, Aboriginal, Indigenous, immigrant, refugee, relations, Indigeneity, multiculturalism, anti-racism, and post-colonial. Because this literature review focuses on the Canadian context, "Native American" was excluded from the search. These descriptors were used in a variety of combinations using Boolean search methods. The final literature review references twenty-nine works, including supporting and background documentation. In the next section, I present the literature review findings.

PART SIX: LITERATURE REVIEW FINDINGS

The eight themes in this section represent a broad range of aspects that characterize the relationship between racialized newcomers and Indigenous people in Canada. Indeed the question “What is the nature of the relationship between immigrants and other racialized groups and Indigenous peoples in Canada?” can be approached in a multitude of ways, of which are not exhausted here. These themes, however, represent the current (yet limited) body of literature that was found.

Theme one focuses on the little recognized, but long history between Indigenous people and early Chinese immigrants on the West Coast and between Indigenous people and the descendants of the pre-Confederation black community on the East Coast. Theme two highlights the intersectionality of experiences of displacement between Indigenous people and refugee(ed) people globally, but with emphasis on the Canadian experience. Theme three examines the existence of racism and prejudice between Indigenous groups and immigrant and refugee populations in urban centres in Canada. Theme four looks at how Indigenous people perceive multiculturalism and immigration, while theme five looks at how racialized newcomers perceive Indigeneity. Theme six highlights the ways in which governments in Canada encourage relationship building between the groups, and theme seven focuses on an Aboriginal non-profit organization’s strides towards relationship building. The final theme, theme eight, addresses the ways in which these groups collaborate through art and culture.

The aim of this literature review is to address the negative interactions, the positive interactions, and the instances where there are no interactions at all. Once we are able to better understand what the nature of the relationships currently are, we will be able to move forward in encouraging relationship and coalition building between various groups.

Theme 1: Historical Relations

The history of Canada is most often told from a Eurocentric viewpoint and largely focuses on the political and economic developments of the French and the British. The treatment of Indigenous people in Canada's history prior to the 1960s is usually relegated to a brief acknowledgement of first contact with French and British settlers. Within Canadian history textbooks, a reason for the absence of Indigenous people is that "they are outside the real action of the textbooks because they are seen as outside the narrative of progress that is Canadian history" (Clark, 2006, p. 49). With regards to Indigenous people and other racialized groups in Canadian history Reynolds (n.d.) argues,

There is a need for a much more committed and comprehensive effort of historical revision in order to integrate First Nation's history into the mainstream of our national history. Such a revision would obviously entail a complete evaluation of what constitutes so-called "mainstream" Canadian history. It would also involve a much fuller recognition of the importance of not only Aboriginal culture but the culture of other neglected or marginalized racial-ethnic groups as well (e.g. Canadians of African, Chinese and Japanese descent).

This section reviews current research on the historical relations between early Chinese immigrants and Indigenous people on the West Coast and the historical relations between the descendants of the pre-Confederation black community and the Mi'kmaw people on the East Coast, which contribute to an expansion of the understanding of the history of Canada.

Chinese-Aboriginal Historical Relations in British Columbia

The Chinese Canadian Historical Society of British Columbia (CCHSBC) is a non-profit, participatory provincial organization, which aims to broaden the understanding of the history of

Chinese people in British Columbia through documentation, research, preservation and education. While the organization has developed many of their own resources, it has also worked in collaboration with many partners in public education programs on the history of the Chinese/First Nations⁵ in British Columbia. This includes a Chinese Canadian/First Nation education curriculum initiative titled “The Anniversaries of Change Coalition.” The organization recognizes the importance of education in providing a more inclusive perspective on inter-community histories rather than treating them in isolation from one another.

In 2010 in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of British Columbia, the CCHSBC developed a project that documents the inter-community histories between Chinese Canadians and First Nations peoples to promote understanding of the shared experiences. The project, titled *Chinese Canadians and First Nations: 150 Years of Shared Experiences*, focuses on the relationships between Chinese Canadians and First Nations people of the province—an unrecognized yet important part of British Columbia’s history that has gone largely unrecorded. Indeed, most projects focus on Chinese history in British Columbia in relationship to the gold rush, in the fishing and agricultural industries, the building of the railroad, and in the development of Chinatowns in Victoria and Vancouver. This project highlights the ways in which the Chinese community was also in contact with First Nations peoples, and that together “they shared experiences of exclusion, racism, perseverance and love” (CCHSBC).

The prevailing drive for the project is understanding how and why early Chinese immigrants and First Nations peoples entered into relationships with one another and why so little of their shared history has been documented. As stated on the website:

⁵ This is a politically charged term, which encompasses first, the primacy of place; second, is a political entity with structures of governance; and third, from its plural form, represents a multiplicity of peoples and cultures forming these political entities (Haig-Brown, 2007, p. 168).

This project is attempting to reconnect Chinese and First Nations communities and give people a chance to reunite with a lost part of their own histories. It also introduces people outside of these relationships to a rich history that is an important part of British Columbia's past. It is important that these stories are not lost or forgotten, but retained for the Chinese and First Nations communities, the future generations and mainstream society. (Chinese Canadian Historical Society of British Columbia)

The project engaged many members from the Chinese community and from First Nations communities in British Columbia, and reveals a commitment to alliance building and political activism from the CCHSBC. Moving beyond simply advocating for greater recognition of the history of the Chinese in British Columbia, the CCHSBC engages in a more inclusive approach by giving appreciation to First Nations communities for sharing their lands and highlighting the long familial and social histories between the groups.

African Nova Scotian-Mi'kmaw Relations

Madden (2009) offers an examination of the contemporary relationship between African Nova Scotians and the Mi'kmaw people and between each group and the state in her book *African Nova Scotian-Mi'kmaw Relations*. Her analysis "adds to the literature that analyses Canada as a national project and disrupts the Indigenous/white, black/white conversation, allowing for nuanced conversations that unmask complicity in the oppression of First Nations peoples" (Madden, 2009, p. 25). Indeed, Madden provides an important addition to the literature as at the time the book was published there were no other works that offered a sustained conversation about these two groups simultaneously.

Members of the black community in Nova Scotia that calls itself indigenous do so because of the existence of their ancestors in Mi'kmaw territory pre-Confederation. The earliest

and longest sustained presence of black people in this region were slaves who arrived first in the 1600s and later in much larger numbers with their white United Empire Loyalist masters. The period between 1775-1783 witnessed the most significant migration of Black United Empire Loyalists and was followed by the Maroons from Jamaica in 1796 and then by the Refugees of the War of 1812. Their claims are based on promises made to the black Loyalists by the British in the American War of Independence of land, freedom and equality if they fought on the side of the British. They were supposed to be treated equally with their white Loyalist counterparts in the granting of land, but these promises were not fulfilled. It is clear the black Nova Scotians do have a long history in the region; however, Madden rejects the use of the term “indigenous black” and chooses instead to refer to the black community as “descendants of the pre-Confederation black community”. Madden argues, “while it is important to acknowledge the inequality inherent in the system that white settlers used to disadvantage black people in Mi’kmaw territory, it is also important to note that white settlers promised land that did not belong to them” (2009, pp. 63-4).

While Madden does compare and contrast experiences of the descendants of the pre-Confederation black community and the Mi’kmaw peoples, she moves beyond that discussion and reviews her research findings through personal interviews with members from both communities on the contemporary relationships between the two groups. She found, despite kinship relations, that just as generations of white Nova Scotians had internalized racism towards the black and Mi’kmaw peoples, so did these communities internalize those same ideas about each other. One participant revealed that while historically there was a great deal of cooperation between the communities, and that the Mi’kmaw assisted black people to survive in the early years, the residential school system played a large role in precipitating racial hatred between the

groups. Mi'kmaw people began to adopt racist attitudes of the larger white community because they were isolated from the black community and vice versa. One participant reveals, "people in the Mi'kmaq community are very ashamed about having black blood in them and there is people in the black community who are ashamed of having Mi'kmaq blood in them" (2009, p. 95). Unfortunately, Madden does not examine this Métis identity any further or address what claims they be making against the state.

Further, while familial and social connections are pervasive within and between these communities, political connections and alliances do not exist. According to Mi'kmaw elder Patrick Oak, the lack of collaboration between the two communities stems from the 1961 decision by the Stanfield government to exclude Mi'kmaw people from the Human Rights Committee. During the 1960s the government did not respond to the conditions of the Mi'kmaw because their issues did not receive nearly the same the level of public attention as the plight of the conditions of the black community. While Oak suggests that the government employed a "divide and conquer" strategy, Madden highlights that there is little evidence that the Black Nova Scotians were concerned with issues other than their own. Indeed, this employs the logics of white supremacy—all non-Indigenous peoples promised the ability to join the colonial project of reaping the benefits of settling on Indigenous lands and therefore remain stuck in the pillars of white supremacy.

Madden concludes her analysis with the following statement:

The way forward, or justice, requires that in seeking the "way out" of this dilemma, descendants of the pre-Confederation black community must engage with Mi'kmaw people about the terms of their continued occupation of Mi'kmaw territories. Indeed, all those who are not Mi'kmaw must do the same. Of course all are free to continue their

conversations with the state on behalf of their own groups interest, but we cannot call this a just solution. Justice built on the lands, backs, bodies, souls, graves, spirits and aspirations of others is not justice but dismemberment, disembodiment and dispossession, even when it is wrapped in the horrors of our own groups experience of the same. (2009, p. 100)

Given that Madden's publication was the first to address these relationships, she does not delve into the complexity of those who are of mixed Mi'kmaw and black Nova Scotian heritage. This is indeed an important topic to be taken up. Madden's analysis does shed light on the tensions that exist between the Mi'kmaw community and the descendants of the pre-Confederation black community, but also opens the dialogue on the relationships between Indigenous communities and racialized groups across Canada. While there may be the expectation that Indigenous and racialized groups should collaborate based on shared experiences of exclusion, it is clear that moving forward is not an easy task.

Theme 2: Indigenous People and Refugee-ed Experiences of Displacement

Editors Daniel Coleman, Erin C. Glanville, Wafaa Hasan and Agnes Kramer-Hamstra of the book *Countering Displacements: The Creativity and Resilience of Indigenous and Refugee-ed Peoples* (2012) have compiled works by a number of authors into one volume that highlights the creativity and agency of people who have been displaced. The editors state that the three main purposes of their volume are to generate dialogue between Indigenous and refugee displacements; to provide a space where contested narratives of displacement could be re-narrated; and to place importance on the agency and creativity of displaced people "who are often represented as objects rather than subjects of their experience" (2012, p. xv). The editors move away from narratives of traumatic displacement because such narratives tend to reduce

displaced persons to objects and victims who lack agency or creative capacity. While the book is based on to the Canadian context, a few of the chapters focus internationally and range from the Americas to the Middle East and the Indian subcontinent.

The editors point out that refugee and Indigenous studies have been disconnected as “the definition of a refugee and the challenges of refugee populations have been addressed thoroughly in refugee studies, while the displacements of Native peoples have been addressed in the field of Indigenous studies” (2012, p. xiii). Although both Indigenous peoples and refugees share common experiences of displacement, the authors do give recognition to the tensions that exist, which include the Indigenous right of land and the refugee right of migration. The editors do not seek to separate the tensions, but instead seek to highlight how the Indigenous and the refugee are inherently bound to one another in the “larger narrative of multiple, and often intersecting, displacements” (2012, p. xvi).

The dialogue of displacement presents an important bridge for narrative building between racialized and Indigenous peoples and speaks to the conditions of colonization and imperialism as structures of subordination, subjugation and exclusion. Displaced persons are those who have been unwillingly removed from their ancestral lands by environmental, economic, social, or political adversities. Displaced populations are usually viewed as being an obstacle to development and have either been forcibly removed or have been denied the authority of their experience on the land (2012, p. xiv). The editors highlight that these two populations stand at opposite vectors on the continuum of displacements. Indigenous people have had their relationship to the land abrogated by the reserve system, which forced migration. Refugee-d populations are those who have left their homes, often without passports and visas, and therefore are outside the provisions of the nation-state. Despite their differing legal categories that inform

public policy and social science research, experiences of exclusion stemming from colonial forces provides a way to examine the intersectionality of these forms of displacements.

While this compilation of narratives is an important text in the emerging dialogue that is closing the gap between immigration and Indigenous studies and discourses, none of the chapters discuss relationships between refugees and Indigenous peoples in Canada in a sustained manner beyond highlighting the intersectionality of experiences of displacement. Further, it is not clear if any of the authors of the chapters are Indigenous peoples of Canada. If indeed none of the authors are, the omission of Canadian Indigenous narrative may be a reflection of the separation between Native Studies and diaspora studies. Despite this possible omission, this is an important book because rather than focusing on trauma or negative aspects of displacement for refugees and Indigenous peoples—as many of the articles listed in the introduction do—this book focuses on resiliency and creativity amongst both groups simultaneously and brings attention to the tenuous relationship between the two.

Theme 3: Racism and Prejudice between Indigenous Peoples and Newcomers

Interculturalism has been appropriated as a critique of multiculturalism, due to the failures of multiculturalism policy in creating a more equitable and open society (Meer & Modood, 2011). The area of *intercultural relations* on the other hand, consists of two parallel sets of phenomenon: acculturation and ethnic or “interminority” relations (Berry, 2006). According to Berry,

These have usually been studied in isolation from each other, but their intersection is of increasing importance for understanding intercultural relations in plural societies.

Although this mutual view of intercultural relations has long been recognised, there has been an imbalance in the research carried out: acculturation studies have been

predominantly done with the non-dominant groups, and ethnic attitudes have been studied mainly among dominant populations. (2006, p. 719)

Despite the demographic trends and the widespread debate surrounding Canadian multiculturalism and due to the focus on “mainstream” and “minority”, there is very little academic literature available with regards to interminority relationships and interculturalism that focuses on interactions and perceptions, and the effects these experiences have on various aspects of immigrant settlement in Canada (for more in depth discussion on this gap in the literature see: Berry, 2006; Hindriks et al., 2011). Further, there is a lack of literature that focuses on relations between First Nations, Inuit, and Métis people in Canada, which are also distinct cultural groups.

The two articles discussed in this section provide an important starting point from which to understand newcomer and Indigenous relations in Canada. Winnipeg offers an interesting opportunity at studying these relationships given the demographics of the city, which are not reflective of most urban centres in Canada; however, it is important for future research to look at other regions in Canada for understanding newcomer and Indigenous relationships. Both studies found considerable lack of knowledge between groups about the ‘other’ and that racism and prejudice between groups was widespread.

Ghorayshi’s study “Diversity and Interculturalism: Learning from Winnipeg’s Inner City” (2010) published in the *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* addresses the gap in the knowledge regarding the ethno-racial composition of Winnipeg’s inner city resulting from immigration and attendant modes of social exclusion. The author argues that through a series of private and public decisions, Canada is experiencing the globalizing of urban communities and focuses on Winnipeg’s inner city as it is deeply touched by the globalizing process. Ghorayshi

states that, “it is in the inner city of Winnipeg that newcomers, especially refugees, have confronted the historical minority—Aboriginal people who struggle with poverty and exclusion” (2010, p. 90).

The data from this qualitative study was obtained through interviews that the author conducted between November 2007 and January 2009. The interviewees included 24 refugees (fourteen women and ten men), twenty immigrants (equal female and male participants) and 27 policy makers, teachers, and service providers, in both government and non-governmental institutions, and one person in the media (sixteen women and eleven men). Further, a project on Indigenous and Newcomer relations, which includes interviews with four people from different Aboriginal serving agencies; three individuals who serve Indigenous and non-Indigenous people; and 16 residents of the inner city, eight Indigenous (four men and four women) and eight newcomers (four men and four women) is used to add to the researchers own information source. In addition, the author draws upon 139 short autobiographies of newcomer youth (20-30 years old) for the discussion.

Ghorayshi finds that while there is a remarkable number of government and non-governmental organizations that serve newcomers and Indigenous peoples in the inner city, insights from the interviewees reveal that racism, misinformation, isolation and lack of interconnectedness between groups is a prevailing problem, which surpasses problems of housing and employment, and she describes the problem as “layers or separation”—that is, between marginalized and mainstream; between groups; and between Indigenous peoples and newcomers. Ghorayshi states, “the colonial, stigmatized, and stereotyped view of Indigenous people is transferred to the newcomers” (2010, p. 95). There are tensions between newcomers and Indigenous people who are disproportionately located in the inner city, and newcomers feel

excluded from Canadian society.

The voices of the participants in Ghorayshi's study suggest that multiculturalism has not resulted in the elimination of exclusion and marginalization of racialized groups; therefore, the author suggest a shift from multiculturalism to interculturalism, which she describes as "finding ways of addressing diversity and difference that negate exclusion, discrimination, inequality, and a fixed notion of Canadian identity" (2010, p. 91). She asserts that interculturalism is not a one-way street to cultural self-assertion, but instead interculturalism relies upon a dialogue between cultures and stresses the importance on intercultural education for both the "majority" and the "minority." To elaborate, multiculturalism has a narrow purview that speaks only to the minorities within it. It focuses on diversity and that which divides and also ignores the needs of majorities. Interculturalism emphasizes interaction and is about understanding each other's cultures in a way that promotes community cohesion (Meer & Modood, 2011). While some have argued that interculturalism is simply an up-dated version of multiculturalism, the emphasis on cross-cultural dialogue is an important factor in facilitating cross-cultural collaboration for Indigenous and immigrant communities.

Madariaga-Vignudo's unpublished article "'More Strangers than Neighbours: Aboriginal-African Refugee Relations in Winnipeg's Inner City'" addressed the following questions: how can we characterize the attitudes between Indigenous peoples and African refugees in Winnipeg's inner city? How much do African refugees know of the colonization experiences and current situation of Indigenous people, and vice versa? How do the groups interact? This article is part of a larger project led by Dr. Parvin Ghorayshi, titled: "Diaspora Communities in the Inner City of Winnipeg."

This qualitative study was based on 27 in depth, personal interviews (22 individual

interviews and two group interviews for a total of 27) with social service providers, ethno cultural community leaders and inner city residents. While African refugees were not the only participants included in the study, particular attention was paid to their responses. Individuals were chosen based on the work they had done in the inner city and their involvement with newcomer and Indigenous communities. Additionally, the author interviewed seven refugees and Indigenous people who resided in Winnipeg's core.

Three major themes emerged from the interviews and the focus groups. The first was lack of knowledge about the 'other' group. Before arriving in Canada, many African refugees are completely uninformed about Indigenous people; gain knowledge based on old Hollywood movies; or learn about Indigenous people from the opinions of visa officers abroad. The author quotes a public servant working in the field of immigration in Manitoba as saying "they may hear stuff from the visa officers . . . 'Why would you go to Winnipeg? There's all the Indians there'" (2009, p. 24). Indigenous people who live in the downtown core also have very little knowledge about refugees in Canada. The author argues, "as is the case for refugee newcomers, Aboriginals' [sic] low educational levels and their lack of opportunity to learn about the immigration system leads them to be unaware of the life experiences of their new neighbours" (2009, p. 27).

The second theme that emerged was inter-group misperceptions. From the interviews it was shown that Native people were stereotypically characterized as lazy, not paying taxes, having drug and alcohol problems, and being exceedingly dependent on welfare. The interviews show that many refugees quickly adopted these stereotypes that the mainstream population holds towards Indigenous people; however, there were refugee respondents that were empathetic. Responses on Indigenous perceptions of refugees yielded mixed results. Some service providers

indicated that their clients held sympathetic views; others revealed that there is competition between groups over scarce resources (for example employment and affordable housing); positive perceptions were also commonplace; and others stated that it was too early to tell given the recent arrival of refugee cohorts to Winnipeg's inner city.

The final theme that emerged was inter-group interactions in Winnipeg's inner city. It was found that interactions were infrequent and impersonal despite living in the same inner city neighbourhoods and interactions that did occur were fleeting and took place in parks, shopping malls, and other public spaces. This observation is important given that it contradicts Contact Theory, originating from Gordon Allport (1982), which argues that increased social contact through geographical proximity will lead to better inter-ethnic relations. This finding is more in line with scarce resources theory, which hypothesizes that with increased (perceived) competition over limited resources other groups become more threatening (Mulder & Krahn, 2005).

Madariaga-Vignudo suggests that despite the generally distant relations an encouraging finding from the study was on the few occasions where Indigenous people and refugees associated by attending the same programs at community organizations, their relationships improved. Given the demographic trends in Manitoba and Winnipeg's increasingly multiethnic composition, the author argues that the way Indigenous and newcomer communities interact and view one another cannot be overlooked.

These two studies are the first, and at the time of the writing of this literature review, the only studies to examine contemporary Indigenous and newcomer relations in Canada with emphasis on intergroup perceptions. Ghorayshi's article provides an interesting critique of multiculturalism and argument for interculturalism, and contributes more broadly to the literature

on inter-minority relations. Ghorayshi incorporates a diverse range of voices into her study, though there is greater emphasis on immigrant and refugee perspectives. Madariaga-Vignudo's article is complimentary to Ghorayshi's as the author provides a more balanced representation of newcomer (refugee) and Indigenous perspectives. While Madariaga-Vignudo does make the connection between Indigenous peoples in Canada and colonization and refugees and histories of colonization in their respective countries, a more thorough discussion on this aspect would have been beneficial.

Will Kymlicka (2010) in a report for Citizenship and Immigration Canada identified salient research themes for the 2008-2010 periods, which included several recommendations for assessing linkages between Aboriginal peoples, interminority relations, and multiculturalism in Western provinces and the Territories. Indeed, this work must be expanded to all regions in Canada.

Theme 4: Indigenous Perspective on Multiculturalism and Immigration

North America was multicultural long before colonization and it has been well documented that at the time of first contact between Europeans and Indigenous peoples, the original peoples welcomed the Europeans and helped them in their settlement in Canada. For an Indigenous understanding of "cultural pluralism⁶," Amadahy and Lawrence (2009) provide the following Cherokee teaching,

Mother Earth and all her children teach us that diversity is necessary to our health and well-being. You do not see the trees insisting that they all bear the same fruit. You do not see the fish declaring war against those who do not swim. You do not see corn blocking the growth of squash and beans. What one plant puts into the soil, another takes. What

⁶ This refers to a form of cultural diversity where cultures are permitted or encouraged to preserve their unique qualities and combine to form a larger and richer whole.

one tree puts into the air another creature breathes. What one being leaves as waste another considers food. Even death and decay serve to nurture new life. Every one of Mother Earth's children co-operates so that the family survives. (p. 116)

Amadahy and Lawrence go on to highlight that while fundamental values of Indigenous communities have survived it is important to realize “they reflect value systems or sets of ideals that have been profoundly damaged by colonialism” (2009, p. 117).

Contemporarily, Indigenous voices and narratives are absent in discourses regarding multiculturalism and immigration in Canada as there is a hegemonic association between the two. Further, according to Sharma (2011) multicultural discourse that posits all non-Indigenous peoples as immigrants has at resulted in two developments that are evident in Canada. The first result is that it legitimizes a discourse that eliminates any distinction between colonizers and immigrants; therefore, it depoliticizes the process of constructing a racialized nation state through colonial practices. Second, official multicultural discourse precipitated the conflation of processes of colonization with those of migration. Sharma argues, “multiculturalism has changed our understanding of Canadian nation-state building from an activity embedded within various imperialist projects . . . to a state-centric discourse in which colonizers become immigrants, immigrants become colonizers, and only Natives [sic] belong” (2011, p. 86). In order to unsettle multicultural discourse, it is important that Indigenous narratives are included. One article (Syed, 2010) was identified that focuses on bringing Indigenous voices into Canada's multicultural discourse.

Syed's article “Storied Understandings: Bringing Aboriginal Voices to Canada's Multicultural Discourse” published in *Policy Futures in Education* addresses “the cultural differences, divisions, and resistances between immigrant and Aboriginal perspectives on

multiculturalism” (2010, p. 71). The impetus for writing this article came from the author’s experience as an international student enrolled in a graduate program at a Canadian university. The author was struck by the absence of Indigenous students in his classes and in the absence of Indigenous voices in the multicultural discourses of teaching and learning.

The author interviewed an Indigenous scholar who works actively in multicultural policy with the purpose of bringing her narrative, and his interpretation of her story, to the ongoing national discourse and debate on multicultural pedagogy. Syed asked Makere (a pseudonym to ensure anonymity) to engage in formal audiotaped conversations so that he could write an article and reflect upon her story and the wisdom she had to offer. This produced eight hours of interview conversations and seventy pages of transcripts. The author chose to present an abbreviated version of Makere’s insights in a “storytelling” style. The author highlights, “as I listened to Makere and reflected throughout the rereading of the transcripts, I did not find a linear listing of her life events and understandings. Instead, I found a recurrence of the image of a circle, and her words and stories moved in what I came to be aware of as cycles . . .” (2010, p. 74). Therefore, the author presents the findings from the themes that arose throughout their conversations.

Makere describes her generation as being caught between two worlds—having “a moccasin on one foot and a shoe on the other” (Makere quoted in Said, 2010, p. 76). Although Makere describes her identity as being fluid, she is comfortable in urban and traditional settings, at the time of the 1990 Oka crisis she wondered what affect this would have on the children. She noticed that during the crisis her son stopped wearing an Indian jacket that his grandfather had given him, and to Makere this was a symbol of confusion at the site of cultural resistance that many children experienced. Eventually, however, she argues that the event politicized a

generation of children to be proud of who they were. She states, “The pride of the identity of being an aboriginal person for them is utterly militant. For some children, it is a pride that has turned to chauvinism and that endangers understandings of multiculturalism. Their education swung from one extreme to another” (Makere quoted in Said, 2010, p. 76).

With regards to Makere’s position as Chair of the national Canadian Multiculturalism Advisory Committee, Makere had to defend her choice to be on the committee from both her own people as well as to the other people on the committee. In response to people from her community asking, “What are you doing with all those people?” Makere would respond, “Well they have to understand our story and if we don’t bring our voice to the table, they’ll never understand our story. They’ll see us as not accommodating, as isolationist, as people who are extremist, radical and want to isolate newcomers. When in fact that’s not our history, nor is it our spiritual value” (Makere quoted in Said, 2010, p. 77).

Makere’s response to members of the committee who asked “Why are you here? You don’t understand oppression; you don’t understand the refugee experience. You don’t understand anything to do with Otherness . . . You are true Canadians, so why are you here?” (Makere quoted in Said, 2010, p. 77) was that her role at the table was to act as a bridge. Makere states that while the people at the table all had some similarity in their experiences as newcomers to Canada, she did not share in those experiences but that dialogue between all cultures is of the utmost importance.

Makere sees an Indigenous understanding of multiculturalism as an opportunity to seize and break the circle of racism and antiracism. She highlights that Indigenous communities were multicultural long before the concept emerged in North American political discourse and she draws on ancestral teachings that view the world as a circle where all living things are related,

and no one being is more valuable or dispensable than the other. In spite of this, Makere states that First Nations people perceive the word “multiculturalism” negatively because of the political definition of the term and the negative connotations of the word “diversity.” She views multiculturalism and diversity as slogans, “a nice way to keep those ‘different people’ quiet” (p. 77), which inhibits speaking openly about race and racism.

The disputes Makere addresses with regards to her position on the CMAC highlight some of the issues surrounding multicultural discourse in Canada, as critiqued by Sharma (2011). It appears that those from her community view members of the CMAC as colonizers, and therefore Makere should not engage with them. Members of the CMAC view Indigenous people in Canada as the only ones who truly belong and because of this cannot share anything in common with newcomers. Makere also describes her position as being precarious and views the committee simply as a platform from which to educate newcomers about Indigenous people in Canada. While Makere touches upon race and racism, she does not engage with it as a common experience that Indigenous people and immigrants share. This prevents Makere from exploring the possibility of cross-cultural collaboration based on shared experiences of oppression as a means at unsettling multicultural discourse in Canada.

This article provides a rare glimpse into an Indigenous narrative on multiculturalism and immigration in Canada, albeit a limited one. The lack of Indigenous voices in multicultural discourse could be another reflection of the separation between the Indigeneity and immigration/multiculturalism. Indeed, one Indigenous scholar’s perspective on this topic cannot be taken as representative of the Indigenous population in Canada; however, it contributes to the dialogue that is closing the gap between Indigenous and newcomer narratives.

Theme 5: Immigrant Perspectives on Indigeneity

In previous sections it has been noted that newcomers to Canada are likely to adopt mainstream, racist perceptions of Indigenous people, especially in Western cities like Winnipeg where there is a concentrated population of both groups. Despite these findings, there are counter narratives from immigrants and other racialized minorities that reflect a curiosity regarding and respect for the original peoples of Canada. The Right Honourable Adrienne Clarkson reveals,

New Canadians want to know about our Aboriginal peoples because they sense that they have a wisdom, knowledge and history which will help immigrants understand Canada as a land with an ancient human history as well as an incredible natural richness. You cannot come to this country and spend time without realizing the important relationship we, who are newcomers, can have with the original inhabitants. This can only be enlightening and enriching. (Quoted in City of Vancouver, 2010, p. 1)

Four chapters from the edited book *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the Lens of Cultural Diversity* will be discussed in this section that reveal some creative ways in which newcomers perceive Indigeneity in Canada. Wong (2011) and Harris-Galia (2011) offer insight through personal narrative. Sehdev's (2011) discussion emerges from a decolonized anti-racist framework, whereby she recognizes her position within colonial processes and argues that others must do so as well in order to move towards healing and reconciliation for Indigenous people in Canada. Costa and Clark (2011) offer an exploratory study on Canadian (established, first- and second-generation) perspectives on Indigeneity in Canada.

Wong (2011) provides a thought-provoking discussion on truth and reconciliation from the perspective of water. Wong criticizes Prime Minister Stephen Harper's 2008 apology for the residential school system to the Indigenous peoples of Canada as being insincere and states that the apology seems like "a political tactic to push Indigenous people's experiences into some

irrecoverable past, closing the door on it so that business can speed up as people ignore the colonial violence that still exists today” (2011, p. 87) and argues that in order to heal the people we must heal the land and the water. Further, Wong argues for support of multilingual fluency in Canada, and given the importance of her mother tongue Cantonese, encourages Canadians to considering learning an Indigenous language. While Wong is an immigrant herself, her discussion reveals an attempt at solidarity and coalition building between her and Indigenous communities.

Harris-Galia (2011) provides an interesting perspective on Indigeneity as a former live-in caregiver living in Nunavut. Harris-Galia highlights that there are Filipinos in Nunavut who have lived there for twenty years and that more keep moving there. Regarding the Inuit, she asks, “what is it about this particular community that makes them stay?” (2011, p. 197) and suggests that the reason is that the Inuit community shares many similarities with the Philippine community. Although with good intentions, Harris-Galia draws on stereotypes to identify similarities, which include: similar physical attributes; parallels with their respective languages; strong sense of community; and strength of faith.

Harris-Galia argues that the Filipino community can learn from Inuit traditional knowledge—*Qaujimaqatuqangit*—that is commonly referred to as “IQ Principles.” She states, “IQ shows us that the values of Inuit revolve around caring for each other, teamwork and community building, resourcefulness, innovativeness, and respect for people, the land, and resources. It is a set of teachings and resources handed down from Inuit Elders . . . and are used to guide the new and upcoming generations” (2011, p. 200). She argues that there are far more similarities between them than differences that make a wonderful blend of East and West in the Far North.

Sehdev (2011) argues that in confronting racism, she and other people of colour must also recognise their own implicatedness in the colonial process even when they deeply and detrimentally affect people of colour as well. She posits, “Our belonging on this land is made possible by treaty⁷, and it is therefore incumbent on us to reconsider our strategies for social justice with treaty in mind. We have played a crucial part in nation formation, but this is a settler nation whose borders extend to absorb Aboriginal people without regard for their sovereignty” (2011, p. 265). She refers to people of colour as “marginalized settlers” and treaty citizens.

De Costa and Clark’s (2011) article offers preliminary findings on how attitudes of Canadians towards reconciliation vary, based on such factors as location, language spoken, and familial experience in Canada, which is part of an ongoing and larger study regarding the Truth and Reconciliation Commission—one of the central institutions of the *Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement*⁸. The authors explain, “reconciliation in settler societies like Canada is an optimistic but vague aspiration, one that most broadly connotes improved relations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people . . . [and] has a diverse array of critics and supporters” (De Costa & Clarke, 2011, p. 329). They are most interested in the ways in which non-Indigenous people talk about reconciliation in Canada in non-Indigenous discourses.

The authors argue, “the nature of Canadian social diversity and change has not been attended to in discussions of reconciliation; an assumption of an undifferentiated category of ‘non-Aboriginal Canadians’ is no more a useful way to proceed than is the persistent

⁷ Indigenous people in Canada entered into treaties with the Crown (Queen of England) beginning in 1701, and are entrenched in section 35 of the Canadian Constitution, 1982.

⁸ This received approval by the Government of Canada on May 10, 2006 and came into effect on September 19, 2007. In addition to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the IRSSA included: Common Experience Payment; Independent Assessment Process; Commemoration; and Healing.

generalization of Aboriginal people in a range of cultural discourse and policy discussions” (2011, p. 330). De Cost and Clark firmly believe that it is vital for all newcomers to understand first that Canada is a nation-state built on the territories of the original inhabitants largely without their consent; and second, that the original expropriation must always mark our response.

The authors recruited four focus groups for a total of 29 participants from York University in June of 2010. There were three group categories: category A comprised of persons who have been born in Canada and whose parents and grandparent were also born in Canada; category B comprised of those who had been born outside of Canada; and category C comprised of those who were born in Canada but for whom more than one parent or grandparent had been born outside the country. It is indeed interesting, and disconcerting, that the authors chose to exclude Indigenous voices on the York University campus from their study. It is not clear why this was so. While the authors had encountered considerable difficulty in recruiting participants for category A they were able to hold two focus groups for category B. Each focus group was facilitated using the same discussion guide, which included the Indian residential school system, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and the national apology to those affected by the Indian residential school system.

While all groups believed that more education on reconciliation is necessary, the authors highlight that the most striking finding was the readiness of the participants in category B and C to discuss race and racial discrimination, whereas participants in category A did not raise these issues at all. The authors did not extrapolate a great deal from the focus groups but intend to administer a much wider series of focus groups using sub-categories of non-Indigenous Canadians from a range of locations across the country.

The first three articles discussed reveal a strong sense of solidarity among immigrants with Indigenous peoples in Canada, and highlight the creative ways in which they conceptualize their relationships. Wong and Sehdev provide compelling arguments supporting reconciliation and Indigeneity through a decolonized anti-racist framework, and Harris-Galia brings attention to Filipino-Inuit relations in Nunavut. De Costa and Clark's study, while limited, shows that first- and second-generation Canadians are more open to discussing aspects of Indigeneity than Canadians who have been here for many generations, and are more likely to discuss issues of race and racism. This shows that there is potential for more open dialogue to take place between newcomers and Indigenous peoples. While all four chapters are limited in scope, they offer interesting insight into this largely overlooked topic.

Theme 6: Governmental Initiatives for Relationship Building

While we must be critical of the motivations informing government action, Good (2009) argues that municipalities have an important role to play in the design and implementation of Canada's model of official multiculturalism in a way that responds to place-based differences. Sandercock (2000) suggests that an appropriate approach to managing intercultural co-existence in a shared space at the municipal level is to use a "therapeutic" one: "a dialogical approach . . . which brings antagonistic parties together to talk through their concerns" (p. 23).

One municipal initiative to support dialogue between Indigenous peoples and newcomers was identified. The City of Vancouver (2011) recognized the importance of open dialogue between Indigenous peoples and newcomers, and in 2010 initiated The City of Vancouver Dialogues Project (hereafter CVDP) aimed at creating cohesive communities by exploring the stories and narratives of the city's Indigenous and immigrant communities. The project aimed to strengthen relationships between Indigenous and immigrant communities, which also included

engagement with youth and elders. From the CVDP, a book and video was created to chronicle the stories, gatherings and initiatives. Additionally, Yu (2011)—who was directly involved in the project—contributed a chapter to a book where he reflects upon his experience, which will be addressed in this section. No other municipal, provincial, or federal projects that aim at building relationships between Indigenous peoples and newcomers were identified.

The CVDP consisted of hosting nine Dialogue Circles, various interviews, cultural exchanges, surveys and participatory research, celebrations, and youth and Elder engagement and involved approximately 2000 participants over a nineteen-month period. The Dialogue Circles were held in a variety of locations in Vancouver, which included immigrant settlement organizations and First Nations territories and gathering places. The Project was guided by the Project Steering Group, which met as required and had a broad range of representation from urban Aboriginal, First Nations, immigrant settlement, educational, and other interested groups.

The Dialogue Circles were a key component of the Project. A Dialogue Circle is a “discussion group where interested participants get together to talk about a particular topic. Such circles have a deep and sacred place in many cultures around the world and in particular in the First Nations cultures of Canada” (City of Vancouver, 2011, p. 7). One major and recurring theme that emerged was seeking understanding. The Project highlights, “these . . . communities together embrace Canada’s past and future but all too often they do not share a common understanding of each other. Stereotypes and lack of information are the unfortunate realities with which we live” (City of Vancouver, 2011, p. 5). Many themes emerged as well around similar challenges newcomers and Indigenous people face within Canadian cities, including racism, identity, language, and healing. This formed an understanding and appreciation for others in the community and “created a bond of trust and communication among the participants”

(ibid). A major theme that emerged at the conclusion of the Dialogue Circles was the need for continued and sustained dialogue. Key reflections of the Project found that dialogue works, community engagement is vital, and education opens the doors to learning.

Yu provides a personal reflection of his experience on the Steering Committee of the CVDP in the chapter “Nurturing Dialogues between First Nation, Urban Aboriginal, and Immigrant Communities in Vancouver” (in Mathur, Dewar, and DeGagné, 2011). Yu states that the impetus for the project came from the recognition that Vancouver stood at a historic juncture where new immigrant communities were transforming the city and that “moving forward meant creating a new vision of Canada that recognised a history of injustices to both Aboriginal people and non-white immigrants” (2011, p. 301). Yu continues, “This terrible history—wrought by white supremacist policies of land dispossession, residential schooling, immigrant exclusion, and racial discrimination in voting, housing, and employment—needed to be acknowledged and its legacies made widely known before a more optimistic future could be envisioned together” (2011, p. 301).

Yu begins his reflection by introducing himself and his story as an acknowledgement of where he comes from and that he, as all migrants whose families came from somewhere else, has made his home on the unceded traditional territory of the Coast Salish people. After highlighting various aspects of the CVDP and incorporating historical analysis into his discussion, Yu highlights the following concern, “Even as we break the silences and speak the truth about many of the terrible things that have been done in our past, we are left with the task of trying to understand what we have in common, what we can take from our broken past, upon which we can build a shared future. Do we need a shared past in order to have a common future?” (2011, p. 307). Yu posits that we remain a far way from creating a new-shared future, but that perhaps one

story at a time about whom we are and where we come from a new-shared history can begin to be built in a collaborative manner.

The CVDP is an interesting example of a government-initiated and funded program that aims at building stronger relationships between Indigenous peoples and newcomers in Canada. While other governments have recognised the growing importance of fostering positive relationships between these groups—see for example a framework for an immigration action plan final report to The City of Saskatoon (Pontikes and Garcea, 2006) and a report on the current state of multiculturalism in Canada to Citizenship and Immigration Canada (Kymlicka, 2010)—this is the only example found of a government taking this approach. The process appears to have been inclusive of a diverse range of people, and the emphasis on elder and youth engagement is a strength of the project. This project, however, also reinforces an aspect of Indigenous and newcomer/racialized immigrant relations as described by Madden (2010), that relationships between groups are often facilitated by governments rather than from the communities themselves. While there is significant mistrust of the government by Indigenous peoples in Canada, and indeed government programs may not be an important aspect for relationship building, the CVDP may provide an impetus for Aboriginal and newcomer organizations to facilitate projects at the community level in the future.

Theme 7: Aboriginal Organization Initiative for Relationship Building

There is an absence of concerted effort by Aboriginal organizations in bridging relationships with newcomer peoples and organizations, and this is partly due to the lack of funding available, which forces most organizations to turn inward (A Sense of Belonging, 2007). Furthermore, Amadahy and Lawrence (2009) stress,

We also want to acknowledge that Indigenous communities are consumed with simply

trying to stay alive, waging struggles that must address youth suicides, violence against women, the rapid spread of HIV/AIDS, housing shortages, contaminated drinking water, mining and deforestation on their lands, the loss of language and ceremonial knowledge, etc. Thus, there is limited capacity to drop these struggles to “develop a vision” on how racialized settlers and Indigenous people can coexist on Turtle Island . . . The colonial system benefits greatly from the fact that our communities are in a perpetual state of crisis. But do we not owe it to the coming generations to find a way of supporting each other and the land that sustains us all? (p. 131)

One Master of Arts thesis (Gyepi-Garbrah, 2010) was identified that analyzes the work being done by an Aboriginal organization in Winnipeg that engages in building relationships with newcomers in Winnipeg’s inner city through anti-racism and cross-cultural programs. This work examines what newcomers in Canadian cities can gain from settlement and cultural assistance from urban Aboriginal peoples and organizations. No other works were found that addressed this same topic area.

Gyepi-Garbrah’s Master of Arts thesis “Understanding Diversity and Interculturalism Between Aboriginal Peoples and Newcomers in Winnipeg” focuses on the importance of Indigeneity in planning for diversity and creating inclusive cities in Canada by evaluating an Indigenous-led organisation in Winnipeg that initiated partnerships with newcomer settlement organizations with the purpose of bringing both groups together to build intercultural relationships. Gyepi-Garbrah argues that the United Against Racism/Aboriginal Youth Circle program of Ka Ni Kanichihk (KNK) provides an ample opportunity to examine the effects of Indigenous-newcomer service agency partnerships on the following matters: the promotion of cross-cultural understanding, reversing negative perceptions and building confidence among

Indigenous peoples and newcomers with each other, and helping indirectly to facilitate Newcomer integration into neighbourhoods predominantly occupied by Indigenous peoples in Winnipeg.

Three focus groups were conducted with between five-eight Indigenous and Newcomer participants each. One of the focus groups consisted of only Indigenous peoples (five participants), the other of only newcomers (six participants) and the last focus group contained half-Indigenous peoples (four participants) and half-Newcomers (four participants). The author was able to have a diverse range of cultural and ethnic backgrounds represented in the focus groups, which included: Indigenous peoples including First Nations (Ojibwa and Cree) and Métis, China, Japan, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Philippines, Nigeria, Moldova and Sudan. Unfortunately, the author did not include an Inuit perspective and this omission is frequent among researchers.

The author, similar to the articles discussed under the “Racism and Prejudice” section, found that negative perceptions between Indigenous peoples and newcomers are pervasive in Winnipeg’s inner city. Prior to engaging in the programs facilitated by KNK, many of the participants held negative views about the ‘other.’ The views shared by Indigenous and newcomer participants in the focus groups reveals the three major impacts of the partnership programs: first, promoting cross-cultural understanding; second, bridging social distance; and third, eliminating negative stereotypes and racism in Canadian society.

A major contribution of this study to understanding the relationship between Indigenous peoples and newcomers is the focus on the importance of Indigeneity in the provision of settlement services for Canadian newcomers. Peters (2005) highlights that Indigeneity in city planning aims at participatory and collaborative planning approaches that “bring together the

diversity of groups and ‘publics’ in a multicultural urban society” (p. 331). This can be applied with regards to the provision of settlement services. Indeed, Gyepi-Garbrah’s study offers some compelling arguments.

Theme 8: Collaboration Through Art and Culture

In the section on immigrant perceptions on Indigeneity, Wong’s discussion (2011) on healing and reconciliation from the point of view of water highlights the importance of healing for Indigenous people and the place non-Indigenous people have in the process. Archibald and Dewar’s study (2010) found that creative arts are viewed amongst Indigenous people in Canada as having healing benefits and support, deepen, and enhance the healing process. Indeed, the authors acknowledge that Indigenous societies have understood the healing power of visual art, dance, drama, music and storytelling for millennia.

This section, which focuses on one project, highlights the ways in which Indigenous peoples and immigrants have collaborated through art and culture and what the outcomes of these collaborations have been. Mitra (2011) writes about her experience as curator of the exhibition *Crossing Lines: An Intercultural Dialogue*, which she describes as one that examines “the issues of connection and disconnection and sites of intersection and divergence that exist between the so-named ‘Indian’ communities in Canada” (p. 280). The exhibition included eight artists from different Indigenous and South Asian backgrounds with the purpose of exploring the possibilities of building trust and solidarity through cross-cultural dialogue between Indigenous peoples and South Asian immigrants in Canada.

The author begins by discussing her reaction to the 2008 Canadian government apology to the First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples of Canada. The author highlights that the government’s apology left out recent immigrant and multiracial perspectives by only addressing

the residential school system, while attending neither colonization nor the result of cultural genocide. This thereby situated the need for initiating the truth and reconciliation process simply to deal with actions in the past. She argues, “It glossed over the systemic colonial barriers that still limit the scope for developing cross-cultural dialogues and collaborations among Indigenous, non-Indigenous, and immigrant communities and reinforce the disconnections and nonchalant attitudes for the general public” (Mitra, 2011, p. 277-8). Indeed, this presents a significant barrier because newcomers may be led to believe that Indigenous struggles against colonialism does not exist today. This allowed her to examine the complexities and differences of the experiences of marginalization and colonization between an Indigenous person and herself (a recent immigrant from India), even though they share the name “Indian”.

Mitra began working on the exhibition in 2009 at the Glenhyrst Art Gallery of Brant, which is located next to the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory and home to a fast-growing South Asian community. The author admits that when she began working on the exhibition she did not know much about the complex histories of the neighbouring Indigenous community. She struggled to use appropriate language that was free of jargon or rhetoric. In retrospect, the author states,

In the process I learned about my own discomfort while working on and researching the concepts for this exhibition, with a heightened awareness of my limited knowledge of the complex histories, narratives, and traditions of diverse Indigenous communities and nations. I realized that my role and responsibility as a recent immigrant in Canada was in a constant state of flux, as it shifted between being a beneficiary, thus perpetrator of the colonial socio-economic privileges of the dominant framework . . . on the one hand, and

on the other, being vulnerable to the discriminatory and unquestionable law of the same structures. (2011, p. 287)

The author argues that exploring the possibility of dialogues provides artists with the opportunity to re-imagine contemporary Canadian society, arising out of ideas of collectivity, community and mutual respect.

Mitra's reflection on curating the exhibition and presentation of some of the art collaborations provides an interesting perspective on immigrant and Indigenous relationships in Canada, and offers an alternate way at building relationships. Indeed, if we understand art as a path towards healing, these collaborations can be greatly beneficial for immigrant, refugee, and Indigenous communities alike. What is missing from Mitra's discussion is an Indigenous voice on cross-cultural art collaborations. The author highlights some of the artwork from the exhibition from both South Asian and Indigenous artists, but does not provide any quotes or analysis from the artist's point of view. It is not clear why there is this omission. Nevertheless, her discussion highlights the healing benefits of art and culture for Indigenous peoples and newcomers in Canada alike.

PART SEVEN: DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

This literature review has demonstrated a number of aspects that characterize the relationship between Indigenous people and newcomers in Canada. First, there is an extreme lack of initiative by governments, academics, and non-profit organizations at facilitating relationship building between these two groups. Second, without an organized effort at relationship building, misunderstanding, prejudice, and even racism is likely to exist, especially in areas where there are large and concentrated populations of both groups. Third, when strides at building dialogue are taken, they are most successful when organized through a decolonized anti-racism framework. When only token acknowledgement is given to Indigenous people in Canada, Indigenous people themselves are unlikely to engage. In addition, conflation of migration and colonization further divides people and contributes to solidifying hegemonic binaries. Dialogue, as demonstrated by the CVDP, the art exhibition *Crossing Lines* (Mitra, 2011), and anti-racism and cross-cultural programs (Gyepi-Garbrah, 2010), appears to be the key to bridging gaps between the groups.

Given the crisis of multiculturalism in Canada, as address by Galabuzi (2011), this juncture provides the opportunity for reimagining a more just and equitable society. One damaging result of multiculturalism in Canada throughout the decades has been the strict separation between Indigenous people and immigrants. While Indigenous people in the early years of European settlement were greatly involved in the welcoming of newcomers, contemporarily newcomers come to Canada with little knowledge of Indigenous people and of the history of colonization. Lack of knowledge of each other promotes racism and prejudice. A more just society cannot be created groups remain divided. Indeed, dialogue provides a way to address what divides these groups and what can bring them together.

The following are recommendations for government policy, future academic research, and grassroots organizing.

1. Given the success of The City of Vancouver Dialogues Project, other municipal governments across Canada should make funding available for organizing similar events. Indeed, if both populations continue to grow in urban centres across Canada this will be of particular interest to municipal governments in managing ethnic relations in the metropolis.
2. Funding should be made available by various levels of government for encouraging relationship building between various Indigenous and immigrant communities through art and culture and other activities that promote dialogue.
3. Anti-racist and post-colonial theorists in Canada must incorporate Indigeneity into their analyses and acknowledge that Canada is simultaneously “white supremacist” and deeply embedded in ongoing settler-colonialism.
4. Scholars from diaspora/refugee/immigration/Indigenous studies could benefit not only in exploring the relationships between various migrant populations and Indigenous peoples globally, but also on other “interminority” relationships. This could be between First Nations, Métis, Inuit, on reserve and off reserve, or status or non-status Indigenous people. It could also examine relationships between various racialized groups to examine what affect immigration (among other factors) has on these relationships. This further unsettles the black/white, Indigenous/settler, minority/majority binaries that prevail in anti-racist, post-colonial, and anti-colonial discourses.
5. Indigenous scholars, while resistant to engaging in the multicultural discourse, should contribute to closing the gap between migration studies and Indigenous studies as they

are deeply connected historically and contemporarily, as has been demonstrated throughout this literature review. It appears as though other people of colour are much more open to discussing racism and colonialism than non-racialized people. A framework for decolonizing anti-racism should be further developed.

6. More research should be conducted on familial linkages between the groups. Mixed-race theorists should examine identity formation among people with mixed Indigenous heritage. There was no literature found in the Canadian context that directly examined those of mixed Indigenous and non-Anglo, non-Franco background.
7. While significant barriers for collaboration do exist, and it is important to deal with these first, it remains vital for Immigrant serving organizations to offer information to their members on Canada's colonial history and its contemporary manifestations. Creating cross-cultural activities and initiatives with Aboriginal serving organizations should be facilitated.
8. Aboriginal serving organizations that operate in diverse neighbourhoods, if funding or resources are available, should collaborate with immigrant serving organizations to organize intercultural and cross-cultural activities. Gyepi-Garbrah's (2010) analysis offers an excellent example of this being carried out.
9. Dialogue is of the utmost importance. As the literature has shown, dialogue between groups breaks down various barriers, creates more compassionate and understanding communities, offers sites for creativity to flourish in a cross-cultural context, broadens our understanding of Canada as an equitable and multicultural society, and offers a site where these groups can be empowered and where counter-narratives can be voiced.

PART EIGHT: CONCLUSION

This paper has addressed the question “what is the nature of the relationship between Indigenous people and immigrants/newcomers in Canada?” through a review of the relevant literature. This question is particularly salient in the 21st century given that Indigenous people and racialized newcomers represent a large portion of the Canadian population and are among the most socioeconomically disadvantaged groups in the country. In addition, there are many more people out there like me—mixed and struggling with how to understand what it means to be both Indigenous and immigrant—which the literature has not substantively engaged with yet. Though the literature is sparse, there are emerging narratives across Canada that provides insight into these largely ignored relationships. While it was found, with focus being on Winnipeg’s inner city, that there is a lack of knowledge between newcomers and Indigenous people (Ghorayshi, 2010; Madariaga-Vignudo, 2009), it has been demonstrated that there are a number of newcomers who have been proactive in attempting to build relationships between the two groups. There is a great deal of work to be done in closing the divide between Indigenous discourses and immigration in Canada. Indeed, experiences of racialization and colonization provide a point from where dialogue and collaboration can occur amongst these groups; however, Indigenous communities are unlikely to engage if collaboration is taken from a pluralist framework. Canada must be acknowledged as an ongoing colonial project, one built upon stolen lands. A starting point is for anti-racist and post-colonial scholars and individuals alike to recognise this legacy. As Leonie Sandercock argues, “The will to change has to come from an ability . . . to imagine oneself in a different skin, a different story, a different place, and then desire this new self and place that one sees . . . the sensibility underpinning this

transformation includes the ability to tell, to listen to, and above all, make for stories to be heard”
(2003, p. 227).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amadahy, Z., & Lawrence, B. (2009). "Indigenous peoples and black people in Canada: Settlers or Allies?" In A. Kempf (Ed.), *Breaching the colonial contract: Anti-Colonialism in the US and Canada* (105-136). New York: Springer Publishing.
- Archibald, L., & Dewar, J. (2010). Creative arts, culture, and healing: Building an evidence base. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health*, 8(3), 1-25.
- Asch, M. (Ed.). (1998). *Aboriginal and treaty rights in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- A Sense of Belonging. (2007). Report: A sense of belonging Winnipeg regional visit, September 24th to September 27th. Accessed June 12, 2012, from <http://www.unac.org/sb/en/Files/REPORT-WINNIPEG.pdf>
- Bauder, H. (2011). Closing the immigration-Aboriginal parallax gap. *Geoforum*, 42(5), 517-519.
- Berry, J. (2006). Mutual attitudes among immigrants and ethnocultural groups in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 719-734.
- Bohacker, H., & Iacovetta, F. (2009). Making Aboriginal people 'immigrants too': A comparison of citizenship programs for newcomers and indigenous peoples in postwar Canada 1940s-1960s. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 90(3), 427-461.
- Boyd, M., & Vickers, M. (2000). 100 years of immigration in Canada. *Canadian Social Trends* (Statistics Canada—Catalogue No. 11-008). Accessed March 20, 2012, from <http://history404.pbworks.com/w/file/49707647/100%20years%20of%20immigration%20in%20Canada.pdf>
- Cameron, E. (2011). Reconciliation with Indigenous ghosts: On the politics of postcolonial ghost

- stories. In M. Chazan, L. Helps, A. Stanley, & S. Thakkar (Eds.), *Home and native land: Unsettling multiculturalism in Canada* (142-154). Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Carter, T., & Osborne, J. (2009). Housing and neighbourhood challenges of refugee resettlement in declining inner city neighbourhoods: A Winnipeg case study. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*, 7(3), 308-327.
- Chinese Canadian Historical Society of British Columbia. (2011). Chinese Canadians and First Nations: 150 Years of shared experiences. Accessed April 20, 2012, from <http://www.chinese-firstnations-relations.ca/about.html>
- City of Vancouver. (2011). Vancouver Dialogues: First Nations, Urban Aboriginal, and Immigrant Communities. Accessed November 2, 2011, from <http://vancouver.ca/commsvcs/socialplanning/dialoguesproject/initiatives/pdf/book.pdf>
- Clark, P. (2006). Images of Aboriginal people in British Columbia Canadian history textbooks. *Canadian Issues*, 47-51.
- Coleman, D., Glanville, E. C., Hasan, W., & Kramer-Hamstra, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Countering displacements: The creativity and resilience of Indigenous and refugee-ed peoples*. Edmonton, Canada: University of Alberta Press.
- Curthoys, A. (2000). An uneasy conversation: The multicultural and the indigenous. In J. Docker & G. Fischer (Eds.), *Race, colour and identity in Australia and New Zealand* (21-36). Sydney, Australia: University of South Wales Press.
- De Costa, R., & Clark, T. (2011). Exploring non-Aboriginal Attitudes towards reconciliation in Canada: The beginnings of targeted focus group research. In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagné (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (327-340). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

- Galabuzi, G. (2011). Hegemonies, continuities, and discontinuities of multiculturalism and the Anglo-Franco conformity order. In M. Chazan, L. Helps, A. Stanley, & S. Thakkar (Eds.), *Home and native land: Unsettling multiculturalism in Canada* (58-82). Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Ghorayshi, P. (2010). Diversity and interculturalism: Learning from Winnipeg's inner city. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 19(1), 89-104.
- Gillborn, D. (2006). Rethinking white supremacy. *Ethnicities*, 6(3), 318-40.
- Good, K. (2009). *Municipalities and multiculturalism: The politics of immigration in Toronto and Vancouver*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Green, J. (2003). Decolonization and recolonization in Canada. In W. Clement & L. Vosko (Eds.), *Policial economy as transformation* (51-78). Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Gyepi-Garbrah, J. (2010). Understanding diversity and interculturalism between Aboriginal peoples and newcomers in Winnipeg. (Master's Thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 2010). Accessed February 12, 2012, from <http://library.usask.ca/theses/available/etd-12272010-203845/unrestricted/FinalThesis2010jvgg.pdf>
- Haig-Brown, C. (2007). Resistance and renewal: First Nations and Aboriginal education in Canada. In T. Das Gupta et al. (Eds.), *Race and Racialization Essential Readings* (pp. 168-178). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- Harris-Galia, R. (2011). Arctic Bayanihan. In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagné (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (193-201). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Higginbottom, G. et al. (2011). Food choices and practices during pregnancy of immigrant and

- Aboriginal women in Canada: A study protocol. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 11(100), 1-10.
- Hindriks, P., Coenders, M., & Verkuyten, M. (2011). Interethnic attitudes among minority groups: The role of identity, contact and multiculturalism. Unpublished paper presented at the European Consortium for Political Research 6th General Conference, Reykjavik, Iceland.
- Human Resources and Skills Development Canada. (2008). Pan-Canadian study of first year college students: report 2: the characteristics and experience of Aboriginal, disabled, immigrant and visible minority students. Ottawa: Human Resources and Skills Development Canada.
- Jefferess, D. (2008). *Postcolonial resistance: Culture, liberation, and transformation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kelley, N., & Trebilcock, M. (Eds). (2010). *The making of the mosaic: A history of Canadian immigration policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kuhn, P., & Sweetman, A. (2002). Aboriginals as unwilling immigrants: Contact, assimilation, and labour market outcomes. *Journal of Population Economics*, 15, 331-355.
- Kymlicka, W. (2010). *The current state of multiculturalism in Canada and research themes on Canadian multiculturalism 2008-2010* (Catalogue no. Ci96-112/2010E-PDF). Accessed March 20, 2012, from the Citizenship and Immigration Canada website: <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/pub/multi-state.pdf>
- Lawrence, B. (2003). Gender, race, and the regulation of Native identity in Canada and the United States: An overview. *Hypatia*, 18(2), 3-31.
- Lawrence, B. & Dua, E. (2005). Decolonizing antiracism. *Social Justice*, 32(4), 120-143.

- Loomba, A. (1998). *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. New York: Routledge.
- Madden, P. (2009). *African Nova-Scotian-Mi'kmaw relations*. Black Point, Nova Scotia and Winnipeg, Manitoba: Fernwood Publishing.
- Madriaga-Vignudo, L. (2009). "More strangers than neighbours': Aboriginal-African refugee relations in Winnipeg's inner city." Unpublished paper. Winnipeg: The University of Winnipeg.
- Mathur, A., Dewar, J., & DeGagné, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity*. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Meer, N. & Modood, T. (2011). How does interculturalism contrast with multiculturalism? *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 1-22.
- Mitra, S. (2011). Learning through crossing lines: An intercultural dialogue. In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagné (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (275-288). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Mulder, M., & Krahn, H. (2005). Individual- and community-level determinants of support for immigration and cultural diversity in Canada. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 42(4), 421-444.
- Peters, E. & Starchenko, O. (2005). Changes in Aboriginal settlement patterns in two Canadian cities: A comparison to immigrant settlement models. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 14(2), 315-337.
- Phung, M. (2011). Are people of colour settlers too? In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagné (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (289-98). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Prakash, G. (Ed.). (1994). *After colonialism: Imperial histories and postcolonial displacements*.

- New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Retzlaff, S. (2008). 'The elders have said' — Projecting Aboriginal cultural values into contemporary news discourse. In K. Knopf (Ed.), *Aboriginal Canada revisited* (330-359). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Reynolds, G. (n.d.). Teaching First Nations history as Canadian history. Accessed August 12, 2012, from <http://www.cbu.ca/mrc/first-nations-history>
- Sandercock, L. (2003). *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel cities of the 21st century*. New York: Continuum.
- Sandercock, L. (2000). When strangers become neighbours: Managing cities of difference. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 1(1), 13-30.
- Sehdev, R. K. (2011). People of colour in treaty. In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagné (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (263-274). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Sharma, N. (2011). Canadian multiculturalism and its nationalisms. In M. Chazan, L. Helps, A. Stanley, & S. Thakkar (Eds.), *Home and native land: Unsettling multiculturalism in Canada* (85-101). Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Shaw, W., Herman, R., & Dobbs, G. (2006). Encountering Indigeneity: Re-imagining and decolonizing geography. *Human Geography*, 88(3), 267-276.
- Smith, A. (2010). Indigeneity, settler colonialism, white supremacy. *Global Dialogue*, 12(2), 1-13.
- Statistics Canada. (2006). *Canada in 2006: Inuit, Métis and First Nations, 2006 census*. [Ottawa]: Author.
- Syed, H. T. (2010). Storied understandings: Bringing Aboriginal voices to Canada's multicultural discourse. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(1), 71-81.

- Thornton, M. (2001). Aspects of the history of Aboriginal people in their relationships with colonial, national, and provincial governments in Canada. In M. Thornton & R. Todd (Eds.), *Aboriginal people and other Canadians: Shaping new relationships* (7-24). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Van Krieken, R. (2004). Rethinking cultural genocide: Aboriginal child removal and settler-colonial state formation. *Oceania*, 75, 125-151.
- Wallis, M., Sunseri, L., & Galabuzi, G. E. (Eds.). (2010). *Colonialism and racism in Canada: Historical traces and contemporary issues*. Toronto, Canada: Nelson Education Ltd.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Halifax, Nova Scotia and Winnipeg, Manitoba: Ferwood Publishing.
- Wong, R. (2011). What would restitution and regeneration look like from the point of view of water? In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagné (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (81-90). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Yu, H. (2011). Nurturing dialogues between First Nations, urban Aboriginal, and immigrant communities in Vancouver. In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagné (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (299-308). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.