

**POLICY, POVERTY, AND INDIGENOUS CHILD WELFARE:
REVISITING THE SIXTIES SCOOP**

by

Sarah Carneiro

A thesis submitted to the Department of Gender Studies
In conformity with the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
(June, 2018)

Copyright © Sarah Carneiro, 2018

Abstract

I analyse the Sixties Scoop through the lens of Indigenous and feminist scholarship to contextualize the Scoop within the specific historical, political, and cultural moment of the postwar Canadian “welfare state” during which it was occurring. In the 1960s and 1970s, Canada was attempting to foment a unique “Canadian” identity that became increasingly tied to the values of cultural pluralism and tolerance. During this time, both the state and Indigenous activism questioned where and how Indigenous people would “fit” (or would not fit) into the burgeoning Canadian cultural “mosaic” of the late 20th century. Through an analysis of the 1966/67 federal government report, *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, and Educational Needs and Policies (The Hawthorn Report)*, alongside articles from the *Journal – Ontario Association of Children’s Aid Societies (JOACAS)*, mostly authored by social workers about reserve communities in Northern Ontario during the 1960s and 1970s, I aim to illuminate the intimate relationship between capitalist development, settler colonialism, and patriarchy in postwar Canada. I argue that one of the causes of the Scoop was the inability of governments and Children’s Aid Societies (CAS) administrators and frontline service providers to conceptualize the mass apprehension of Indigenous children from their homes during the 1960s to 1980s as holistically and inextricably connected to the social, political, cultural, and economic aspects of Indigenous people’s lives.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to everyone who has supported me through this learning and writing process. I would like to express my gratitude to the entire faculty, staff, and colleagues in the Department of Gender Studies for welcoming me into the Queen's University community. Thank you to my supervisor, Dr. Margaret Little, for always being attentive, invested, and interested in this project from the earliest stages to the final edits. I would also like to thank Dr. Scott Morgensen, Dr. Katherine McKittrick, Dr. Trish Salah, and Dr. Leela Viswanathan for teaching and guiding me with patience and kindness during my time here. Thank you to the wonderful friends whose love and care made this thesis possible. And of course, my deepest appreciation is for my family – the inspiration for everything I do.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Literature Review	3
1.2 Theoretical Framework	7
1.3 Historical Context	13
1.4 Methodology	22
1.5 Chapter Summary	25
Chapter 2 Integration, Citizens Plus, and the <i>Hawthorn Report</i>	27
2.1 Introduction	27
2.2 Historical Context	28
2.3 Report Findings	32
2.4 Indigenous People as Citizens Plus	34
2.5 Gendered Primitive Accumulation	36
2.5.1 Defining “development”	41
2.5.2 Explaining “economic backwardness”	45
2.5.3 Educating Indigenous children	50
2.5.4 Child welfare	56
2.6 Conclusion	59
Chapter 3	62
3.1 Introduction	62
3.2 Historical Context	62
3.3 CAS and First Nations	68
3.3.1 Poverty	71
3.3.2 Discrimination	73
3.3.3 Systemic barriers	75
3.4 Gendered Primitive Accumulation: A Case Study	76
3.5 The Sixties: Resistance and Resurgence	84
3.5.1 Kenora CAS: A Case Study	93
3.6 Conclusion	99

Chapter 1

Introduction

Following the extension of provincial child welfare services onto First Nations reserves across Canada in the 1960s, the rate of child apprehensions among Indigenous children reached crisis levels. This situation remained largely invisible to those outside of the Indigenous communities that were experiencing this phenomenon. Without diminishing the horrors of residential schools, Coleen Rajotte, a Cree filmmaker who was herself adopted into a non-Indigenous family during the Sixties Scoop, explains that: “At least kids that went to residential schools grew up with other brown-faced kids and went home in the summer and knew their language and where they came from. We were removed from our families and our culture and we lost that forever” (Galloway, 2018).

Patrick Johnston (1983) coined the term “Sixties Scoop” to refer to the disproportionate number of Indigenous (including First Nations, Métis, and Inuit) children who entered into and remained in the care of child welfare systems across Canada, specifically in the 1960s. In an interview between Johnston and a long-time provincial government employee in British Columbia, the employee admitted that provincial social workers would literally “scoop” children from First Nations reserves, believing that they were saving children from desperate poverty, unsanitary living conditions, and malnutrition. Many First Nations children apprehended by child welfare authorities were never returned to their families. They were placed in mostly non-Indigenous homes – the majority of which were white – and often given no knowledge of their Indigenous heritage or families. In 1986, the Spallumcheen Indian Band in BC calculated that from 1951 to 1979, provincial child welfare authorities had apprehended 67% of Spallumcheen children (Walkem, 2002). According to a highly critical review of Manitoba’s child welfare

system in 1985, apprehension of Indigenous children from their homes amounted to nothing short of “cultural genocide” (Kimelman, 1985).

Indigenous children have “historically been the battleground on which the struggle between Indigenous People and newcomers has been waged” (Walkem, 2002, p. 9). The Indigenous child welfare crises of the late 20th century, similarly occurring in the US, represented “both a legacy of earlier settler colonial policies and the later manifestation of them” (Jacobs, 2014, p. 258). In Canada, the government has historically aimed assimilation projects at Indigenous children. Canada’s residential school system, modeled after federal Indian boarding schools in the US, was endorsed by an 1879 government report as a cost-effective means of assimilating Indigenous children (Davin, 1879). Following the decline of the federally funded residential school system in the 1950s, provincial child welfare systems across Canada emerged as residential schools’ successors for Indigenous children (Armitage, 1998).

Drawing from both Indigenous and feminist interventions into Marxist theory, I present an analysis of the changing relationship between the Canadian state and society and First Nations during the 1960s that encompasses the specificities of the settler-colonial context during this time period. This framework will guide my reading of the 1966/67 Canadian government report entitled *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, and Educational Needs and Policies (The Hawthorn Report)* alongside articles from the *Journal – Ontario Association of Children’s Aid Societies (JOACAS)*, mostly authored by social workers and social service professionals writing about reserve communities in Northern Ontario during the 1960s and 1970s. My analysis of these primary source materials aims to illuminate the intimate relationship between capitalist development, settler colonialism, and patriarchy in postwar Canada. I contend that the child welfare system is a “contact zone” (Pratt, 1992) between Indigenous peoples and the state wherein unequal colonial gender, race, and class relations are most obviously observed and most intimately felt.

While Johnston located the scoop in the 1960s, the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in provincial child welfare systems across the country continues into the 21st century.¹ According to the 2013 Ontario Incidence Study of Reported Child Abuse and Neglect, Indigenous children were still 130% more likely to be investigated as possible victims of child abuse or neglect than white children and 168% more likely to be taken into the care of child welfare authorities (Contenta, Monsebraat, & Rankin, 2016). And while only 2.5% of people under 18 in Ontario are First Nations, they make up nearly a quarter of all children in care (Contenta, Monsebraat, & Rankin, 2016). The severity of the issue has not abated with the passing of decades – just last year, in 2017, Indigenous Services Minister Jane Philpott described the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in the child welfare system as a “humanitarian crisis” (Barrera, 2017).

In the same year, the federal government settled a class-action lawsuit with survivors of the Scoop for \$800 million following an 8-year court battle (Tasker, 2017). Recently, child welfare agencies managed by Indigenous communities and legislative changes have emerged as solutions to the persistent overrepresentation of Indigenous children in out-of-home care arrangements (Sinha & Kozlowski, 2013). While Indigenous autonomy over child welfare matters has increased, these agencies face many challenges including: serving Indigenous families affected by the intergenerational impacts of past colonial policies, a complicated legislative framework, and persistent federal underfunding of on-reserve child welfare services, particularly those provided by Indigenous agencies (Sinha & Kozlowski, 2013).

1.1 Literature Review

The Scoop emerges as a distinct chapter in academic Canadian child welfare history, beginning in the 1960s and ending in the 1980s. Indigenous activism to change child welfare

¹ Aside from Indigenous children, Black children in Ontario are also greatly overrepresented in the custody of Children’s Aid Societies. In Toronto, where Black children make up only 6.9% of the population, they represent 65% of children in care (Gordon Pon, et al, 2011).

systems beginning in the 1980s led to First Nations and Métis groups assuming various levels of control over the development and provision of child welfare services to their communities (Canada, 1996). Although Indigenous children continue to be disproportionately represented among children in care, the signing of the first agreements to transfer child welfare responsibilities to Indigenous people in the 1980s ushered in a different phase of Canadian-Indigenous relations in child welfare literature. More recent literature on the subject of Indigenous people and child welfare analyzes this shift to group autonomy in the area of child welfare (Walkem, 2002; Hardy, Schibler, & Hamilton, 2006; MacDonald, 2009; Sinha & Kozlowski, 2013). Across the literature, the Scoop is historically situated within the postwar period, emerging in the 1960s and concluding in the early 1980s, and describes the trend of high rates of child apprehensions from Indigenous families and the practice of placing these children in mostly non-Indigenous families and sometimes geographically distant from their home communities.

Academic literature concerning Indigenous people and the child welfare system is scant before 1980. One of the reasons for this is that the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in child welfare systems across Canada was largely invisible to child welfare academics and even to those child welfare workers directly involved (Timpson, 1995). After the release of the infamous White Paper (officially known as the “Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy”, 1969), an increase in organized Indigenous activism spurred mainstream interest in the child welfare crisis and called the non-Indigenous public’s attention to the generally low socio-economic position of Indigenous people in Canada. The political activism of Indigenous people and several government inquiries and reports by non-government agencies (Hepworth, 1980; Johnston, 1983; Kimelman; 1985) called attention to the systemic and routine apprehension of Indigenous children that, up until this point, was only visible to impacted Indigenous communities and thought of as individual, exceptional cases by frontline service providers

working on reserves (Timpson, 1995). A body of academic literature on Indigenous children and child welfare systems then began to emerge in the 1980s.

A consensus among authors included in this review is that government policies and administrative behaviour are the main causes of the child welfare crisis on reserve communities in the decades following the Second World War. Specifically, authors agree that the Scoop was a result of the extension of provincial child welfare services to reserve communities with an amendment to the Indian Act in 1951. The authors view child welfare services as the state's attempt to ameliorate the material poverty on reserves that the state itself had a hand in creating through historical policies, such as the residential school system. Nearly all authors suggest that the residential school system is a predecessor of the child welfare system on reserves. Furthermore, many authors identify jurisdictional disputes between levels of government regarding financial responsibilities for services to status Indian people as a major factor in creating an administrative structure that encouraged the practice of removing children from their homes (Timpson, 1993; Armitage, 1998).

A narrative that emerges across much of the academic literature on the Scoop is that the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in state care was a result of fundamental cultural differences between Indigenous people and white-majority Canadian society. These differences were embedded into the child welfare system, resulting in an administrative structure, policies, and legislation that were inappropriate, ineffective, and, ultimately, detrimental to Indigenous people. By evaluating Indigenous families using white middle-class standards of childcare, social workers oftentimes mistakenly alleged neglect and needlessly removed children. Mohawk legal scholar Patricia Monture (1989) concluded that cultural bias was and continues to be present at every level of the child welfare system from frontline service providers, to the lawyers involved in custody cases, to the judges who decide these cases. As a result, neglect and abuse have been

alleged to occur because staff and the judicial system are ignorant of Indigenous cultures and childrearing practices.

The differences between authors emerge when attempting to answer the question of why Indigenous children in particular were apprehended in such high numbers not seen among white populations.² Some authors explain the Scoop as an inevitable colonialist and assimilationist manifestation of an unequal colonial power dynamic between Indigenous people and the state (McKenzie, 1985; Cull, 2006; Walkem, 2002; Jacobs, 2014; Stirrett, 2015). Other authors focus less on understanding the Scoop within larger processes of settler colonialism and instead take the position that the Scoop was a result of an ineffective child welfare system failing to effectively address the poverty, racism, violence, and alcoholism on reserves (MacDonald, 1985; Timpson, 1993). These works tend to view Indigenous people as a disadvantaged social group, similar to other racial-ethnic minorities within Canada; their generally lower socio-economic position is not pointedly identified as an effect of colonialism nor is the apprehension of Indigenous children.

Brad McKenzie and Pete Hudson (1985) associate the nature of the interaction between the child welfare system and Indigenous people with the process of colonialism. They cite the simultaneous denigration of Indigenous culture and the universal imposition of the dominant society's standards and definition of child welfare as a way of colonizing Indigenous nations. Margaret Jacobs (2014) places the Scoop on a continuum of colonialist and assimilationist policies that extend beyond the child welfare system. Jacobs views the Scoop as a distinct but related phase in a long history of attempts by the Canadian state to assimilate Indigenous people and undermine their claims to political sovereignty. As support for her argument, she cites other settler states such as the United States and Australia that have employed similar strategies of cultural genocide through the removal of Indigenous children. In her Masters thesis, Natasha

² For a historical examination of the overrepresentation of Black children in the care of child welfare systems in the US, see Dorothy Roberts' *Shattered Bonds: The Color of Child Welfare* (2002).

Stirrett (2015) makes connections between the child welfare system and other state institutions in which Indigenous people are overrepresented, such as the criminal justice system, to argue that the Scoop was a part of ongoing attempts by the settler state to displace Indigenous people. Since these arguments focus on larger structures of oppression, their proposed solutions to the Scoop focus less on reforming the child welfare system and more on holistic decolonization.

Other authors do not explicitly connect the Scoop with historical and ongoing colonization. Joyce Timpson (1993) cautions that colonialist and assimilationist explanations for the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in state care may underplay the material realities faced by Indigenous families during this time. She finds that residential schooling both spurred socioeconomic change for Indigenous communities and left a large number of graduates unable to cope with such changes. The shocks of relocation and the loss of the traditional economy resulting from formal education combined with the sudden availability of alcohol to create conditions that left Indigenous communities vulnerable to intervention of provincial child welfare authorities. John A. MacDonald (1985) maintains that the disadvantaged socio-economic conditions on reserves and the government policies responsive to such conditions resulted in removing children and placing them in non-Indigenous families. Within these works, the root cause of the Scoop is identified as material deprivation on reserves and the solution is legislative reform that addresses poverty amongst Indigenous people. Perhaps as a consequence of not employing colonialism as an analytical frame, Indigenous groups are conceived as cultural, rather than political entities in these works.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

I engage primarily with Dene political scientist Glen Coulthard's work *Red Skins, White Masks* (2014) to apply Marxist theory in examining the relationship between the state and First Nations people within this particular historical moment. For the purpose of historical precision and working within the limited scope of this thesis, my analysis will only concern reserve First

Nations communities during the 1960s to mid-1970s. Putting Coulthard's and other Indigenous scholars' works into conversation with feminist theory can identify the ways in which the imposition of patriarchal relations between men and women is central to the dispossession of First Nations people and nations. As Coulthard argues, colonial power in late capitalist settler-states depends on less coercive methods of dispossession, namely enfoldng them in capitalist modes of production. I contend that the transformation of Indigenous kin structures and organization of labour to approximate the traditional nuclear family unit is implicitly and explicitly stated in the policy of "integration" during the postwar era. Although not unapologetically assimilationist like policies of the prewar era, integration assumed that Indigenous modes of production were separate and unrelated to Indigenous cultures. In practice, policies, legislation, and programs informed by the logic of integration nevertheless required the assimilation of Indigenous people, nations, and cultures. Relatedly, the imposition of patriarchal social relations is reflective of the historical oppression of Indigenous women. The gender discrimination experienced by Indigenous women is intertwined with ongoing dispossession and the maintenance of capitalist social and economic hierarchies.

According to Engels in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* ([1884] 1972), women's oppression arose alongside the origins of class oppression in the transition from hunting and gathering societies to agricultural societies that had developed the idea of private property. Engels argues that the development of institutionalized patriarchy emerged as a means of ensuring that men passed down their property to their own children. Therefore, the domination of women by men was key to reproducing the class system over generations. This not only includes the control of women's sexuality, but also their removal from the public sphere and wage labour and relegation to the private sphere and unpaid domestic activities. Based on this conceptualization of gender oppression, women's emancipation depends on the abolition of private property through a socialist revolution, the elimination of patriarchy in the law and the

family, the entry of women into the workforce on equal footing with men, and the transformation of domestic work through the socialization of housework and child care. In short, the decline of women's economic, political, and social power began with the rise of private property and continues because of it. Engels believes the dismantling of a system of private property holding and realization of a communist society will abolish the class and gender hierarchies maintaining this system.

Marxist feminism takes issue with Engels' argument that the entry of women into the waged workforce will result in the end of patriarchy and the undermining of men's domination over women. Capitalism has not resulted in the abolition of gender differences or the equal treatment of workers as Engels predicted. Heidi Hartmann (1979) identifies the ways in which the maturation of a capitalist economy has disadvantaged women through the cementing of a patriarchal sexual division of labour. Hartmann argues that patriarchy and capitalism are complementary systems; the family wage maintains women's economic dependence on men because, as wives and mothers, they are predominantly responsible for unpaid domestic work and men for wage work. Writing over a decade later, Jane Acker (1988) adds that wage work and the contexts in which it is earned are themselves inherently "gendered". Acker uses the term gendered here to refer to the ways in which gender-based stereotypes and inequalities in power mediate the relations of distribution in capitalist societies. The gender-based structure of the wage, which results in men earning higher wages than women, disadvantages women even as they leave the home and enter into the labour force. Furthermore, this gender-based structure is reproduced in the personal relations of distribution within the context of the private sphere. Marxist feminists question the supposed gender neutrality of the category of class and reveal the exploitation of women's labour both inside and outside of the home.

Early Marxist feminist theorists are less attentive to racial differences between women and between men and women. The nuclear family unit has not historically been the norm for most

women in the First World, particularly racialized women and/or poor women. Marxist feminism is generally even less attentive to the colonial power dynamics between Indigenous peoples and settler states. Engels does pay more than passing attention to North America's Indigenous peoples in *Origin*. Based on existing anthropological studies on Iroquois societies, he suggests that while Native American people maintained a sexual division of labour, this did not necessarily result in women's oppression. Because women performed functions that contributed significantly to the economic survival of their clans, women had significant social and political rights. Only when women were removed from the workforce and relegated to labour within the home did they experience gender-based oppression (Engels, ([1884] 1972). Engels refers to hunting and gathering as a primitive communist mode of production. Evident here is the contention that Indigenous modes of production were merely one stage of a dialectical chronology of human development.³

Here, Coulthard's modified Marxist analysis is also useful. Coulthard intervenes in traditional Marxist thought to make Marxist doctrine applicable in settler-colonial contexts. He outlines several important considerations when using Marx's writings on colonialism to analyze the relationship between Indigenous people and settler-states like Canada. First, Coulthard suggests that a reconceptualization of Marx's primitive accumulation thesis is needed. Rather than viewing primitive accumulation as a historically situated stage in the development of a capitalist mode of production through colonial expansion, we should understand it as an on-going structure and practice of dispossession. Second, Coulthard (2014, p. 125) argues that primitive accumulation must be stripped of its "normative developmentalist character". Coulthard takes issue with the view that primitive accumulation is the only and necessary condition for developing critical consciousness and alternatives to capitalist modes of production in settler-

³ Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson (2014) takes issue with the colonialist way that Engels configures Indigenous peoples and cultures into Marxist theory. Simpson argues that he and his contemporaries present an Iroquois "tradition" decontextualized from historical, colonial, and acculturative forces that fixes Indigenous peoples in an imagined anthropological moment.

colonial societies. Finally, Coulthard stresses that colonial power associated with primitive accumulation does not have to be coercive. In places where colonialism no longer requires the openly violent dispossession of Indigenous lands and resources, the reproductive power of colonial rule rests on the ability to entice Indigenous people to identify with unequal forms of recognition and accommodation granted by the state (Coulthard, 2014).

Colonialism is the background against which intersecting axes of oppression, including patriarchy, white supremacy, capitalism, and state domination, have converged to sustain oppression faced by Indigenous people in Canada over time (Coulthard, 2014). Thus, authentic decolonization must confront more than economic relations; it must also challenge the ways in which intersecting axes of oppression interact with one another to form the “constellation of power relations that sustain colonial patterns of behaviour, structures, and relationships” (Coulthard, 2014, p. 15). Coulthard himself owes much to Indigenous feminist scholarship. Joyce Green (2017) argues that Indigenous feminism is similar to other feminist positions in its foregrounding of women’s experiences and activism, its recognition of the gendered and raced nature of lived experiences, and its critique of patriarchy. It differs, however, in its central focus on the oppressive nature of colonialism and colonialism’s impacts on Indigenous women’s social experiences (Green, 2017). For Indigenous women, patriarchy is “enacted in the context of colonialism, and justified by the legitimating ideology of racism, which frames Indigenous women as sexually available and inherently worthless” (Green, 2017, p. 11). Indigenous feminists argue that colonization has included the imposition of Western and Christian patriarchy on Indigenous societies, which have experienced some degree of incorporation into the patriarchal capitalist economy (St. Denis, 2007). Indigenous feminists are urgently concerned with tackling the oppressions and injustices faced by Indigenous women in the present day through theoretically informed activism (Green, 2017).

While Indigenous peoples' modes of life and experiences of racism and dispossession are different from non-Indigenous racialized people in settler states, their oppression is not unconnected to the larger logics of capitalism and settler colonialism. Conceptualizing settler colonialism along a white/Indigenous binary does not adequately describe the intricacies of the logic of settler colonialism. Lisa Lowe (2015) posits that forced labour existed alongside emerging European ideals of individual liberty and continued even after legal emancipation. The enslavement and indentureship of colonized peoples and the appropriation of their lands were the bases of the European economy and the free market in the 17th to 19th centuries – the transition from mercantilism to the “free” market created a market that was only free for some. Lowe demonstrates how the creation of racial categories and hierarchies and the subjugation of racialized and colonized people created the conditions that made liberalism's promises of freedom possible. The categories and hierarchies of races cemented during this time period form the basis of contemporary understandings of race (Lowe, 2015). Similarly, Iyko Day (2015, p. 112) argues that capitalism within settler colonialism is “not a thing but a social relation”. From the beginning of the settler colonial project in North America, settler colonial logic operated to eliminate Indigenous peoples through identity legislation and genocidal wars while increasing the population of Black slaves in order to increase white settler property (Day, 2015). In the post-slavery, post-frontier era, Indigeneity and Blackness retain opposite racial meanings – Indigenous peoples are dissolvable and Blackness is essential and always capable of contamination (Day, 2015).

The extension of state-recognized human rights and government social services in the postwar area did not in and of itself question the racism and white supremacy embedded in the hegemonic political ideology and economic system of the Canadian postwar welfare state. Drawing from Indigenous and feminist scholarship, I charge the definition of and solutions to the so-called “Indian problem”, as the government and non-Indigenous public expressed them during

the 1960s and 1970s, with failing to confront, the “matrix of oppressions”⁴ that sustain the colonial power imbalance between the state and Indigenous peoples. Although both the *Hawthorn Report* and social workers’ accounts advocate for the recognition and accommodation of certain Indigenous cultural practices, they neglect to understand First Nations cultures as being politically, socially, and economically, as well as ontologically and philosophically, distinct. Relatedly, the problems First Nations people faced during this time period are not understood as a matrix of intersecting oppressions within the specific context of a settler state. As a consequence, forms of cultural recognition that require Indigenous cultures to be reconcilable with settler state sovereignty and modes of production do not depart greatly from earlier assimilationist policies (Coulthard, 2014). Discourses of economic development on reserves that impose capitalist and colonial social relations amount to Coulthard’s modified conceptualization of primitive accumulation. That is to say, a process of dispossession that demands Indigenous lands and resources remain open for capitalist exploitation. Indigenous feminists point to the imposition and internalization of patriarchy and the domination of Indigenous women as a central mechanism of colonization. I suggest that Ontario’s provincial child welfare system of the 1960s and the 1970s was ineffective and inappropriate for Indigenous families because it defined and attempted to solve the problems facing Indigenous families through integration into mainstream social and economic life without addressing the racism and white supremacy embedded within the liberal democratic capitalist Canadian settler state.

1.3 Historical Context

The social, political, and economic positions of Indigenous people in Canada were gaining the attention of the government and the non-Indigenous media and public during the 1960s. This concern about the generally low socio-economic status of Indigenous people emerged within the political culture of the postwar welfare state and Canada’s renewed search for a

⁴ This term is often attributed to Black feminist scholar Patricia Hill Collins (1990)

uniquely “Canadian” national identity. Nancy Fraser (2009, p. 100) terms this economic organization “state-organized capitalism”, meaning the “hegemonic social formation in the postwar era, a social formation in which states played an active role in steering their national economies”. Drawing from the experiences of the Depression and wartime planning, the welfare states of industrialized Western nations (as well as some newly independent former colonies) employed Keynesian tools to buffer the inevitable boom-bust cycles of capitalism (Fraser, 2009). These measures included: infrastructural investment, industrial policy, redistributive taxation, social provision, business regulation, nationalization of certain industries, and the decommodification of public goods (Fraser, 2009).

According to Fraser, state-organized capitalism was economist, androcentric, and Westphalian. Firstly, state-organized capitalism required the use of state power to regulate economic markets. Welfare states derived their political power from their rhetoric of promoting social justice and inclusion. Social justice in welfare states was understood as matters concerning the equitable distribution of goods and capital; social divisions were primarily viewed as class divisions. Second, the ideal citizen in welfare states was constructed as an “ethnic-majority male worker – a breadwinner and a family man” (Fraser, 2009, p. 101). The nuclear family supported by a sole male earner formed the basis of employment, welfare, and development policies. As previously pointed out by Marxist feminists, the family wage served to reproduce men’s authority and devaluing women’s unpaid reproductive labour in the home. The institutionalization of androcentric family structures also had the effect of naturalizing and depoliticizing gender discrimination (Fraser, 2009). Lastly, state-organized capitalism was Westphalian in that it aimed at “mobilizing the capacities of nation-states to support national economic development in the name – if not always in the interest – of the national citizenry” (Fraser, 2009, p. 101). The basis of the welfare state was the territorially defined nation-state.

In the context of the political climate of the postwar era, the Canadian federal government undertook steps to reassess its legal relationship with First Nations people. The Indian problem refers to the “deep-rooted belief that perceived differences between Indians and other Canadians constitute a regrettable situation that needs to be remedied” (Dyck, 1991, p. 2). The ways in which the state approached the Indian problem and the solutions to it were articulated within the political culture of postwar state-organized capitalism as Fraser (2009) describes. During this period, the state understood the Indian problem to be the socio-economic disparities between Indigenous people, specifically residents of First Nations reserve communities, and all other non-Indigenous people as a whole. The solution to the Indian problem was thought to be policy and legislative changes that sought to integrate Indigenous people into the dominant culture from which they were politically, economically, and socially excluded by their special Indian status. Importantly, the integration of First Nations into Canadian life would be done in order to provide them with equality of opportunity in a liberal democratic society. The extension of social services that were not already offered to status Indian people was also part of the goal of enabling First Nations to compete on equal footing in the capitalist market economy. Official channels identified a lack of access to social services – not systemic and structural racism – as the main barrier preventing Indigenous people from improving their socio-economic position.

From Confederation to the 1960s, child and family welfare policy for status Indian people was a key piece of Canada’s general policy of assimilation (Armitage, 1998). During the 1960s, approaches to child welfare changed towards integrating services for status Indians with services for non-Indigenous Canadians (Armitage, 1998). Rather than attempting to assimilate Indigenous people with restrictive and punitive legislation, the government shifted its Indian policy in the 1960s to one of integration whereby Indigenous people would be enfolded into Canadian society. Beginning with a Special Joint Committee of the House of Commons and Senate appointed in

1946, the government initiated a series of major policy reviews and legislative changes (Dyck, 1991). The committee's recommendations and another parliamentary inquiry held a decade later guided a revision of the Indian Act in 1951 that included a removal of the most openly assimilationist provisions of the Indian Act (e.g. lifting the potlatch ban) (Dyck, 1991). In keeping with the goal of integration, the changes to the Indian Act specified that negotiations be held between the federal and provincial governments to extend health, welfare, and educational services to First Nations reserves. The 1951 amendment to the Indian Act included section 88, which extended provincial legislation to status Indians who had, until that time, been primarily under the sole jurisdiction of the federal government. Another Joint Parliamentary Committee in 1961 recommended the acceleration of efforts to integrate Indigenous people into Canadian society (Weaver, 1993).

The period of integration in the 1960s included the closure of many residential schools and the replacement of these institutions with provincial child welfare services on reserves. As provincial child welfare services were extended to reserve residents through individual agreements between the federal and provincial governments following the amendment to the Indian Act, the child welfare system eventually replaced residential schools as alternative parenting institutions for First Nations. Survivors of residential schools described rampant sexual and physical abuse, neglect, and bullying at the schools (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015). Although the residential school system was largely dismantled by the 1960s, child welfare on First Nations reserves was still plagued by many of the same problems of its predecessor (Armitage, 1998). The closure of separate residential schools for First Nations children was a part of the wider policy of integration, which sought to correct the generally low socio-economic position of Indigenous people through the extension of the same government services and resources available to the non-status population. Here, the government achieved political legitimacy through the rhetoric of social justice, particularly in the area of child welfare matters.

The 1960s also saw the rise of the pan-Indian Red Power movement across North America. Lee Maracle (2009, p. 360), Sto:lo poet, author, and activist, characterized Indigenous peoples' experiences of the 1960s in Canada as a time when "the possibility of surviving led to us taking on the business of studying ourselves, our situation, studying colonization, studying feminism, studying radicalization, studying all kinds of things with one another and particularly rediscovering our history and our culture". Maracle (2009, p. 360) adds that the Sixties were also a time when "we [Indigenous peoples] tried hard to resist colonization and to fight for our rights, but we weren't really clear what that was". Across Canada and the US during the Sixties, Indigenous peoples participated in blockades, demonstrations, and occupations in resistance to the oppressive conditions on reserves and the general displacement and dispossession of Indigenous people from their homelands (Deloria Jr., 1973). In Canada, the decade was a period of mounting political tension between the government and Indigenous people that was exacerbated in the release of the infamous White Paper in 1969.

The White Paper, which sought to abolish the special legal relationship between Indigenous people and the government in favour of equality with other Canadians, resulted in a swift and organized response from many Indigenous groups on an unprecedented scale. According to Temagami Anishinaabeg scholar Dale Turner (2006, p. 17), "the government had an opportunity to gain the Indians' trust: instead, the White Paper politicized the relationship". Although the White Paper was the federal government's attempt to correct socio-economic disparities between Indigenous people and other Canadians, it was ultimately shelved as official policy after Indigenous groups rallied against its explicit principles of forced assimilation (Turner, 2006). The release of the Trudeau government's White Paper was a watershed moment for Indigenous activism in Canada. Indigenous groups that had previously seen themselves as separate nations came together under a united and organized effort. Beginning with the publication of Harold Cardinal's *The Unjust Society* in 1969, the late 1960s and 1970s witnessed

the birth of contemporary Indigenous resistance literature, including socio-political commentaries, poetry, and autobiographies (LaRoque, 2010). Cardinal (1969, p.1) writes directly in response to the White Paper, charging the Trudeau government of advancing a “thinly disguised programme of extermination through assimilation”.

The White Paper was a policy paper proposal written by the then-Minister of Indian Affairs, Jean Chrétien. The belief in “equality” is at the heart of the document. It is argued: “True equality presupposes that the Indian people have the right to full and equal participation in the cultural, social, economic and political life of Canada” (Chrétien, 1969). Differences between Indigenous people and other Canadians, particularly those differences encoded in Indian policy and legislation, are viewed as a form of discrimination. It follows that the solution to the poverty and discrimination facing Indigenous people is the removal of separate legislation and administration concerning Indigenous matters. Additionally, programs and services for Indigenous people would be offered through the same channels and departments for Canadians without Indian status. Although “special treatment” would be abolished, Chrétien espoused the importance of recognizing Indigenous peoples’ “unique contribution of Indian culture to Canadian society”.

If successful, Chrétien argued that this policy presented Indigenous people with the opportunity to play “a full role in Canadian society and in the economy while retaining, strengthening and developing an Indian identity, which preserves the good things of the past and helps Indian people to prosper and thrive” (Chrétien, 1969). In order to accomplish the goals of the White Paper, the Indian Act would be repealed, arrangements would be set in motion to transfer the title of Indigenous lands to Indigenous people, government funds would be funneled into economic development programs for Indigenous people, and the Department of Indian Affairs would be dissolved (Chrétien, 1969). According to Chrétien (1969), the Canadian government believes that “no one shall be shut out because of his race”, but due to their distinct

political and legal status, Indigenous people are excluded from society. Chrétien equates the end of “legal discrimination” against Indigenous people with the repeal of the Indian Act as an end to differential treatment based on race. He contends that Indigenous people are the only remaining racial-ethnic group to receive differential treatment under the law and the removal of their “separate” legal status will enable them to participate equally in society alongside other racial-ethnic minorities and white majority Canadians who do not have Indian status (Chrétien, 1969).

The White Paper came about during a renewed postwar search for a specifically unique national identity that would distinguish Canada from Britain and the US and on the heels of the introduction of official multiculturalism (Mackey, 1998). During the late 1960s, the Canadian economy was booming and white European immigrants could no longer fill the huge demand for skilled labour (Mackey, 1998). As a result of economic considerations and an international postwar political climate that discouraged overt racism in policy, the Canadian government changed its immigration law to allow in Asian and other skilled racialized immigrants (Mackey, 1998). With increasing demographic diversification, the burgeoning Canadian national identity increasingly became connected to tolerance and cultural pluralism (Mackey, 1998). However, the notion of Canada as a peaceful meritocracy was closer to a constructed national identity than a reality.

Similarly, the stark dichotomy between a disadvantaged Indigenous minority and a united, industrialized “Canadian” majority did not adequately describe Canadian society in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In 1969, the same year the White Paper was released, racial tensions flared in Toronto, Canada’s biggest city and the place where a large number of new immigrants came to settle. Racial and ethnic minorities, specifically Black and immigrant youth, described feeling helpless and frustrated because of a lack of educational and job opportunities and prejudice against them (Warson, 1969). Such frustrations frequently exploded into violent rivalries between minority youth, specifically involving Black, Chinese, and recently immigrated

white European (i.e. Polish, Portuguese, Jewish, and Italian) young people (Warson, 1969). While living in Toronto in her late teens in 1967, Maracle (1975) also describes many incidences of harassment and brutality she and her Black friends experienced at the hands of police officers. Consequently, the “hassles and racist crap” she and her friends endured sparked Maracle’s initial interest in political activism and her involvement with the Red Power movement (Maracle, 1975, p. 58).

Mackey (1998) argues that the introduction of multiculturalism in 1971 was the government’s way of avoiding a potentially volatile situation posed by Quebec separatism and increasing politicization of cultural minorities. Rather than enforcing assimilation to a singular culture, the state institutionalized and internalized various forms of difference in order to control access to power and legitimate state power (Mackey, 1998). At the same time, the state had to address the specific challenge of Indigenous peoples’ distinctiveness – they did not fit in with either the two “founding races” of Canada (the French and the English) or immigrant and ethnic groups (Mackey, 1998). A predecessor of the White Paper, the 1966/67 *Hawthorn Report*, sought to understand and place First Nations people within the burgeoning Canadian “cultural mosaic” of the postwar period. Thus, persistent questions about Indigenous peoples’ place in Canada were connected to nation-building projects in the 1960s and the later institutionalization of cultural difference with the introduction of multiculturalism as official policy in the 1970s.

While mass removals of Indigenous children from their homes had been occurring since the introduction of section 88 to the Indian Act, the non-Indigenous public was largely ignorant of this phenomenon until the 1980s. The 1980s saw the publication of several reports and inquiries by governments and non-governmental organizations that validated and publicized the concerns that social workers and Indigenous communities and activists had been voicing for years. A 1980 report on foster care and adoption in Canada by Phillip Hepworth and the Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD) provided the first statistical analysis of child welfare services across

the provinces in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. Hepworth found that in 1980, over 4% of status Indian children and 3.5% of all Indigenous children were in the care of provincial and federal child welfare services; the same figure for all Canadian children was 1.35%. He also noted that the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in out-of-home care had been drastically increasing over time. Hepworth found that five times as many status Indian children were being adopted by non-Indian parents in 1980 as were being adopted in the mid-1960s; the total number of status children adopted rose from 137 in 1964-65 to 581 in 1976-77.

The 1983 publication of *Native Children and the Child Welfare System*, by Patrick Johnston, the then-program director of CCSD, presented further evidence that substantiated First Nations' activism against the apprehension of children from their families and communities. This publication was a milestone in the history of Indigenous child welfare and sent shockwaves through the child welfare system and governments (Canada, 1996). Johnston identified Northern Ontario, the four Western provinces, and the two territories as areas where the issue of child welfare and Indigenous people were of particular concern. Johnston adds that even in areas where the actual number of status children in care is relatively small, such as in Ontario, they represent a significant proportion of all status children. In 1985, Associate Chief Judge Edwin C. Kimelman released a highly critical review of Manitoba's child welfare system. The inquiry was a result of the efforts of the province's Indigenous leadership who charged the child welfare system with committing "cultural genocide" against First Nations and Métis people and "selling" their babies (Kimelman, 1985, p. 1). Particularly of concern was the substantial number of Indigenous children removed by provincial and federal authorities and placed in non-Indigenous homes outside of the province and the country. According to the report, 86% of children placed in homes outside of Manitoba were of Indigenous ancestry. Kimelman concluded unequivocally that the placement of children out of the province amounted to cultural genocide carried out in a systemic and routine manner. He found that out-of-province adoption was only a symptom of a structurally

flawed child welfare system that failed Indigenous children, families, and communities at every level.

1.4 Methodology

“Resurgence” is defined as “a process of renewal or awakening from a period of dormancy. In Indigenous contexts, it also carries a particular cultural and political connotation, referring to a form of mobilization and action that is grounded in the revitalization of [Indigenous peoples’] traditional ways” (Starblanket, 2017, p. 25). Indigenous scholars’ theoretical and methodological interventions into Western knowledge production and the larger process of “resurgence”, therefore, are two sides of the same coin. Indigenous efforts towards decolonization involve “reclaiming, reconnecting, and reordering those ways of knowing which were submerged, hidden, or driven underground” (Smith, 2012, p. 72). The recovery of Indigenous ways of living in and understanding the world is an important way in which Indigenous peoples attempt to recreate their humanness and subsequently reclaim control over their lived realities. Indigenous methodologies and research praxis are necessary components of revitalizing and reclaiming Indigenous cultures, languages, and systems of governance and part of the pursuit of decolonization. Indigenous methodologies envision the termination of colonial rule by regenerating Indigenous knowledges and calling forth a way of life that brings Indigenous and non-Indigenous people together in the work of decolonizing society at large (Morgensen, 2012). They do the work of exposing normative knowledge production as colonial, thereby unsettling power within the settler academy (Morgensen, 2012). Western systems of knowledge are turned into an object of critique and inquiry, rather than being regarded as the only legitimate way of knowing the world (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008).

The non-Indigenous researcher is then confronted with the question: “How can a non-Indigenous researcher participate?” (Kovach, 2009). Indigenous methods of research turn the activity of research into a moral one – they call for a “collaborative social science research model

that makes the researcher responsible, not to a removed discipline (or institution) but rather to those studied” (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008, p. 15). As such, self-reflexivity on the part of the non-Indigenous researcher is necessary in creating respectful and beneficial research on, with, and about Indigenous peoples. This means exploring one’s beliefs and values about the production of knowledge and examining the power relations present when conducting research (Kovach, 2009). Closely related to locating oneself in relation to the research is reflecting on the purpose of the research and the researcher’s intentions in studying marginalized people. The ethics of research should align with a “politics of the oppressed, with a politics of resistance, hope, and freedom” (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008, p. 15). Research about Indigenous people should be accountable to Indigenous people and evaluated in terms of the benefits it creates for them (Kovach, 2009). Decolonization of self, institution, and society should be the paramount objective in such research. Relatedly, the role of the non-Indigenous researcher within Indigenous research is “relational, iterative, and must uphold, rather than weaken the work of Indigenous scholars” (Kovach, 2009, p. 170). As a white graduate student at Queen’s University, a colonial institution built on Haudenosaunee and Algonquin lands, I understand my positioning in the project of Indigenous self-determination and decolonization to be supportive (as opposed to central or directive) in nature – my project attempts to create an allied critique of colonial systems of governance and understandings and representations of Indigenous peoples through the use of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous critical theory.

My intention in drawing from Indigenous theorists of resurgence in attempting to produce an intersectional analysis and historical narrative of the Scoop is to foreground Indigenous peoples’ resistance, resourcefulness, and resiliency in the face of settler colonialism. The aim of my project is contributing to decolonization and supporting Indigenous peoples’ self-determination struggles. I endeavored methodologically not to produce what Eve Tuck (2009) calls “damage-centred” research as a non-Indigenous academic working from primary sources

that describe the loss and destruction experienced by Indigenous people. Damaged-centered research, while attempting to hold those in power accountable for oppression by documenting pain, reproduces a monolithic image of marginalized people and communities as powerless and depleted (Tuck, 2009). Research is not an objective pursuit of knowledge but an activity imbued with power and privilege that occurs within specific historical, cultural, and political contexts with material consequences: research makes claims on people's lives and shapes their lived experiences (Smith, 2012). As Dian Million (2015) points out in her analysis of the TRC, damage-centred narratives undergird national reconciliation efforts and projects of Indigenous self-determination in contemporary neoliberal Canada. Tuck (2009, p. 417) argues that the “antidote” to damage-centered research is to work from a “desire-based framework” – one that “accounts for the loss and despair, but also the hope, the visions, the wisdom of lived lives and communities”.

In order to avoid reproducing a damage-centered historical narrative, I sought to demonstrate how Indigenous people were active participants in defining their own identities and charting new paths forward for themselves as peoples in the 20th century and beyond. While conducting a literature review on Indigenous child welfare, I found that there was a dearth of scholarship that contextualized the Scoop within larger histories of Indigenous struggles against poverty and dispossession, specifically the Red Power movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s. In my understanding of resistance, I was also careful to not define resistance solely as large-scale political mobilization. As Michi Saagig Nishnaabeg scholar Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2011) argues, doing so overlooks how Indigenous people have acted within the family unit to keep languages, cultures, and systems of governance alive. Research in the human disciplines has historically contributed to the colonial project by providing colonizing nations with “objective” representations of non-white peoples that were implicated in colonizing strategies (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008). With this historical context in mind, I endeavored to

avoid the rhetorical repetition of derogatory colonial archetypes and representations of Indigenous people in research, which have historically rationalized and legitimated their brutalization, dispossession, and disempowerment. This involves only explicitly referencing derogatory terms only when necessary and ensuring that referencing these terms serves to meaningfully contribute to my critique of settler colonialism. I found that centering Indigenous scholars of resurgence in my critique of settler colonialism was also useful in this endeavor as their work aims to foment meaningful self-determination and troubles “recognition” by settler society as necessary to the reinvigoration of Indigenous ways of life (Simpson, 2011; Coulthard, 2014; Green, 2017). In using feminist and Marxist critical theories in synthesizing my own argument, these Indigenous scholars also aided in accounting for the colonial and Eurocentric biases of non-Indigenous critical theory and making non-Indigenous theory more appropriate for a settler colonial critique.

1.5 Chapter Summary

In Chapter 1, I will explore the relationship between market capitalism and settler colonialism in postwar Canada as exemplified by the *Hawthorn Report*. As Coulthard observes, capitalism is integral to the displacement of Indigenous people and lands. Rather than the openly assimilationist policies of the prewar era, the narrative of integration purported to accomplish the full emersion of First Nations people into Canadian social and economic life while accommodating certain elements of First Nations cultures. However, this state-sponsored form of cultural recognition, which Coulthard terms the “politics of recognition”, requires First Nations cultures to be reconcilable within capitalism and colonial sovereignty. The Report exemplifies the government’s approach to the Indian problem during the postwar era, specifically demonstrating the hegemony of integration policy following the Second World War. Its proposed integration of First Nations into the mainstream white-dominated economy necessitated the reorganization of gender roles and family structures in First Nations societies to approximate white middle class

ideals. In this way, child welfare policy informed by the logic of integration was unable to tackle the complex web of oppressions faced by Indigenous people during this time and actually resulted in further colonization through the mass removal of children and the disciplining of families. Only through Hawthorn's ignorance of the economic and political marginalization of non-Indigenous racialized Canadians in "white society" is the Report able to endorse a way of improving First Nations' socio-economic position that does not involve the dismantling of white supremacy embedded in capitalism.

Chapter 2 zooms in on the Scoop within the context of the official policy of integration and Indigenous activism in the 1960s and 1970s. Using literature from JOACAS, I will investigate the similarities and differences in the ways in which Indigenous social workers and non-Indigenous social workers conceptualized the child welfare crisis on reserves. I will demonstrate how the depoliticization of Indigenous cultures and the separation of social problems and family disruptions from historical and ongoing colonialism contributed to delayed responses and ineffective approaches to the problem of Indigenous child apprehensions. Furthermore, I argue in Chapter 2 that provincial child welfare administration, policy, and services informed by the logic underpinning the policy of integration was a contributing factor to the Scoop as the child welfare apparatus was implicated in disciplining Indigenous families to approximate the white middle class ideal.

Chapter 2

Integration, Citizens Plus, and the *Hawthorn Report*

2.1 Introduction

Through an analysis of the *Hawthorn Report* (1966/1967), I will explore the relationship among market capitalism, racism, sexism, and settler colonialism in the Sixties in Canada. The Report an example of the official policy of integration under state-organized capitalism and demonstrates Coulthard's modified conceptualization of primitive accumulation as an ongoing process of dispossessing Indigenous people. I argue that the central mechanism through which primitive accumulation was manifested under the state-organized capitalism of the postwar period was through the restructuring of Indigenous kin structures to approximate the sexual division of labour within the nuclear family unit. The nuclear family, headed by a male wageworker supporting his dependent wife and children, formed the basis of social and economic policy under state-organized capitalism. The imposition of these patriarchal gender relations onto Indigenous societies is part of the ongoing oppression against Indigenous women and conducive to the imperatives of colonialism (i.e. the dispossession of Indigenous people). Thus, the integration and colonization of First Nations people into the settler state as the *Hawthorn Report* outlines is dependent on the restructuring of Indigenous kin structures and gender roles. Concerning child welfare, the logic of integration undergirding the Report enabled Hawthorn to conclude that the extension of provincial child welfare legislation and services to First Nations reserves was a worthy goal and a success in contexts where it had been fully implemented.

Reflective of the Canadian government's shift from an openly assimilationist Indian policy, the *Hawthorn Report* is underwritten by the concept of "citizens plus" wherein First Nations people are able to choose whether or not (and to what degree) to integrate into Canadian society. Although underpinned by the same liberal ideologies as the later White Paper, Hawthorn

insists that First Nations people should be entitled to their special legal status and that the federal government should continue to be responsible for the management of Indian affairs (at least for the foreseeable future). In this chapter, I centre Glen Coulthard's conceptualization of Indigenous cultures as ontologically distinct "modes of life" to critique the form of state-sponsored cultural recognition underwriting the *Hawthorn Report*. The requirement in the Report that First Nations cultures and economies be reconcilable with capitalism and the sovereignty of the settler-state precludes the concept of Indigenous peoples as citizens plus from offering them meaningful autonomy and self-determination. Only through Hawthorn's reluctance to explicitly name and denounce the structurally embedded racism faced by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous racialized people in Canada can the concept of citizens plus be viable. By subsuming non-Indigenous Black and non-Black racialized people with white people under the category of "Canadian", Hawthorn ignores the political and economic marginalization of non-white people who do not fall under the Report's opposing and separate category of "Indian".⁵ Thus, the citizens plus concept is predicated on the fiction that non-white people enjoyed equality of opportunity in a white-dominated capitalist society if they were integrated into the very same "Canadian" systems and institutions that oppressed them.

2.2 Historical Context

Commissioned in 1963 by the federal Indian Affairs Branch (then a part of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration) and published in two volumes in 1966 and 1967, the Report was based on data collected on First Nations between 1964 and 1966. It was the first national survey of the conditions of First Nations in Canada, combining data from 592 bands across the country (Weaver, 1993). The main source of information for this study came from a Resources Questionnaire prepared and circulated to the bands by the Branch in 1964. The 124

⁵ As Hawthorn does not consistently differentiate between white and racialized non-Indigenous people when using the term "Canadian", the following section will use the term "Canadian" to describe all non-Indigenous Canadians when it is used in Hawthorn's original analysis.

questions in the survey covered topics such as: land and timber and other resources, ownership of various kinds of capital, types of jobs, wages, duration of employment, and organizations in each band community. The responses to the questionnaire were collected, recorded, and reported by superintendents, employed by the Branch and responsible for the administration of Branch business to the band under their jurisdiction. As Hawthorn proclaims, the information collected from these surveys provided “a far more accurate, detailed and comprehensive picture of Canada’s 200,000 plus Indians than any that has been available before” (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 35).

According to anthropologist Sally M. Weaver (1993), the decision to undertake the study resulted from the convergence of two events: the disenchantment among senior Branch officials and lobbying by the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire (IODE). Growing discontent among First Nations communities with government administration, increased public awareness of Indigenous issues, and the government’s larger project of re-examining Indian policy resulted in increased frustration among Branch officials with their programs. In early 1963, Colonel H.M. Jones, the director of the Branch at the time, decided the Branch needed to obtain concrete data on First Nations in order to reformulate the department’s programming. Coincidentally, the IODE implored the Minister to undertake a study that would investigate how First Nations could achieve equal opportunity with other Canadians.

The Sixties saw the rise of Indigenous activism and the Red Power movement in North America. The 1960s in Canada were, as historian Bryan D. Palmer (2009, p. 193) argues, years of “self-discovery as Aboriginal people chartered new paths of opposition, demand, and protest”. This decade saw the emergence of a pan-Indian consciousness and the formation of alliances amongst Indigenous and colonized people across North America and internationally. Indigenous people across North America vocalized their frustration with unemployment, poverty, and stark living conditions on reserves and called governments to action. In the Canadian context, a demonstration attended by 400 protestors in Kenora, Ontario was the first major march by

Indigenous activists in the Sixties (Maracle, 1984). At the 1967 International and Universal Exposition or “Expo 67” in Montréal, the Indians of Canada Pavilion caused a controversy by revealing Indigenous histories that had been left out of mainstream retellings of Canada’s past. The Pavilion described to the international public how Indigenous societies had been negatively impacted by colonization and showed the impoverished conditions in which many Indigenous people in Canada were living (Maracle, 1984).

Palmer (2009) characterizes the Red Power movement that emerged in Canada and the US in the late 1960s to mid-1970s as youthful, militant, inspired by international currents of radicalism, and premised on the idea that all Indigenous people shared a common history of dispossession that required redress. During this time period, activists across North America organized demonstrations, blockades and marches and formed representative bodies to express the grievances and desires of Indigenous people to the state and non-Indigenous public. In both structure and theoretical investments, the Red Power movement was heavily influenced by global anti-colonial struggles of the decade, such as the American Black Power movement and decolonizing efforts in the Global South (Rutherford, 2011). In her autobiography, Red Power activist Lee Maracle (1975) describes her experience as a member of the Native Alliance for Red Power (NARP), an Indigenous anti-colonial group formed in 1967 in BC. Early on in her involvement with the group, Lee was introduced to Franz Fanon’s *Black Skins, White Masks* and participated in discussions with other members about violent resistance, Marxism, and Mao Tse-tung’s revolutionary communism. Most Red Power groups rallied around anti-imperial and anti-capitalist critiques of settler states (Palmer, 2009), and NARP was no exception. The organization also participated in marches and demonstrations with American Indian tribes in the US and supported the resistance efforts of other Indigenous groups in Canada.

Although Palmer locates the beginning of the Red Power Movement in the politically charged climate of 1967-68, the release of the White Paper in 1969 was a watershed moment that

brought Indigenous people in Canada together in a united front against the state and Canadian society. The publication of Harold Cardinal's highly influential *The Unjust Society* in 1969 heralded the beginning of contemporary Indigenous resistance literature (LaRocque, 2010). Cardinal's scathing critique of Canada's treatment of Indigenous peoples came in response to the release of the White Paper. Cardinal (1969, p. 1) argues that generations of Indigenous peoples have "grown up behind a buckskin curtain of indifference, ignorance, and all too often, plain bigotry". According to Cardinal (1969, p. 1), the White Paper is nothing more than "cultural genocide". He explains that the aim of his book is to "open the eyes of the Canadian public to its shame" and to challenge the government to "offer the Indians of Canada hope instead of despair, freedom instead of frustration, life in the Just Society instead of cultural annihilation" (Cardinal, 1969, p. 2). As the 1970s wore on, the initial militant spirit of the Red Power movement was replaced by state-funded chiefs' conferences and other moderate developments (Palmer, 2009).

The government's decision to undertake the Report is reflective of larger shifts in thinking about government responsibility, social justice, and equal opportunity. The definition of Canada's Indian problem and the solutions to it were being reformulated in the postwar period. In the two decades immediately following the Second World War, Canada's reputation within international bodies such as the United Nations was tarnished by its system of Indian affairs administration that was regarded as indefensible in an era of growing internationalism and material prosperity (Dyck, 1991). The new climate of liberalism compelled the Canadian government to investigate the causes of Indigenous peoples' "plight" and formulate new ways of eliminating the socio-economic gap between reserve residents and non-Indigenous Canadians (Jacobs, 2014). In the context of a growing welfare state, both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous public had increased their expectations of the quality and quantity of government social services. During the same decade, growing Indigenous activism and the Red Power movement called for

the end of ongoing colonialism and social injustices against Indigenous peoples across North America and globally.

2.3 Report Findings

Led by Harry B. Hawthorn, anthropologist at the University of British Columbia, the research team was comprised of 52 fellow social scientists, mostly anthropologists. The only requirement placed upon the study by the Branch was that this information be useable by government officials in reformulating Branch programs and services (Weaver, 1993). The first volume of the Report was published in 1966 and the second was released a year later. The Report concentrates on four key areas of First Nations life: economic development, constitutional and administrative matters, education, and government and leadership. The Report includes 151 direct calls to government action in all four of these areas. The first volume of the Report focuses primarily on regional and national statistics on earnings and employment among First Nations, as well as the socio-economic and socio-cultural factors responsible for the enormous economic gap between First Nations and “other Canadians”. The second volume mainly concerns the education of First Nations children, the legal relationship of First Nations people to the state, Indian administration, and band council affairs.

Reflective of the economist character of the state-organized capitalism of the postwar decades, the Minister asked that the study be undertaken in order to “[understand] the difficulties they [Indigenous people] faced in overcoming some pressing problems and their many ramifications” (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 5). The underlying contention of the study is that the “pressing problems and their many ramifications” faced by First Nations in postwar Canada were rooted in material inequality. In the words of the Report, “they [First Nations people] want the material blessings other Canadians have in the way of incomes, houses, cars, furnishings, clothes, foods and so on, perhaps partly because they are advertised at and exhorted to want them equally with the rest of us” (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 5). The Report is an example of how the Indian problem

(and the solutions to such) was conceptualized by the government and the non-Indigenous public during the postwar period. Hawthorn understands the Indian problem as the inability of First Nations to enjoy the material prosperity available to Canadians. The solution to this problem, thus, is to integrate First Nations people into the market economy on equal footing with other Canadians, which primarily involves the extension of provincial government services and systems to First Nations and their “acculturation” to white society. Hawthorn (1966, p. 22) concludes, “further economic participation of Indians in White society seems the only feasible path by which to achieve substantial improvement in economic status”.

The Report presents a dismal picture of the socio-economic status of First Nation reserves. Based on data between 1964 and 1966, Hawthorn (1966, p. 5) concludes, “Their [Indigenous people’s] income levels and their average expenditures are rising, but on average are now far less than equal to national or regional averages and the gap is ever widening”. Indeed, data reveals economic disparities between the First Nations sampled and other Canadians. It is important to note that when discussing statistics on employment and earnings, the Report deals with data collected mostly from “employable” males aged 16-64. The questionnaire, off which these statistics are calculated, did not contain any questions concerning the employment of women or workers less than 16 years of age. Thus, the category of “worker” is defined along age and gender lines. Women and children were considered workers within the nuclear family unit under state-organized capitalism so data on their employment and earnings was not collected.

The data reveal high rates of unemployment and underemployment among First Nations men. The following statistics are derived from 7,962 jobs of varying duration and various industries carried out by 6,327 employable males from a sample of 35 bands. Table B shows that 28.5% were employed more than nine months of the year, while 61% were employed less than six months, and 23.6 % less than two months (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 48). Average yearly earnings reveals gaps between First Nations men and their Canadian counterparts. Table B shows that First

Nations men earned \$1,361 per year compared to the general Canadian average of almost \$4,000 per year (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 48). A further breakdown based on data collected by a special welfare and housing survey by the Branch in 1965 reveals that only 11.5% of First Nation households had incomes of \$4,000 per annum or more (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 46). Furthermore, Hawthorn characterizes First Nations households as “heavily dependent” on welfare, citing a figure in Table B that shows 33.5% of households are dependent on grants provided by the Branch. When all types of transfer payments are taken into consideration (e.g. unemployment insurance, family allowances, old age security and assistance, and welfare payments from public bodies and band revenues), social welfare amounted to 31.4% (or almost a third) of total income from employment (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 46).

2.4 Indigenous People as Citizens Plus

Hawthorn recommends that First Nations people should be considered citizens plus. This concept means that in addition to the regular rights and duties of Canadian citizenship, status Indian people should retain the additional rights and privileges their status affords them. These additional rights and entitlements are the “plus” in citizens plus. Differing rhetorically from the policy of assimilation, the concept of citizens plus purports to allow for the full participation of First Nations in the social and economic life of what Hawthorn terms “white society” while requiring that they neither abandon their distinct languages and traditions nor lose their special legal relationship with the state. The Report differs from the White Paper in that it does not recommend the immediate abolishment of this special status and federal system of Indian administration. Hawthorn focuses on improving the low socio-economic position of the vast majority of Indigenous people in Canada through legislative and policy changes to the existing system, rather than the dismantling of the existing system.

The first of Hawthorn's 151 recommendations is as follows: "Integration or assimilation are not objectives which anyone else can properly hold for the Indian" (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 13). Concerning the role of the Branch moving forward, Hawthorn (1966, p. 13) recommends that its efforts be concentrated on "middle range objectives, such as increasing the educational attainments of the Indian people, increasing their real income, and adding to their life expectancy". In summary, the solution to the Indian "problem" is not the abolition of Indian status and the assimilation of First Nation cultures, but the reorientation and improvement of the existing system of Indian administration and its programs. Quite simply, the researchers "do not think that the Indian should be required to assimilate, neither in order to receive what he now needs nor at any future time" (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 6).

Based on the data on the economic conditions on First Nations reserves, Hawthorn (1966, p. 6) suggests that rather than citizens plus, status Indians are actually "citizens minus". In order to make these choices, the Indian must free "himself from the shackles of poverty and social exclusion" (Hawthorn, 1967, p. 166) through the "economic development" of reserve communities. The economically depressed status of reserve residents (in comparison to the standard of living widely accepted in white society) prevents them from being able to make the same choices available to other Canadians. Hawthorn argues that economic development should primarily seek to:

...Provide facilities and services that would widen the range of choices available to individual Indians, e.g. to work full-time, part-time, or not at all; to be relatively well paid or poorly paid; to leave their reserves to take advantage of higher income opportunities, or to stay; and for those who leave, a choice to lose their distinct ethnic identities in complex urban-industrial environments, or, alternatively, to assert them aggressively using what organized bargaining power they can muster as a separate pressure group. (1966, p. 23)

As Hawthorn (1966, p. 31) puts it, economic development is a “means by which they [Indigenous people] may participate more fully and effectively in the larger society and live a fuller, richer, more meaningful and satisfactory life”. The Report follows a developmentalist narrative: state-sponsored programs to stimulate economic development on reserves are a means to an end. That end is equality of opportunity with non-status Canadians for reserve residents whose choices are constrained by their poverty. The integration of First Nations people into the market economy is the answer to the Indian problem. Under the citizen’s plus framework, people with Indian status can retain their special cultural and legal privileges, while fully participating in Canadian economic and social life, thereby alleviating poverty on reserves and reducing government expenditures on social welfare for First Nations people. However, in identifying Canadian society as white-dominated while not questioning white supremacy, Hawthorn erases the historical and ongoing legal, political, and economic marginalization of non-Indigenous racialized Canadians. Only in ignoring the socio-economic disparities masked by the monolithic category of “Canadian” could Hawthorn conclude that integration could secure equality of opportunity for First Nations people.

2.5 Gendered Primitive Accumulation

Hawthorn’s method of data collection and interpretation, from the questionnaires created by the researchers and collected by government employees to the recommendations endorsed by the authors, were produced within the matrix of power relations within the state-organized capitalist economy of the postwar period and demonstrate how research is informed by the unequal colonial relationship between Indigenous peoples and the settler state. First, the collection of employment and earning statistics only pertaining to males reflects the devaluing of First Nations women’s productive labour, both waged and unwaged. Second, in this way, Hawthorn presupposes that First Nations women’s roles do (or if they do not, should) correspond with those of white, middle class Canadian women (i.e. domestic and childrearing responsibilities

within the private domain of the home) and that Indigenous families do (or if they are not, should) look like the nuclear family ideal. Thirdly, by assessing poverty solely based on a comparison in aggregate income levels, Hawthorn delegitimizes Indigenous cultures that are subsistence and land-based and privileges capitalist modes of production. Hawthorn closely associates First Nations ways of life to poverty, deficiency, and dependency, arguing that reserve residents exist within a “culture of poverty”. Last, federal government officials had exclusive authorship over the questionnaires upon which Hawthorn’s team based their analysis. The unequal power dynamic between the state and Indigenous people is evident in the fact that superintendents filled out the questionnaires on behalf of the bands under their jurisdiction.

The developmentalist narrative running throughout the Report reveals the gendered nature of the process of primitive accumulation during this particular historical moment. The creation of the nuclear family and the sexual division of labour within it underlies Hawthorn’s understanding of economic development and Hawthorn’s proposals for the integration of First Nations into the capitalist settler-society. Hawthorn takes for granted that the integration of First Nations into the white-majority Canadian society, through capitalist economic development, is the only pathway to improving socio-economic conditions on reserves while empowering First Nations people to choose to retain some, all, or none of their distinct cultures. I counter that the restructuring of Indigenous kin structures to approximate the nuclear family as an economic unit is itself a form of colonization that particularly disadvantages Indigenous women and maintains their oppression within the particular configuration of power in a late capitalist settler-state. While Indigenous women do not all share the same culture, they do have a common colonial experience shaped by an imposition of patriarchy on Indigenous societies (Stevenson, 1999; Green, 2007). The violence against and disempowerment of Indigenous women is deeply connected to historical and ongoing colonization. Rather than being a side effect of colonial policies, the dispossession and domination of Indigenous people in Canada by European powers

depended on the disempowerment of Indigenous women (Horn-Miller, 2005). As Coulthard (2014) notes, capitalism dispossesses Indigenous people within the matrix of other forms of oppression along state and gender lines. In this way, the oppression faced by First Nations women cannot be disentangled from the specific power relations operating in a settler colonial context and under conditions of ongoing colonization.

Some Indigenous societies prior to colonization were more egalitarian because of the nature of relational practices among genders, and colonization has resulted in the degeneration of Indigenous women's roles in contemporary society (Sayers, et al., 2001). For instance, in traditional Haudenosaunee society, women had important economic, social, political, and spiritual roles as mothers, cultivators, diplomats, and advisors; neither men nor women were considered superior to the other and relationships between them were seen as complementary (Horn-Miller, 2005). Indigenous structures of governance reflect their cultures and values (Sayers, et al., 2001). As such, the underlying principles of equality and mutual consent in the Great Law of Peace (the Constitution of the Iroquois Confederacy) indirectly informed the relationship between men and women in Haudenosaunee society (Horn-Miller, 2005). However, Green (2007) cautions that not all pre-contact Indigenous societies were completely egalitarian or innocent of gender-based oppression. Green insists that pathways to self-determination and decolonization that embrace "tradition" must be interrogated through an Indigenous feminist critique to ensure that they benefit contemporary Indigenous men, women, and children.

Through legislation, the colonial then later federal government appointed itself the designator of "Indianness" and, therefore, the sole guarantor of special rights and entitlements to those Indigenous people it deemed to be "Indians". Legal definitions of the term "Indian" have existed since 1850 (Lawrence, 2004). With the passing of the Indian Act in 1876, the federal government claimed sweeping powers over many aspects of First Nations' life, including governance structures, cultural practices, and education. Importantly, membership provisions in

the Indian Act stipulated that Indian ancestry was to be passed down exclusively through the male line. This meant that if a male family member lost or forfeited his Indian status through the legal process of voluntary or involuntary “enfranchisement”, his female relations would automatically lose their status and the accompanying legal privileges and entitlements. Additionally, First Nations women could have their status revoked and their children could be denied status if they married non-status men (Stevenson, 1999). By losing their status and the ability to pass their status onto their children, the population of legal Indians continued to decrease with every new generation even though women of Indigenous ancestry continued to have children. In this way, gender discrimination, encoded in the Indian Act, was central to legally “disappearing” Indigenous people and their claims to land. As Bonita Lawrence (2004, p. 281) argues, identity legislation amounts to the “legal dismemberment” of Indigenous identities and nations.

Membership provisions were made more stringent when the Indian Act was amended in 1951. The government established a register of all people included under the Indian Act. “Registered” or “status” Indians were generally band members covered under the Act (Furi & Wherrett, 2003). Under section 12(1)(b), a woman who married a non-status man was not entitled to be registered, thereby losing her First Nations membership and the rights and privileges connected to it, such as living on reserve, voting for band council and chief, sharing in band moneys, and owning and inheriting property on reserve (Furi & Wherrett, 2003). The “double mother” clause under section 12(1)(a)(iv) stipulated that a person whose parents married on or after September 4, 1951 and whose mother and paternal grandmother had not possessed status before their marriages would lose their status upon turning 21 years of age (Furi & Wherrett, 2003). These amendments upheld patrilineal lines of descent. Section 11(1)(f) specified that the wife or widow of a registered Indian man could gain status. Conversely, section 109(1) provided that the wife and children of a man who became enfranchised would also be enfranchised (Furi & Wherrett, 2003).

The Report itself is constrained by federal identity legislation. Because the Branch commissioned it, Hawthorn's survey of the conditions of Indigenous people in Canada is only concerned with Indigenous people who come under the jurisdiction of the Branch (i.e. those with status). Furthermore, the data collected for the purposes of the Report refer to Indigenous people regularly resident on reserves. Although entitled "A Survey of the Contemporary *Indians* of Canada" [emphasis my own], the Report's analysis, conclusions, and recommendations are only applicable to a certain segment of the country's Indigenous peoples. Status Indians who do not live on reserves, Indigenous people without status, and Métis and Inuit people are not included in Hawthorn's survey. Although non-status Indigenous people may have been experiencing similar oppressions as those with status (e.g. intergenerational trauma as a result of residential schooling, poverty, and racism), their experiences and circumstances were not considered when Hawthorn and his team were defining problems and formulating solutions. In *The Unjust Society*, Cardinal (1969, p. 136) refutes the government's position that Indigenous people's special legal and constitutional relationship with the state is the cause of poverty amongst them: "One needs only examine the position of the non-registered Indians or Métis to find that their precious supposed constitutional and legal equality has failed, almost criminally, to mean equality, socially, economically or even legally". Although federal identity legislation functions as a central mechanism of colonization, Cardinal and the Indigenous people who opposed the White Paper did not agree that the complete abolishment of the system was the key to improving the socio-economic situation of Indigenous people.

Legislation, particularly legislation that defined Indianness, played a crucial role in imposing European patriarchal kin structures onto First Nations, resulting in the marginalization of First Nations women. At the same time as they disempowered women, membership provisions were included to limit the number of status Indians the government was responsible for, facilitate the assimilation of those who possessed status, and dispossess Indigenous people of their land.

Furthermore, identity legislation marginalizes those Indigenous people who do not meet the state's criteria for "Indianness".

2.5.1 Defining "development"

Rather than unapologetically assimilationist, the *Hawthorn Report* demonstrates what Coulthard terms "the colonial politics of recognition", which he argues emerged in the postwar era but was hegemonized as policy with the release of the White Paper in 1969. Within the politics of recognition, the state accommodates the "cultural" in ways that do not engage with alternative Indigenous economies or a substantive notion of Indigenous sovereignty. In Coulthard's words (2014, p. 66), the state insists that "any institutionalized accommodation of Indigenous cultural difference be reconcilable with one political formation, namely, colonial sovereignty and one mode of production namely, capitalism". Although the Report and the White Paper differ in important ways, they are both exemplary of this form of cultural acknowledgement and recognition theorized by Coulthard. When analyzed using Coulthard's modified conceptualization of Marx's theory of primitive accumulation, the Report, with its focus on economic development, provides a rich understanding of how the politics of recognition was deployed and operationalized in Indigenous policy under state-organized capitalism in Canada. In place of such a politics of recognition, Coulthard advances alternative conceptions of Indigenous culture and pathways towards resurgence. Coulthard defines a holistic understanding of Indigenous cultures and calls for cultural recognition as a "mode of production/mode of life".

For Marx, the concept of mode of production encompasses two interrelated processes: the resources people use to produce what they need to sustain themselves materially; and the ideological processes that condition productive forces. The understanding of culture for Coulthard (2014, p. 65), thus, is "the interconnected social totality of distinct modes of life encompassing the economic, political, spiritual, and social". I find that Coulthard's definition of culture, as a mode of production/mode of life, is a useful framework from which to critique the definition of

culture that undergirds Hawthorn's concept of citizens plus and its location within the politics of recognition. Historically, Indigenous demands for cultural recognition have often called into question the structural or economic aspects of colonialism and hegemonic capitalist social relations and the state form (Coulthard, 2014, p. 35). In effect, the politics of recognition decouples Indigenous cultural claims from transformative changes to unjust distributions of power and resources at their roots. Furthermore, Hawthorn's reluctance to call white supremacy into question and the Report's contention that non-Indigenous racial-ethnic minorities do not experience political and economic marginalization in liberal democracies demonstrates the way in which the concept of citizens plus suffices only to maintain the status quo.

Coulthard explains that Indigenous people's experience with histories of dispossession, not proletarianization, has been the main factor defining the relationship between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian state. Therefore, Indigenous anti-colonialism and anti-capitalism has been oriented around questions of land. Coulthard terms this place-based decolonial thought and practice "grounded normativity," or the "modalities of Indigenous land-connected practices and longstanding experiential knowledge that inform and structure our ethical engagements with the world and our relationships with human and nonhuman others over time" (Coulthard, 2014, p. 13). He argues that grounded normativity is the local, landed law of Indigenous people that stands as a basis for determining, life, law, and social order. Coulthard's claim is more than an acknowledgement that Indigenous law is different than settler law. Under his claim, Indigenous law ontologically displaces settler law; Indigenous people are under no ontological or moral obligation to concede to the power of settler law. Such a place-based critique informs and undergirds Indigenous calls for cultural recognition that challenge the legitimacy of the settler-state's colonial sovereignty and the hegemony of capitalist social relations. Coulthard embraces Indigenous resurgence as total resistance to incorporation into the capitalist settler state or a "turning away" from colonial forms of cultural recognition.

Hawthorn (1966, p. 56) defines culture generally as a “fairly distinct complex of institutions, values, and ways of doing things”. Just like other social groups, First Nations people have “consistent patterns of life” that are related to cultural values. He argues that although there are differences among First Nations cultures, all share some common characteristics that differentiate them from non-Indigenous Canadians. These characteristics have developed in response to specialized interactions with white society and government administration unique to First Nations people. Hawthorn identifies pride of origin, knowledge of history, passing on of traditions and preservation of language as examples of cultural characteristics that are compatible with the concept of citizens plus. First Nations people are recognized in this framework as a distinct social and cultural interest group alongside other racial-ethnic minorities within Canadian sovereignty, with some important differences. Hawthorn (1967, p. 105) argues that the status Indian population is a minority group in the double sense that many Indians are culturally distinctive and often represent an economically deprived minority as well.

The concept of citizens plus as outlined by Hawthorn exemplifies the politics of recognition that emerged in the postwar period and was hegemonized with the release of the White Paper in 1969. Although this foundational concept differs from the strict liberal notions of equality underwriting the White Paper, Hawthorn’s work is nonetheless susceptible to similar criticisms. While Hawthorn concedes that First Nations are distinct from other ethnic groups based on their special legal and historical relationship with the state, this concept is absent of a substantive understanding of Indigenous sovereignty and alternative economies. Within both the concept of citizens plus and the White Paper, the sovereignty of the Canadian state is absolute and not up for consideration (Turner, 2005). Furthermore, these approaches do not understand the *sui generis* nature of Indigenous rights as a “class of political rights that flow out of Aboriginal nationhood and that are not bestowed by the Canadian state” (Turner, 2005, p. 5). Although Turner and Coulthard part ways at the point when Coulthard completely rejects incorporation into

the settler state, they both understand Indigenous cultures as ontologically distinct from colonial sovereignty and modes of production. In sum, the citizens plus concept fails to correct the unequal colonial relationship between First Nations people and the state because it fails to target the generative elements of such a relationship and leaves the roots of structural oppression untouched. The unequal colonial relationship, based on the imposition of colonial sovereignty and ongoing dispossession, is at the root of the colonial relationship.

Hawthorn's ignorance of the political and economic marginalization of Black and non-Black people bolsters the fiction that non-white people achieved equality of opportunity alongside white people in the postwar era. The Report forcefully refutes claims that non-Indigenous racialized people are oppressed in Canada. Hawthorn (1966, p. 208) argues "disadvantages in service provision which now attend Indian status occur at a time when no successful defence can be offered for an inferior second-class status for a non-White ethnic minority". The contention is that since non-Indigenous racialized groups have already been given access to the same government services and systems as white citizens in Canada, they are on equal footing with them in the free market economy. According to this thinking, any marginalization or oppression experienced by these groups can only be a result of individual and personal failures to integrate into white society. In Hawthorn's version of Canada, status Indian people are not yet on equal footing with "other Canadians" because they do not have access to the same government systems and services as everyone else with the added barrier of having a culture that is unsuited to the accumulation of capital. The Report presents Canada as a country starkly divided between rural, primitive and disadvantaged "Indians" on one side and urbanized, white and integrated racial-ethnic minority "Canadians" on the other. First Nations people are still erroneously regarded as racial-ethnic minorities in this framework, but are separate from white and racialized Canadians because of their distinct legal and political status and their incomplete integration into the dominant culture.

Hawthorn suggests that the extension of equal legal and political rights to racialized minority groups during the postwar period have effectively amounted to the end of differential treatment based on race:

While liberal democracies not only tolerate the special claims of certain groups --the aged, the unemployed, the sick, the young, etc. -- but provide special facilities or benefits for individuals in these categories, they have been increasingly unwilling to tolerate different treatment based on grounds of “race” alone. The ending of imperialism in Africa, the struggles of the American Negro for equality of treatment, and the propaganda necessities of the Cold War have all contributed to this new climate of opinion to which governments are responding (1966, p. 208).

Only by erasing the lived experiences of Black and non-Black racialized people in Canada, such as slavery, racist immigration policies, police brutality, and interracial violence in urban centres, is Hawthorn able to claim that capitalism is an equal playing field for all races, classes, and genders and recommend that Indigenous people become integrated into the free market economy like other “Canadians” as a way of improving their socio-economic position. While Hawthorn explicitly acknowledges the political, economic, and cultural dominance of white settlers in Canada by characterizing Canadian society as white, the Report avoids using the terms “racism” and “racist” and takes white supremacy as a given. In the Report’s discussion of white people’s exclusionary treatment of First Nations, Hawthorn carefully terms this racial hatred as “discrimination” that Hawthorn presumes will disappear once the majority of Indigenous people have been integrated into white society.

2.5.2 Explaining “economic backwardness”

Despite the change in language from assimilation to integration, Indigenous policy in the 1960s was essentially guided by the unchanged Eurocentric assumption that the personal and cultural deficiencies of First Nations people were the causes of the economic “backwardness” of

reserve communities (Dyck, 1991). Attempts to change the nature and behaviour of First Nations people in order to ameliorate their social, economic, and political marginalization flowed from this assumption. This Eurocentric assumption underwrites many of the Report's recommendations that call for the funding and development of government programs focused on providing First Nations reserves with vocational training, job placements, and support moving to urban centres. First Nations people are expected to play an active role in changing their lives to better suit the needs of the market economy and to more closely resemble those of white Canadians. The understanding of First Nations cultures presented in the Report rhetorically allows for integration to occur without resulting in the assimilation of First Nations cultures. A holistic understanding of Indigenous cultures as modes of production/modes of life, however, negates the possibility of First Nations people as citizens plus.

According to Hawthorn (1966, p. 56), the "behaviour patterns of many Indians, and the attitudes and responses evoked among Whites prevent most Indians from participating and sharing effectively in the economic opportunities potentially available to them". Hawthorn (1966, p. 56) cites the "special and distinct culture or cultures of Indians" that diverge most sharply from those of white society as major barriers to the successful participation of First Nations in the mainstream Canadian economy. Hawthorn defines First Nations cultures as "non-industrial" and locates specific characteristics common across non-industrial cultures that create barriers to integration into industrial cultures. These characteristics have the effect of discouraging First Nations people from wanting to accumulate capital in order to achieve higher status in mainstream Canadian society.

Hawthorn identifies specific "socio-cultural" elements common to many First Nations cultures that explain their unwillingness and/or inability to reap the benefits of a booming postwar economy. Some characteristics include: an attachment to the reserve community and the land; a preference for outdoor and seasonal work; and a strong desire for individual autonomy. Hawthorn

does not explicitly conclude that First Nations cultures are objectively deficient or amoral in and of themselves. Rather, Hawthorn examines First Nations values and ways of life in comparison to white society, concluding that only certain elements of First Nations cultures should be changed to facilitate integration. Although the citizens plus scheme accommodates certain aspects of the cultural, it does not accept subaltern political economies. Instead of viewing capitalism as structural to the dispossession of Indigenous people and their lands, the enfolding of First Nations into the capitalist economy is the *only* solution to economic disparities.

The division of labour according to the nuclear family norm as the basic economic building block is central to the non-violent form of primitive accumulation particular to the state-organized economy. The measure of economic development in the Report is telling of the centrality of the nuclear family unit to capitalist economic processes:

“First (and by far the most important) is dependence upon steady or regular wage and salaried employment; i.e. a large minority, or majority, of adult *male* band members employed at steady, reasonably well-paid semi-skilled labour, or regularly employed in highly-paid seasonal skilled labour” [emphasis my own] (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 136)

Emphasized in this passage is the understanding of the category of worker as adult and male. Furthermore, Hawthorn (1966, p. 244) specifies that the income available from traditional ways of making a living (e.g. hunting, fishing, and trapping) is not conducive to maintaining a standard of living enjoyed by other Canadians. The most important hallmark of economic development (and relatedly, integration into Canadian social and economic life) is a large number of male waged workers employed in industrial and business sectors. Hawthorn bifurcates the cultural from the mode of production, understanding First Nations cultures as removed from the land and easily integrated into capitalism.

Following the nuclear family model wherein a male earning a family wage supports his wife and children, women are tasked with undertaking the production of use values within the

home (Hartmann, 1979). In order to successfully integrate First Nations, the Report recommends that wives and mothers be taught how to keep themselves, their families, and their homes as close to white middle-class ideals as possible. Therefore, the transition into a capitalist economy relies upon the enforcement of gender roles and a sexual division of labour between men and women that approximates the nuclear family unit. The nuclear family unit as a gendered-based structure, as Acker (1988) argues, is not solely reflected within the relations of production, but also the relation of distribution. Within the waged based system, marriage and kin relations provide the avenues for the distribution of the wage to the unwaged. Distributive relations within the home differ greatly from those in the labour market; the entitlement of a woman to financial support from her husband is based on their relationship, rather than on a principle of market exchange. This leaves the unwaged housewife economically dependent on her husband. Implicitly stated in the Report, the organizing of First Nations kin structures to approximate this gender-based structure is essential to their successful integration into the dominant white culture. In this way, the reorganization of Indigenous kin structures to approximate the nuclear family arrangement can only function to further socially and economically disempower Indigenous women.

Hawthorn recommends the development of educational programs to prepare First Nations wives and mothers for the role of a dependent housewife. Counseling should be provided to them in order to facilitate the placement of First Nations people in semi-skilled jobs in industrial and business sectors located in urban centres. Specifically, social workers should acquaint First Nations wives and mothers with the “legal, social and medical services available to them, and to enable them generally to adjust to the difficulties of urban living” (Hawthorn, 1967, p. 185). Additionally, home economists should instruct First Nations people who have moved into towns and cities in matters of “household management, clothing, food and sanitation in order to live a style of life acceptable to their White neighbours in town” (Hawthorn, 1967, p. 185). Primitive

accumulation, thus, is essentially dependent on the unwaged, domestic labour of First Nations women within the home.

Hawthorn understands racial “discrimination” to be a barrier to First Nations people’s successful participation in the market economy, rather than embedded within the capitalist mode of production that is key to the dispossession of Indigenous people. Gender, race and class inform and structure capitalist economic processes (Acker, 1988). According to Hawthorn (1966, p. 144), the “main difficulty” of placing First Nations into semi-skilled labour is the “attitudes of exclusiveness or hostility towards them by White employers and residents”. Even when Indigenous people have adequate skills and training for the job, Hawthorn observes that negative representations of Indigenous people as lazy, careless, and disobedient discourage white employers from hiring them. In small or medium-sized industrial or commercial centres located close to reserves, Indigenous people also face difficulties in accessing housing and other services. Essentially, Hawthorn argues, the attitudes of white society towards Indigenous people have almost entirely excluded First Nations from receiving their equal share of a booming postwar economy. Hawthorn argues that rather than racial divides, the mistreatment of Indigenous people by whites is a result of cultural differences.

Interestingly, Hawthorn charges First Nations women, particularly wives and mothers, with inciting much of the racist treatment they receive from white people:

Some Indian wives and mothers, faced with unlimited childbearing and unlimited demands from kin for support, on bare subsistence incomes and with inadequate housing and facilities, simply give up. They have nothing to look forward to, to dress for, or to put up an appearance for. *Much of the opposition to employing Indians, or allowing them to reside in the community appears to be based mainly on the slatternly and demoralized appearance, living habits and behaviour patterns of their womenfolk* [emphasis my own] (1966, p. 62).

The mentions of Indigenous women appearing untidy, dirty, and overworked evoke the colonial archetype of the “ignoble savages” or “squaw drudge”. Winona Stevenson (1999) outlines how colonial agents needed to manipulate public perceptions of Indigenous people in order to rationalize colonial relations and agendas. This racist image emerged within early missionary literature to portray a phantasmagorically promiscuous Indigenous woman who is a beast of burden and a slave to men. Through the image, missionaries denigrated those aspects of Indigenous women’s lives that emphasized their personal autonomy (e.g. polygamy, right to divorce) and characterized Indigenous women’s lives as subject to the savagery of their men and cultures. Such a narrative justified the imposition of Christianity and patriarchal family structures that had the effect of socially, politically, and economically disempowering Indigenous women.

As Stevenson points out, visual and other forms of representation continue to be important to legitimizing colonial imperatives. State-organized capitalism projects the narrative of economic development and integration onto the bodies of First Nations women. Hawthorn’s implicit invocation of the “squaw drudge” archetype identifies the appearance and behaviours of First Nations women as barriers to their people’s full participation in a white-dominated Canadian society. At the same time, First Nations women are targeted as projects for improvement and their participation in the transition from traditional, resource-based reserve economies to full integration into the market economy is deemed essential. In transforming their appearances and ways of life to conform to middle-class white norms, First Nations women will, according to the Report, facilitate their peoples’ integration into the market economy.

2.5.3 Educating Indigenous children

Hawthorn concludes that the education of First Nations children is essential to preparing them for entry into the world of waged labour. He devotes a large part of the second volume of the Report to analyzing and making recommendations on improving First Nations children’s academic performance in order to facilitate their entry into the labour market. Hawthorn faults the

federal government for perpetuating poverty on reserves by handing out social assistance, rather than reorganizing their economies and preparing residents for waged work. The education of First Nations children is crucial in the process of transforming traditional, resource-based reserve economies into ones that are fully integrated into the market economy:

A viable economic development program for Indians during the foreseeable future, therefore, will have to focus, not so much on employing, re-employing or redirecting the employment of Indians now of working age, as on educating, training and preparing for work, young Indians who will be reaching working age in rapidly increasing numbers over the years ahead. Education, in brief, is deemed to play a crucial role in the economic development of Indians and in their integration into the larger Canadian society (Hawthorn, 1967, p. 6).

Following the policy of integration, Hawthorn strongly endorses transferring First Nations children into public schools and phasing out of schools run by the Branch. Only in exceptional cases wherein federally funded educational institutions are superior to local public schools should Indian children attend reserve schools (Hawthorn, 1967).

As Hawthorn (1967, p. 168) points out, “an Indian’s ability to find a job is a result not only of his education but also of his level of acculturation”. The function of schooling for First Nations children is twofold: integrated schools should prepare students for the exercise of a trade and adapt them to white society. This includes familiarity with white values, standards of living and working, and official languages. Education for Indian children is preparation for life in a rapidly and inevitably industrializing and urbanizing white society. According to Hawthorn, traditional patterns of survival on reserves are being replaced with capitalist relations of production and First Nations people are failing to succeed in the market economy because they are not adequately prepared for well-paid, steady wage labour. The key to ensuring equality of

opportunity for First Nations is providing First Nations children with the same level and quality of education as other Canadian children in the same institutions.

Hawthorn characterizes the entire educational system in Canada as dominated by whiteness. In fact, Hawthorn recommends that Indigenous children are educated in these provincial institutions for the related purposes of finding employment and becoming acculturated to white society. Through a public school education, Hawthorn (1967, p. 168) claims: “If he [an Indigenous child] is well acquainted with the values of the Whites and has good linguistic ability, if he is keenly aware of the working standards of the Whites, then he will have a better chance of finding a job and keeping it”. Hawthorn here not only denotes the dominance of whiteness in the education system, but also the white supremacy embedded within the capitalist mode of production. In the same sentence, Hawthorn does not account for the racism that all non-white people experience in a white-dominated society. And while Hawthorn names institutionally embedded white supremacy, his recommendations do not advocate for the eradication of racism in the educational system or in society as a whole. Rather, Hawthorn advises Indigenous parents to condition their children to approximate whiteness as closely as possible in order better integrate themselves into white society, an opportunity Hawthorn argues that non-Indigenous racial-ethnic minorities have already been offered through a public school education.

Hawthorn points out that the experience of schooling for First Nations children is less enriching than that of Canadian children. He notes high dropout rates, chronic absenteeism, and low levels of academic achievement among First Nations youth. This is part of the reason why First Nations people generally have fewer educational credentials than others. Hawthorn (1967, p. 116) suggests that First Nations children are caught in a “no man’s land”. With the transformation of their reserve communities, they internalize some of the values of white society while lacking the cultural values needed to succeed in the new and rapidly changing economy. Hawthorn argues that certain elements of non-industrial First Nations cultures are antithetical to success in the

labour market. Specifically, he notes that First Nations cultures have different measures of success and systems of rewards than white society. Achievement in school is not highly valued in First Nations communities and parents do not often see academic achievement as key to their children's future success. Hawthorn notes that since children receive few rewards for good school performance at home, motivation to succeed decreases with each year in school.

A move towards the integration of First Nations into the market economy involves not only academic achievement in the school environment, but also the transformation of many aspects of First Nations people's lives. First Nations children are "faced with the problems of overcoming disparate patterns of learning and of acquiring a new role in an unfamiliar setting" (Hawthorn, 1967, p. 110). Rather than change the structure of public or federally funded schools on reserves to embrace First Nations cultures and values, Hawthorn instead suggests a change in the behaviour and actions of Indigenous peoples. Their children's scholastic success necessitates the total overhaul of First Nations kin structures, childrearing practices, and ways of life. As Hawthorn argues, in order to successfully integrate into public schools, First Nations parents need to provide the "correct" physical and psychological home environments that are conducive to learning alongside non-Indigenous children in the public schools and the larger white society. The correct home environment is explicitly identified as "middle class". Hawthorn outlines the major differences in the physical and psychological environment between "Indian" and "non-Indian" (i.e. white middle class homes). Hawthorn (1967, p. 110) states that the "middle class milieu" generally offers more "nurturant conditions for growth and development" than the "reserve milieu". Children raised within the middle class milieu according to the standards of the white majority are better prepared for academic success in public schools.

Through the gendered division of labour within the family, women and mothers become the primary (and often only) providers of childcare (Swift, 1999). Thus, the responsibility for altering both the physical and psychological environment of the home to approximate white

middle-class ideals implicitly falls to First Nations mothers. First Nations women in particular are vulnerable to being constructed as “bad mothers” by the state and the courts because they do not always meet the dominant class and cultural expectations that make up the “ideology of motherhood” (Kline, 1992). The ideology of motherhood is the “the constellation of ideas and images in Western capitalist societies that constitute dominant ideals of motherhood against which women’s lives are judged” (Kline, 1992, p. 208); the motherhood ideology, operating within historical and current structures of colonialism, constructs some social locations more appropriate for motherhood than others. “Good” and “bad” mothers are constructed along racial, cultural, and class lines. First Nations mothers are vulnerable to state intervention because of their generally lower socio-economic status in comparison to other Canadians (Cull, 2006). Relatedly, discussions of child neglect and bad parenting always imply that mothers are responsible for neglect; the literature on child neglect also agrees that neglecting mothers are poor (Swift, 1999).

For instance, many of the aspects of the physical environment Hawthorn identifies as not conducive to academic success are within mothers’ responsibilities in the nuclear family unit (e.g. childrearing, food preparation, housekeeping). First Nations mothers’ behaviour implicitly becomes the target of intervention; their compliance with white middle class family ideals and standards is key to the successful integration of First Nations individuals and families into Canadian social and economic life. The dominant ideology of motherhood imposes dominant cultural values and childrearing practices, consequently devaluing First Nations family life (Kline, 1999). Evaluated by Eurocentric middle class standards, Hawthorn (1967, p. 110) describes First Nations homes as “sometimes dirty”, “overcrowded”, and “unattractive, unpainted, and uncared for”. Children’s clothing is similarly described as “unclean”, “unironed”, and “in poor condition” (Hawthorn, 1967, p. 110).

Narratives of uncleanliness that appear in discussions of childrearing echo derogatory colonial representations of Indigenous women and imply that First Nations mothers are

inadequate in their roles as the primary providers of childcare. The disciplining of First Nations mothers' roles and responsibilities within the family to approximate middle class ideals is essential to economic development and subsequent integration into white society. Hawthorn explains that First Nations children's difficulty in school is related to the physical and psychological home environment. In order for First Nations children to succeed in public schools, Hawthorn implicitly requires the complete overhaul of First Nations modes of life, which are constructed as deficient and inadequate for survival. However, even if First Nations women are successful in approximating the white middle class ideal, Kline (1999) points out that First Nations women's existence at the intersection of race, class, and gender precludes them from being treated the same way by the state and its institutions as white wives and mothers.

For the First Nations child, Hawthorn (1967, p.170-1) emphasizes that the skills attained in public schools should be able to "bring him an income sufficient to provide him and his dependents with adequate living". Education, thus, does not simply prepare First Nations for semi-skilled wage labour; the function of schooling prepares specifically male Indigenous children for their future roles as breadwinners within the nuclear family unit. Again, the restructuring of reserve economies is dependent on the simultaneous transformation of Indigenous kin structures to approximate the relations of production and distribution within the nuclear family. To draw again on Fraser (2009), state-sponsored capitalism was androcentric and the nuclear family supported by a sole male earner formed the basis of employment, welfare, and development policies. The organization to approximate this family unit is necessary to smoothly integrate First Nations families and individuals into the market economy. This fits into the Report's broader narrative: once First Nations people are able to bring themselves out of a state of poverty and dependence on reserves through participation in the labour market as semi-skilled or seasonal laborers, they can decide which elements of their ethnic identity they wish to retain.

However, these elements must be easily compatible with capitalist relations of production and colonial sovereignty.

Hawthorn (1967, p. 169) posits this question near the end of the chapter on First Nations education: “Does education encourage a serious conflict of loyalties in the long?” In Hawthorn’s vision of First Nations people as citizens plus, he argues that First Nations can improve their level of education and prepare themselves for waged labour without sacrificing their distinct cultures. By comparing First Nations people to French Canadians, Hawthorn (1967, p. 169) argues that the “young Indian can acquire various of the Whites’ values and modes of behaviour with no weakening of his ethnic identity”. However, this narrative of economic and social development fails to conceptualize First Nations cultures as ontologically distinct, place-based law that is the basis for determining, life, law, and social order. The imposition of capitalist relations of production and social hierarchies and colonial sovereignty amounts to ongoing dispossession through non-coercive tactics of opening up Indigenous lands for capitalist exploitation. Integral to the process of primitive accumulation is the restructuring of First Nations kin organizations and divisions of labour along gendered lines. Furthermore, Hawthorn’s analysis is evacuated of any consideration of race and racism – this is exemplified in his conflation of Indigenous people with the white French Canadian minority.

2.5.4 Child welfare

The Report was released around the time when federally funded residential schools for First Nations children were being phased out and the child welfare system was becoming the main alternative parenting institution. The Special Joint Committee of the House of Commons and Senate (1946-8) endorsed the closing of residential schools; the subsequent revisions to the Indian Act in 1951 cemented the policy of integration (Armitage, 1998). Hawthorn (1966, p. 303) endorses the integration of First Nations people through the extension of provincial services, stating that the elimination of the attitude that status Indian reserve communities fall outside of

the jurisdiction of the provinces because of their “alleged special link” with Ottawa is needed. Hawthorn understands the extension of the same provincial child welfare services offered to non-Indigenous Canadians to reserve residents as beneficial to First Nations people because it is a move towards achieving equality of opportunity for First Nations. In other words, the solution to improving the socio-economic status of First Nations is by removing barriers to equal treatment (i.e. separate child welfare services and administration for First Nations children and families).

The first agreements between the federal and provincial governments for the extension of Children’s Aid Societies (CAS) services onto reserves began in Ontario in 1955-56 (Hawthorn, 1966). Although child welfare legislation was applied to all provincial residents, including reserve residents, neither provincial government nor private child welfare providers served reserve communities before these federal-provincial agreements (Hawthorn, 1966). This meant that Branch agents lacked the legal authority to deal with issues such as apprehension, guardianship, and adoption (except through the cooperation of provincial officers) (Hawthorn, 1966). In cases where intervention occurred in the absence of provincial child welfare services, officials would informally place younger children with another family or extended relatives on the reserve; older children would be sent to residential schools (Hawthorn, 1966). At the time of the Report’s publication, Hawthorn (1966, p. 326) notes that provincial child welfare services had only been extended to about half of the country’s status Indian population and that the situation in some provinces is “very unsatisfactory”. The main problem that Hawthorn identifies in the area of child welfare for First Nations is that some reserves do not have the same services available to other Canadians. Hawthorn (1966, p. 327) claims that, “in *all* cases where an agreement has been reached the program appears to be operating with reasonable satisfaction to Branch officials, Children’s Aid officials, and the Indians” [emphasis my own].

Hawthorn does identify certain problems that have arisen due to the extension of provincial child welfare services onto reserves. The major difficulty facing CAS service providers

on reserves is the strained relationship between social workers and First Nations people. Despite this and other “minor” problems, Hawthorn (1966, p. 328) champions the extension of provincial child welfare services on reserves as “one of the most significant achievements in the elimination of discriminatory treatment between Indians and non-Indians in the field of welfare”. The familiarization of First Nations communities with the child welfare system is assumed to put an end to incompatibilities between child welfare service providers and the First Nations communities they serve. The high apprehension rate is merely the product of “uncertain initial encounters” and will correct itself over time (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 329).

Hawthorn understands the extension of provincial child welfare services to reserve communities as beneficial to First Nations people since it is a move towards placing First Nations people on equal footing with other Canadians. Relatedly, the idea of equal opportunity is a central tenet in the contemporary liberalism out of which Hawthorn’s work emerges (Turner, 2006). In order to achieve equality of opportunity for all citizens, they must have access to the same goods, services, and institutions. It follows that the state is responsible for removing barriers to equality, necessitating the extension of the same government services to all citizens and the elimination of special privileges for particular social groups (Turner, 2006). Although Hawthorn does not advocate for the dismantling of the current system of Indian administration, it nonetheless follows the belief that First Nations peoples distinct historical and legal relationship with the state has created an impediment to their achieving equality with other Canadians. The underlying goal of economic development and integration of First Nations people is achieving equality of opportunity for First Nations within the market economy. The Report fails to consider that due to First Nations existence at the nexus of race and class in the settler colonial context and the hierarchy of labour within the capitalist system, equality of opportunity between white Canadians and Indigenous people could never be assured. As previously argued, this form of integration and

cultural recognition amounts to primitive accumulation, thus facilitating the dispossession of Indigenous people and their lands.

Hawthorn does not view the strained relationship between First Nations people and the social workers providing their communities with child welfare services as related to the racism and Eurocentric bias embedded within the child welfare system. Hawthorn (1966, p. 329) argues that there is “no uniquely Indian aspect to the problem of Indian-social worker relationships which constitutes a major barrier to service”. The solution to this problem does not involve the correction of structurally embedded power imbalances between CAS workers and their First Nations clients. Rather, the approach Hawthorn (1966, p. 329) endorses personalizes the issue, recommending that the problem can be “overcome by cautious and patient effort” and “skill and time”. Interestingly, Hawthorn (1966, p. 329) points to the “weak nuclear family unit but sometimes strong extended kinship bonds of Indians” as the cause of behaviours on the part of First Nations parents that social workers find problematic. Again, the state and its arms-length institutions delegitimize First Nations’ extended definition of family beyond the nuclear family.

2.6 Conclusion

In short, Hawthorn understands First Nations communities to be like any other racial-ethnic minority in Canada; the difference between First Nations and any other racial-ethnic minority is found in the distinct historical, administrative and legal relationship First Nations share with the state. In terms of cultural differences between First Nations and so-called white society, Hawthorn sees these differences as pliable and connected to poverty on reserves and specialized interactions with the state over time. Such a definition of the cultural does not include alternative Indigenous economies or any substantive notion of Indigenous sovereignty. When Indigenous culture is appraised as a mode of life, Hawthorn’s ideal of First Nations as citizens plus can only result in assimilation. Much like other social and economic problems Hawthorn identifies on First Nations reserves, integration through capitalist economic development on

reserves will correct poverty and dependence. As contact between First Nations and white Canadians inevitably intensifies over time, the government programs and economic restructuring Hawthorn recommends will allow First Nations to integrate successfully into white society. A marker of such success in this narrative is achieving equality of opportunity for First Nations in the market economy and affording them with the same choices available to other Canadians. Although Hawthorn's goal of assisting reserve communities to become economically self-sufficient is laudable, the restriction that First Nations cultures *always* and *necessarily* be reconcilable within the political formation of the settler-state and capitalism as a mode of production does not present First Nations people with the kind of choice the concept of citizen's plus purports to offer.

The capitalist economic development scheme Hawthorn prescribes for self-sufficiency on reserves is exemplary of Coulthard's (2014) modified conceptualization of primitive accumulation as an ongoing process of dispossession that demands Indigenous lands and resources remain open for capitalist exploitation. The Report demonstrates the process of primitive accumulation within the particular political culture of state-organized capitalism. Drawing from Indigenous feminist methods, I add to Coulthard's thesis by pointing to the ways in which this iteration of primitive accumulation is deeply gendered. The economic development scheme not only requires the transformation of First Nations' forces of production, it also depends on the disciplining of First Nations family structures and sexual division of labour to align with the nuclear family unit. The imposition of these social relations is related to the ways in which historical and ongoing colonization is facilitated by the oppression of Indigenous women.

Hawthorn's unquestioned and uncritical evaluation of the extension of state-sponsored child welfare programs and services onto First Nations reserves in the postwar era is implicated in the dispossession and assimilation of Indigenous people. As Indigenous activism in the late 1960s

across North America pushed Indigenous issues closer to the surface of the government and non-Indigenous public's consciousness and the rates of Indigenous children in the care of CAS ballooned, social workers' accounts published in JOACAS became more critical of the effectiveness of the child welfare system to address the needs of Indigenous children and families. As the next chapter will explore, these accounts do not all agree with Hawthorn's evaluation of Indigenous child welfare. While the accounts are often reflective of a similar narrative of integration as exemplified by the Report, many present a dismal picture of child welfare services on reserves.

Chapter 3

On the Ground: Perspectives from Social Workers

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the main themes highlighted across the body of social work literature in JOACAS published in the 1960s and 1970s, to provide insight into how social work professionals identified the problems that marked the incorporation of First Nations into the provincial child welfare system. These accounts, written mostly by non-Indigenous⁷ CAS directors, caseworkers, and counsellors writing about or working in rural reserves in Northern Ontario, call attention to the problems of poverty, alcoholism, discrimination and cultural bias, and systemic barriers to providing adequate and appropriate child welfare services. I suggest that one of the contributing factors in the perpetuation of the apprehension of Indigenous children was the depoliticization of Indigenous poverty and family disruptions, as demonstrated by official and non-Indigenous definitions of the child welfare crisis impacting First Nations reserve communities in the 1960s and 1970s.

3.2 Historical Context

Processes of industrialization created the conditions that precipitated the legalization of child protection issues in Canada in the late nineteenth century. By the 1870s, Toronto had emerged as a major commercial and manufacturing centre. At this time, the city had nearly 500 factories that employed 9,400 people in a variety of industries (Jones & Rutman, 1981). Two classes solidified during this period: a middle class, comprised of bankers, businessmen, and government officials, along with their families, who were the main recipients of the benefits associated with industrialization; and an industrial working class made up mostly of immigrants

⁷ I employ the term “non-Indigenous” in this section to describe authors who are neither self-identified as Indigenous nor as belonging to any particular racial-ethnic group in the original texts.

from England, Scotland, and Ireland of significantly lower socio-economic status (Jones & Rutman, 1981). Rapid and intense industrialization resulted in poverty and homelessness for many working class children. Additionally, thousands of homeless children from the United Kingdom were also sent to Canada as apprentices during the late 19th century (Swift, 1999). Many children eventually made their way to urban centres, such as Toronto, where child poverty became a visible issue (Swift, 1999). The connection between the expansion of industrial capitalism and child welfare is repeated in postwar social work literature regarding Indigenous communities and will be examined later in this chapter.

Organizational and legislative action for explicit measures to protect children occurred during these decades. In Ontario, a social reform movement to improve the living conditions of impoverished children, comprised mostly of the women of the nascent middle class, helped establish the first CAS in Toronto in 1891 (Swift, 1999). The Toronto CAS became the model for the 1893 Children's Protection Act, which provided for the establishment of CAS in Ontario with extensive legal powers to intervene in cases of child neglect and cruelty; it also officially sanctioned the province's foster care system (Jones & Rutman, 1981). There were 55 CAS in Ontario by 1964 (Foster, 1964). Although the CAS system was the main provider of child welfare and protection services for most Ontarians by the early twentieth century, CAS did not serve status Indian people on reserves.

Prior to the Second World War, the Canadian government had policies, laws, and administration to address family and child welfare issues for status Indian people that were different and separate from those used to address the same issues in non-status populations. Armitage (1998) characterizes child welfare for First Nations people from the years between 1876 and the 1960s as dominated by the policy of assimilation. Beginning in 1876, residential schools run by Christian religious organizations and funded by the federal government, were the central institutions used to assimilate Indigenous people during this period. Residential schools

also sometimes served as alternative parenting institutions. For instance, a child could be required to attend residential school if an Indian agent or justice of the peace believed that the child was not receiving adequate care or education in their homes (TRC, 2015). In 1920, the government amended the Indian Act to allow the government to legally require any First Nations child to attend residential school, regardless of the quality of care or education they received in their homes. The amendment stipulated that every status Indian child between the ages of 7 to 15 who is physically able must attend state-sponsored schools and allowed truant officers to enforce compulsory attendance. Over a third of status Indian children were attending residential schools by the early 1940s with enrolment peaking in the 1956-57 school year (TRC, 2015).

The number of residential schools began to sharply decline from the 1950s onwards. Suffering from years of underfunding, the residential school system was in a state of crisis by 1945 (TRC, 2015). In addition to the problems plaguing the existing Indian Affairs educational system, 42% of school-aged First Nations children did not have access to formal education of any sort (TRC, 2015). Realizing that the residential school system was on the verge of collapse, the federal government looked for alternatives. The 1946-1948 Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons recommended the closure of separate schools for status Indian children. The transfer of First Nations children from segregated educational institutions to public schools was part of the federal government's shift from assimilation to integration during the postwar era. Ideologically, extending the same social services available to non-status Canadians to First Nations people was related to the goal of achieving equality of opportunity for every individual in Canada.

The 1951 amendment to the Indian Act included the addition of section 88 which provided that "subject to the terms of any treaty and any other Act of the Parliament of Canada, all laws of general application from time to time in force in any province are applicable to and in respect of Indians in the province". This meant that status Indians were covered under all

provincial legislation, including child welfare legislation. In Ontario, a Select Committee of the Provincial Legislative Assembly released a 1954 report entitled the *Civil Liberties and Rights of Indians* in which it urged the provincial government to reach an agreement with the federal government in regards to providing provincial child welfare services to reserves (Hawthorn, 1967). In 1956, the federal government agreed to cover the costs of child welfare provided by individual CAS for status Indian children (Hawthorn, 1967). From 1957 to 1965, CAS dealt exclusively with the federal government and covered the costs of caring for status children with funding provided solely by the Indian Affairs Branch (Timpson, 1993). Although First Nations people on reserves were now covered under provincial child welfare legislation and served by the same CAS that serviced non-status Canadians, the federal government exclusively financed the care of status First Nations children.

The 1964 *Report of the Advisory Committee on Child Welfare*, presented to the Minister of Public Welfare in Ontario, provided a snapshot of the province's child welfare system at the time. In general, the Committee noted that CAS were not sufficiently staffed or adequately funded. Community and preventative services were almost non-existent in the majority of communities. Furthermore, the antiquated funding structure of the provincial child welfare system encouraged out-of-home care arrangements. Under the financing structure created by the 1954 Child Welfare Act, which also covered status Indians, the primary assured income for a CAS was the reimbursement for costs incurred for each day a child is in care away from his or her home. While the province always funded in-care services, funding for community and preventative programs was dependent on unpredictable financing from municipalities and private donors. The idea underlying the 1954 legislation was that professionals in publicly funded, quasi-private organizations primarily delivered out-of-home protection services to children experiencing neglect or abuse. Under this legislation, child welfare agencies were not officially

required to provide services to prevent child neglect or abuse. For status children and their families, this funding structure would prove disastrous.

In the Committee's brief discussion of Indigenous children in the system, it found that the social and economic conditions on reserves create "a number of serious problems in the proper care and treatment of children" (Foster, 1964, p. III). The Committee noted that CAS serving Indigenous people encountered challenges in finding suitable adoption homes for Indigenous children. Although the Committee noted that CAS serving reserves have difficulties placing children in homes in their own communities, it did not explore the nature or causes of these difficulties. It also argued that placing Indigenous children in white homes is similarly challenging because of racism against Indigenous people (Foster, 1964). The Committee did briefly note that Indigenous children were vastly overrepresented in certain CAS districts, especially on Manitoulin Island. However, the section of the report dedicated to Indigenous children, encompassing both First Nations and Métis people, barely covers half a page. The section concluded: "the question of serving the Indian population is deserving of special concern and study" (Foster, 1964, p. 23). The issue of alarmingly high rates of child apprehensions from reserves is left largely unanalyzed.

Government inquiries are, whether by royal commission, select committees, or advisory committees, undertaken because of "deficiencies in programmes and services which need government action to be corrected" (Manson, 1967, p. 207). In its concluding comments, the Committee accordingly called for "radical changes in The Child Welfare Act which will materially alter long existing relationships between the Province, the municipalities and the Children's Aid Societies" (Foster, 1964, p. VI). In 1965, a new Child Welfare Act was passed, embracing many of the recommendations advanced by the Committee. In sum, the new Act differed in important ways from the previous one: the definition of "protection" was broadened to include preventative in-home services such as guidance and counseling; the province undertook a

larger share of all child welfare costs and a greater responsibility over the operation of CAS; municipal control and involvement also increased; and, finally, the state, rather than individual CAS, became the legal guardian of children taken into CAS care (Manson, 1967).

Consistent with the change of prevention efforts from optional to mandatory services, the system's funding structure was also altered. Under these changes, the CAS filed an estimate of the total expenditures with the director of child welfare and then received municipal approval; the province paid 60% of the budget directly to the CAS and the municipality covered the remaining 40% (Manson, 1967). However, the new Act did not address the challenge of finding qualified professionals and specialized facilities to deliver the now-mandatory prevention services to families (Manson, 1967). While prevention services were stressed in the amended Child Welfare Act of 1965, the financing of child protection services for status Indian children on reserves was still under the purview of the federal government.

Joyce Timpson (1993) argues that one of the main reasons for the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in-care during the 1960s was the structure of the contracts between individual CAS and the federal government. The funding agreements, based on in-care services, precluded the development of preventative and in-home approaches to child welfare for impoverished reserve communities that might have reduced the number of Indigenous children taken into CAS custody (Timpson, 1993). With the 1965 Indian Welfare Agreement, financing of child welfare for status Indian children on reserves was changed so that the federal government reimbursed the province, instead of individual CAS, for approximately 93 % of child welfare costs for status Indian children (Timpson, 1993). Timpson argues that the funding structure of this new agreement continued to discourage the development of creative preventative approaches to Indigenous child welfare for reserve communities. With a virtually unlimited budget for protection and out-of-home services paid for by the federal government, the province had no incentive to find better and cheaper alternatives to apprehending and adopting out Indigenous

children (Timpson, 1993). While the federal government became preoccupied with post-White Paper (1969) developments (e.g. constitutional negotiations and land claims), the rising numbers of Indigenous children in provincial child welfare systems across the country and skyrocketing child welfare expenditures went unnoticed (Timpson, 1993). Additionally, in the context of a booming postwar Canadian economy and growing public service sector, government spending was not a controversial issue at least until the 1970s (Mackey, 1998). Rather than achieving equality of opportunity for First Nations, the application of the same child welfare approaches, policies, and funding structures developed for non-Indigenous urban centres to rural reserves proved inappropriate and destructive for Indigenous families (Armitage, 1998).

The Scoop was also in many ways the transfer of Indigenous children from residential schools into the child welfare system. From the 1940s onwards, residential schools increasingly transitioned from educational institutions to child welfare facilities. By 1960, 50% of children were attending residential schools for child welfare related reasons (TRC, 2015). In 1966, 75% of the 10,000 Indigenous children attending these institutions had been placed because social workers judged that their parents were not adequately caring for them (Palmer, 2012). When the closure of residential schools began in earnest in the 1970s, provincial child welfare systems took over the administration of child welfare services for status Indian people that had previously been the responsibility of the federal government during the residential schools era. The shuttering of residential schools, combined with the extension of inadequate and inappropriate provincial child welfare services onto reserves resulted in the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in provincial child welfare systems across the country.

3.3 CAS and First Nations

As mentioned in the preceding chapter, the *Hawthorn Report* (1966/67) painted an optimistic picture of the state of child welfare services for First Nations people. Although the Report identified several problems caused by the extension of provincial child welfare services

onto reserves, these problems were not understood as causes for serious concern or action. Hawthorn suggested that one of the most pressing issues was the strained relationship between CAS service providers and the First Nations people they served. However, Hawthorn supposed that this relationship would improve once First Nations people became familiarized with social workers and the child welfare system. Hawthorn's larger preoccupation was with provinces that had not reached agreements with the federal government to extend CAS involvement to reserves. Besides the hostility, suspicion, and discontentment CAS workers encountered when providing services to reserve residents, the Report concluded that the biggest problem was the absence of child welfare services to First Nations, not the services themselves. Hawthorn pointed to the 1956 financing agreement between Ontario and the federal government as a positive example for other provinces to follow.

CAS workers and other professionals serving First Nations families and children on reserves during the 1960s and early 1970s present a drastically different evaluation of the state of child welfare for Indigenous people than Hawthorn. As Timpson (1995) points out, the problem of disproportionately high rates of child apprehensions on reserves across the country in the 1960s to 1970s was only visible to those directly involved. While the non-Indigenous Canadian public and child welfare academics were not aware of the child welfare crisis on reserves until the end of the 1970s, some CAS workers had already begun to take notice of the problem by the 1960s and early 1970s. The Kenora CAS reported that 80% of the children in its care were Indigenous in the mid-1960s (Copeland, 1965). In 1971, the population of status Indians in the area under the jurisdiction of the Kapuskasing CAS comprised only 9.6%, but 20.4% of the children taken into its care were Indigenous (Glenesk, 1971). Two First Nations reserves serviced by the Kenora CAS, Grassy Narrows and Islington, had the highest caseloads in the area (Kenora CAS, 1974). The disproportionate number of Indigenous children in CAS care was a longstanding issue that at least some CAS in Northern Ontario identified as a cause for concern

long before the Scoop garnered national attention. Although the accounts were published between 1963 and 1976, they echo the findings of the 1964 *Report of the Advisory Committee on Child Welfare* in Ontario. Clearly, the abovementioned changes to child welfare legislation in the 1960s did not adequately address the specific issues impacting Indigenous communities that resulted in the wholesale apprehension of their children.

Most of the authors were writing about their experiences working in Ontario, the first province to address the extension of provincial child welfare services onto reserves (Hawthorn, 1967). Professionals involved in the provision of child welfare services to status Indian people do agree with Hawthorn that they encounter difficulties relating to their clients, but this difficulty is not the only one they identified as a cause for concern, nor was it the most pressing one. The disconnect in the understanding of the situation between officially funded, high-level research such as the *Hawthorn Report* and frontline service providers is evident. However, the accounts agree with Hawthorn in asserting that many reserves are plagued with poverty and that poverty is at the root of the social problems on reserves.

The following subsections present the main themes highlighted across the body of social work literature in JOACAS. The themes of poverty, discrimination, and systemic barriers emerge as the main causes of the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in CAS custody and out-of-home care arrangements in the 1960s to mid-1970s. Poverty is identified as the “root” or “real” cause of child neglect and other social problems, such as alcoholism, that, according to the social workers’ judgments, necessitate the intervention of the child welfare system. Many accounts point out the discrimination faced by Indigenous families and argue that this is part of the reason for child neglect in Indigenous communities. Finally, the social workers understand that the issues in child welfare for Indigenous people are serious and many of the issues originate from within the legislation and funding structure of the system itself. Social workers and other professionals serving Indigenous communities impacted by poverty, discrimination, and serviced

by overworked and undertrained staff saw few options besides child apprehension in cases of child neglect. It is important to note that Indigenous CAS workers or child welfare professionals did not write the accounts analyzed in the following subsections. Those articles in JOACAS written by Indigenous authors will be compared and contrasted with these non-Indigenous accounts later in this chapter.

3.3.1 Poverty

Social workers frequently mention the depressed material conditions they observe on reserves. Poverty defined as material and monetary deprivation characterized by filthy and overcrowded living conditions is common throughout the majority of the social workers' accounts. Extreme poverty amongst Indigenous families is frequently cited as the "root" or "real" cause of child apprehensions. Low socio-economic status is understood as both a problem on its own, as well as a contributing cause of other social problems, such as alcoholism, that lead to child neglect within Indigenous families necessitating CAS intervention.

Donald Lugtig (1963, p. 6), the Director of Fort Frances CAS, describes the home of an Indigenous couple in contact with the CAS as "dilapidated". The term "squalor" is also repeatedly used to describe the living conditions of Indigenous families. A. Morgan (1968, p. 8), a District Supervisor with Thunder Bay CAS, says that: "[CAS staff] have known for years of literally hundreds of Indian families squatting on the fringes of small Northern communities living in conditions of filth and squalor with poorly motivated parents". A note from the JOACAS editor preceding Morgan's piece adds that the "ills" Morgan details are scarcely mentioned in another contributor's piece about Dokis First Nation where the residents there have "a natural resource and manage their own industry and political life" (p. 8). The editor concludes by affirming that: "Evidently Indian family life is not threatened when it does not rest on a basis of poverty" (p. 8). Christina Albrecht (1970, p. 3), a social worker with Kenora CAS, describes the difficulties Indigenous children experience when readjusting to their homes on reserves after

returning from residential schools for summer break: “There is the problem of good beds, clean rooms, good meals as opposed to the squalor of their real home i.e. log cabin or tent, sleeping on the floor or chair, no night clothes, the stench. Already at an early age, the child is torn”. She suggests that for many Indigenous youth, jail is an escape from a “miserable home life” (p. 3). Albrecht identifies poverty as well as a variety of other social problems impacting Indigenous families as the causes of child neglect. She states that: “There is no clear cut solution to these problems. However, there is an urgency to act – now!” (p. 3).

A 1971 study of children in the care of Kapuskasing CAS conducted by summer student Debbie Glenesk finds that status Indian children are overrepresented in care and the reasons for apprehension are different from other groups of children. They are more likely than white children to be taken into care because of neglect and desertion. In fact, no white children were taken into CAS care due to neglect during the time period under study while 55.5% of Indian children were apprehended for the same reason (Glenesk, 1971). Glenesk defines neglect as: “An improper home environment for a child, characterized by a lack of supervision, improper feeding, a lack of adequate clothing and/or inadequate health standards” (p. 17). The study identifies poverty as one possible reason for apprehension and concludes: “How to raise [Indigenous people’s] standard of living in a manner conducive to developing integrity rather than dependency, is a vital consideration and one which cannot be resolved by a CAS alone” (p. 21).

Dorothy Metcalfe (1973, p. 3), a social worker with Bruce County CAS, notes that for low-income Indigenous families, of which there are many, screen doors to keep flies out are a “luxury”. She also notes that due to the “geographical condition” (p. 3) of the Saugeen First Nation, wells are impossible in certain areas so the residents have to draw water from the nearby town. Metcalfe hopes that eventually water, sewers, and indoor plumbing will be installed on the reserve. Writing in 1973, Winifred Rosseter, a teacher in North Bay, and Ronald Holmberg, a Professor of Social Welfare at Nipissing University state: “Reserve living is the reason Indian

children score poorly on standardized IQ tests, or achieve inadequately in the academic world. In small crowded homes the atmosphere is not conducive to studying” (p. 5). One or more families are observed to be living crowded together in small dwellings that are rarely equipped with indoor plumbing (Rosseter & Holmberg, 1973).

Alcoholism is frequently noted as a result of chronic poverty on reserves. The accounts identify chronic and widespread alcoholism among Indigenous parents and caregivers and rarely, teenagers. Morgan recounts how a Member of Parliament visiting a reserve in Northern Ontario was “shocked” to see “small children waiting for their parents outside the beverage parlour, and to learn of families selling their welfare vouchers to obtain money for liquor rather than obtain food for the children” (p. 8). Rosseter and Holmberg (1973, p. 3) argue: “Drunkenness is the symptom and the problem will not disappear until the eradication of the cause, i.e. economic and social deprivation of Indians”. Metcalfe finds that alcoholism in Indigenous communities is a “problem of great concern” (p. 3). She uses the example of a “Mr. Debassige”, who drinks heavily in part because he lives in an overcrowded one-bedroom home without indoor plumbing, to suggest that alcoholism on reserves is caused by poverty. In a proposal by Kenora CAS (1974, p. 1), submitted to and approved by the Chief and Council of Whitedog and Grassy Narrows reserves, it is argued that alcoholism is one of the causes of “the situations of the families and community disruptions”. The proposal outlines how alcohol abuse and increased dependency on welfare are a result of the abatement of traditional livelihoods (e.g. commercial fishing and guiding). Alcohol abuse among youth is blamed on the lack of meaningful cultural and creative outlets on reserves (Kenora CAS, 1974, p. 2).

3.3.2 Discrimination

Some authors note discrimination experienced by Indigenous parents, children, and families. Although this discrimination is on the basis of race, not all of the authors explicitly refer to discrimination as “racism”. Albrecht argues that not only is Canadian society racially and

economically distinct from Indigenous communities, but also “judgmental”. Albrecht (1970, p. 3) describes Indigenous families who move to urban centres in search of better opportunities as “lost in the community” as they encounter a language barrier, lack of housing, and “prejudice” in the city. To illustrate her point, Albrecht tells the story of “Dorothy”, a fictional character representing a typical child of parents who have moved to the city in search of a better life. Dorothy becomes pregnant as a young teenager and gives birth to her child out-of-wedlock. Like her parents, Dorothy experiences difficulty in coping with her situation and she often neglects her child. Although in the past, extended family members and communities on reserves supported single mothers, Indigenous single mothers living in cities cannot find acceptance from either their own people or the white society (Albrecht, 1970).

According to Jack Copeland (1965, p. 8), Assistant Director of Kenora CAS, an Indigenous child who is brought up in a white home becomes a “lost soul” as he or she reaches adolescence. Copeland says these children suffer from being alienated from their culture and language as well as the “traditional prejudice many white people still feel against his race” (p. 8). Copeland notes that 80% of the permanent wards of Kenora CAS are Indigenous. In response to the lack of local Indigenous homes willing to permanently adopt these children, Copeland details how Kenora CAS worked with other reserves to airlift and place these children in families on those reserves, sometimes hundreds of kilometers from the children’s home communities.

David B. Knight (1973, p. 5), an Assistant Professor in Geography at Carleton University and a Board Member of the Ottawa CAS, explicitly calls out the racism in Canadian society: “Cultural differences in Canada are often expressed in racist terms. It is a ‘society’ that considers minority children as different”. An advocate for “transracial” adoption, Knight recommends that “as white people, with all our sensitivity and enlightenment, attempt to understand how skin colour difference counts in the everyday experiences of our children” (p. 7). While Knight mostly references Black scholarship in supporting his position, he defines transracial adoption as the

adoption of *any* non-white child by a white family, specifically including Indian children (Knight considers the particular racial background of the child irrelevant).

3.3.3 Systemic barriers

Some accounts detail the lack of services, funding, and programming needed to adequately assist Indigenous families struggling with poverty, racial discrimination, and alcoholism. Morgan (1968) argues that CAS are not equipped to solve the socio-economic problems that result in child apprehension and that increased involvement by other provincial agencies (e.g. Education, Social and Family Services) is needed to improve the situation. Glenesk (1971) finds that the agency's programs and services are ineffective, citing the statistic that 65% of families, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, from whom children were removed had previous contact with the agency and that this contact was almost exclusively on a protection or apprehension basis (Glenesk, 1971). She suggests that a better co-ordination of services across government departments and reallocating CAS resources towards preventative programs, rather than out-of-home care arrangements, could resolve some of the reasons children come into care in the first place. For instance: "If the money spent on children in care could be used to improve accommodation and provide pre-school enrichment programs or cultural programs in conjunction with other departments, operated and controlled by the Indian people themselves, perhaps then the cycle of dependency could be eased" (p. 21). She stresses that current CAS services should "recognize certain aspects of Indian culture relating to child rearing and the family and that our services be adapted to the demands imposed on us by these differences" (p. 20). The inclusion of an Indigenous staff member is "a self-evident requisite for improving our service" (p. 20).

Kenora CAS (1974) points out that while several social agencies (CAS, Community and Social Services, Corrections Services, and the Ontario Provincial Police) have been involved in the relocation of the two reserve communities, the involvement of these agencies has positively impacted the residents. Although leaders of these communities have tried to improve the quality

of life on their reserves, the funding and training needed to execute these programs has not been made available to the bands. It is recommended that the government agencies need to take a new direction in program development and service delivery. Similar to Glenesk's findings, the inclusion of Indigenous workers on the staff of Kenora CAS is a main recommendation towards the improvement of the agencies' interactions with these communities. Specifically, this means the creation of programs run by Indigenous community members to support struggling families, encourage cultural and religious revival, and provide positive leadership for youth (Kenora CAS, 1974).

Additionally, social workers point to the difficulties in providing services and administering programs to Indigenous families who often view the child welfare system with contempt and suspicion. Lugtig (1963) points to language barriers between Indigenous clients and non-Indigenous social workers. In her study of Kapuskasing CAS, Glenesk also found that Indigenous single mothers were particularly hesitant to access CAS services and supports. Metcalfe observes that for many years, Indigenous people thought the function of the child welfare system was to remove children from their homes and place them in white families (Metcalfe, 1973). Other workers describe the Indigenous families they work with as "not readily receptive to their intervention" and the relationships with them as "the least productive and the most frustrating" (Beamis & Lee, 1973, p. 9).

3.4 Gendered Primitive Accumulation: A Case Study

Written in the early 1960s, Local Director of the Front Frances CAS Donald Lugtig's article in JOACAS entitled "Our Experience with an Indian Couple" (1963) most clearly demonstrates the concept of gendered primitive accumulation within the particular context of postwar integration of Indigenous people under child welfare legislation. The sexual division of labour according to the nuclear family norm as the basic economic building block is central to the non-violent form of primitive accumulation particular to the state-organized economy. Lugtig's

narrative specifically and the child welfare system in general are opportunities to analyze how Indigenous women and families were disciplined into approximating the nuclear family unit. The patriarchal social and economic relations embedded within the nuclear family unit have the effect of altering the roles, power, and autonomy of Indigenous women in Indigenous societies experiencing policy and legislation aimed at their integration into mainstream Canadian life, rendering them more dependent on men and limiting their agency.

Lutig, identified in the article as the Local Director of the CAS in Fort Frances, presents the story of an unnamed social worker and the worker's interactions with a local Indigenous family. Lutig explains that such a narrative should serve as an example of how social workers can adapt their methods to suit the particular needs of Indigenous individuals. Like Hawthorn, Lutig notes that workers serving Indigenous families encounter problems establishing rapport. He writes that the work done by this social worker "illustrates how a worker with skill and imagination is able to adopt casework methods in this area in an effective way" (p. 5). The Indigenous family at the center of this story is made up of Tootsie, her husband Joe, and their infant child. When the worker received this case, Tootsie had been in a sanatorium for nearly a year. Provincial police had forcibly taken her to the sanatorium and her child had been taken from her and placed in the care of the CAS without her knowledge. The sanatorium staff did not make any effort to contact the CAS to inform them that the child's mother was in their care. Tootsie eventually escaped from the sanatorium.

While Tootsie evaded police, the worker assigned to the case was investigating the family. The baby had been removed from its parents and had been moving from various foster homes for two years by this point. The worker discovered Tootsie and Joe living together in a tent off the reserve during this time. The social worker and the couple eventually worked together to return the child to the care of its parents. The story of Tootsie, Joe, and their baby, at its core, is an example of the "successful" integration of Indigenous people into mainstream Canadian

economic and social life, later modeled and endorsed by Hawthorn. For Lugtig, the effectiveness of the caseworker's approach is evident in the ways in which the family more closely resembles the nuclear family unit and the division of labour within that unit by the end of the family's interaction with the CAS. In this way, the practices of CAS administrators and social workers echo the *Hawthorn Report* and the larger discourse and policy of integration. The story is also an example of how the child welfare system's involvement with Indigenous families during this historical period was framed within the heteronormative patriarchal family structure and capitalist schemes of economic development.

When first encountering the family, the social worker describes Tootsie and Joe living in conditions of abject poverty. The worker discovers that Tootsie and Joe are living in a tent beside a "dilapidated" cabin in which Tootsie's "poor and bedraggled" grandparents live (p. 6). The worker notes also with displeasure that the couple does not live on the reserve. When the worker approaches Joe, the worker notes that he speaks "halting" English and that Tootsie does not speak English at all (p. 6). The couple's story is as much a tale of economic development as it is an example of a CAS worker employing creative approaches to serving Indigenous families. On follow up visits to the couple, the worker is impressed to see that the couple is living together with their child in a neatly kept log cabin. Over the course of the narrative, the couple's socio-economic situation has vastly improved and nearly approximates the standards of living accepted by white middle class Canadians. Lugtig frames the ending of the story as a happy one, with Tootsie and her husband with their baby in their new home. Their successful attainment of middle class possessions is central to a suitable family life as understood by the child welfare system and white society.

According to Swift (1991, p. 252), the nuclear family does not only refer to the "configuration of two parents living in a private dwelling with their children", but also implies a gender-based division of labour. A shopkeeper interviewed by the caseworker identifies Joe as a

“reliable worker who paid his accounts on time” (p. 6). Lugtig describes him as a “handsome man who looked like a *voyageur*” (p. 6), using the French word for the contracted employees who worked as canoe paddlers, bundle carriers, and labourers for the fur trading companies of the late 17th to mid-19th centuries (McGill University, 2001). After a follow-up visit with the couple, Joe is again determined to be a “good worker and provider” (p. 7). Much of the reason for the positive evaluation of Joe in the narrative is his successful performance of his role as a breadwinner within the two-parent model. He is specifically and repeatedly identified as a “worker”, which echoes the economic language found in the Report. Recall that the foremost identifier of economic development according to Hawthorn (1967, p. 136) is a “large minority, or majority, of adult male band members employed at steady, reasonably well-paid semi-skilled labour, or regularly employed in high-paid seasonal skilled labour”. Joe and Tootsie’s “happy ending” necessarily involves the approximation of the nuclear family as both a kin structure and a sexual division of labour embedded in the capitalist economy.

The character of Tootsie is exemplary of how the CAS and other state institutions disciplined Indigenous women and families into fitting into the nuclear family unit and its sexual division of labour. Lugtig’s description of Joe not only reveals the implied economic function of the father within the nuclear family, but also the obverse economic function of the mother. The responsibility of childrearing is understood to solely belong to mothers. When Tootsie is forcibly taken to the sanatorium, her baby is placed in the care of CAS without her knowledge or consent. CAS also apprehended the baby without considering the possibility of placing the infant with its father and/or Tootsie’s grandparents. According to the information available in Lugtig’s article, it appears that none of the child’s other family members were made aware that the CAS had taken the child, nor did the officials at the sanatorium provide any information about the child’s family to the CAS. In this case, state institutions at once already assumed and reinforced the gender roles operating within the nuclear family. In Tootsie’s absence, the child is understood to be in need of

a caretaker and the intervention of a CAS worker. Combined with a funding structure that discouraged in-home care arrangements, the apprehension of Indigenous children also devalued Indigenous kin structures that often included extended family members beyond the two-parent model. The threat of losing their children to the CAS operated as an unfortunate incentive for Indigenous mothers and families to meet the white middle class expectations and biases of the child welfare system.

While Joe's economic function is a worker outside of the home, Tootsie's role fits into the traditional duties of a middle-class housewife. The sanatorium to which Tootsie is committed, ostensibly for the treatment of tuberculosis, functions not only as a medical facility, but also a provider of education in matters of household management. The caseworker notes that Tootsie returned from the sanatorium with "improved housekeeping habits" (p. 7). While the worker concludes that Tootsie's mental "disturbance" was related to being committed to the sanatorium, the worker finds that Tootsie was able to "learn enough from this experience to use it constructively in her homemaking duties" (p. 7). Here again we see that state institutions produce and reproduce the gendered expectations of the nuclear family unit. The two-parent ideal is not a natural and immutable kin structure, but rather a social and economic arrangement that must be constantly upheld and reiterated through disciplinary forces. As Hawthorn (1967, p. 329) explains: "the weak nuclear family unit but sometimes strong extended kinship bonds of Indians frequently produces behaviour on the part of Indian parents that the Children's Aid workers find difficult to accept". Historically, missionaries and labour programs at residential schools, which trained boys in manual labour and instructed girls in domestic chores, enforced gendered divisions (Starblanket, 2017). The child welfare system is only one such force amidst a multitude of institutions that are directly and indirectly implicated in the reproduction of gendered divisions of labour. I argue that in the decades immediately following the Second World War, the

integration of Indigenous people under provincial social welfare systems in Ontario, demonstrates the gendered nature of historical and ongoing colonialism.

Tootsie's character progression within the article echoes historical conceptions of race and difference. After all, the central question Lugtig poses at the beginning of the article is: "how can casework principles and methods be applied in working with more *primitive* people in distant reserves?" (p. 5) [emphasis my own]. Lugtig again refers to Indigenous people as "more primitive" on another occasion in the article (p. 7). Dyck (1991, p. 3) characterizes the relationship between Indigenous people and other Canadians as one of "coercive tutelage" which is a "form of arbitrary restraint or guardianship exercised by one party over the other". The idea that Indigenous people are in need of guardianship and protection by colonizing nations is embedded in the modern discourse of racial difference that gained hegemony during the age of colonial expansion of Europe (Mahmud, 1999). In this discourse, European colonizing nations have the duty and right to govern other races and the salvation of other races required subjugation to European powers.

This racial discourse reconciled liberal ideals of freedom and equality with the discriminatory and exclusionary practices of European colonialism. It enabled European colonizers to view non-Europeans as "moral and political infants, and thus below the age of consent" who actually benefitted from colonial domination and paternalism by more developed races (i.e. Europeans) (Mahmud, 1999, p. 1222). Subjugation to a "superior people" or those belonging to a "more advanced state of society" is a great advantage to the colonized because the colonizers will "[clear] away obstacles to improvement which might have lasted indefinitely if the subject population had been left unassisted to its *native* tendencies" [emphasis my own] (Mill, 1910, p. 224). Racial difference served as the main sorter of humanity, identifying some people as superior (i.e. fit to rule) and others as inferior (i.e. unfit to rule).

The way in which Tootsie is characterized as a child needing guardianship plays into a history of paternalism and colonial domination in the relationship between settler society and Indigenous peoples. While Lugtig does not overtly suggest that Tootsie is inferior because of her indigeneity, her childlike description is not unrelated to historical discourses of racial difference that legitimated colonial domination. Lugtig and others in the narrative describe Tootsie as trapped within a childlike state of arrested development, paralleling her material poverty at the beginning of the story. The nurse who treated Tootsie and the white people living in town who were acquainted with the couple thought Tootsie was “mentally disturbed” (p. 5). A shopkeeper interviewed by the CAS worker describes Tootsie as “very shy and uncommunicative”, having the occasional “tantrum” when she did not get what she wanted, and not having the ability to speak English (p. 6). Lugtig describes Tootsie as a “rather immature *girl* who drew strength from her husband” [emphasis my own] (p. 6). Tootsie’s characterization as mentally a child in the view of authorities and other white people deems her unfit to care for her own young child and requiring the intervention of state institutions.

The capacity to govern oneself and others is drawn along the lines of race, class, and gender with the “white, male, propertied adult furnishing the standard” (Mahmud, 1999, p. 1223). As an Indigenous woman, the state (e.g. provincial police forces) and its affiliated institutions (e.g. child welfare systems and medical health care facilities) consider Tootsie to not only be a ward of the government, but also the responsibility of her husband. The heterosexual, two-parent ideal places the breadwinning male at the head of the family. The worker notes that her husband acts as her caretaker, making up for her “weaker nature” (p. 6). Indigenous feminists have pointed out that colonization has not only involved the appropriation of sovereignty, lands, and resources, but also the imposition of Western Christian patriarchy on Indigenous people (St. Denis, 2007).

Canadian Indigenous policy and administration have been central mechanisms in redrawing and redefining Indigenous kin structures and gender roles to facilitate colonization.

The consolidation of the Indian Act in 1876 gave the federal government “control and management of the reserves, lands, moneys and property of Indians”. The 1876 Act also established the criteria for being considered “Indian” in the eyes of the state, which was primarily defined as being inherited from male family members or acquired by the wives of Indigenous men. The original consolidated Act specified that a “treaty” Indian woman who married anyone who was not a treaty Indian or a “non-treaty” Indian (defined in section 4 as a “person of Indian blood who is reputed to belong to an irregular band or who follows the Indian mode of life”) would cease to be an Indian in the eyes of the state. Furthermore, if an Indian woman married an Indian outside her band or a non-treaty Indian, she would lose her own band membership and automatically become a member of her husband’s band (section 3, d). Such provisions limited the ability of Indigenous women to live on reserve lands and enjoy special entitlements of band membership while placing them in a position of dependence on their husbands. Legislative changes to eliminate the aspects of the Act that discriminated against Indigenous women were only to come in the 1980s after Indigenous women successfully challenged the federal government. From its inception, the Indian Act encoded racist and sexist discrimination into legislation with the effect of marginalizing Indigenous women and undermining Indigenous societies.

Mi’kmaw scholar Bonita Lawrence (2004, p. 16) argues that the federal regulation of Indigenous identity in Canada must be seen as having the “overarching primary goal of setting the legal parameters by which Indigenousness can be said to be eliminated”; the only way to totally sever Indigenous people from their lands is to extinguish them as distinct people. Attempts to legislate Indigenous identity have functioned to unravel social connections and their ties to most of their former land base (Lawrence, 2004). In Canada, land appropriation or privatization has always been accompanied by further attempts to legislate the parameters of indigeneity (Lawrence, 2004). Identity legislation has served to define who has access and ownership of land,

with the state assuming guardianship and therefore, the power to grant land title. This necessarily involves the unquestioned sovereignty of the settler state and its ability to define the parameters of indigeneity. On a practical level, the gendering of identity legislation has deprived Indigenous women and their descendants of status (McIvor, 2004). While many of these women and children regained their status after the passing of Bill C-31, their ability to pass on their status to their children is still circumscribed by identity legislation.

3.5 The Sixties: Resistance and Resurgence

In the preceding subsection, I used the case study of Tootsie and Joe to suggest that the integration of Indigenous people into the provincial child welfare system beginning in the 1950s and 1960s resulted in gendered primitive accumulation through the imposition of capitalist social and economic relations. While Tootsie and her husband were targets of discipline, the story also demonstrates how they resisted and negotiated with the disciplinary forces of colonial institutions and legislation. This speaks to the ways in which Indigenous people, through a variety of channels such as organized activism, scholarship, and everyday acts of resistance, refused to be passive in the face of discriminatory treatment and destructive government administration and policies. The story documents Tootsie's attempts at evading authorities and escaping institutionalization. She initially refused to be committed to the sanatorium and had to be forcibly taken there by provincial police. Tootsie then escaped from the sanatorium and evaded the police when they went looking for her in the wilderness. The worker's interactions with Joe and Tootsie demonstrate how families negotiated with CAS and the child welfare system to keep or return their own children. Indigenous people did not passively internalize the language, culture, and ways of life of the white society. Rather, the couple carefully negotiated with the colonizer's institutions in various ways that enabled them to ensure their family's survival.

Tootsie initially resists colonial institutions and agents by refusing medical treatment and evading authorities altogether, but she later consented to being tested for tuberculosis after the

worker tells her that her child's return is contingent on her taking such a test. The worker ensures her that the CAS will not recommit her to the sanatorium and that she can take the test in the location of her choosing. Tootsie and her husband's decision to submit to the CAS terms should not be read as their submission to colonial institutions. Again, the couple carefully selects which elements of white society they choose to engage with in order to survive late capitalism in a settler colonial state. In order to communicate with the worker who may have information about his child, Joe speaks to the worker in English, rather than in his mother tongue. Later on once the couple is reunited with their child, it is revealed that the couple can speak English better than they had previously allowed the worker to believe. While I argue that the child welfare system was instrumental in disciplining Indigenous families into approximating the two-parent frame during the integration era of Indigenous policy, I also contend that resistance to assimilation attempts is present in the interactions between families and the child welfare system. While the "overwhelming majority of Aboriginal people have gone through some degree of incorporation into the patriarchal capitalist political economy" (St. Denis, 2007, p. 41), the continued existence of Indigenous people *as peoples* is evidence of the incomplete entrenchment of settler colonialism.

As introduced in the earlier chapter, the Sixties was an important time for Indigenous activism and identity. Indigenous people across North America loudly voiced their frustrations and disillusionment with the poverty and racism they encountered on a daily basis. Red Power activist Lee Maracle (1975) points to the blatant racism she endured from police officers while living in Toronto in the late 1960s as the catalyst to her political activism. During this time, Indigenous people in Canada formed cross-national and global alliances with other Indigenous groups and colonized people to resist assimilation and demand redress from governments for centuries of colonization and oppression. Most voices of the Red Power movement advocated for a revolutionary refusal of incorporation into the Canadian state and market economy (Palmer,

2012). While Hawthorn's report was important in adding scholarly legitimacy to claims of destitution and poverty on reserves, Hawthorn's recommended solutions envisioned the integration of Indigenous people as wagedworkers in the capitalist economy. For many (although not all) Red Power activists, approaches to alleviating poverty on reserves that were entrenched in the ideals of liberal democracy and the imperatives of free market capitalism did not align with their own vision of self-determination as Indigenous peoples. For these activists, capitalist domination was a central component of colonialism and facilitated their continued dispossession.

The future of Indigenous cultures and identity emerged as a pressing issue in the discussions happening within official bodies and activist circles during this time period. The *Hawthorn Report*, published between 1966-1967, was the first nationwide survey of First Nations people in Canada and was centrally focused on investigating the possibilities for Indigenous people in the rapidly changing postwar world. Activism during this time also questioned how Indigenous people were to understand their pasts and ways forward into the future. By the 1960s, generations of Indigenous peoples in North America had been the target of assimilation and elimination policies and the impacts on Indigenous families, livelihoods, traditions, and languages were painfully and powerfully felt. In his book *God is Red* (1973, p. 247), Red Power activist and Lakota author Vine Deloria Jr. comments that Indigenous activism during the late 1960s and 1970s "has attempted to recoup the lost ground and return to their culture, outlook, and values of the old days". Even though Indigenous activism during this time was allied with and influenced by the Black Power movement, Deloria Jr. affirms that the oppression Indigenous people face is different from the oppression faced by other racialized groups. Making reference to assimilation policies, Deloria Jr. (1973, p. 50) argues: "Where other groups suffer deliberate discrimination and oppression, American Indians are the only group whose oppression comes primarily from an effort to help them change into replicas of the white man." Speaking within a Canadian context, Harold Cardinal echoes this argument in *The Unjust Society* (1969, p. 1) where he states: "For the

Indian to survive, says the government in effect, he must become a good little brown white man". While other racial-ethnic minorities have been historically segregated and shut out of settler society, Cardinal argues, the state has historically attempted to eliminate Indigenous people *as peoples* through incorporation into settler society. Sioux activist Mary Crow Dog explains the difference between the Red Power and Civil Rights movements as: "The blacks want what the whites have, which is understandable. They want in. We Indians want out! That is the main difference" (quoted in Rutherford, 2011, p. 63). While the oppressions experienced by Indigenous peoples and racialized non-Indigenous people were clearly related, they were not the same.

According to Deloria Jr. (1973, p. 50), Indigenous people have a "cultural and social worldview that derives from a completely different background than that of every other group in American society". For Deloria Jr., the history of settlement in North America can be understood as a "continuous conflict of two mutually exclusive religious views of the world" (p. 249). The fundamental divergence between the worldviews of Indigenous people and Eurocentric worldviews is in the way land is conceptualized. Deloria Jr. argues that Indigenous tribal religions, which were inseparable from social, cultural, and political aspects of tribal life, were concerned with the interrelationship of all things. For many tribal religions, the "whole of creation was good, and since the creation was good, and since the creation event did not include a 'fall', the meaning of creation was that all parts of it functioned together to sustain it" (Deloria Jr., 1973, p. 95). Land, therefore, deeply informed Indigenous peoples' relationships to each other and non-human beings as respectful, reciprocal and non-exploitative. In contrast, the Christian religion of European settlers conceives of land as an object that can be possessed and has largely avoided any consideration of ecological factors (Deloria Jr., 1973).

Coulthard draws from Deloria Jr.'s definition of Indigenous metaphysics in articulating his critique of recognition-based approaches to reconciliation. Deloria Jr. emphasizes the importance of the land in providing an ontological framework for understanding relationships.

Coulthard (2014, p. 60) explains that Indigenous anti-capitalist and anti-colonial activism is not only oriented around struggles for land, but also deeply informed by what the land teaches about “living our lives in relation to one another and our surroundings in a respectful, non-dominating and non-exploitative way”. Coulthard calls this this ethical framework, informed by place-based practices and knowledge, grounded normativity. In his case study of the Dene land claims negotiations with the Canadian government in the mid-1970s, he argues that this understanding of the land grounded Dene critiques of capitalism and colonialism. Related to this understanding of land as informing an ethical framework and philosophy, Coulthard (2014, p. 65) argues that the Dene articulated culture as a “distinct mode of life” encompassing the economic, political, spiritual, and social. This definition of culture contrasts with state-sponsored, recognition-based approaches to settling land claims with Indigenous peoples, which require the unquestioned sovereignty of the settler state and the maintenance of capitalism.

Jean Goodwill, a staff member in the Indian Affairs department in Ottawa and a self-identified Indigenous woman, is one of only two accounts from Indigenous authors in the body of social work literature in JOACAS surveyed in this chapter. While Indigenous child welfare is the topic of her piece, Goodwill conceptualizes the issue as one of cultural difference. Goodwill’s discussion of “cross-cultural differences” points to Coulthard’s and certain Red Power activists’ and other Indigenous voices’ conceptualization of Indigenous cultures. The title of Goodwill’s article, “What the social agency must learn about Indians”, is telling of its purpose in being published in JOACAS. Goodwill aims to assist CAS and their staff in understanding the reasons why Indigenous families are uncooperative and hostile to social workers.

Much like Hawthorn, Goodwill (1968, p. 12) stresses the importance of individual autonomy in choosing whether or not to integrate and to what degree. She claims that the “Indian will accept the ways of the non-Indian at his own pace” (p.12). However, she stresses that “mass integration will never work” because there are too many “cross-cultural conflicts” (p. 10). These

cross-cultural conflicts stem from the philosophical differences between Indigenous people and non-Indigenous Canadians: “The Indian thinks differently, he has a *different philosophy on life* and when ideas are imposed on him, he does not readily accept them, and this is when communication ceases to exist” [emphasis my own] (Goodwill, 1968, p. 11). Goodwill describes an unequal power relationship between CAS workers and their Indigenous clients, characterized by workers imposing white middle-class biases and expectations on families. She speaks to the existence of “white man’s standards” (p. 11) concerning poverty and childcare that are foreign and confusing to Indigenous families who have their own standards. For the “Indian”, it is difficult to “understand why these children must be taken away OR why he cannot adopt a child” (Goodwill, 1968, p. 11). Rather than “mass integration”, Goodwill encourages CAS workers to become more involved in the Indigenous communities in order to better understand how to address their needs. For instance, she suggests that social workers should get involved in “community activities, Indian group meetings, close liaison to others who work with Indians – [the social worker] may then find that he is becoming more effective in helping the Indian improve his standard of living” (p. 12). Her understanding of self-determination is also political, speaking to the activism of Indigenous people during this time:

The Indian people themselves are getting more opportunities to meet one another on a Regional and National basis. We are now being consulted by various groups, Government and agencies, and this must be accelerated. I do think the non-Indian society is beginning to realize that the destiny of our people is in our own hands, we should do the deciding and be given the opportunity to do this whenever it is possible (p. 13).

Eric Carlson (1975), an educational counsellor of Cree heritage also employed with the Indian Affairs department, writes in JOACAS to fill the dearth in counselling literature concerning Indigenous clients. Carlson posits that the job of counselling Indigenous people is “clouded and complicated by [their] peculiar social background” (p. 11). He argues that the

“debilitating and demoralizing effects of all types of colonialism” (p. 11) have had negative implications for many Indigenous people’s mental health. And while French Canadians share their fear of “cultural repression”, the situation of Indigenous people is unique because they also “nurture grievances at the injustices, real and/or imagined, of past treaties, land expropriations, administrative treatment, and racial prejudice” (Carlson, 1975, p. 11). Carlson’s analysis is the most explicitly focused on colonialism, referencing the works of “Mead, Benedict, Fanon, and others” (p. 11).

Carlson explicitly connects political developments with Indigenous people’s negative attitudes towards government counsellors and other employees: “There is little doubt that continuing public policy, in both its legislative and administrative components, determines significantly the attitude of the Native person to the majority society, to himself and to the counselor who is the servant of both” (p. 12). And while Carlson notes that recent political developments may be leading towards providing monetary compensation to Indigenous people for unlawful land seizures, “cultural alienation and loss of self-esteem are not compensable in dollars and cents” (p. 15). While individual and collective improvement is related to political developments, Carlson stresses that for Indigenous clients, “there is a need for honest pride and, if the current cultural revival is an answer, it is long overdue” (p. 14). In addition to “cultural alienation and a loss of self-esteem” that have made Indigenous people “virtual strangers in their own lands”, they are also faced with “racial prejudice that, alas, still endemic in certain parts of the country” (p. 15).

Carlson and Goodwill’s narrative is similar to the accounts written by non-Indigenous authors in that they identifies rapid industrialization and increased interaction with white society as the cause for poverty and social problems, such as child neglect, amongst Indigenous communities in the 1960s and 1970s. Carlson argues that the “average Native person has been isolated from mainstream Canada for two to three hundred years” (p. 11). According Goodwill,

the low standard of living on reserves is a result of Indigenous people having to adjust to a “fast” society in a very short period of time (p. 11). She argues that in the past, there was “virtually no child neglect” (p. 11) among Indigenous families. Albrecht (1970, p. 2) claims the “Indian’s plight” is a result of the transition from a “tribal way of life to a modern urban, white culture”. A study by Kenora CAS (1974) lists the abatement of traditional livelihoods such as commercial fishing, guiding, and hunting on reserves as a major cause of social problems impacting families. A.J. Kushnier (1976), Supervisor of Family Service Intake and Court Supervisor of Thunder Bay CAS, argues that the breakdown of traditional childrearing practices occurs when parents have difficulties adjusting to mainstream society. She identifies interracial marriage, migration to cities from reserves, and racism as factors contributing to the erosion of traditional ways of life, leading to family breakdown and child abuse. Like Goodwill, Kushnier points out that child abuse is “non-existent where cultural values have remained in tact” (p. 14). According to this narrative, increasing exposure to white society during the postwar era did not result in the replacement of Indigenous family values with those of the white middle class majority. Rather, the erosion of traditional childrearing practices, due to rapid integration with mainstream society, leads to a loss of cultural values and viable parenting skills. As Carlson points out: “While some Native people have in the last few decades succeeded in adapting to the dominant culture, more are floundering as they attempt to achieve a *modus vivendi* with the majority society” (p. 11). In other words, social problems experienced by a large number of Indigenous people in the postwar era resulted from failed or incomplete integration into the mainstream white culture. On reserves that are unable to become economically self-sufficient in a racist “white man’s world”, rates of alcoholism, incarceration, and domestic abuse soar, resulting in equally high rates of child abuse and neglect. Several non-Indigenous authors, especially those published after the release of the White Paper in 1969, recommend inclusion of Indigenous people in the development and

provision of Indigenous social welfare programs and service delivery (Glenesk, 1971; McGlone, 1973; Beamis & Lee, 1973; Metcalfe, 1973; Kenora CAS, 1974).

While there are similarities between both sets of accounts, Goodwill and Carlson tend to stress the distinctiveness of Indigenous cultures, not only socially and linguistically, but also politically and ontologically more than do the non-Indigenous accounts. Goodwill differs in her definition of Indigenous cultures and ways of life as well as placing emphasis on centering Indigenous people in solutions to the child welfare crisis. In this way, this understanding of the Indigenous child welfare crisis is related to a conception of Indigenous culture and self-determination that undergirds critiques of the postwar settler state espoused by other Indigenous voices, including activists and authors that may not be directly speaking to child welfare.

Knight's (1973) conceptualization of Indigenous culture is the least related to Goodwill and Carlson's definitions. In advocating for transracial adoptions, Knight conflates Indigenous children with other ethnic groups in Canada, ignoring the land-based and ontologically, historically, and legally distinct nature of Indigenous cultures. He argues that preventing transracial adoptions is "a separatist philosophy little better than the apartheid policies in South Africa" (p. 8). In conflating Black people in South Africa with Indigenous children in Canada, Knight reveals that his argument is also lacking in historical context and a nuanced understanding of settler colonialism. He does not consider that the removal of Indigenous children from their parents to be educated in residential schools has historically functioned to assimilate them into white society. The inability to understand how the child welfare system was similarly functioning in this way precluded critical reflection on services and programming on the part of CAS administration and staff. As a member of the Board of Directors of the Ottawa CAS, Knight's opinions would have had considerable influence on the development and delivery of CAS services for Indigenous families.

Non-Indigenous accounts recognize the connections between Indigenous culture and economic activity, although they are less likely than Goodwill or Carlson to connect the socio-economic situation of Indigenous people, their behaviours and cultures to political and legal developments. Published in the same year as Goodwill, Morgan (1968) advocates for the improvement of the socio-economic conditions on reserves, connecting poverty with child neglect. And while the editor's note on Morgan's article suggests Indigenous control over economic and political life will improve reserve poverty, both Morgan and the editor's discussions do not engage in any discussion of culture or cultural resurgence. They take it for granted that the interrelated problems of poverty and child neglect will be solved once Indigenous communities have control over resource extraction and self-government. Metcalfe (1973) applauds the participation of women on band council, but she does not connect the poverty she observes on the reserves with developments in federal Indigenous policy. Furthermore, the non-Indigenous authors rightfully comment that discrimination impacts Indigenous families' abilities to attain the necessities of life, but none of the non-Indigenous authors interrogate the presence of racism within the child welfare system itself. Only one account (Glenesk, 1971, p. 21) suggests a "possibility exists that a different standard is applied to Indian than to white families," although her meaning is unclear.

3.5.1 Kenora CAS: A Case Study

The story of the protest that took place in Kenora in 1965 demonstrates the pushback and barriers Indigenous people encountered when attempting to improve their situations. The peaceful march on the town council attended by 400 people, mostly residents of the neighbouring reserve, is identified as an early example of Red Power activism in the 1960s (Maracle, 1984; Palmer, 2012; Rutherford, 2011). On November 22, 400 Indigenous people from reserves surrounding Kenora peacefully marched on town council to read a list of injustices including poverty on reserves, racial prejudice, and labour exploitation (Anglin, 1965). The marchers suggested the

creation of a Mayor's Committee composed of white residents and Indigenous people to facilitate cross-cultural communication and the council's assistance in pressuring provincial and federal bodies for better services (Anglin, 1965).

One of the leaders of the march was Fred Kelly, an Indigenous CAS caseworker, who was fired several days after participating in the march (Special to the Globe and Mail, 1965). Although Harold Treem, the Director of the Kenora CAS admitted he had faced pressure from members of the CAS board who disapproved of Kelly's participation in the march, he insisted that Kelly's firing was unrelated to the protest (Special to the Globe and Mail, 1965). In a later newspaper advertisement Charles Clark, the director of the Kenora CAS board, whom Treem insisted was not consulted about Kelly's dismissal, said he did not believe that the CAS should be involved in "community issues" (Special to the Globe and Mail, 1965). He also added that the CAS was not discriminatory towards Indigenous employees and would hire them if they were "the right type", specifically those with professional social work training (Special to the Globe and Mail, 1965, p. 4). This is despite the fact that Treem was the only professionally trained social worker employed at the Kenora CAS (Mortimore, 1965).

A newspaper article dated the day before the march reveals that Treem was heavily involved in the planning of the march. Treem, who later marched in the protest, describes the chronic underfunding and understaffing that negatively impacts the CAS ability to prevent child neglect on reserves and results in the apprehension of Indigenous children (Mortimore, 1965). Again, Clark rebukes Treem's statements by accusing Treem of exaggerating the CAS issues and pointing out that a quarter of the 365 children taken into care that year were adopted as proof. In this article, Clark is identified as a member of the staff of the local paper mill (Mortimore, 1965). Despite his important position as chairman of the CAS board, there is no mention of him having received any professional social work training. Kenora's mayor similarly accuses the CAS of being greedy and lazy, arguing that the CAS was only asking the municipality for more funding

because it would have been simpler to attain money from the town council than to appeal to the public as it usually does every year (Mortimore, 1965). The town council had previously sued the CAS for “wasting money” and denied requests from the CAS for additional funding (Mortimore, 1965). Note that before the introduction of the 1965 Indian Welfare Agreement, CAS partly depended on funds from their respective municipalities in order to operate.

Jack Copeland was the Assistant Director of Kenora CAS at the time of the protest and Kelly’s dismissal. In the same year, he published an article in JOACAS, which was analyzed earlier in this chapter. In his article, Copeland applauds the efforts of the CAS in placing Indigenous children in CAS custody with Indigenous adoptive families. The children were apprehended by the CAS from reserves near Kenora and adopted out to other reserves hundreds of kilometers away. Similar to Treem, Copeland does not identify the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in the agency’s custody as the main issue. According to Copeland, the problem is figuring out what to do with all of these children after CAS has apprehended them. The bifurcation of community issues from Indigenous child welfare is evident. Copeland does not question the CAS’s approach to child welfare for Indigenous families nor is he interested in investigating the causes of the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in his agency’s care. Furthermore, while Copeland understands the importance of placing Indigenous children with Indigenous families due to cultural differences between Indigenous people and non-Indigenous people, his conception of Indigenous culture is monolithic and superficial. Implicit in Copeland’s strategy to remove Indigenous children from their home communities and place them on other reserves is the contention that all Indigenous cultures are the same, regardless of history and geographic location. While the march occurred in November and the article was published in January about events that happened the year before, the CAS’s decision to fire Kelly over his involvement in community issues demonstrates the continued misunderstanding of the issues impacting Indigenous clientele on the part of CAS management. I suggest that the resistance to

make connections between child welfare and community issues and to meaningfully include Indigenous people in Indigenous child welfare development and delivery was a contributing cause of the Scoop. Although many articles penned by other non-Indigenous social workers in JOACAS make connections between social problems and child welfare, especially those written in the post-White Paper era, the non-Indigenous Kenora CAS staff in the mid-Sixties does not appear to agree with these views.

Although the council was generally unmoved by the protesters' appeals and Kelly lost his job with CAS, the National Indian Council's vice-president Gene Lahache championed the occasion as an opportunity to "draw Indian people together for a common goal" (quoted in Rutherford, 2011, p. 54). Kelly also continued his activist work after his firing. In a speech delivered at Lakehead University three months after the march, Kelly clarified that "The gap between the Indian and white socio-economic standards is not the Indian problem. To insist that it is so, is to put the onus of fitting into the main-stream of society upon the Indian alone" (quoted in Rutherford, 2011, p. 88). Kelly's statements contradict the conceptualization of issues faced by Indigenous people presented by official and non-Indigenous channels. For instance, Hawthorn (1967, p. 5) concludes that Indigenous people want "material blessings other Canadians have in the way of incomes, houses, cars, furnishings, clothes, foods and so on, perhaps partly because they are advertised at and exhorted to want them equally with the rest of us". The fact that Hawthorn's conclusions were based on questionnaires wholly administered, interpreted, and recorded by Indian Affairs officials may partly explain the discrepancies between Hawthorn and Indigenous perspectives on the Indian problem in the 1960s. As Kelly points out, insisting Indigenous people conform to the standards of Canadian society is akin to assimilation. He argues that while Indigenous societies are fundamentally different from white society, he ends his talk with a plea for common understandings, rather than one-sided integration, between the two societies (Rutherford, 2011).

An opinion piece published in the *Toronto Native Times* (TNT) in 1978 and reprinted in JOACAS over a decade after the march on Kenora town council continues to point at cultural bias on the part of social workers and the child welfare system. Often, social workers accuse Indigenous parents of neglecting their children because social workers judge Indigenous childrearing practices and ways of life against the hegemonic values and standards of the white middle-class (TNT, 1978). CAS is “too willing” to take Indigenous children from their families, which social workers see as “deprived”, and move them into homes that more closely approximate the ideals of white Canadian society (TNT, 1978, p. 7). This article blames CAS workers’ unquestioned application of middle class standards of childcare and living conditions to rural Indigenous families. The author recommends that CAS should make a concerted effort to have more Indigenous representation in every level of the system and appointing Indigenous people to act as liaisons between CAS and their communities. Again, the centrality of Indigenous people in formulating solutions to identified issues in the child welfare system is stressed.

In a rebuttal to the TNT critique published in the same year, Joyce Timpson, then working as a social worker for Kenora CAS, demonstrates the inability to see the connections among self-determination, cultural resurgence, and child welfare issues in the Indigenous context. Despite the efforts at collaboration with Indigenous clientele in the early 1970s (McGlone, 1973; Kenora CAS, 1974), Indigenous children continued to be overrepresented in Kenora CAS’s care at the end of the decade. Timpson (1978a, p. 9) points out: “On one particular reserve in the area during 1977, the percentage of all its children who required CAS care at one time or another was 10%; on another, 16%”. In response to TNT’s claim of cultural bias in the child welfare system, Timpson points out that CAS workers “cannot stand by and watch infants die from freezing or lack of proper feeding. Such neglect is neglect by anyone’s standards” (p. 9). Timpson rightfully argues that CAS “must have the involvement of the native community to do our jobs effectively”

(p. 13) and recommends increased collaboration between agencies and local bands in dealing with child welfare problems.

Timpson challenges Indigenous organizations to “make children’s welfare their number one priority, before hunting and fishing rights and before land claims” (p. 12-13). She correctly reasons that “unless the children are protected there is no future for anyone” (p. 13). Earlier in her work, however, she points out that child neglect is negligible on northern reserves that are sometimes economically self-sufficient through fishing, trapping, and tourism. Here, she clearly demonstrates the correlation between self-determination over economic processes and incidences of child neglect, a connection made throughout the social work literature concerning reserve Indigenous peoples. In a separate article published in JOACAS in the same year, Timpson (1978b, p. 15) forcefully argues that: “We must attack social problems at their roots...the way of life of a proud people has been destroyed in the last century by thoughtless development and the destruction of their economic base”. Yet, due to the nature of colonization, self-determination over economic processes must be formally secured and recognized in the courts through the attainment of hunting, fishing, and trapping rights and land claims. Based on Timpson’s own understanding of the root cause of child neglect (i.e. poverty), the issues of child neglect and self-determination over economic processes are interrelated. Her recommendation that Indigenous organizations prioritize child welfare issues before hunting and fishing rights and land claims, however, separates issues that are intertwined in a settler colonial context.

The unequal colonial relationship and the structures that sustain it (e.g. racism, sexism, capitalism, etc.) are thusly overlooked in this formulation. Timpson also does not address how the child welfare system itself had been and continued to be part of the process of dispossessing Indigenous societies. Sexist oppression is a central mechanism in the ongoing colonization and dispossession of Indigenous people (Green, 2017). It should not be surprising, then, that Indigenous land claims and constitutional talks with mostly male leadership did receive the bulk

of government attention and funding in the post-White Paper era, further marginalizing mostly Indigenous women's groups that called attention to social problems in their communities (McIvor, 2004). While Timpson challenges Indigenous organizations to privilege child welfare, she does not account for the role the state also played in creating a false separation of Indigenous concerns, thereby limiting the ability of Indigenous people to attain substantive self-determination over all areas of their lives. I suggest that one of the causes of the Scoop was the institutionalized bifurcation of Indigenous child welfare issues from political processes. As Fiona MacDonald (2009) argues:

Although culture and identity are integral to the pursuit of a just form of autonomy for groups, the most important factor is the remaining, albeit at times more covert power relations that exist between groups and the state. It follows from this observation that groups must be conceived of as being *political* as much as they are viewed as *cultural*. (p. 188)

3.6 Conclusion

The incident in Kenora paints a picture of systemic issues that constrained the ability of some CAS employees and Indigenous people to criticize the system and incite change. As was the case with Kelly, CAS workers, especially Indigenous ones, who published their concerns about chronic overfunding and poverty on reserves may have been risking their jobs to speak out against the difficult conditions they encountered. The funding structure, which reimbursed CAS for each day a child is in its custody, foreclosed the possibility of preventative services for struggling families, especially disadvantaging Indigenous families who were already judged to be poor. Interestingly, Treem says that the CAS would have taken many more children into its care if the society could locate workers and homes to take care of them (Mortimore, 1965). Although underfunding was an immediate concern impacting service delivery to reserves, his comments reflect that shifts in the understandings of child neglect and the role of child welfare were needed

to effectively address the issues within the system and on Indigenous reserves. As the Kenora march demonstrates, the idea held by some child welfare authorities that the child welfare crisis was unconnected from so-called “community” and political issues prevented effective consultation and cooperation between CAS and Indigenous people. Hepworth (1980, p. 121) strongly states: “Native children come before Native land claims”. I suggest that this is a symptom of the depoliticization of Indigenous cultures that undergirded many non-Indigenous and mainstream and official understandings of the Indian problem and integration during the late 1960s and 1970s. As Timpson’s rebuttal demonstrates, the continued separation of Indigenous child welfare issues from political developments, resulted in a circumscribed understanding of Indigenous self-determination and leaves the matrix of domination that perpetuates the apprehension of Indigenous children from their families unquestioned. The internalization of this approach by upper level staff of CAS across Ontario and the structural barriers Indigenous people faced in affecting change within the child welfare system combined to continue the apprehension of Indigenous children from their homes throughout the 1970s and early 1980s.

As Mohawk legal scholar Patricia Monture (1989) argues, legislative changes to the system cannot be the singular solution to the overrepresentation of First Nations children in the system. The issue stems from a conflict in the basic values of both societies and, therefore, fundamental change requires a re-examination of ideologies underlying dominant structures, such as legal institutions and their traditions (Monture, 1989). Attempts to remedy the situation must also involve the realization of First Nation demands for self-determination and sovereignty (Monture, 1989). Much like the *Hawthorn Report*, social workers’ accounts of their work with Indigenous families on reserves are important in exposing the injustice of settler colonialism and advocating for better for Indigenous families. And while many of the social workers note the distinctiveness of Indigenous cultures and point out the damages caused by the imposition of white society on Indigenous families, most did not connect Indigenous child welfare to

colonialism, self-determination, and land. When Indigenous social workers did attempt to address issues in the communities they served, they faced dismissal from their positions. Additionally, the funding structure and bureaucratic restrictions of the child welfare system, embedded within and reflective of the imperatives of the capitalist, heteropatriarchal settler society, prevented the development of effective approaches to Indigenous child welfare, resulting in the apprehension of Indigenous children from their families in the thousands.

Conclusion

The 1960s ushered in a period of resurgence for Indigenous people across North America. Indigenous people were voicing their discontentment over the impacts of historical and ongoing colonialism on their communities in new ways. Youthful, militant, radical, and international, the Red Power movement emerged amongst Indigenous people across Canada and the US in the late 1960s. During these decades, Indigenous people were resuscitating past ways of life and charting new directions for their futures. And while not all Indigenous people shared the same visions for their futures, they agreed that Indigenous people needed to decide for themselves what paths their people took into the 21st century and beyond. As Cree author and Red Power activist Harold Cardinal stated in 1969: “We will not trust the government with our futures any longer. Now they must listen and learn from us” (p. 17). The release of the White Paper (1969) was a watershed moment for Indigenous people in Canada and drew the many disparate Indigenous groups together in a united front against state-sponsored assimilation.

Even before the release of the White Paper, Indigenous people were not the only ones invested in shaping their futures in the postwar era. Beginning in the late 1940s, the government gradually changed its policy towards Indigenous people from one of unapologetic assimilation to the more palatable policy of integration. In short, this meant the extension of provincial legislation and social welfare services to the status Indian population, once solely under the jurisdiction of the federal government. Commissioned by the Canadian federal government in 1964 and published in 1967, two years before the White Paper, the *Hawthorn Report* was released just as the Red Power movement was gaining momentum. As the first nationwide survey of the socio-economic conditions of First Nations, the Report revealed that many reserves across the country were mired in poverty and plagued with social problems. With its many recommendations concerning nearly every aspect of First Nations people’s lives, the Report painted its own picture of Indigenous people’s futures. Specifically, Hawthorn advanced the

concept of First Nations as citizens plus. Hawthorn recommended that First Nations people should be able to maintain their special legal relationship with the Canadian state while enjoying all the same benefits and opportunities of modernity available to other non-Indigenous Canadians. Central to Hawthorn's citizens plus model was the liberal notion of choice. Specifically, this referred to Indigenous people being able to decide for themselves how much or how little they wished to integrate into mainstream Canadian society.

In Chapter 1, I employed Glen Coulthard's (2014) modified conceptualization of Marxism and his definition and critique of the "politics of recognition" to critically evaluate the Hawthorn Report (1966/1967) and its capitalist scheme of social and economic integration. The Report is an example of the official policy of integration under state-organized capitalism and demonstrates Coulthard's modified conceptualization of primitive accumulation as an ongoing process of dispossessing Indigenous people. I argued that the central mechanism through which primitive accumulation was manifested under the state-organized capitalism of the postwar period was through the restructuring of Indigenous kin structures to approximate the capitalist sexual division of labour within the nuclear family unit. Although Hawthorn's concept of citizen's plus purported to give Indigenous people autonomy over their lives, this concept constrained substantive self-determination because it required that First Nations cultures and economies be reconcilable with capitalism and the sovereignty of the settler-state. In doing so, the formulation of Indigenous people as citizens plus does not call into question the matrix of colonialist oppression that resulted in the poverty and social problems on reserves the Report purported to ameliorate. Hawthorn's positive evaluation of child welfare for Indigenous children and families and his recommendation to further integrate Indigenous people into provincial child welfare systems justified the continuation of mass apprehensions.

Also happening during the 1960s and into the early 1980s was a phenomenon coined as the Sixties Scoop. The official policy of integration proved acutely disastrous for Indigenous

people when applied to the area of child welfare. With the integration of Indigenous people under provincial child welfare legislation and services, child welfare agencies apprehended thousands of First Nations children from their families on reserves and adopted them to mostly non-Indigenous families. While Hawthorn did not view the integration of First Nations reserve populations into the child welfare system as cause for concern, the social welfare literature concerning Indigenous people published in JOACAS presented a drastically different situation. Social workers' accounts of working on First Nations reserves in Northern Ontario describe their frustrations with not being able to address what they viewed as the root causes of child neglect. Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous accounts located the origins of the social problems and family disruptions plaguing some reserves in the increased interaction between Indigenous and Canadian societies in the postwar era. Indigenous authors tended to focus more on the importance of Indigenous culture and the connectedness between Indigenous people's lives and political developments.

I used the case study of the Kenora CAS from 1964 to 1978 to demonstrate how non-Indigenous accounts tended to depoliticize social problems and family disruptions, leading to a severing of culture from other aspects of First Nations lives. I argue that one of the causes of the Scoop was the inability of non-Indigenous governments and CAS administrators and frontline service providers to conceptualize the child welfare crisis as holistically and inextricably connected to the social, political, cultural, and economic aspects of Indigenous people's lives. As a related consequence, before the 1980s, mainstream child welfare literature did not understand the child welfare system as being complicit in the colonization of Indigenous societies through the continued apprehension of Indigenous children. The bifurcation of child welfare and social issues from so-called political issues (e.g. hunting and fishing rights and land claims) was mirrored in post-White Paper high level government negotiations and consultations with Indigenous organizations, preventing holistic and substantive Indigenous self-determination.

Simpson (2011) explains the importance of children in the resurgence of Indigenous political cultures in the 21st century:

For Indigenous People, our children learn about governance, power, decision-making and our political cultures first and foremost in our families. The family is the microcosm for the nation. Parents model leadership. When we model coercion, hierarchy, and authoritarian power we produce political leaders who embody those values. If we want to create leaders of resurgence based on a different set of values and a different conceptualization of leadership, then we had better model that to our children from the very beginning (p. 122).

For Simpson, contemporary reconciliation must be grounded in political resurgence and support the resurgence of Indigenous languages, cultures, and governance systems. One of the most important ways Indigenous people can create the “best political and cultural context for the lives of [their] people to flourish” (Simpson, 2011, p. 87) is by parenting their children according to the values upon which they wish to model their nations, now and generations into the future. For Indigenous people, the raising of children is inherently political and tied to self-determination. Residential schooling, the child welfare system, and mandatory colonial schooling have not allowed Indigenous parenting styles to evolve to meet the needs of contemporary Indigenous societies (Simpson, 2011). Thus, cultural resurgence and decolonization depend on the ability of Indigenous people to reclaim control over how their children are brought up. This includes jurisdiction over the creation and development of culturally grounded support systems for families who are in need of them (i.e. child and family services) (Walkem, 2002). It is precisely because education and child welfare have historically served settler states as vessels of assimilation that the reclamation of control over these institutions by and for Indigenous people is central to their resurgence as people. As the Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs assert: “Our inherent right of Self-Determination will only be achieved through the recognition of our jurisdiction for

our children and families, and has a strong and lasting commitment to ensuring that this right is recognized and fully implemented” (Walkem, 2002).

References

- Acker, J. (1988). Class, gender, and the relations of distribution. *Signs*, 13(3), 473-497.
- Albrecht, C. (1970). Conflict. *JOACAS*, 14(13), 1-3.
- Anglin, P. (1965, November 23). March 4 abreast, 400 Indians protest 'white bias'. *Toronto Star Daily*, pp. 1, 2.
- Armitage, A. (1998). Family and child welfare in First Nations communities. In B. Wharf (Ed.), *Rethinking child welfare in Canada*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barrera, J. (2017). Indigenous child welfare rates creating "humanitarian crisis" in Canada, says federal minister. *CBC*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/indigenous/crisis-philpott-child-welfare-1.4385136>
- Beamis, C., & Lee, B. (1973). Dialogue: CCAS and Native People. *JOACAS*, 16(1), 9-12.
- Canada. (1996). *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Gathering strength, volume 3*. Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Cardinal, H. (1969). *The unjust society; the tragedy of Canada's Indians*. Edmonton: M.G. Hurtig.
- Carlson, E. (1975). Counseling in the Native context. *JOACAS*, 18(6), 10-15.
- Chrétien, J. (1969). *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian policy*. Ottawa.
- Contenta, S., Monsebraat, M., & Rankin, (2016). CAS study reveals stark racial disparities for blacks, aboriginals. Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2016/06/23/cas-study-reveals-stark-racial-disparities-for-blacks-aboriginals.html>
- Copeland, J. (1965, January). Adoption of Indian Children. *JOACAS*, 8, 7-9.
- Coulthard, G. (2014). *Red Skins, White Masks*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Cull, R. (2006). Aboriginal mothering under the state's gaze. In J.C. Lavell & D.M. Lavell-Harvard (Eds.), *Until our hearts are on the ground: Aboriginal mothering, oppression, resistance and rebirth*, (pp. 141-156). Toronto: Demeter Press.

- Davin, N.F. (1879). *1879 Report on industrial schools for Indians and Half Breeds (Davin Report)*.
Ottawa: The Minister of the Interior.
- Day, I. Being or nothingness: Indigeneity, antiblackness, and settler colonial critique. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, 1(2), 102-121.
- Deloria Jr., V. (1973). *God is Red*. Grosset & Dunlap: New York.
- Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Smith, L. T. (2008). *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Dyck, N. (1991). *What is the Indian "problem": Tutelage and resistance in Canadian Indian administration*. St. John's: The Institute of Social and Economic Research.
- Engels, F. ([1884] 1972). *The origin of the family, private property and the state*. New York: International Publishers.
- Foster, C.J. (1964). *Report of the Advisory Committee on Child Welfare to the Minister of Public Welfare*.
Ontario
- Fraser, Nancy. (2009). Feminism, capitalism and the cunning of history. *New Left Review*, 56, 97-117.
- Furi, M. & Wherrett, J. (2003). Indian status and band membership issues. Library of Parliament.
Retrieved from <https://lop.parl.ca/content/lop/researchpublications/bp410-e.htm>
- Galloway, G. (2018). Sixties Scoop deal in jeopardy as more potential claimants object. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/sixties-scoop-deal-in-jeopardy-as-more-potential-claimants-object/article38216223/>
- Glenesk, D. (1971, October). A study of children taken into care. *JOACAS*, 13, 16-21.
- Goodwill, J. (1968). What the social agency must learn about Indians. *JOACAS*, 11(3), 10-13.
- Gordon Pon, et al. (2011). Immediate response: Addressing anti-Native and anti-Black racism in child welfare. *International Journal of Child, Youth and Family Studies*, 3, 385-386.
- Green, J. (2007). Taking account of Aboriginal feminism. In J. Green (Ed.), *Making space for Indigenous feminism*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

- Green, J. (2017). Taking more account of indigenous feminism: An Introduction. In J. Green (Ed.), *Making space for Indigenous feminism* (2nd ed.). Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
- Hardy, M., Schibler, B., & Hamilton, I. (2006). *Strengthen the commitment: An external review of the child welfare system*. Department of Family Services and Housing. Retrieved from http://gov.mb.ca/fs/childfam/pubs/strengthen_the_commitment.pdf
- Hartmann, H. I. (1979). The unhappy marriage of Marxism and feminism: Towards a more progressive union. *Capital and Class*, 8, 1-33.
- Hawthorn, H.B. (1966). A survey of the contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, political, educational needs and policies: Part one. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch. Retrieved from <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010186/1100100010187>
- Hawthorn, H.B. (1967). A survey of the contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, political, educational needs and policies: Part two. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch. Retrieved from <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010186/1100100010187>
- Hepworth, P.H. (1980). *Foster care and adoption in Canada*. Ottawa: The Canadian Council on Social Development.
- Hill Collins, P. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Horn-Miller, K. (2005). Otinayer: The “women’s path” through colonialism. *Atlantis*, 29, 57-68.
- Jacobs, M. D. (2014). *A generation removed: The fostering and adoption of Indigenous children in the postwar world*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Johnston, P. (1983). *Native children and the child welfare system*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Limited.
- Jones, A. & Rutman, L. (1981). *In the children’s aid: J.J. Kelso and child welfare in Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kenora Children's Aid Society. (1974). *Children and families of White Dog and Grassy Narrows*.

- JOACAS*, 17(3), 1-4.
- Kimelman, E.C. (1985). *No quiet place: Final report to the Honourable Muriel Smith, Minister of Community Services/Review committee on the Indian and Metis adoptions and placements*. Manitoba.
- Kline, M. (1992). Child welfare law, “best interests of the child” ideology and First Nations. *Osgoode Hall L.J.*, 30(2), 375-425.
- Knight, D. B. (1974). Transracial adoption. *JOACAS*, 17(2), 5-8
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations and contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kushnier, A. J. (1976). Child Abuse in Northern Ontario. *JOACAS*, 19(9), 13-16
- LaRocque, E. (2007). Métis and feminist: Ethical reflections on feminism, human rights and decolonization. In J. Green (Ed.), *Making space for Indigenous feminism*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
- Lawrence, B. (2004). *“Real Indians” and Others*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Lowe, Lisa. *The Intimacies of Four Continents*. Duke University Press, 2015.
- Lutig, D. J. (1963). Our experience with an Indian couple. *JOACAS*, 6(1), 5-7
- MacDonald, F. (2009). The Manitoba government’s shift to “autonomous” First Nations child welfare: Empowerment or privatization? In A.M. Timpson (Ed.), *First nations, first thoughts: The impact of Indigenous thought in Canada* (pp. 173-198). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- MacDonald, J. A. (1985). Child welfare and the native Indian peoples of Canada. *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, 5, 284-305.
- Mackey, E. (1998). *House of Difference*. London: Routledge.
- Mahmud, T. (1999). Colonialism and modern constructions of race: A preliminary inquiry. *University of Miami Law Review*, 53(4), 1219-1246.
- Manson, F. (1967). Statutes: The Ontario Child Welfare Act of 1965. *University of Toronto L.J.*, 17, 207-

217.

- Maracle, B. (Host). (1984, February 4). Rise of the Native Rights Movement [Radio program]. In *Our Native Land*. CBC: Ottawa. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/archives/entry/our-native-land-rise-of-the-native-rights-movement>
- Maracle, L. (2009). "Red Power: Legacies and lives, an interview by Scott Rutherford". In K. Dubinsky, C. Krull, S. Lord, S. Mills & S. Rutherford (Eds.) *New World Coming: The Sixties and the Shaping of Global Consciousness* (pp. 358-367). Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Maracle, L. (1975). *Bobbi lee: Struggles of a Native Canadian woman*. Richmond: LSM Information Center.
- McGill University. (2001). History: The voyageurs. Retrieved from <http://digital.library.mcgill.ca/nwc/history/08.htm>
- McGlone, P. (1973). A program to offset culture shock. *JOACAS*, 16(19), 7-9
- McIvor, S. D. (2004). Aboriginal women unmasked: Using equality legislation to advance women's rights. *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, 16, 106-136.
- McKenzie, B., & Hudson P. (1985). Native children, child welfare, and the colonization of Native people. In K.L. Levitt & B. Wharf (Eds.), *The Challenge of Child Welfare* (pp. 125-141). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Metcalfe, D. (1973). Working with the Saugeen Reserve and its people. *JOACAS*, 16(3), 1-4.
- Mill, J. S. ([1910] 1951). *Utilitarianism, liberty, and representative government*. New York: Dutton.
- Million, D. (2013) *Therapeutic nations: Healing in an age of Indigenous human rights*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Monture, P. (1989). A vicious cycle: child welfare and the First Nations. *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 3, 1.
- Morgan, A. (1968). Apprehension of Indian children. *JOACAS*, 7(8), 8-9.
- Morgensen, S. L. (2012). Destabilizing the settler academy: The decolonial effects of indigenous

- methodologies. *American Quarterly*, 64(4), 805-808.
- Mortimore, G.E. (1965, November 22). Indians plan to march: Claims town council niggardly with CAS. *The Globe and Mail*, p. 35.
- Palmer, B. D. (2009). *Canada's 1960s: The ironies of identity in a rebellious era*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Pratt, M.L. (1992). *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation*. New York: Routledge.
- Roberts, D. (2002). *Shattered Bonds: The Colour of the Child Welfare System*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rosseter W., & Homberg R. (1973). The education of the Canadian Indian. *JOACAS*, 6(10), 1-7.
- Rutherford, S. T. (2011). *Canada's other red scare: Rights, decolonization, and indigenous political protest in the global sixties*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.
- Sayers, J. F., et al. (2001). *First Nations women, governance and the Indian Act: A collection of policy research reports*. Retrieved from:
http://fngovernance.org/resources_docs/First_Nation_Women__Governance.pdf
- Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Simpson, L.B. (2011). *Dancing on our turtle's back: Stories of Nishnaabeg re-creation, resurgence and a new emergence*. Winnipeg: ARP Books.
- Sinha, V., & Kozlowski, A. (2013). The structure of Aboriginal child welfare in Canada. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal* 4(2): 1–21.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). New York: Zed Books.
- Special to the Globe and Mail. (1965, November 29). Kenora Indian says he lost job for his role in protest march. *The Globe and Mail*, p. 4.
- St. Denis, V. (2007). Feminism is for everyone: Aboriginal women, feminism, and diversity. In J. Green

- (Ed.), *Making space for Indigenous feminism*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
- Starblanket, G. (2017). Being Indigenous feminists: Resurgences against contemporary patriarchy. In J. Green (Ed.), *Making space for Indigenous feminism* (2nd ed.). Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
- Stevenson, W. (1999). Colonialism and First Nations women. In A. Robertson & E. Dua (Eds.), *Scratching the surface: Canadian anti-racist, feminist thought*. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Stirrett, N. (2015). *Re-Visiting the Sixties Scoop: Relationality, kinship, and honouring Indigenous stories*. (Unpublished Masters thesis). Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.
- Swift, K. (1991). "Contradictions in child welfare: Neglect and responsibility". In C. Baines, P. Evans & S. Neysmith (Eds.) *Women's Caring: Feminist Perspectives on Social Welfare* (pp. 234-268). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Tasker, J.P. (2017). Ottawa announces \$800M settlement with Indigenous survivors of Sixties Scoop. *CBC News*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/ottawa-settle-60s-scoop-survivors-1.4342462>
- The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *The final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Retrieved from: http://www.myrobust.com/websites/trcinstitution/File/Reports/Volume_6_Reconciliation_English_Web.pdf
- Timpson, J. (1978a). The silent minority. *JOACAS*, 21(2), 15-16.
- Timpson, J. (1978b. November). A CAS response. *JOACAS*, 21, 9-13.
- Timpson, J. (1995). Four decades of literature on Native child welfare. *Child Welfare*, 74(3), 525-536.
- Timpson, J.B. (1993). Four decades of child welfare services to native Indians in Ontario: A contemporary attempt to understand the 'Sixties Scoop' in historical, socioeconomic and political perspective. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Wilfred Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario.
- Timpson, J.B. (1995). Four decades of literature on Native Canada: Changing themes. *Child Welfare*, 74(3), 525-537.

- Toronto Native Times. (1978). Children's Aid Societies: Do they really understand or care: A Native view. Reprinted in *JOACAS*, 21(9), 6-8
- Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409-427.
- Turner, D. (2006). *This is not a peace pipe: Towards a critical Indigenous philosophy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Walkem, A. (2002). *Calling forth our future: Options for the exercise of Indigenous peoples' authority in child welfare*. Vancouver: Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs.
- Warson, A. (1969). Rising tensions and conflict in the city streets [excerpt]. *Human Relations*, 9(17), p. 3.
- Weaver, S.M. (1993). The Hawthorn Report: Its use in the making of Canadian Indian policy. In N. Dyck & J.B. Waldram (Eds.), *Anthropology, public policy, and Native Peoples in Canada* (pp. 75-97). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.