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Abstract

Indigenous societies discuss the importance of Mother Earth for their well-being and many are working to regain control of their lands and waters and how they are used. Critically, many state that land access strengthens culture and traditional (ecological) knowledge. In this research I tried to determine if the reality reflects the rhetoric, looking particularly at how the concepts of economic development and traditional knowledge interact with each other, and impact Indigenous resource management. The case study focused on the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq, examining the process of management implementation at a macro level. Sixteen semi-structured interviews took place in nine of thirteen communities. The results illustrated that economic development is necessary for Mi’kmaq sustainability and community sustenance, but also economic development is a needed political tool to gain power with the state. Further, traditional knowledge is connected to land management. With the loss of this knowledge due to colonialism and a greater influence of mainstream western liberal thought, respect for the land is reduced and this impacts Indigenous resource management practices. These factors also negatively impact relations between individuals and within the community as a whole. For true (Mi’kmaq) sustainability, resource management strategies should be based on Mi’kmaq values and practices and be wary of capitalist tendencies.
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## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHF</td>
<td>Aboriginal Healing Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSMC</td>
<td>Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq Chiefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESA</td>
<td>Department of Economic and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFO</td>
<td>Department of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNNRM</td>
<td>First Nation natural resource management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWGIA</td>
<td>International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMK</td>
<td>Kwikmu’kw Maw-klusuaqn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>Mi’kmaq Rights Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>nongovernmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNS</td>
<td>Province of Nova Scotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCAP</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFII</td>
<td>Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEK</td>
<td>Traditional Ecological Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDRIP</td>
<td>United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPFII</td>
<td>United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary

NATION: The term *nation* in a western sense implies statehood, yet as a Mi’kmaw, *nation* is a means of explaining a society of people, it is how we unify ourselves. Nation and territory are interrelated: territory means the traditional area in which our people lived - these boundaries are not defined by state lines. A nation would be the group of people(s) living within a territory. For instance, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Newfoundland and Maine are the traditional *territory* of the Mi’kmaq. We are a single nation. We shared parts of this territory with other nations, like the Maliseet. Our territory as we call it is “Mi’kma’ki”.

SELF-GOVERNANCE: This term implies First Nations having governing control over programs, services and issues that affect them. It implies recognition that we are nations and not subordinate to the Crown. Self-governance recognition of Aboriginal treaty and title rights means our treaty and title rights speak to our access and use of land and territory, as well as our right to govern, and are connected to our identity and self-determination. Notably, there can be self-governing recognition without recognition of self-determination – basically self-governing recognition means that First Nations can have a degree of control over certain areas of governance within a First Nation community or society, but how these programs are administered are dictated by western government. First Nations cannot hope to have any degree of management over natural resources unless there is some type of recognition of rights and title, and some form of self-governing recognition.

MANAGEMENT: Given that we are the original peoples of North America and an equal party to the Crown, through self-governing mechanisms and based on our claim that the lands we live on is our traditional territories, we (First Nations) attest we should have the right to manage the land and natural resources. At one time, “management” was not the utilized word
— it was “ownership” — yet this implies we own the resources and land. For First Nations, we live in tandem with nature, and we cannot own the land, so care or management better defines this relationship. Co-management means shared responsibility and decision-making towards the use of land/resources between government and First Nation. The land and resources are tied to our identities, our cultures, our societies – and the proper management of the land will ensure our survival. With this, the term self-determination means that we have the right to define our own terms, and our own governance systems and programs based on our cultural foundations and understandings and not have systems and processes invented by the dominant order imposed upon us.

RECOGNITION: Recognition is also another sticky word. Basically it means that the Crown — the dominant order — identifies the rights of Indigenous peoples. Recognition can be formal, which I do not define as true recognition, but governments use this term anyway. Formal recognition basically implies that the state/ Crown/ dominant order/ hegemon/ west says they identify or “see” our rights. It is a limited form of recognition because often self-determination is not accepted. Policies, agreements, and/or legislation is put in place decreeing “recognition” but the terms under these documents state that First Nations can govern over their communities through Crown legislated policies. This is a form of false recognition. Recognition can only come (true recognition that is) if it includes self-determination.

NEGOTIATION: Negotiation means reaching an agreement on decisions related to Aboriginal treaty and title rights. In Nova Scotia, no new treaties are being created. Our treaty rights have been “recognized” (see RECOGNITION). Yet, we have to implement these rights – the implementation of these rights is a long process. Natural resource management fits under implementation, because we are working with the Crown to determine how much leeway and control they will give us to land and title.
CONSULTATION: Consultation is a completely different term from negotiation. Consultation only means the government has an “obligation”, i.e. they are required to talk to First Nations and seek their guidance on anything that affects our treaty and title rights. Consultation is a hugely undefined term and is interpreted by every single individual differently – the term can be manipulated to suit a government’s best interests.

NATURAL RESOURCE: It is a very western term. First Nations use the term nature, land, or Mother Earth (Pacha Mama). I find land limits the discussion to mean what is on the land – it does not include the water, the air or subsurface. For the Mi’kmaq, we are tied to the water and the word land does not encompass all that we see in nature. With the term Mother Earth, I do not feel comfortable using it together with the word management because as our mother we do not have the authority to oversee her. In the text when I use Mother Earth I am respecting her and recognizing her authority. The term “Natural resources” broadens the discussion of nature to include non-renewable resources, renewable resources, the land, the animals, the fish, the sea. It enables me to talk about a multitude of areas within our ecosystem without having to write the exhaustive list. However, it can dehumanize and desensitizes one’s connection to Mother Earth. My application of the term natural resources is not used as a means of desensitizing myself or my relationship to Mother Earth, but I am trying to be all encompassing of multiple terms, and use terminology that is understood by a mainstream audience.

TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE: The west uses the term traditional ecological knowledge (TEK). I do not like this term because (as will be discussed in my literature review) it implies a process whereby western scientists separate our cosmological relationship with the Earth and extract the information that is only useful for the dominant order. The English term Mi’kmaq organizations use is Mi’kmaq Ecological Knowledge, yet in our own language how we define this word and the management of the land is
through Netukulimk. Under all these terms, at a general level I have reconciled all these terms and simply use “traditional knowledge.” It is the word I use to bridge a Mi’kmaq understanding with a western understanding.

NAMES: There are numerous terms to define the identity of the Mi’kmaq. At a macro level “First Nations”, “Aboriginal”, “Amerindian”, and “Indigenous” are utilized, and I use them interchangeably, even sometimes using the politically incorrect term “Indian” (but only in special contexts). Our nation, however, our people are called the “Mi’kmaq” or incorrectly the “Micmac.” Amongst Mi’kmaq speakers the term “Lnu” is used. For me, as a non-Mi’kmaq speaker, I will largely use the term Mi’kmaq.
Chapter 1: Introduction

My name is Zabrina Lorraine (Peters) Whitman. Shortly, I will introduce my research: a study examining the relationship between economic development, natural resource management and traditional Mi’kmaq concepts of caring for Mother Earth, and how this interconnects with relations between individual Mi’kmaw and communities. Before I embark on this discussion, I must first introduce the researcher (myself) and provide a basis for my positionality. I am proudly a Mi’kmaq youth from Glooscap First Nation. Who I am, and how I define myself is not singularly based on my individuality, but rather my identity is framed around my relationships with others, most especially my family and my community. I am the great-granddaughter of the late Chief Louis Peters of Bear River First Nation, the granddaughter of the late Chief Joseph Peters of Glooscap First Nation, and I am the daughter of retired Councillor Lorraine (Peters) Whitman and horticulturalist/business owner Thomas Whitman. My great-grandfather, Pup as he was called, was a guide, a linguist, a leader, a role model, a beloved father and grandfather, trapper and woodsman. My grandfather “Grampie Peters” was a competitive woodsman and was married to my dearest Nanny, the late Elder Doris (Brooks) Peters. Genetically speaking, I am half Mi’kmaq and the other half is a mix of European ancestry. I have never formally lived on reserve, but I have spent a considerable amount of time in my community of Glooscap, and cosmologically I follow the Mi’kmaq way.

I work tirelessly to make my family proud. My parents come from large families. In particular, my mom has thirteen siblings and so despite being an only child, I have dozens (and dozens) of cousins to make up the space where loneliness would be. I am extremely proud of all
my family. My mother raised me knowing my culture and encouraging pride in my identity. Despite being bullied for over twenty years of my life by teachers, peers, and non-native relatives, I have been taught by my parents and my mom’s family to never feel ashamed. My family has taught the centrality of responsibility, family, education, and community, especially community service, which has always been a central factor of my life. I started tutoring at age eight in Glooscap and have always helped in the community especially at Elders’ functions and developing and supporting programs for our youth. I believe it is important that our youth see POSITIVE young role models, and so even though it keeps me involved in too many activities, community contribution is important and is something that I enjoy.

Being partially “white” and growing up off reserve has also enabled me to understand the western way of thinking. Formal education is an excellent mechanism for this. My anal retentive, obsessively organized, systematic ways follow more of the western-European way than the laid-back relaxed way of many native cultures. This impacts my identity and how I interpret things around me. At the same time, I intensely believe in informal education and can be quite critical of the formal (education) system. I believe no one is stupid, but unfortunately our current education system perpetuates the myth that people are stupid because it is not supportive of diverse learning styles. A considerable amount of my work with youth has been to encourage self-pride and to nurture their talents. Despite my criticisms of formalized education, I am still a mainstreamer, working my way through its hierarchy of learning. The way the formal education system is set up nurtures my learning style, and as I am a self-proclaimed nerd, it has been a great forum for me to absorb knowledge. My interest in formal education is actually rooted in Grampie Peters. He was the one that intensely emphasized the importance of formal education. Having lived the majority of his life having some of his basic human rights denied, he argued that education and knowledge
are instruments that can never be taking away from a person. In Iqaluit, I had a wise Inuk Elder
tell me that we need people educated in the western system so that we can learn and better
understand the West, so that we can have individuals represent us and be able to speak both
languages, to understand the terms of the white man and to break down natives’ ways into terms
that are understandable to settler society. This is the tool I see formal education being for me.

As much as the classroom has been a part of my intellectual development, much of my
knowledge (thus far) has come from observing my family and others at political venues, by
listening to my Elders and through travel. I have traveled all across North America, Europe, parts
of the Middle East and North Africa, and through these experiences I have learned there is
considerable beauty in the world and an abundance we can learn from one other. On that account,
I decided to study global development studies.

My interests have always been in Indigenous and international issues. For me, there are
commonalities between developing countries and their donors, and First Nations and the federal
government of Canada. Given these similarities, as well as shared colonial histories across the
continents, I felt it imperative I expand my undergraduate studies where I concentrated on politics
and First Nation issues within Canada, to widen my scope of analysis to an international stage.
Not only this, but I genuinely relish learning about other peoples, other ways and broadening my
perception of “what is.” My hands-on experience at places like the United Nations, Aboriginal
Affairs Canada, at an international non-governmental organization (NGO), and at the Canadian
Mission in Egypt have all supported this development. Travel has certainly framed my identity
and supported my interest in global politics and development.

Over the last seven years, I can claim to have followed my Mi’kmaq ancestors and have
lived a semi-nomadic lifestyle (Francis, Jones and Smith 2006:33; Dickason 2002). I have lived
between Ontario, Nova Scotia, Egypt as well as most recently in Manhattan. I am a true and proud Nova Scotian Mi’kmaq, but Egypt is certainly my second home. I have lived and worked in Egypt off-and-on for the last five years. It is a culturally and historically rich country (Humphreys 2007; see also United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] 2013). It is the place where I met my husband – Mahmoud Foaz – the most philosophical thinker I have ever met. Like my parents and my nanny, my husband is one of my role models. I have learned to be more thankful for the gifts God has given me and to appreciate every moment in life. It is not my place to talk about my husband’s stories or experiences, but my experience living in Egypt pre, during and post (?) revolution has made me less tolerant towards arrogance, and especially frustrated with people who complain about the smallest inconveniences in life. When you spend countless nights worrying about civil war, theft and violence, when you have witnessed extreme poverty, and when you are aware of people in your acquaintance not having access to basic needs like food and are dying from starvation, you re-evaluate your own selfishness.

RESEARCH QUESTION AND OBJECTIVES

In this thesis I will examine the concept of (aggregate\(^1\)) First Nation management of natural resources. My research project asks: what is/ what should be the relationship between (the modern definition of) economic development and traditional knowledge/understandings of living and caring for the land, for the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous peoples? I will focus on culture/polity, land and economics. In Mi’kmaq culture these factors are interconnected. Under these categories, the sub-questions I would like to answer are: (1) what is Mi’kmaq tradition in relation to Mother Earth/natural resources and how are relationships defined? Has this

\(^{1}\) Meaning multiple communities are involved in decision-making processes
identity(ies)\(^2\) transformed over time? (2) What is the significance of natural resource management to Mi’kmaq people and is it possible/desirable for us to achieve this goal? (3) How do we define sustainability?

My conclusion is that Mi’kmaq natural resource management and sustainability in Nova Scotia in this time and space should be based on economic and ecological sustainability. It is about balancing the interaction between western concepts of capitalism and economic development with holistic understandings of relationships between individuals, communities, and Mother Earth. It is even more delicate and requires greater attention when management moves beyond the community level to where there is a plethora of First Nation leaders, actors and opinions involved. This paper will examine how these concepts and relations are understood and interact with one another, and ultimately, as a final sub-question will ask if, (4) ethically, are there certain natural resources we can develop and others we should not?

**SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS**

The intention of this research was not to create new theories or hypotheses, but rather to connect theory to application, to determine if what indigenists and post-colonial academics are saying reflects what is happening on the ground. Largely, the results in relation to Indigenous cosmological viewpoints are the same as in other dimensions of Indigenous societies – everything is based off collective decisions. Holism is critical (Little Bear 2000:84). Our identity is inherently tied to the land (Alfred & Corntassel 2005:612), therefore it is imperative our culture remains present and supports traditional knowledge and land conservation and care. We

---

\(^2\) As will be discussed in chapter four, the Mi’kmaq do not embody a single, static image, so even though the Mi’kmaq are a distinctive ethnic group, I state “identity(ies)” to open the door for dialogue and support the idea that individuals of the same ethnic and/or cultural group may not share the same identity.
(Indigenous peoples) cannot become truly healthy without this connection (Little Bear 2000:79). Thus, self-determination is imperative.

This research explored collective management. This is an important theme that I would argue has not been explored extensively at a practical level with the exception of dialogues on social movements and coalition building (see Escobar 2008). Different from the aforementioned, this research is an examination of an organism (a single community) internally, and looks at how westernization at a macro-level impacts relations and culture. I have not found literature that discusses how to strengthen ourselves internally, but this research argues that to re-instill trust and accord, we need greater communication and group functions directed at the future and rebuilding internal relationships. When we divide ourselves it hurts us more. We (the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq) struggle with overrepresentation due to individualism - which is due to colonial and neocolonial policies of divide and conquer - and in correlation, a hierarchical system that creates mistrust and competition. A lack of internal communication gives the illusion to the grassroots that there is no representation. This illusion is due to a lack of awareness, competition and poor communication. A lack of collective action and coordination impacts our unity when combating the dominant order, but also it impacts our culture, because individualism and self-interest is not innate; it is not part of our value system and it is not part of the (a) Mi’kmaq identity. Antagonism is aimed at the lack of wealth distribution, inclusion, and chiefs are most targeted.

There are certain values that describe Mi’kmaq identity. These values are important for maintaining a connection to the land and for interacting as a collective group. However, colonialism and neocolonialism have affected our ideology and disturbed our cosmological understanding of the world. Cultural connections to the land are diminishing and some Mi’kmaw are behaving individualistically. In order to maintain our identity as Mi’kmaq, we must be
proactive to prevent the eradication of traditional knowledge and prevent our value system from
dissipating all together. These implications are not simply aimed at personal identity and personal
relations, but impact the collective as a whole. The Mi’kmaq are a holistic, egalitarian society.
This unity has increased our influence and power when engaging with others, namely the Crown.
Yet, paradoxically, Crown policies and behaviour (and mainstream western liberal thinking
generally), instill mistrust and competition. These factors do not support healthy communities.
They reinforce dissension, cultural disintegration, and fragmentation.

There is considerable literature discussing the problems of liberalism, imperialism,
colonialism and neocolonialism (for example Smith 1999; Alfred and Corntassel 2005; Alfred
1999; Alfred 2005; Porter 2010b; Simpson 2001; Sioui 1992). The lack of meaningful
engagement in Nova Scotia reflects the discussion by these academics. Alfred and Corntassel
(2005) explain the power dynamic. Participants provided the same observation, reflective of a
neoliberal critique. In the overall natural resource management framework of state-Indigenous
relations, this research illustrates the limitations we (Indigenous peoples) encounter when we are
not genuinely recognized as an equal party. Under this form of recognition and through these
types of repressive relationships, recognition of First Nation governance, treaty and title rights is
(and/or will be) regulated within the boundaries of reserve land, a space that generally lacks
adequate resources and economy (RCAP 1996c:801). For overall sustainability (of the Mi’kmaq,
other Indigenous peoples and Mother Earth), our rights must extend beyond these boundaries, but
with this our challenge becomes greater. To achieve this, to achieve recognition, we have to be
conscious of how neoliberalism works and the way in which power manifests itself (monetarily).
Hence, economic development is not simply a result of land access, but it is a needed pre-
condition in order to broaden our spectrum of natural resource management, as well as other forms of governance and rights.

Theorists extensively discuss the impacts of colonialism, and this case study illustrates some of the first-hand outcomes of dependency and cultural loss. Decolonization theory advocates for self-determination (Alfred & Corntassel 2005:605; LaDuke 1994; Alfred 2005). Under this we have to determine how economic development fits into decolonization movements, or if there is an alternative between decolonization and the mainstream, because the needs, at least for the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq, may or may not fit into a strategy of decolonization. For the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq, employment and job creation (variables of capitalism and the market system) are fundamental community needs. As David Newhouse iterates, we cannot escape capitalism (2001; 2004), so we need to discuss a Mi’kmaq strategy of economic development. Even though Alan Cairns (2000) iterates, like this research, that employment and jobs are needed to address the disparity between the general population and Aboriginals, he, like and Flanagan and colleagues (2010), overlook our culture. This is a form of erasure as our culture is a necessary component of our distinct identity as a people. Fundamentally erasure contradicts Mi’kmaq sustainability. For us, it must be a balance between economic and ecological sustainability. We need this balance to reflect a Mi’kmaq strategy of natural resource management, a balance between personal need and desire, and community benefit.

Indigenist scholars like Alfred and Corntassel (2005; see also Alfred 1999) may also argue that my position supports erasure, as they are more critical of capitalism than I. I support their arguments; their criticisms are valid and theoretically I understand their viewpoints. Still, my purpose was to dialogue with community members and look at the plausibility of these theoretical discussions. We should not embrace western “capitalism,” but we still need to have
some type of community sustenance strategy. How the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq implement it (and if they accept my research) is still to be decided.

**PURPOSE OF CASE STUDY AND RELEVANCE**

Nova Scotia is unique because the Mi’kmaq already have a tripartite framework agreement in place. This agreement has established a negotiation process on natural resource issues and consists of consistent dialogue. This case is one of the largest working tables in Canada comprising two levels of western government and thirteen First Nation communities, and is one of the few places in the country where a partnership is province-wide (Province of Nova Scotia [PNS] 2011). Importantly, this relationship has been used as an example by the United Nations (Kwilmu’kw Maw’klusuaqn Negotiation Office 4 May 2010). With the *Peace and Friendship Treaties*, we claim we have never ceded rights to the land and therefore governments should recognize the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq as an equal partner when discussing issues that affect us. The Crown recognizes that Mi’kmaq: Crown relationships are exceptional and different in lieu of the terms under the *Peace and Friendship Treaties* (Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development 2010). As such, a process of recognition has begun through the *Made-in-Nova Scotia Process*, also called *Kwikmu’kw Maw-klusuaqn* (KMK). In relation to the framework agreement, through this process the Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq Chiefs, Government of Canada, and Province of Nova Scotia negotiate issues related to treaty rights, Aboriginal title and Mi’kmaq governance (PNS 2011). This is substantial as it demonstrates that the Mi’kmaq have already formally established relationships with the state and are working to implement these treaty and title rights. Extending formal recognition to implementation can be a trying process and it can be useful to gain perspective around this subject. The Nova Scotia case enables scholars, planners, leaders and bureaucrats to reference an example where there is a strong,
concentrated and developed process underway. The Mi’kmaq have achieved a level of success, yet this research will provide insight as to where we go from here with the implementation of rights, including, but not limited to, natural resource management.

Nova Scotia is different from most provinces and territories in Canada in that the Mi’kmaq are the only tribe within their provincial/territorial jurisdiction, meaning that all the First Nation communities in this provincial boundary share the same cultural and traditional cosmological values. This can support stronger cohesion. Additionally, documents and processes speaking to governance and resource management generally apply to all thirteen communities, and decisions are commonly based on consensus. Further, in 2008 the thirteen Nova Scotia chiefs signed the Nationhood Proclamation asserting Mi’kmaq nationhood over our traditional waterways and land. Thus the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq serve as a good illustration of a First Nation working collectively on governance. At the same time it is also important to look at the working relationship between Mi’kmaq communities to strengthen relations, and for other Indigenous groups that want to work on a collective basis to gain perspective on some of the factors that take place when decision-making is so broad and includes so many people. Even though I am discussing natural resource management, the results of this study can be applied to a general discussion of decision-making and broad conversations on governance.

At the macro level, the purpose of this research is to provide a deep examination of the implementation of Indigenous natural resource management at an aggregate level - and to explore the overarching dichotomy, from a First Nation perspective, between Indigenous knowledge and identity and western neoliberal concepts of economic development – so as to influence future discourse on self-governance and its relationship to management. It is important to this research to understand that Mi’kmaq communities are not homogeneous, yet given the level of this
research it may not be possible to get across all of the heterogeneous differences. Also, although this research is meant to be a tool for advancing and assessing Indigenous cases of management elsewhere, the factors will be different and so the analysis and research to be presented cannot be accepted as functional and universal for all. The paper will try to include perspectives from other international cases within its work, but due to page constraints and the nature of this paper (it is a Master of Arts [MA] thesis and not a Doctor of Philosophy [Ph.D.] dissertation), it can only give a limited view of the differences and similarities.

This case study is based on the thirteen First Nation communities in Nova Scotia (see Figure 1) and their relationship with and implementation of self-government, and treaty and title rights, in natural resource management. The Supreme Court of Canada issued the Marshall decision in 1999 affording our (the Mi’kmaq) treaty rights under the Treaties of 1760 and 1761 to hunt, fish, and gather a “moderate livelihood” (R. v. Marshall 1999). This decision was a landmark case and is consistently referenced by the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq. Following the Marshall decision, dialogue began with the Crown to establish a long-term “rights-based process of determining land claims, fishing rights, etc.” (Kwilmu'kw Maw'klusuaqn Negotiation Office: N.D.). This research project primarily focused on activities subsequent to this date. The reason I chose to start my analysis with this date is that this is the point in which the Mi’kmaq started to have more formal self-governing control and input in areas like natural resources, and actions started to take place.
Figure 1: Map of Mi’kmaq Communities in Nova Scotia

Photo from the Government of Nova Scotia Website (PNS 2011).

APPROACH

An interdisciplinary approach will be used to assess this case study. Global Development studies is an interdisciplinary program, and given that my background is in Aboriginal studies and political science, I utilized literature from these different disciplines, as well as history, regional planning and geography. Indigenous cultures are fluid (Alfred 2005; Sioui 1992; Little Bear 2009) and our histories and current-day situations complex. One cannot try to present any kind of analysis on Aboriginal peoples without a holistic approach, which means looking to a variety of discourses to see the multiple areas and factors that frame and affect our communities, our lifestyles and our positions. I am looking to the social sciences and arts over more quantitative discourses because I am a qualitative person by nature, and culturally qualitative approaches better support Indigenous ontologies (Smith 1999; Wilson 2008).

On a theoretical level, my philosophical foundations are a reflection of my life and experiences, my identity and positionality. I find value in a diverse number of disciplines (e.g. economics, history, anthropology, cultural studies, political science, sociology), theories, and
perspectives. I especially value post-colonial arguments (for instance Said 1978; Porter 2010b). Economically I understand the market-system and despite my cynicism towards capitalism, at a practical level, neoliberal capitalism is the accepted perception by the dominant order and so it enables me to understand how the mainstream system works and why. Arguments of integration and industrialization are not only pushed by neoliberal scholars and Canadian bureaucrats (e.g. with Prime Minister Trudeau and the *White Paper* of 1969, and currently Prime Minister Harper’s autocratic legislations under Bill C-45) but First Nation economic endeavours to achieve self sufficiency also fall under these lines. Indigenist scholars (for instance Alfred 2005; ibid. 2004; LaDuke 2005) who support environmental action and traditional revitalization and strengthening are mobilizing change and encouraging anti-hegemonic solutions. Post-colonial arguments explain how and why neoliberal (neocolonial and historically colonial ways as well) ways have led to our current situation and by utilizing a broad range of theorists within each paradigm, we can expand the discussion to include domestic Canadian perspectives (e.g. Henderson 1997; Cairns 2000; Borrows 1997) as well as international perspectives from the developed (e.g. Deloria Jr. 1994; Smith 1999) and developing (e.g. Li 2007; Escobar 2008) world. I draw connections between all of these ideas and processes, and coordinate a holistic understanding. Nonetheless, epistemologically I support a decolonized Indigenist approach. As such, this paper will examine neoliberal, post-colonial and Indigenist arguments because despite epistemologically supporting decolonization theory, I am conscious that we live in a globalized western society. So how do we practically implement non-western goals? The need to understand how we transform and implement rhetoric and theory was the reason I wanted to look at the relationship between traditional knowledge and economic development.
To clarify my positionality further, so not to be misunderstood, a multicultural argument is often one that is advocated by liberal Canadian philosophers (see Taylor 1994; Kymlicka 1996; ibid. 1991). My interpretation of these arguments is that diversity and difference of rights and culture are supported under these viewpoints, especially for the support of minorities and Indigenous peoples. Although these arguments are valid and I commend ideas of inclusion, this is not the perspective I take nor a concept I advocate for in this research. For instance, as I understand Taylor (1991), recognition of an individual or a group must come from the outside, meaning recognition is defined by others. Although the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq (and other Indigenous groups) are fighting for recognition of their rights, the flaw in this type of recognition is that it is still based on liberal tenets, yet an Indigenist premise of recognition is that our cosmological and epistemological differences must be accepted and we should not be pushed to adapt to a generalized way. Under a multicultural model, certain values are naturally accepted for all and commonalities are identified between groups to make some of these values consistent and work for all. I am not saying that there are not commonalities between peoples; however it is not right, as I just explained with recognition, for others to identify the similarities without that individual or group explaining why, or why not, such an interpretation fits. For example, under a Canadian multicultural model, western economic development and capitalism is the accepted form of economy. Yes, traditionally the Mi’kmaq had economies and were in fact well-known traders (Dickason 2002:87), but the ideological values under capitalism and Mi’kmaq-indigenous economy are not the same (e.g. competition, ownership, self-interest versus holistic communitarian practices like reciprocity and sharing). From my understanding of the fundamental differences between liberal multiculturalism and indigenism, I support an Indigenist perspective.
Methodologically, I will follow an Indigenist framework, especially drawing on the works of Shawn Wilson (2008), G.A. Getty (2010), Renee Pualani Louis (2007) and Linda Smith (1999). My methods will support our ontological foundations, embracing the qualitative nature of First Nation societies. Primarily, data collection was based on sixteen semi-structured interviews with Nova Scotia Mi’kmaw community members in nine communities, and life-long participant observation, but was also supported in part by literature collection. Interviews lasted approximately two hours. Pivotaly, I am responsible to the participants and our Mi’kmaq communities, and so I have worked to ensure that their perspectives are properly presented (Louis 2007:131). To this end, I have used participatory mechanisms based on Mi’kmaq cultural practices. Participatory approaches are becoming more commonly used in development studies (Mosse 1994:521; Perez 2010:169), and are advocated for by First Nation communities (Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch:N.D.; L. T. Smith 1999; Wilson 2008).

AUDIENCE AND DISCLAIMER ON THE USE OF LANGUAGE

Perhaps one of the most difficult feats in this academic journey is the writing process, because I am writing for a “bicultural” audience (Wilson 2008:132). Vitally, I have to support my relations and be accountable to communities and participants. At the same time I have to write to an academic audience and meet the formal standards expected. With this a number of factors have to be taken into consideration. I am guarded about what type of information is discussed in the thesis, and how the information is presented. I am particularly concerned with how the Crown can manipulate information to suit its needs – this often means that First Nation rights and/or funding is reduced. Overall, Canadian Aboriginals are suspicious of governments.³ Even though I am conscious of language and aware of how the bureaucratic and neoliberal systems can behave, by

³ We need only look to the recent Idle No More Movement as well as First Nation political opposition against government legislation like Bill C-45, Bill C-428, Bill C-27.
virtue of my age, given that I am not politically active and I have not achieved the level of philosopher king (Plato 2004), I need support. I had discussions on and aspects of my paper reviewed by appropriate Mi’kmaw representatives to assure that none of the information or language used will negatively impact our thirteen communities.

I also feel it imperative that I make a disclaimer about language. Language is powerful. Words carry a history and have connotations as well as denotations. Depending on the context a word (or expression) is used in, it can give different meanings and understandings. When working with different cultures and societies, understanding the intent of the words used is important. Different arenas also have their own vocabulary. It can be complex and confusing especially when a single word can mean different things to different people. The complexity is intensified when working between different cosmologies (see Kneen 2009; Little Bear 2000:86). How a Mi’kmaw understands something can be different from a white person and this is because of our cultural and linguistic foundations. Some words do not translate easily between languages – Mi’kmaq is an action-based language, while English is noun-based. It can be difficult to articulate an idea or concept into English and so we have to find comparable words in the English language – yet these words, as just stated, may already mean something else to English speakers, so if the word is not defined this can create misunderstandings and miscommunication (for example see Amadahy & Lawrence 2009; Lawrence & Dua 2005; Sharma & Wright 2008-9). I think along the lines of the argument made by Ronald Dworkin (2006) that individuals, societies and groups cannot share a similar foundation to work from unless there is dialogue and communication. This begins with the task of defining what we mean by the words we use.

I want to try to establish a balance or find equilibrium between Mi’kmaq understandings, western understandings and the array of words used to express all these ideas. Leroy Little Bear
utilizes the term “jagged worldview” (2009:84-85). This jagged worldview is significant to a paper of this nature, where I am examining two different cosmological and epistemological views. A reader may look at the language I use to describe concepts (e.g. “natural resource management” versus “land care”) and they may feel it defines my positionality and viewpoint; however, upon careful examination, one will see I flip-flop between terms: my language will vary when I speak at a very personal level, from when I am trying to argue an academic point. I am conscious that I need to use terms that are the most understandable to the academic community, and no less important, a mainstream audience.

The terms and concepts discussed within this paper are also very legalistic and governmental. Words like self-governance, self-determination and management carry so much meaning and are so similar and often used interchangeably even when they explain different components under an umbrella of autonomy. The same goes for negotiation and consultation. Please reference the Glossary to see how I interpret specific terms and to know why I may bounce between words.

Overall in this paper, one will see I use many legalistic and bureaucratic terms. I have adapted this language from years of being surrounded by governmentality. It does not mean I necessarily accept all of these terms used to describe us, but it is the language that is most recognized and understood by individuals working in this sphere. These are also the terms used internationally and discussed by academics. As complex as the understandings are for these words, it is the terminology used and so knowing how I interpret these words, you, the readers, can move forward with me and have an understanding of my interpretation of these ideas as well.
OUTLINE

The outline of this thesis is as follows. Chapter two will review some of the available literature, discussing First Nation cosmological and epistemological foundations, relationships to nature, and will compare all of this information to western thought-processes. This will provide a foundation for understanding an introduction of decolonization theory and environmental planning discourse related to natural resource management. Chapter three will examine first the criticisms of research and development, and the creation of Indigenous methodologies leading into my methods framework.

Chapters’ four to six is the results and discussion portion of my thesis. Chapter four is titled *Traditions and Relations* and will look at tradition, decision-making and representation, and communication. This chapter is important because it discusses the premise of our identity in relation to Mother Earth, explicitly collective decision-making, the implications of high-level decision-making relationships and challenges. Chapter five: *Zones of Influence* introduces the impetus behind First Nation management of natural resources. In this chapter, doctrines of oppression and colonialism will be examined, how these assimilative techniques have influenced First Nation development and identity, why natural resource management is important, and how First Nations are trying to regain control. Chapter six builds on the concepts introduced in chapters four and five to look at the subject of sustainability – the tension between sustainability of community through economic success versus social success as achieved through the protection of land and strengthening of culture. Overall the chapter will examine the subthemes of economic development, the concepts of stewardship, and different types of natural resources. The final chapter will examine the implications of these results at both a theoretical and practical level, and how these results may apply to other nations and situations.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

For Indigenous people, culture, identity and well-being are based on the care and protection of the ecosystem. The protection of Mother Earth is vital for First Nations — in this case, the Mi’kmaq. Centrally, we argue that traditional knowledge must be at the heart of resource management in order to revitalize and support our communities. The purpose of this chapter is to examine some of the available literature on the subject of traditional knowledge and Indigenous management, and look critically at how natural resource management (vis-à-vis self-governance) is recognized, understood and viewed by the Canadian state, environmental planners and theorists, and how this relates to Indigenous viewpoints and ideologies. I will also provide a basis of how all these perspectives may influence individual Amerindians’ opinions and understandings on natural resource management.

This chapter is limited in its review of Mi’kmaq-related literature. Relevant pieces are included, but for many of the topics I am exploring I did not find any Mi’kmaq related literature and/or I focus on some of the most acclaimed academics on the themes presented in this chapter. There is some Mi’kmaq literature I could have critiqued and mainstream academia may criticize my omission yet I have to balance my role as a community member, and socially (and culturally) it is not okay for me to be critical of those Mi’kmaw. Lastly, please note that the literature reviewed on Mi’kmaq cosmology describes it through broad terms speaking overall to an Indigenous viewpoint (see Henderson 1994; Battiste 2004; Dickason 2002). The academics I use to describe Mi’kmaq culture are not Mi’kmaq, but I feel they best describe my culture and our cosmological understanding. While each nation has its own specific traditions and interpretations, there are many values and practices that are consistent for many groups; we share similar
cosmological and epistemological viewpoints and this is why their arguments work in the context that I am applying it.

Four key topics have been identified within this debate and are the foundation of each of this chapter’s subsections. The first part examines Indigenous cosmologies: what broadly are Indigenous worldviews and how do these views correlate to natural resource management? An Indigenist and post-colonial critical analysis will be applied to explain the mainstream western worldview and its interpretation of Indigenous knowledge. Part two will follow the discussion on the foundations of western ideology and describe how different scholars interpret Indigenous governance and natural resource management. Part three is a presentation on how different parties support Indigenous erasure. From here, decolonization theory will be introduced.

INDIGENOUS COSMOLOGIES

Aboriginal Knowledge - an Interconnected Relationship with the Ecosystem

To fully understand an Indigenist approach to natural resource management, one must understand the ontological foundations of First Nation societies. Importantly, there is no single Indigenous paradigm – each society, each group, each tribe have different practices and societal customs. Yet there are overarching values and ideas that are similar. As such, the purpose of this section is to explain what are these overarching beliefs and understandings, utilizing one primary source – Leroy Little Bear (2000), supported by the indigenist and culturally-based writing of Georges Sioui (1992), as well as Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel (2005). As Indigenous scholars, all four academics are able to clearly articulate a broad understanding of Indigenous cosmologies without universalizing peoples.

Most First Nation societies are based on a connection to the land. Centrally, the Earth is our mother, meaning we all come from her and are a part of her. It is a holistic and reciprocal
belief system; all beings, all energy forms, are interconnected, interrelated and equal (Sioui 1992:8). In this “sacred circle of life” (ibid.), it is recognized that a person’s actions have an affect on them and others. If a person acts in a respectful way, this will be reflected back. If a person disrespects himself or herself, other people, or the ecosystem, this will cause hurt and destruction in the future. This relationship with others is often described through the term “all my relations”. It implies that all animate things are interconnected. This perception is about unity, respect and wholeness. Little Bear describes the concept of wholeness as being “. . . like a flower with four petals. When it opens, one discovers strength, sharing, honesty, reciprocity and kindness. Together these four petals create balance, harmony and beauty” (2000:79). It is not a system centred on the betterment of the individual over the group. Instead, individuals work together through cooperation for the advancement of the entire community. The community is a crucial factor under an Indigenous system. As Little Bear goes on to explain, “the ‘spider web’ of relations ensures that the welfare of the group is the most important thing in aboriginal societies. The value of wholeness tells the members, that, if all do their part, then social order will be the result” (ibid.: 84). Language, values, customs, spirituality and law are all derived from these holistic cosmological and epistemological understandings that First Nation societies have.

Most Indigenous languages are very process and action-based (ibid.:78). Language and culture is place-oriented (ibid.), because the terms used in First Nation languages and the cultural practices conducted are founded on the local ecosystem. This is important to understand because, consequently, when this ecosystem is damaged or if the society is relocated, the language and culture is harmed and cannot be relocated. I will examine momentarily what happens to the individual when cultural identity is lost, but to comprehend this explanation one must first understand the importance of diversity and individuality in First Nation communities.
Each First Nation is unique and different. Difference is important in an Indigenous worldview. Individuals are encouraged to be independent, and others must be respectful of each community member’s personal journey in life. People should not interfere with personal autonomy because “non-interference [shows] respect for others’ wholeness, totality and knowledge” (ibid.:80). Additionally, “each being ought to have the strength to be tolerant of the beauty of cognitive diversity” (ibid.). Thus, Indigenous paradigms do not support universal approaches. A one-size-fits-all model stifles creativity, harmony and positive development. These societies are not alarmed by difference, because as long as a person is whole (which they achieve through independence), and as long as they support the values of the society (which an individual does when they are whole), then there is no risk of harm and no need for formal laws, rules and regulations. Indigenous societies, their view of the world and interactions within it can therefore be described as a form of internalized knowledge (ibid.:84). “Law is not something that is separate and unto itself. Law is the culture and culture is the law” (ibid.:83). Formal legal rules and structures are not needed because an Indigenous value system penetrates all parts of one’s life and relations.

Therein, when an individual loses connection with the land and/or their culture, they lose touch with their identity and are incomplete. If a person is not whole they cannot contribute to society, and this creates disharmony. Colonial and neo-colonial assimilation policies are principally responsible for this current crisis and imbalance in First Nation communities. As Georgina Tobac explains, “every time the white people come to the North or come to our land and start tearing up the land, I feel as if they are cutting my own flesh; because that is the way we feel about our land. It is our flesh” (in Sioui 1992:18). My interpretation is that when the Earth is exploited and hurt it also impacts the wellbeing of the people. Contact with settler populations has
caused natives to lose touch with Indigenous norms and values. “If a person is not balanced [as is the case with many First Nation peoples today], then he or she is sick and weak – physically, mentally, or both – and cannot fulfill his or her individual responsibilities” (Little Bear 2000:79). Land exploitation and universal western policies are destroying Indigenous peoples, ways and identities.

Understanding the relationship to land is important for understanding a holistic environmental planning approach. “Relationships to each other, communities, homelands, ceremonial life, languages, histories . . . these connections are crucial to living a meaningful life for any human being” (Alfred & Jeff Corntassel 2005:599). In order to address the turmoil within Indigenous communities, many Indigenous scholars and activists (for instance Alfred 1999; Alfred 2005; Amadahy & Bonita Lawrence 2009; LaDuke 1994; Lawrence & Enakshi Dua 2005; Little Bear 2000; Simpson 2001; Sioui 1992; Smith1999) argue that there must be a return to an Indigenous value system – this change must extend towards all aspects of society, including the economic sphere, in order for a holistic, long-lasting change. Through self-determination, First Nations have the right to decide how to manage their political, economic, social, educational, religious and cultural structures with these structures being based on an Indigenous worldview.

**How the West Views the World and Traditional Ecological Knowledge: A Critical Analysis of Mainstream Western Ideology by Post-Colonial and Indigenist Scholars**

The west (meaning the dominant order) views the world in a radically different way than Indigenous peoples. The mainstream western worldview is based on Liberalism. Liberalism is very individualized. It is about self-interest. It is a paradigm that enforces hierarchy and diminishes equality in an Indigenous sense (Little Bear 2000:82). Under this philosophy, a person should work to their greatest capacity to benefit themselves and to outdo other individuals (Smith
It is a society largely based on competition. From a classic Liberal perspective, individuals have the right to life, liberty and property (Locke 1690:8-9). The western ideal believes that humans have possession over nature and land, and that the ecosystem is theirs to exploit (Porter 2010b:53). Centrally the economy is of primary focus. Social and cultural aspects of life are of less value than the economy, whereas in an Indigenous perspective each part equally contributes to community well-being.

The current western paradigm (neoliberalism) puts great onus on the individual to be an active, competitive part of the economy. Economic success and development are about exploiting Mother Earth. There is no consideration of future ramifications; the focus is on the present moment and material wealth (Smith 1999; Little Bear 2000:84-85). The dominant order truly believes that universal approaches work and that intrinsically its worldview of humanity is the correct one and can be applied to all societies (Briggs & Sharp 2004; Smith 1999). Western powers rarely let Indigenous peoples present their needs from their point of view (Simpson 2001:140); “Hence the subaltern must always be caught in translation, never truly expressing herself, but always already interpreted” (Briggs & Sharp 2004:664; see also Smith 1999). It is this western lens that forms the basis of governmental policy (for example the implications of Bill C-45 and Bill C-38 on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, the Fisheries Act, the National Energy Board Act and the Navigable Waters Protection Act) causing further oppression.

Leanne Simpson (2001), and Sarah Radcliffe and Nina Laurie (2006) broadly discuss how this western interpretation is applied to the utilization of Aboriginal knowledge, while Gretchen Fox and Russell Barsh relate the discussion to the Nova Scotia context. Simpson (2001) is disapproving of the practical application of western recognition of Indigenous knowledge. She explains that the technical aspects of Aboriginal knowledge have been extracted by the west to
formulate what is called Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), that this “has been a process of ‘scientificizing’ [Indigenous] knowledge for use in and the consumption of Euro-Canadian society” (ibid.:139). Skillfully neoliberalism has been able to utilize the parts of Aboriginal knowledge (ibid.) and culture (Radcliffe & Laurie 2006) that can be marketed, so to feed into the capitalist system, while overlooking the core premise of Indigenous worldviews (ibid.) and, thereby, neglecting the purpose behind Indigenous peoples’ management of environmental resources. Ergo, “Indigenous knowledge is allowed to offer contained technical solutions that fit within the current scientific worldview, but not to challenge the content, structure or value system of this [scientific] view” (Briggs & Sharp 2004:665; Porter 2010a). In the context of Nova Scotia, Fox argues, similar to Simpson, that government strategies also overlook the historical context (2006:121). Secondly, government practices “delegitimize Mi’kmaq peoples ability to use local knowledge” (ibid.:123). Overall, the west (the dominant order/ hegemon) does not genuinely recognize Indigenous claims of self-determination and self-governance (Simpson 2001; Barsh 2002; Fox 2006:122). This means it does not actually support true Indigenous management techniques of natural resources despite the formal documents stating otherwise. This problematic stance is an innate aspect of development and planning.

WESTERN RECOGNITION OF MANAGEMENT AND RIGHTS

Mainstream western scholars and the Canadian state base their positions on an economically and colonially-based interpretation of First Nation resource management. For example, scholars like Tom Flanagan, Christopher Alcantara, and André Le Dressay (2010) argue that the difference between First Nation societies (historically) and western capitalist societies is

---

4 The term “hegemony” under Antonio Gramsci’s definition entails more than one variable, but significant for the point being made is that it is a form of social control by the dominant group in society (Strinati 2004).
not as substantial as it seems. Their hypothesis, which sounds very similar to a modernization theory based on development from a “traditional society” to one of “high mass consumption” (Rostow 1998 [1960]), states that historically First Nations had economic institutions within their societies, and because cultures are not static a shift could have occurred in the absence of colonialism where these economic institutions could have developed overtime into something similar to a capitalist society (Flanagan et al. 2010:40). Given this potential for a capitalist state to have developed autonomously, current-day First Nations should be able to adapt (ibid.:40-41). This argument reinforces a westernized-universal approach to natural resource management – one where the Earth’s gifts are meant for development and consumption. Flanagan, Alcantara and La Dressay’s assumption is very Eurocentric, but it has widespread support, especially given that Tom Flanagan has acted as a special advisor to Prime Minister Stephen Harper (University of Calgary 2010). As incorrect as this view might be to actually understanding Indigenous ways and Indigenous peoples, it represents a primary perspective in mainstream discourse.

Scholar Alan Cairns supports the claim that First Nations have special rights in Canada, but he argues that a focus on cultural and social issues supports differences, which prevents the establishment of dialogue and good working partnerships (2000:86). As an alternative, he argues for a greater focus on similarities and unification. Although he argues that assimilation no longer exists within Canada (ibid.:77), he contradicts himself by stating that First Nations should integrate into the Canadian workforce (ibid.:29). The basis of this economic-led self-governance argument is that employment and economic prosperity will eradicate poverty in Indigenous communities and will enable Indigenous peoples to live a greater, more equal standard of life comparable to other Canadians. Employment will eradicate dependency and underdevelopment (ibid.). This viewpoint undermines difference (Porter 2010b:12), culture and land, and its vital
role in poverty eradication and the diminishment of oppression (Alfred 2009; Smith 1999). It overlooks the effects exploitative industry has on nature and, in turn, on Indigenous peoples.

Despite the flaws in these arguments, the discussion of economic development and capitalism in First Nation communities cannot be overlooked given our globalized civilization(s). Wanda Wuttunee is a First Nation economist and David Newhouse is a First Nation professor of business administration. Newhouse calls the western capitalist system the “Borg” (2004; 2001), referencing an assimilative system that can adapt itself to survive in any culture or society, while Wuttunee (2004) is mindful of the exploitative, individualistic nature of the market-system. Both scholars are working to reconcile the divide between western-based economics and traditional Aboriginal values. Newhouse states that First Nations did have economies (2001:78), but he is not making the same argument as Flanagan and colleagues. Cosmologically and epistemologically, Indigenous societies were (and are) different from societies under modern models of capitalism. Even though there were components in our societies that had the same tenets as modern-day capitalism, Newhouse explains that the economy in a First Nation society was only an aspect of the social structure (2001:81), and “what was not common however was the accumulation of wealth for its own sake in order to generate more wealth” (ibid.). The values are different between these economic systems. Yet Newhouse also asserts that western capitalism is inescapable. We cannot resist being a part of this system, because the reality is that we already are (2001:78). Newhouse focuses on how we can assure economic development in First Nation communities, without having economic development be another assimilative, homogenizing act. His answer is “red capitalism” (2000:57). Indigenous values must remain intact. Under “red capitalism”, traditionalism and western capitalism are combined (ibid.). Our economic structures must emphasis human capital over individual capital accumulation (ibid.). It should be
“community development” (ibid.35) rather than “economic development”. The common structures of a functioning economic system will remain, but it will be an Indigenous system framed on Indigenous ideas and concepts.

For Wuttunee, a market strategy should not be prescriptive, but should merely be based on certain indicators (2004:70). These indicators include qualitative factors, the future, community, and productivity skills, such as employment and knowledge (ibid.). Many of these values are found within Indigenous communities. Further, individualism is not the central basis of this paradigm, but rather, as in Newhouse’s thinking, relationships are what form the core foundations of Indigenous economies (ibid.:69). Improving one’s quality of life is important to economic theories and Wuttunee does not deny that this is also a factor in Indigenous economic practices, yet quality of life is not defined as financial success, but instead it is framed through nature protection, cultural sustenance and care for our future. Like hegemonic economic development, the focus is on improving one’s quality of life, however Wuttunee’s definition of life quality is about safeguarding Mother Earth for future generations (ibid.:68). The paradigm Wuttunee is working to establish could be extremely valid and plausible, yet an analysis needs to be made if any such examples exist.

At a practical level, environmental planners appear to provide greater support and understanding of Indigenous resource management. For instance, differing from the integrationist approaches offered by Flanagan, Alcantara and La Dressay, and Cairns, at face-value Marcus Lane and Michael Hibbard are more supportive of First Nation political autonomy stating “political autonomy is at the heart of sovereignty” (2001:182). This statement implies that they support Indigenous-based governance strategies. However, there is no discussion about cultural recognition and identity in the paper. Many mainstream planners, like western theorists, are still
very modernist (Sandercock 2004:119), meaning that they have not opened their mind to critically reflect and analyze what Indigenous natural resource management truly is about, nor what recognition of Indigenous self-determination means. One post-colonial planner who identifies this weakness is Libby Porter. Porter contends that the field is colonial and that fundamental changes cannot occur unless planning is deconstructed (2010). Even though planning has shifted, its practices need to be “collaborative” (ibid.:79). Planning is still inherently oppressive, romanticizing Indians and “render[ing] Indigenous peoples as the absolute Other of the modern rational world. It constructs Indigenous people as having lived an ahistorical existence, without capacity for change” (ibid.:37). Under this stereotype, Indigenous knowledge is only sought if it is related to culture and land preservation, in cases where cultural value is “traditional”, meaning that ideas or practices that are more modern or current-day are not considered valid or relevant by planners (ibid.:122). When looking specifically at Nova Scotia, Gretchen Fox and Russell Barsh provide their perspectives. Fox explains that planning strategies overlook the historical treatment of the Mi’kmaq (2006:121). Further, for Barsh, resource management is developed and implemented by the Crown without First Nation consultation (2002; see also Fox 2006:122). Government practices “delegimitize Mi’kmaq peoples ability to use local knowledge” (Fox 2006:123).

All in all, I have come to realize that environmental planning seems only to be inclusive of First Nations when it relates to land protection, but our input is undermined when management relates to natural resource development. As Porter (2010b) explains, the western construct of land is based on a Lockean definition wherein there is a binary between raw, untouched land, and worked, cultivated land. Under this dichotomy, a person’s duty is to develop and work the land. The conception of the savage living in the harmony with nature is so imprinted into the non-
native mind that when natives are “modernized”, they are no longer viewed as native. It seems then that Indigenous people are not allowed to develop or move forward: if we do not fit within this idealized and romanticized view of what is an Indian and if our input does not relate to this stereotype, then we are overlooked and excluded from the planning process. The field of planning is hugely limiting, and what worries me more, is that we (natives) ourselves may have internalized this romanticized view and are having an ontological warfare within, trying to balance and understand where we fit within this polarized world of “harmonized savage” and “industrialized white” (see Little Bear 2009:84-85). It is critical when reading these papers and analyzing the application of Indigenous resource management in various contexts, to identify what factors are missing from the discussion. This can reveal what type of recognition is at play.

Neoliberal and modernist approaches like the examples given are problematic. A neoliberal response intensifies problems and is inherently exclusionary (Miller 2003:29; Sandercock 2004:121; Smith 1998:191). Neoliberal and western approaches in general mask factors like colonial history, class, gender, culture and migration (Dei, Hall & Rosenberg 2008:4; Fairhead & Leach 2000:1082; Hayden 2003:368; Igoe 2005:117; Lewis 2000:364; Li 2002:268; Matzeke & Nabane 1996:67; Neumann 1997:570; Sylvain 2002:1082). In understanding every individual as similar and having universal needs (as Cairns argues the focus should be), such scholarship and policy perpetuates and creates deeper inequalities within the societies. It does not recognize that historical dependency caused a breakdown of the traditional structures of First Nation societies (Alfred 1999:50; McIsaac 2008:89). Therefore without addressing structural inequalities, marginalization will continue.
INDIGENOUS ERASURE

Western-centred management techniques enforce the erasure of Indigenous peoples, meaning the dissolution of Indigenous identities, communities, lands and cultures. Specific to this research, recognition of diversity and the care for Mother Earth are lost (Porter 2010b:39-41; Dua & Lawrence 2005; LaDuke 1994). Erasure is unknowingly and knowingly inflicted by the government, First Nation leaders, theorists (such as those already presented), planners and environmental activists. Alfred and Corntassel show how state-imposed concepts support the erasure of Amerindians (2005:598). Their argument is that the state attempts to define First Nation identity. This imposed identity is based on mainstream western universalizing terms, which not only removes power from First Nations peoples, but also impacts culture. When I apply this argument to the topic of resource management, the same thing is taking place. Generally, knowledge is appropriated or destroyed. “When the knowledge is removed from our people, the power of our knowledge is lost” (Simpson 2001:140). Despite a degree of formal control — meaning that management is based on a formal agreement — the values, the epistemological and methodological applications, are ultimately Western. Such form of management takes away the core cosmological aspects of who we are as (Indigenous) peoples.

First Nation leaders can also (unknowingly) reinforce erasure. This is one of the greatest criticisms Alfred provides in his book Wasáse (2005). He explains that band council governmentality mimics the western Eurocentric bureaucratic systems of domination (ibid.:42). These individuals are really neoliberals who have adapted to a western understanding of development and society (ibid.:51; see also Green 2003:67). Alfred states that “this is founded on a base concession to white power . . . in order to gain the benefit they expect from economic partnerships, band council politicians have to accept the promise of money in exchange for
protecting their people, lands and cultures” (2005:42). Alfred fundamentally believes that many of these leaders are corrupt (ibid.).

Yet Alfred, who at other points condemns universal approaches (see Alfred and Corntassel 2005; Alfred 1999), is victim to his own criticisms. When we universalize the reason why each leadership may choose not to rise against government bureaucracy we diminish the people themselves and the efforts of all the leadership. By universalizing all band councils he is creating a strong binary between anarcho-Indigenous-minded people (a term to be discussed shortly) and band council-centric minds, postulating a hurtful divide between the two. When Alfred attacks band councils in *Wasáse*, he encapsulates that Indigenous identity (that of the individual in the western sense), which he and Corntassel criticize in their article “Being Indigenous” (2005:598). In making such a universalizing statement, he is putting all native leadership into a single box while failing to examine other reasons why they may be subservient. In doing this, and in offending these people, it creates an arena of more tension and hurt within Indigenous communities, weakening the people to a larger degree.

In relation to these points, I still feel Alfred’s discussion is important: Indigenous leaders have relied on a belief that if they obtain self-governing power they can liberate the people and (better) protect the land, but as he identifies, the problem is in the method/system of governing itself, therein we must look at new effective ways to strengthen our communities. Are our leaders doing a good job of representing our communities? Although some band leaders recognize that the current, implemented governance system is weak, I do not think they fully comprehend how detrimental band council systems are, that this system in-and-of-itself supports and sustains colonialism and the western model. However, I do not agree in blanket terms or criticisms.
At a practical level, both planners and activists support erasure. As stated earlier by Sandercock, many planners have modernist values (2004:119). Indigenous people should have greater control over land management and be involved in the decision-making process. However, trusteeship remains. Action-based knowledge and development is still founded on orthodoxy (Simpson 2001:140; see also Porter 2010b). A participatory approach is “an alternative western paradigm . . . but nonetheless a fundamental western paradigm” (Simpson 2001:141). The Canadian style of involvement and support for self-governance mimics this developmental participatory approach. Planners, bureaucrats, policy-makers, whatever the term to be used, all of these parties are caught within their assumptions and biases - their approaches mute the community voice (Sandercock 2004:122). It is a top-down planning style (ibid.), despite how “transformative” scholars like Lane and Hibbard (2005) claim it to be. This is erasure. If Indigenous management plans focus on economic and monetary-specific approaches and overlook cultural value, this implies the exclusion of First Nations in the design and facilitation of resource management. Positively though, at least planners are dialoguing in some way with First Nations. On the other hand, mainstream environmental activists can view First Nations as the problem and not the solution.

Mainstream environmental activists have “historically played into the colonial mind-set by denying the existence of Indigenous ecological knowledge . . . and the significance of this knowledge in sustainable thinking” (LaDuke 1994:137). Indigenous management practices not only support our (First Nation) integrity and survival, but traditional land management techniques are holistic and “environmentally friendly”. Mainstream environmental movements have been viewed as advocating for the protection of nature and overlooking the needs of the people. Rightly, Winona LaDuke labels this as “environmental racism” (ibid.:138). The environmental
movement is also indicated by the inability of mainstream organizations to recognize, for instance, the relationship between ecologically destructive projects (or culturally altering environmental initiatives like the seal campaign) and cultural and physical genocide . . . ‘social justice issues’ must be recognized as a part of an environmental agenda – for if there is no one left who understands how to care for an ecosystem in a sustainable, practice manner, it will not be cared for” (ibid.). Examining only non-human-components not only prevents proper land management, but it supports our (First Nation) dissolution and eradication. Leanne Simpson asserts that mainstream environmentalists do not see that sick land means sick Indigenous communities (2001:145). For true recognition, Indigenous knowledge (not “TEK”) and culture must be at the forefront of resource management: the methodology and epistemology must be based on a decolonized framework. I am conscious that the entire environmental field is not this way. Coalitions are formed between environmental organizations and Indigenous peoples, yet the purpose of this section of the literature review is to establish different forms of erasure. This latter topic must be explored in another discussion.

The perspectives presented provide an array of important understandings on the topic of erasure, many of which are not normally discussed in mainstream circles. Understanding the different ways erasure can manifest itself is important for the application of Indigenous resource management. Establishing where these fault-lines are is the first step to addressing the problem and creating methods of prevention.

**DECOLONIZATION THEORY(IES)**

Decolonization theories declare that State-sanctioned self-governance arrangements do not truly support healthy Indigenous communities. Indigenist arguments state genuine self-determination must be based on a decolonized-indigenist approach, an approach centred on the
values iterated in part two of this literature review. Decolonization “recognizes that our true power as Indigenous people ultimately lies in our relationships with our land, relatives, language and ceremonial life” (Alfred & Corntassel 2005:605). In order to achieve this, there cannot merely be institutional change, but a shift in action (hence the premise behind the *Idle No More* movement) and thought (ibid.:611). This shift must begin with the individual (ibid.), because relationships are rooted at the personal level and harmony cannot transpire unless the individual is mentally and physically well. The role of the individual in this sense (as explained early on in this chapter) is much different from the role of the individual in mainstream western culture. As a holistic society, a change at the micro level (within the individual) will extend and influence the macro (the community) — that is, the change will move outward to relationships with others (Alfred & Corntassel 2005; Little Bear 2000). From this perspective, an individual has autonomy, but it is understood that whatever is going on inside the person will impact the whole. This is different from the capitalist notion of individualism. Importantly, there is no single model of decolonization (Alfred & Corntassel 2005:612; Dua & Lawrence 2005; LaDuke 2000; Alfred 1999; Alfred 2005). A set agenda or roadmap is a very western universalized approach and would overlook the organic nature of Indigenous worldviews. As native languages are based on the environment from which the people are derived, decolonization must also be based on the contextual needs of those people; it must be a focused approach based on each particular society’s needs and relationships to Mother Earth.

Alfred offers one of the best articulations of what a decolonized philosophy is through his description of “anarcho-indigenism” (2005). Anarcho-indigenism is based heavily on traditional Indigenous political systems, such as having a decentralized economy and local decision-making (ibid.:45). Importantly, Alfred never states that this is the exact model that Indigenous peoples are
striving to achieve. In this, I feel Alfred brilliantly captures Indigenous traditional thinking (at least from my Mi’kmaq standpoint). Alfred is able to eloquently explain an idea without actually providing a specific framework. A set framework would dictate a single path, and Indigenous societies are largely fluid and organic. A specific decolonized method may work for one community but not another. To prevent prescriptiveness, Alfred references other theories and ideas (e.g. anarchism). All Indigenous scholars need to do this in their writings if they are advocating for Indigenous peoples’ control over their own spheres of knowledge and management of natural resources. As long as Indigenous scholars are theorizing specific models and ideas, they remain within the rigidity of western academia, which then prevents healthy communities from developing because these Indigenous minds are still thinking in a western linear way (Smith 1999). It is difficult to change this colonized mindset; as Alfred explains, “the struggle to restore connections is severed by the colonial machine” (2005:45). It is a struggle; some of these colonial ideas have been unconsciously absorbed. The key to such change is through academics like Alfred and the way he spreads ideas.

I contend that it is still possible to have a concept of economic development under a decolonized perspective. Importantly, the basis of resource management is not for material wealth and gain. For Alfred, economic self-sufficiency must maintain and preserve culture, and not “[contravene] traditional values” (1999:139). Another scholar who focuses on this issue from a decolonized perspective is Winona LaDuke (1994). Under this decolonized approach, an economic model must be “decentralized, self-reliant and very closely based on the carrying capacity of that ecosystem” (ibid.:129). The cornerstone to achieving the practical implementation of decolonization is having the necessary preconditions. These preconditions include a strong Indigenous cultural identity, community learning and a political framework
focused on Indigenous governance and values (ibid:141). Its economic agenda must be a political strategy based on “cultural values and long-term self sufficiency brought about by careful stewardship” (ibid.). Land management must be based on holistic practices and must be focused on protecting the land so that its resources are available seven generations into the future. Yet, even though LaDuke theoretically examines how economic success is possible, a practical challenge I recognize is that communities without these preconditions in place are disadvantaged. They are trying to achieve self-determination and self-governance, but yet in order to do so they need a strong cultural base. This creates a never-ending cycle. How do we break this cycle and establish these preconditions in this neo-colonial world? Further, even if the preconditions are present, communities must still overcome other hurdles. Not all decolonizing initiatives are successful, and those that are successful must always be based on compromise and partnerships.

Overall, the statements and positions presented by scholars on First Nation-Crown relationships have to be examined in greater detail when looking at resource management in Nova Scotia. Realistically, on the ground, how do First Nations manage these difficulties? Coalition-building with other marginalized populations is an important discussion and should be applied when looking for best practices on how to create positive working relationships with western powers, while still ensuring personal (Indigenous) identity and well-being; however, due to the complexity of this subject, it cannot be discussed within this work.

CONCLUSION

Indigenous natural resource management does not simply mean First Nations have control over the resources. There are multiple interpretations of what this management should look like and often these management terms are driven by the west. Rather, Indigenous management must be based on Indigenous knowledge, not liberalism or any other mainstream
western economic-centred paradigm. Mainstream western liberal approaches only appropriate from Indigenous cultures that which is marketable, providing short-term limited solutions and perpetuating continuous oppression. Even when mainstream western actors (scholars, planners, bureaucrats) attest they support sovereignty and equality, they often are blind to the role of culture. Theoretically a decolonized approach is the best perspective(s) for applying Indigenous natural resource management. It is intended to prevent Indigenous erasure. Yet at the same time, arguments put forth by these theorists must also be realistic and cognizant of the limitations of living within a western hegemonic world. My research project sets out to understand how we can have Indigenist approaches to management in a globalized largely hegemonic society.
Chapter 3: Methods

INTRODUCTION

Research is not simply an act of gathering new information and making new discoveries. It is also a mechanism for control and power. Historically, the field of development and the research associated with it has been problematic, overlooking the participant societies involved in the research. How, why, for whom, and in what ways this information is collected has an impact. Researchers are now advised to be aware and reflexive of their actions and their processes, especially when working in Indigenous communities. It is necessary for an ethical researcher to be aware of the history attached to research, and to be aware or indeed hyper-conscious of his or her assumptions. Accountability and responsibility are two central tenets that I live by and carry forward into the work I am doing academically. As such, constant thought, rethought and reflexivity has gone into developing this study’s methodology. The purpose of this chapter is to look at the concept of research and how my interpretation of it will frame my methods and practices. The first section will examine the history of Development research and knowledge-creation and criticisms of this field. From here, this will lead into how Indigenous researchers place themselves in the research process. Thirdly I will discuss what an Indigenous methodological framework is, creating the basis to frame the development of my research design (sections five and six). The last two sections will look at ethical issues and relationships.

DEVELOPMENT AND KNOWLEDGE CREATION

Research and Development are fraught with controversy, diverging theoretical opinions and worldviews. This is principally because research and Development are based on power and who has control over the production of knowledge, meaning that historically (and currently)
research and Development have been framed by the dominant order, and what it defines as
knowledge (Scheyvens, Scheyvens & Murray 2003:182; Lee 2008:127; Cervone 2007:9; Smith
1999; Kapoor 2004; Briggs & Sharp 2004). This has led to “much discussion in the past of
whether research in Third World countries [and the Fourth World] is ‘parasitic’, or may be
characterized as ‘data mining’ ” (Binns 2006:19). In many instances, this western control has
marginalized and oppressed local peoples (Li 2007:15; Mosse 2004:48; Ferguson 1994:25-26;
Smith 1999; Kapoor 2004; Briggs & Sharp 2004), chiefly because of the Eurocentric nature of
research and development theory (Cowen & Shenton 1996:5; see also Li 2007:233; Smith 1999).
Why? Europeans created the concept of development. Early research practices were particularly
at fault for doing this.

Classic development research was heavily positivist and science-based, and quantitative
methods were considered the only valid and real form of data collection. Empirical-analytical
science (Habermas [1978] in Murray & Overton 2003:20) was the earliest form of research
collection and comes from a foundation which “largely believed that facts speak for
themselves” (ibid.). One example of this is positivism. Positivism has been a “branch of science
which has come to dominate the public imagination and, to some erroneously, define intellectual
endeavour or progress” (Murray & Overton 2003:20; Bryman, Bell & Teevan 2012:8). One
criticism of such research methods is that “societies and people under study are objectified and
knowledge production is detached from its political and ethical implications” (Cervone 2007:97,
This research rarely includes local knowledge and involvement (Cervone 2007:98, Hoben
1995:1015). This illustrates a form of disrespect in Indigenous contexts, “deepening the problem
that Aboriginal people have with the settler colonial society and having an immense effect on the
social and emotional well-being of the Indigenous population” (Grieves 2008:385-286). Early development research has also been criticized for believing that researchers are objective bodies, and that their methods prevent error and bias.

New western development theories have surfaced to counteract the drawbacks of early development. Hermeneutics argues that empiricism (and all forms of science) is a social construction; science can never produce all the facts “it is, at best, a statement of possibilities” (Kana’iaupuni 2005:32). It is now common to acknowledge that the premise of “the detached neutral researcher is unsustainable” (Cervone 2007:101). Research is never one-way; it is about multiple truths (Kana’iaupuni 2005:33; Briggs & Sharp 2004; see also Menchú 1984; Lovell 1990). Mainstream researchers and developers are starting to include local knowledge: they are conscious that a long-term relationship must be built and this relationship must be founded on respect (Mosse 1994:521-522, Perez 2010:169, Classen, Humphries, Fitzsimons, Kaaria, Jimenez, Sierra, & Gallardo 2008:2413, Dove 1994:347, Li 2007:267, Crewe 1997:76). New mainstream approaches include participatory methods, but even when there is greater participation, they still contain some degree of “old orthodoxies” (Hoben 1995:1018; Scoones 1996:50). Mainstream (hegemonic) theoretical frameworks are viewed by some Indigenous academics (see Smith 1999; Alfred & Corntassel 2005; Wilson 2008; Pualani Louis 2001) as being oppressive.

These Indigenous researchers are trying to counter hegemonic research approaches, but this is not a straightforward task. In her book *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Linda T. Smith explains that Indigenous researchers are educated in the western system, and they too have to negotiate their positionality and unlearn inherent assumptions attached to western research and development (1999:137). Smith cautions Indigenous researchers to be wary of arrogance (ibid.:139). Even if a researcher is Indigenous, this does not mean they speak for the people they
are researching or that they necessarily understand the needs of the community. It is not simply about getting outside researchers to change, but Indigenous researchers themselves need to decolonize their mind (Pualani Louis 2007:130; also Smith 1999). It is not an easy process, but it one that we have to do if we are fulfilling our promises to our families and communities. In essence Indigenous researchers must be just as aware of the orthodoxies. Indigenous research methodological frameworks are one form in which Aboriginals are working to achieve this.

**INDIGENOUS METHODOLOGIES**

Indigenous researchers are trying to change research so that it is based on Indigenous cultural ontologies and epistemologies. Originally, Indigenous methods were viewed from the margins, but they are now becoming a more recognized form of resistance (Pualani Louis 2007:130) and an alternative way of looking at research processes (ibid.:133; Wilson 2008:16; Smith 1999). It is important to understand that there is no single Indigenous methodological framework. To be truly based on our ways, it must support autonomy and the unique cultural needs of the participant communities. I need to explain that there is no available literature discussing a specific Mi’kmaw methodology with the exception of a page on the Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch website. For me, I would argue that our daily social and cultural interactions are what inform my conception of a Mi’kmaw-Indigenous methodological practice. It is also not a Mi’kmaw cultural practice to try to define societal practices. I do not feel comfortable detailing this perception, because I do not find it appropriate to “scientificize” my culture, but I hope the details provided below will help readers understand how I position myself and how as a Mi’kmaw researcher I utilize broad concept of Indigenous methodologies in a similar way as Alfred tried to define an Indigenous theoretical concept (see Alfred 2005:45).
In contrast to mainstream western research, Indigenous methodologies are fluid (not linear), researchers must be humble, and participants must be viewed as partners and comrades. Renee Pualani Louis points out four other key principles: *relational accountability, reciprocal appropriation, respectful representation*, and rights and protocols led by Indigenous protocols (2007:131). Other Indigenous theorists (see Smith 1999; Kana’iaupuni 2005; Getty 2010; Wilson 2008; Lee 2008) state similar principles. These principles are not doctrine that must be followed rigidly, but rather are values and viewpoints that are based in many Indigenous societies. Let me better explain these principles as I understand. First *relational accountability* means being responsible and accountable to “all my relations” including the spiritual world and Mother Earth (Pualani Louis 2007:134, Wilson 2008:89). As Shawn Wilson explains, “rather than viewing ourselves as being IN relationship with other people or things, we ARE the relationships that we hold and are a part of” (2008:80). We are a part of the group itself. It is a holistic process. Secondly, under *reciprocal appropriation*, knowledge cannot just be extracted from the community without providing benefits to the people and the land. For me, I prefer not to say appropriation, because this carries a negative connotation. Rather I would use the term “humble interpretation,” which better enables a merging with Pualani Louis’ (2007) third principle of *respectful representation*. Respectful representation means to listen to participant voices and present the information in the way they want it shared. Fourthly, the research methods should follow an Indigenous protocol, so logically I would think the protocol should be based on the protocols of that tribe being studied (in this instance, a Mi’kmaq Protocol).

---

5 Some of the principles include: (1) Elders do not tell answers; you must find it yourself. (2) Ethics of non-interference, one person cannot tell another what to do or what is right for them. (3) Everything is shared 4) Gratitude is rarely shown or verbalized because you are expected to do everything to the best that it should be done (Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch:N.D.).
Duty and responsibility are important Mi’kmaq values (as will be discussed in the results chapters). I carry these values into my methods. I am not an academic doing research for the acclaim; I am conducting this study so that we (the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq) can use the information to strengthen our understandings and relations. My fundamental duty is to report back to the communities and chiefs. So even “while I claim this research project to be my own, I cannot claim ownership any information that belongs collectively to Indigenous peoples” (Wilson 2008:132). Any reader reviewing this work must understand this information belongs to the Mi’kmaq (Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch:N.D.). I must consult with all the appropriate individuals to receive guidance and check that I am keeping true to the collective. I cannot represent this information. I can only present it meaning it is my role to provide a plan of action to the data to be presented. This ties into my role as an insider because I am driven by how these results can benefit the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq. With this, my beliefs as a Mi’kmaq align with the underlying basis of an Indigenous methodological framework – the research must benefit the community. From the basis of these principles, I developed my methods process.

**DESIGNING DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH**

**Topic Selection**

It was important that I receive feedback, guidance and consent from community members and chiefs in the design of this research. How I understand and formulate a participatory relationship differs from some Indigenist researchers like Shawn Wilson. He attests that the First Nation community should develop the research (2008:59). My comprehension of his words is that a First Nation researcher should go to the community and ask community members what they want to research and how they want to frame the research, meaning that a significant amount of time needs to be focused on engagement prior to establishing a research proposal. I chose not to
do it in quite that manner. I did get advice from family members when I started constructing my research question. I spoke to these relatives not as family members, but for the professional roles they occupied (e.g. band council, health and wellness field, advisors at political organizations).

After developing my research proposal, I sought advice and consent from a number of different groups and individuals, including the following:

- Mikmaw Ethics Watch
- Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq Chiefs
- Individual meetings with Chiefs and/or their councils
- Meetings and conversations with First Nation groups, tribal councils, organizations and lobby groups
- Research participants
- Internationally, discussions with colleagues at the United Nations Secretariat of the Permanent Forum of Indigenous Issues (UNSPFII), and with attendees at the Permanent Forum of Indigenous Issues (PFII) in May 2012.

Importantly, in response to Wilson (2008), I do not think my methods of engagement makes it any less participatory. There is no single way of doing methods. “To assume there is a singular answer to this question only feeds scholarly beliefs of essentialism emphasizing the ‘messenger’ instead of the ‘message’ ” (Pualani Louis 2007:132). There is no single method of engagement.

**Data Collection**

The main methods were: (1) semi-structured interviews, (2) participant observation, and (3) literature collection. To receive permission to conduct interviews, I made informal calls and/or wrote emails to each of the chiefs. Letters of Information (LOI) and community consent letters were given to responsive Chief and Councils. I presented to all Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq chiefs, and the Grand Chief of the Grand Council on October 25, 2012 at the October meeting of the Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq Chiefs. I received verbal consent from all the chiefs for my research question and received verbal permission to conduct this research, but I needed to get
in contact with each individual chief for their conditions to enter their communities. Processes to enter communities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Written or verbal approval from the chiefs and/or their communication representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One chief told me that his consent at the Assembly meeting signified I had permission to enter his community and interview anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentations or meetings with Chief and councils - they verbally or formally gave me consent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I did not conduct any interviews in communities where I did not have direct consent from a chief. Chiefs have very hectic, busy schedules and it was difficult to reach each of them and schedule meetings. I was also under a time schedule, so unfortunately I had to complete the interviews by a certain date. In total, nine of the thirteen communities participated in the research. For future work, it is important that these community voices are included. Under this, I know that my sample size is not a true representation of every Nova Scotia Mi’kmaw community. To balance this, I have met with representatives of different Mi’kmaq organizations each of these communities are a part of, for their feedback, guidance and/or review of this work.

To include as accurate a sample size as possible and to reflect the actual community demographics and viewpoints, it was important not only to have interviews with chiefs, but also with other members of the community. For example, within the sample population I wanted to interview an Elder, a political representative (e.g. Chief), a woman, a traditionalist, a youth and someone working in the area of economic development. The categories of women, youth and Elders are important to have reflected in this research because often these voices are overlooked or not always represented in research (Scheyvens, Scheyvens & Murray 2003; van Blerk 2006; Momsen 2006). I wanted to get an array of opinions on this topic, so it was critical to have input from communities that are focused heavily on economic development and input from communities that are traditionalists. There are also communities that are consistently overlooked.
politically and socially because they have a small population basis; these reflections are important for understanding an aggregate management system. To be as comprehensive as possible, I originally wanted to have the opinions of at least one person from each community (there are thirteen First Nation communities), the Kwilm’kw Maw-klusuaqn Negotiation Office (the Mi'kmaq Rights Initiative), and from each part of the Grand Council within the Nova Scotia jurisdictional boundaries (Mainland and Cape Breton Island).

As a Nova Scotia Mi’kmaw, I used personal knowledge through a lifetime of participant observation (Wilson 2008:86) and through contacts to try to achieve this diversity in the sample size. The process of participant selection was voluntary, using snowball sampling through advice from Chief and Councils, contacts that my family or I knew⁶, and through the use of community newsletters. Councils and tribal organizations suggested different individuals in Nova Scotia to interview. In some cases this was successful and in other cases it was not. In other instances, I had a number of individuals willing to participate, but due to time constraints, or because I had not received permission from the community’s chief to enter the community, I could not conduct the interviews. All the participating chiefs were extremely supportive, helpful and welcoming. Some preferred not to give me direction on whom to interview, but rather had me recruit through their community newsletters. Despite having only one person contact me through a community newsletter, I preferred this mechanism for recruitment, because it assured I had interested candidates and it removed any perceived conflict of interest on the part of council and me.

I also attended the Nova Scotia Native Women’s Association’s Annual General Meeting from October 26-October 28, 2012. I attended the meeting with the hopes of getting their input on

---

⁶ Using family as “intermediaries” is a common Indigenous method, and it makes the researcher more accountable because they do not want to ruin any relations made by the family (Wilson 2008:129).
my research topic. I spoke informally to a number of women, but did not interview any either because of lack of time, I could not get in contact with them, they did not return my messages, or because they were from communities I did not receive permission to conduct interviews.

Within these nine communities, I had participants from the different spectrums I had hoped to achieve. I had an interview with a chief. I interviewed business people, economic development officers, environmentalists, fishermen, craftspeople, fisheries officers and guardians, negotiators, traditionalists, youth, elders, and women. Although I tried to achieve a balanced sample, I was not able to interview any male youth and I had no youth under the age of eighteen. Additionally, I was not able to interview a traditional female elder. Moreover, I wanted to interview a representative from the Grand Council. Due to the busy schedule of Grand Chief Sylliboy, he was not available for an interview, but he did encourage me to talk to other members of the Grand Council, but again due to their schedules, I was not able to have their perspective within the sample population. I have had informal conversations with members of the Grand Council. The cultural values expressed in chapter four as well as many of the identified challenges are the same as they have discussed.

This primary data collection was supported through other qualitative and quantitative literary sources. I examined primary documents, such as treaties and legal documents from the federal government, provincial government and the Mi’kmaq. Secondary research analyzed international and national documents and reports on the issue from Indigenous organizations (e.g. the Assembly of First Nations), and international bodies (e.g. the United Nations). Theoretical literature and journal articles on self-governance, development and environmental planning also supported this analysis.
The Interview Process

Most participants I contacted to informally ask and/or confirm their participation in this research. For those with access to Internet, I sent an electronic copy of the consent form and copies of my questions for them to change or add to. In some cases I was in communities conducting interviews and this lead me to interview other people as well. When I went to interview individuals, I first asked their permission to conduct the interviews. We reviewed the consent form and then they signed it. I made sure they felt comfortable with me recording the interviews. There was only one case where a person asked me to take hand-notes. Participants also reviewed the questions and were given a copy. The interviews were semi-structured so although there were set questions, conversation naturally flowed and I did not rigidly follow what was written. I did not want to impose or affect the ideas and opinions of those speaking. Interviews were conducted in English and all questions and forms were in English. I apologized to participants for not having Mi’kmaq versions, but I am not a Mi’kmaq speaker and the person I contacted to translate had been away on a spiritual journey and so the translations were not available when I was conducting interviews. All participants were accepting of the English versions. The interviews often lasted two hours. After the interview was over each participant was given his or her gift of appreciation. I scanned all the consent forms at home and either mailed or emailed copies of this to the participants for their records. I then transcribed all interviews. After the interviews were transcribed, I sent copies of these transcripts for the participants to review and provide input.

Ethically, all participants and participant communities worked under informed consent, and they were provided a Letter of Information. Participation was based on confidentiality and anonymity. In situations where I do identify communities, names or areas in my research it is
because I feel this information is useful for enhancing solidarity and coordination. This discretion is done case-by-case.

I selected semi-structured interviews over focus groups because I do not want participants to feel they needed to guard any of their statements. In focus groups, different people may not actually express their opinion or they may give me false information because they are conscious of other people present in the room (Willis 2006:146; Lloyd-Evans 2006:158-159). Even though I consciously tried to mitigate this problem by choosing interviews over focus groups, in some communities, two-to-three people participated in the interview. Sometimes this was problematic because one participant was always more guarded to voice their opinion in front of the other person. In some cases, seniority took over – the younger participant felt they should give the older, more senior speaker the floor. Although this is a form of respect, it did create problems with getting the type of results I was looking for. There was only one interview where I found having multiple individuals present truly problematic. The one person did not allow the other individual(s) to speak and the one individual monopolized the interview. In this one interview, I did not receive the results or get the questions answered I had been hoping for.

Data Analysis

After transcribing, my process of data analysis followed a systemic path: I began by reading each transcript thoroughly and identifying key words from each statement, such as economic development, fishing and leadership. Strauss and Cobin ([1990] in Bryman, Bell and Teevan 2012:259) reference three types of coding. I utilized two (open and axial) of these types to develop key subthemes and primary themes to base my chapters on. This process consisted of making an extensive list of words coming out of each interview and assembling this in an excel document. I noted which words were repeated and how many times they were repeated. I tried to
make connections between words that have similar concepts and group them together (e.g. family, sharing, communication, coordination). The most discussed words (the top ten-to-thirty) were highlighted as being the critical topics of that interview. After each interview was processed and principal words identified, I imported highlighted words to an excel document that amalgamated all the interviews together. At this level I repeated the process of identifying the top key words. Through a process of elimination I eventually established the themes and subthemes for the results/discussion chapters, assuring that the data still related to my original thesis question.

I used colours and numbers for each theme and subtheme. I organized the transcripts based on these codes. My rationale is that although there are general questions I am trying to answer, if I do not systemically look for predominant themes, then I run the risk of too much bias in my research. What I mean is that if I do not analyze each interview and break it down in a systematic manner, I fear the themes I identify as being important will match what I think is significant and not necessarily what the group of participants are saying. For Shawn Wilson a systematic analysis is not holistic (2008:119). I disagree. I feel it is another measure of accountability, checking against my assumptions. I know that everything is interrelated (ibid.:69) in a Mi’kmaq society, and so it will be difficult to judge which ideas are more important, yet I do not feel coding will not weaken my work as an Indigenous researcher.

Each community has a number from one to thirteen, but I have kept this confidential. Each participant was given a number in the order of who was interviewed first. I spent consider time (months) deciding if I should give my participants aliases or keep them numerically-coded within the thesis text. The coding process is very technical and it may seem dehumanizing when I number the participants as opposed to giving aliases, but I feel an alias can be attached to how I
view or identify that person as being, and to me this breaches our relationship of trust. Identifying participants numerically better protects confidentiality and anonymity. Yet I realized that within this text, it could distract readers to see numerical names, so for easy readability I gave aliases. How I chose the aliases followed a logical format. I own a naming book. Each number would represent the order of letters in the alphabet (e.g. 1 is A, 2 is B, 3 is C, etc.). Based on the gender of the participant, I would select the first name listed for that letter. So for example, participant 01 was female. The first female A name in the book was Abigail. This became participant 01’s alias within the text of this thesis. The alias for all participants is as follows:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Candace</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Daisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Felipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Gabrielle</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Harold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Ina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nadine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the thesis text, I will use the following coding formula when I reference a statement within a transcript: NAME YEAR:XX:XX. The first XX references the page the statement can be found on and the second XX is the number of the statement segment.

**INSIDER/OUTSIDER RELATIONS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

I identified two areas of concern when conducting this work: potential mistrust towards me as an academic—suspicion based on the fact that I am an insider but also an outsider (Smith 1999:5) — and the risk of a power-relationship due to my role as researcher. In some instances individuals may be skeptical of me because the assumption can exist that a person who studied in the western system is no longer a person of the community; they are a bit of an outsider. Smith (1999) provides methods on how to approach this problem. She also explains that Indigenous researchers will be judged under different criteria than outsiders (e.g. family, status and politics)
and there is a deeply held view by Indigenous communities that Indigenous peoples are never good enough nor capable enough to do this work (ibid.:10). These biases can exist but in the end I decided that the only thing I could do is behave as only I know how, like Zabrina.

In terms of the issue of the researcher (me) in a position of authority, this can cause problems with research presentation, because researchers can knowingly and unknowingly be ethnocentric and represent/interpret the individuals they are working with. This position of authority can be especially problematic when engaging with youth, who can feel there is a definite power-imbalance (Apentiik & Parpart 2006; see also Kapoor 2004). Even though I am from the community, as the researcher I have to be hyper-aware that I do not represent the community (Smith 1999:139). I do not speak for the community and I cannot interpret their statements as I want them to be understood. It must be a collaborative relationship built on Indigenous philosophies and methodologies, meaning it has to be holistic and not a hierarchical relationship (Wilson 2008; Smith 1999). At the same time, the power relationship between researcher and researched community is not completely dissolved, but I can make the process more participatory.

Some individuals may also be worried that my genealogical positionality and my Mi’kmaq identity will create a conflict of interest, but I want to clearly state that there is NO conflict of interest (COI) in the Western sense, even for onlookers there may be a perceived conflict of interest. I am a Mi’kmaw. I am a member of a participant community, and relatives occupy various political, social and bureaucratic roles in the Mi’kmaq landscape. Despite my family affiliations, my research is not motivated by my family or by my specific community. None of the information I collected is on behalf of my family. My role is as an academic and a
researcher. Although I am hoping my thesis will benefit the Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq community at large, there is no specific benefit for my family or my community.

I have tried to engage as best as possible, but I have to be mindful that participatory methods are not perfect; they are not 100% participatory (Beazley & Ennew 2006:193-195). There will always be some type of power imbalance that will exist, particularly when interviews are conducted, as interviews can be one-sided (Willis 2006:150). At the same time, as an insider, I understand the culture, and different internal politics and relationships at play. I know our history and our challenges. Ultimately, it is still about creating a relationship of trust through openness with the communities and participants, and trying to be as accountable as possible.

Importantly, I also cannot romanticize communities or believe that there is one single community view. This is a reason why I aimed for my sample to have different demographic components. This helped to navigate this problem. I know that I am biased (Kapoor 2004; Desai & Potter 2006, Cervone 2007). To limit my personal biases, I kept notes and reflected to try to recognize any assumptions and to recognize any points where I try to represent and interpret the voices of community members.

RELATIONSHIPS

Current development theory states that the researcher needs to be conscious of their relations and must ensure accountability to their participant communities. However researchers have a number of groups they must be accountable to and often these groups can come in conflict with each other. Decidedly, researchers need to state where their priorities are aligned and account for why. Personally, there are a number of relationships I am accountable to. Although there may be other relationships I am overlooking, through this research process I am at a minimum accountable to chiefs and band councils, Elders, my family, my self, my community,
my school and last but not least the Creator. Most of these relationships are interconnected and so if I abide by the Mi’kmaq values of respect and reciprocity, there should be limited or no conflict.

My two primary source of guidance (spiritually, emotionally, physically) are the Creator and our Elders. For the times when that I need help with internal questions and stresses in my day-to-day life, I seek prayer. This is a critical part of my identity and I believe that it helps guide me to do the right things. Our Elders are our knowledge-keepers (Battiste 2004:10). They are vital to my research because it is these individuals who carry our traditions and for me their approval is one of the most important factors that define success. Receiving approval from my Elders is pivotal for me not just in this research, but in life.

It is extremely important that I be accountable and considerate to my chiefs and their band councils. Our chiefs are our elected leaders and I know their positions are very difficult. Some of these chiefs I have known since a child and I look up to them for their commitment to their communities. At the same time I am conscious of the weaknesses of the western system and the negative impacts this system has on our communities (see Alfred 2005). Some participants speak harshly of our leaders. It is in part because of these realities that I am embarking on this knowledge quest and I hope that our leadership understands that my heart is genuine.

If I am respecting my chiefs, Elders and Allah, then I am balancing my commitment to my family. Their (my family) expectations are that I work my hardest, I am committed, and I am kind, honest and diligent. On a personal level, I need to balance this academic work with family commitments, which I am not the best at doing. I am a bit of a hermit when I am doing schoolwork and so I need to re-instill balance in my life through socializing. Notably my family, especially my parents and husband, give me the energy to push forward when I am mentally burnt out, because it is their love and support that helps me.
Critically I must follow the direction of my participants: their words speak truths (see discussion of truths by Lovell 1990). It is not my place to appropriate their words, but merely to present them. I must be accountable to these participants and assure they are informed throughout the process - I want them in control of how their ideas are used. I have a deep appreciation to all those who were willing to speak to me. This is also why I feel it important to protect their identity. I do not want anyone to suffer repercussions for having an opinion. Autonomy is a central factor under our ontological understandings (Alfred 2005:39). I do not want anyone’s right to opinion to be infringed upon.

Overall I feel that by following these ways and by balancing these relationships, I can assure my commitment to the overall Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq community. I am not saying I am perfect, I am only trying to be conscious of my actions and trying to be respectful to everyone. I know that I will still encounter individuals who will criticize this work. I know this research will have limitations and that is expected, yet if I am doing my personal best to be respectful to all, that I cannot ask more of myself. For me, I am not on a mission to exploit Mi’kmaq communities – my commitment to the communities is greater than my ego (Wilson 2008:60). And my personal aspiration is to see success and long-term prosperity in our communities, so if I work as best as possible for our communities, I am also being true to myself. At times though, my morale will get weak as I push forward and exhaust myself to reach my deadlines and coordinate with all the actors involved, but I feel the stress and exhaustion is worth it if I do something I can be proud of.

Contacts and associations made in the field (or for me, at home) are not the only groups that impact a researcher’s positionality. Institutional contacts are another form. Despite the intense financial burden I am facing to conduct this investigation, I consciously chose to be unfunded. When funding is involved, a researcher has even greater obligations to that funder.
I did not want a western organization dictating how I must conduct research when they do not understand the Mi’kmaq way. At the same time I did not want the risk of a First Nation funder to state what slant or perspective I must take thus preventing me from trying to balance all the views of each individual and community involved. I did not want this work biased based on the interest of others. Lack of funding has been a significant stress factor for me, and it has been a large impetus behind completing this work within a prompt manner. Overall, I am a perfectionist and it is more important to do a quality job and stress about finances than sacrifice my reputation and professionalism. In relation to this point, I am overlooking one important relationship – my relationship to academia.

My academic commitment to my university can be at odds with my community relationships. Institutions (whether academic or organizational) have certain requirements that their researchers must fulfill. This will reflect the way a researcher conducts and presents their research; it can cause “spilt loyalty” (Kapoor 2004:103). I am conscious of my formal requirements, but I know that some of my decisions may conflict with western academia. For instance, I have chosen to use a qualitative Indigenous approach for my primary data collection. Under these methods I will not do anything to contradict my cultural values – these types of methods of non-western ideas of knowledge are dismissed or discredited by those western academics that believe dogmatically in fact and figure (Briggs & Sharp 2004; see Rigoberta Menchú controversy specifically Menchú 1984, and Stoll 1998). It can be hard for researchers like me that work with non-western populations, to have their research fully accepted by mainstream academia and its associated institutions and organizations. This problem becomes even greater when non-western cosmological ideas are put forth – many of these worldviews fundamentally clash with hegemonic western thought (Kapoor 2004; Briggs & Sharp 2004).
Fortunately, I am in a program and have a thesis committee that supports anti-hegemonic thought. Outside of this circle it is possible that academia may criticize my methods but I am okay with this. As long as I am being a good model for the Mi’kmaq people, then this is what matters most.

CLOSING WORDS

The act of research cannot be done haphazardly. Every decision is based on an assumption, bias or viewpoint, and every decision has an impact. Historically research has provided positive outcomes for the researcher, but negative outcomes for the participant communities. This relates in part to the epistemological core of research and its relationship to Development. The field of Development and the field of research are intrinsically Eurocentric – this Eurocentric nature affects all, even Indigenous researchers because they have been educated in this western system. In order to create processes that are more holistic and that benefit communities as opposed to oppress them, the processes must be based on Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies. Indigenous researchers should use local Indigenous methods if they are being true to their community and holistic in their practices. This is what I am trying to achieve within my methods, through my relationships and even though I will encounter ethical dilemmas, I will mitigate these problems as best as possible.
Chapter 4: Tradition and Relations

A number of factors influence identity, but we are especially framed by relationships, the landscape (space) we live in, and our culture. Looking at these factors enhances the basis for understanding how people behave and why. This chapter establishes the cosmological and theoretical viewpoints of the individuals I interviewed, thus providing an understanding of behaviour and practical needs discussed later. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss some of the factors influencing Mi’kmaq identity in order to determine our paradigm of thinking in context to nature, economic development and each other. What I will argue is that Mi’kmaq behaviour is changing, shifting towards more of an ethnocentric worldview, and as I will explain later, especially in chapter six, this type of shift devalues Mi’kmaq sustainability, success and holistic methods of natural resource management.

Section one discusses the concept of tradition and culture, loosely defining Mi’kmaq tradition, especially in the context of relationships and ecological knowledge. This enables one to understand how the Mi’kmaq relate to Mother Earth, and how this traditional knowledge influences relationships (human and non-human). It sets the stage for discussion on Mi’kmaq culture today. Section two will focus specifically on the concept of human relationships and representation currently and given that the Made-in-Nova Scotia Process is composed of all Mi’kmaw communities and its success is based on internal unity, this section provides perspectives on our challenges, illustrating that mainstream western thought is not only affecting the individual, but also the collective. The final section discusses communication and is in response to challenges identified in section two.
DEFINING TRADITION?

How do we define tradition? This was a question asked by Karl and Felipe. For instance, “traditional knowledge could be only maybe a couple of hundreds of years old, and for somebody else that could be longer” (Karl 2012:02:06). For Felipe, he said, “I really don’t know if there was a traditional way” (Felipe 2012:01:03). Discussing a concept like tradition can be very contentious. From an Indigenist perspective, I have to be wary not to box people into standardized descriptions, and this is what I think Felipe is trying to say. At the same time, as Karl explains, tradition is contextual. Accordingly, in this section I will first explain how I am using the term “tradition”. From this overarching definition, I will try to examine specifically what is Mi’kmaq tradition and how think tanks and leaders describe this point, before I present what participants said in association to those arguments.

I define tradition as the values and practices of a society historically. These values have carried forward today to define a group and/or a society’s identity. Often we describe these types of values as “culture”. Eric Hobsbawn defines tradition as a means of legitimizing, creating social cohesion and socialization (1983:9). This term, like community and ethnicity, can be problematic. It can be an ethnocentric tool to essentialize groups and create a static image of a people (see Anderson 1983; Barth 1998). An image of a society’s tradition can be used (internally and externally) to romanticize the people. This is not my intent. Rather, I use tradition interchangeably with the word culture. Though tradition and culture are “ambiguous” ideas, I am endeavouring to determine “cultural concepts, understandings, tolls and techniques [that] … tend to be general statements of principles” for how the Mi’kmaq manage the Earth and relate to each other (Royal Commission of Aboriginal Peoples [RCAP] 1996c:461). As Karl and Felipe were articulating, Mi’kmaq tradition, like culture, is not homogenous; rather it is fluid. Our
(Indigenous) practices change due to internal and external influence (Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues 2010 [SPFII] 2010:19). As the Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq Chiefs [ANSMC] explain, methods change over time with every generation (2007:6). Therein, I am trying to establish common values or “general statements of principle” to establish the basis of a Mi’kmaq identity to determine if such values still exist today. This ultimately will provide a basis for understanding how economic development and natural resource management correlate to traditional knowledge, a discussion that will be explored more in-depth in chapter six. I looked to participants to see what values they identified as our tradition and culture. Four overarching values were discussed consistently. These values speak broadly to Mi’kmaq cultural, social, political and environmental configurations.

**Value 1: Sharing And Reciprocity Between Humans**

In the past, relations between individuals, families and communities were based on reciprocity, civility and hospitality. They gave to each other and were “accepting [non-judgmental] of people” (Gabrielle 2012:08:31). As Lance explained, “Traditionally I think they would have helped each other. You know if I’m sitting here and I got a full moose and you got nothing, of course I’m gonna help you out. I’ll give you moose meat. You’re gonna help in ways you can” (Lance 2012:07:22). A similar image is depicted by explorers in historical testaments - “They [the Mi’kmaq] have courage, fidelity, generosity, and humanity, and their hospitality is so innate and praiseworthy” (Marc Lescarbot [1606] in Whitehead 1991:24). As an egalitarian society, the whole (the community) is placed ahead of the individual (ANSMC 2007:6; Kipuri 2009:52; Little Bear 2000:79; SPFII 2010:23; Sioui 1992:9). So for example, hospitality was so important it “could be carried to the point of self-impoverishment” (Dickason 2002:61).
Competition, in the liberal sense of individual gain, was not an inherent feature of Mi’kmaq culture historically.

**Value 2: Respect for The Universe**

**Value 3: Careful Utilization Of Resources**

Respect was not limited solely to human relations. The Mi’kmaq worldview is holistic and so respect and reciprocity is extended to non-human beings equally as it is humans (Daisy 2012:01:01; Abigail 2012:04:07; Lance 2012:01:01; Oliver 2012:01:01; Pamela 2012:02:07; see also United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues [UNPFII] 2008:2; Department of Economic and Social Affairs [DESA] 2009; Battiste 2004). Elder Harold provides a beautiful illustration of this understanding:

... boy those old timers, the old-timers like my father and them, mostly (pause). I don't know people like them today or not. You come along a brook or something, you couldn't do something like that, throw it [a rock] in the river or the lake or something. “what are you throwing that in there for, what are you going to do with that, throw it in there? You can’t throw that in there.” He [my father] said, “water is just like a spirit by itself. You look after it. You drink it. It will keep you clean. It will feed ya. But it will also take your life if you're not careful. So you have to look after water that way, you have to have a great respect for the water and the land.” When we were back in the woods with him too. You know how kids like to yell and holler, we couldn't do that with him too. He said, “you know” he said “animals, this is their home. We're coming back in here and all this noise.” He said, “suppose a little mouse was there, with little ones heard all this noise coming, she's got to move them hide them somewheres. We can't be making noise for them you know. You have to respect the animals that they are home.” The old Mi’kmaq belief was I own what I'm standing on. Once I move off of that a snake, well that's his land. A mouse could cross well that’s his land. We don't own the land. Nobody can own land. If you truly really want to own the land you have to kill every living thing on it, even the grass and stuff to really possess it but you can't do it. You know what I mean? (Harold 2012:04:08).
This is the basis of traditional (ecological) knowledge. This form of egalitarianism is not only recognized by participants, but is discussed by Indigenist and mainstream historians and scholars. Patricia Monture-Angus, Danny Paul and RCAP state that the concept of human domination over nature was not present (Monture-Angus 1995:231; Paul 2000:29; RCAP 1996b:633). Respect and offerings was given to beings for the gifts they had given (Battiste 1997:15). Under this philosophy, “available resources were open to all” (Dickason 2002:26). Everyone shared the resources and ensured it was available for all. Over consumption did not exist (Barsh 2002). Individuals only used what they needed and nothing more. At the same time, nothing was wasted.

**Value 4: Conservation In Times Of Hardship**

Often Indigenous societies are painted as living in “harmony with nature” (preserving nature), the noble savage using zero resources (see Asad 1973:263; Ferguson 1994:67; Li 2007:30; Mosse 2004:47; Porter 2010b). This romanticized image, we were not. It is necessary to make this point because the romanticized savage is a common mainstream development stereotype (see discussion by Li 2002:276; Li 2007:230; Sylvain 2002:1076; Matzeke & Nabane 1996:66). In contrast, the Mi’kmaq were a hunter-gatherer society, meaning we depended on the Earth’s resources for food and sustenance (Lance 2012:05:16; Abigail 2012:17:55; Jack 2012:10:36; Felipe 2012:01:03; Harold 2012:07:21; Oliver 2012:01:01; see also Dickason 2002:87). Hunting and fishing are factors of our traditional identity. We are deeply connected to the water and rely on its gifts for survival (Harold 2012:07:21; Lance 2012:0517; Karl 2012:28-29:37; Felipe 2012:01:03). Our application of this knowledge comes together in the Mi’kmaq concept *Netukulimk*.

*Netukulimk* implies the use of the natural gifts from the creator “for the self support and well-being of the individual and the community at large” (ANSMC 2007:6). This includes
personal and collective responsibility to Mother Earth. It is holistic philosophy that includes water and land use, and management (ibid.; see also RCAP 1996b:47). With such responsibility, we did have management practices. Russell Barsh explains in his research that the Mi’kmaq did not overhunt or overfish, and in times of (resource) scarcity they would naturally self-regulate (2002). The Mi’kmaq conservation philosophy is that all beings contribute to the circle of life and without all parts the balance of our ecosystem would be disrupted. This type of philosophy could be described as ecological stewardship. Different from western culture that has rules and laws (“external knowledge” as Little Bear describes), First Nation values and actions are naturally internalized in the subconscious, as a part of day-to-day living (Little Bear 2000:84).

These four values closely reflect Netukulimk therefore I argue that if a person follows these values, they are essentially practicing (Mi’kmaq) ecological stewardship. From the statements collected by participants, I also argue that these four values contribute to a Mi’kmaq identity. I understand that there are other values that can contribute to this identity. The values presented can also be worded and understood by different individuals in different ways. How one describes these values is not what is important it is the concepts and the substance within these values that are of importance (meaning respect, egalitarianism, reciprocity and collective well-being). These values feed into our strategies of natural resource management (to be discussed in the next two chapters) and support strategies discussed by Indigenous organizations (see ANSMC 2007) and academics (LaDuke 1994; Wuttunee 2004; Simpson 2001; Porter 2010a; Porter 2010b).

**Governance**

Our traditional political structure, though not discussed by participants, should also be introduced as it provides a perspective for comparison in the subsequent section. It also
introduces the role of Elders in the Mi’kmaq community. Our society was not divided in the same way as western society, meaning the public sphere and private sphere, social, economic and political realms were interconnected and there was no clear line distinguishing each part from the others. Value one discussed the importance of reciprocity and human relations socially. This extends to the polity. “Egalitarian societies did not separate authority from the whole”, meaning decision-making was based off of what was best for all, humans and non-humans alike (Dickason 2002:26). With this, “personal abilities translated into influence rather than coercive authority” (ibid.). Leaders truly acted and reflected the will of the people, lived life following our holistic values and were highly respected. Further, all individuals in the society “whether male or female, Elder or youth, [had] a unique gift or spark and a place in Mi’kmaq society. Each has a complementary role that enables communities to flourish in solidarity” (RCAP 1996b:47).

Our traditional territory, of what is now Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, parts of Quebec and Maine, was divided into seven districts (see Sable and Francis 2012:20). Each district, which represented hunting grounds divided between families, had a sakamow (chief). The seven districts formed the Santé Mawiomi (the Grand Council). The Grand Council, which still exists today, is compromised of kep’tinaq (captains) and the jisaqamow (Grand Chief). Historically, the Grand Council selected the leader of the småknis (warriors) and putús (special advisors, storytellers, and speakers) to advise them. Each district had an input, but the input most valued was that of our Elders. As Danny Paul explains, “the Elders, both male and female, were the most appreciated. The Mi’kmaq held them in the highest regard and accorded them the utmost respect” (2000:16). Importantly, decision-making was representative and inclusive of everyone.
THE MODERN-DAY INDIAN

As time changes, so does culture, tradition and inevitably identity. I argue that there is a distinct difference between a culture transforming over time, and a society’s identity assimilating into the dominant order. Globalization has challenged many minority and Indigenous populations, causing societies to transmute into imitations of mainstream western “pop” society. It is necessary to observe Mi’kmaq culture presently and compare it to the four pillars identified to determine the presence of traditional knowledge, and the possible repercussions when tradition is lost. The challenges presented in this section and the next will illustrate the negative impacts mainstream westernization (especially capitalism) has on the person and community. With that, this section will introduce two terms, Modern Day Indian and White Indian. These terms will be referenced throughout this work. In this section (and throughout this paper) I will argue that as our culture changes this will impact identity. Understandably, discussions of identity are controversial. With the information provided, it is up to the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq to discuss this question in greater detail and determine how, we, as a collective should define our identity today. Perhaps that outcome will not appease other groups and their definitions of identity, but it will be one that reflects our self-determination and our people.

The term “Modern-day Indian” is about the clash of Indigenous and Eurocentric worldviews. It was discussed by Abigail and Oliver, and discussed indirectly by Barry. This term relates to Little Bear’s term “jagged worldview” (2000:84). Little Bear and these participants directly, as well as indirectly through overall dialogue with each participant interviewed I think, are all trying to find a term to define our position in the Twenty First Century, to philosophically understand who we are as people and what is that identity. Participants discussed the Modern-Day Indian in two different ways. The first perception was how the Mi’kmaq apply traditional
values in a globalized society. It is the blending of ideas and cultural practices to be innovative and progressive (Oliver 2012:01:01; Abigail 2012:14:46; Harold 2012:02:04). It is the application of our tradition to current circumstances. This definition I think is truly fitting of the term “Modern-day Indian”. The second concept offered is more negative (Barry 2012:06:17). It implies a Eurocentric transformation of (some) Mi’kmaq. With this concept, traditional knowledge and Mi’kmaq cultural values are not a part of a person’s identity. This concept diverges from the former definition, so to differentiate between the two divergent viewpoints I will use the term White Indian when referencing this latter thought. These terms will be used as guideposts for analyzing identity, tradition, and land use today.

**Challenge 1: Language**

The Mi’kmaq have been impacted by western civilization. Colonialism and assimilative policies (to be discussed in the next chapter) are two factors negatively influencing our cultural and traditional practices. With globalization and technology, we are even more altered (see discussion on languages, RCAP 1996a:603). Newhouse identifies indicators under this “process of modernization” (2000:56). Some of these indicators include the adoption of the western bureaucratic system, the use of English as “lingua franca”, and the shift of knowledge from oral transmission to textual (ibid.). All of these shifts have happened in Mi’kmaq communities, and have, in varying ways, affected our culture and reduced tradition. For instance, participants feel Mi’kmaq language has been impacted. Language preservation is important because “that’s what happens first when a culture starts to lose itself, their way of communicating. So like, that was the way we communicated always through Mi’kmaq so if that’s gone, ok then we’ll communicate through English and then it’s just a matter of time before . . . assimilation” (Gabrielle 2012:17:73-74). Language is instrumental in the transmission of traditional knowledge and culture to the next
generation. It is intrinsic to understanding and relating to Mother Earth (Gabrielle 2012:07:27; see also RCAP 1996a:602). When these connections are lost and at the same time we start to adapt and incorporate different (non Mi’kmaq) values, can our identity be considered Mi’kmaq?

Participants feel there is (starting to be) a deterioration of our culture. Discussed by RCAP, “in deploring the loss of its ancestral language, an Aboriginal group may be deploring the loss of a symbol of its identity” (1996a:612). As Barry explains, “culture is not trying to preserve the nature at all for the community. It’s being forgotten . . . If we wanted to preserve our culture, we have to nurture nature first, and then we can figure it out after” (Barry 2012:20:73; see also Nadine 2012:07:02). When I asked Gabrielle this same question, how strong tradition, language and culture was in her community, her response was “I don’t think it’s that strong” (Gabrielle 2012:06:22). This is concerning because as Naomi Kipuri argues, language and nature are the two most important factors defining Indigenous cultures from western culture (RCAP 1996a:612). These indicators illustrate the impact the western “modernization process” has had on culture.

**Challenge 2: Technology And Challenge 3: Fear Of Nature**

As a holistic society we are one with Mother Earth. It becomes concerning when individuals speak of how some Mi’kmaw fear nature:

> We’d have kids playing in the woods, now they are afraid of the woods. A lot of kids I know they can’t see a road they don’t wanna go in. When I was growing up we never had streetlights, and here kids can’t even walk a couple hundred feet and they’re scared. So. I don’t know things are changing, and everything is changing, gotta have computers, gotta have flashlights, things, like that. (Barry 2012:3-4:08; see also Gabrielle 2012:04:12).

Technology, meaning material objects, creates a divide and disconnect. There are arguments in support of technology, globalization and the ways it has enhanced societies and how it has simplified processes of doing things (see Minde & Nilsen 2003; Jentoft 2003; Dei, Itall &
Rosenberg 2008). I am not critiquing these arguments or the application of technology in this way. Rather, based on the opinions of participants, I am critical of material objects and consumerism. This is the context in which I apply the term technology. This type of “technology bubble” causes individuals to be too focused on their gadgets and prevents them from maintaining relationships (Daisy 2012:04:14). Consumerism as understood by participants (see chapter six) is connected to greed and wealth accumulation. Consumerism has a negative side effect.

“Individuals need to stop doing things for themselves and for money. Think of the consequences” (Daisy 2012:02:03). According to Daisy, the consequence is an erosion of collective practices and dissolution of respect (Daisy 2012:04:14). As explained by Little Bear, individualism is an inherent aspect of western thinking (2000:82). Yet it is more than just this. It is not merely interest in accumulating wealth and objects over an interest in the land and the people, but for participants there is also an isolation of the individual from interactions with others.

**Challenge 4: Elders And Youth**

It was observed that the youth are most impacted by: (1) pop culture and (2) the loss of traditional knowledge. Speaking to the situation in her own community, Abigail stated “they [kids] don’t know much bout the culture and land, they have no respect for elders (laughs sarcastically), but also the land itself.” (Abigail 2012:14:47). According to Patricia Monture-Angus and RCAP, youth are the pillars of our future and so if societal values are not instilled in them, culture is lost (Monture Angus 1995:49; RCAP 1996a:23). With the statements of participants and based off arguments made by scholars like Monture-Angus and flowing from the RCAP report, cultural loss is something we should fear. The United Nations (UN) reported that the rate of erosion of traditional ecological/ environmental biodiversity-related knowledge has never been as high as in the current generation (see Department of Economic and Social Affairs
This supports the argument that westernization impacts culture and ecological knowledge, as well as supporting the results presented as challenges two and three. Arguably, based on the results presented thus far, for the Mi’kmaq, materialism, language loss and a separation from nature are components that can cause cultural erosion. I am not saying we are yet, as a nation, the White Indian, or that our ecological knowledge is lost. Yet the impression I get from participants is that relationships are not the same as before, and that traditions have lessened. Pivotal to addressing these problems, participants said, are our Elders.

Elders must be present and active. In Indigenous communities Elders teach values, traditional knowledge and behavior (Borrows 1997:454; RCAP 1996a:325). As presented in the last section on governance, our Elders are central societal figures. They are indispensable to healing in Indigenous communities. Marie Battiste explains “elders speak to spiritual connections at the core . . . these connections are the source of finding an ecological vision of Indigenous humanities” (2004:10). Our Elders are our educators (Oliver 2012:08:05; Nadine 2012:08:05; Madeline 2012:08:05; Lance 2012:12:43). Yet despite this information, for a variety of reasons participants feel Elders have a reduced role in most Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq communities (Felipe 2012:05:09; Ed 2012:05:10; Pamela 2012:18:58). Battiste describes this as an “eroded connection” (2004:10). Given how important Elders are to our society, I argue that Elders are needed to preserve culture and traditional knowledge.

I support this argument further: there are communities where our culture seems more intact. In these communities there is greater Elder participation, and a greater respect for our Elders (Karl 2012:25:33; Jack 2012:12:45). As Ina explained in her community, “if they [Elders] wanted chief and council to pay more attention to something – they’ll say it and Chief and Council will respect their wishes. Everyone really respects their Elders” (Ina 2012:13:46). In
these same communities cultural practices were regularly taught to the children (Candace 2012:09:15; Jack 2012:10:36; Ina 2012:11:38). Elders need to actively participate in the community and educate our youth in our cultural ways. “I think we should educate our kids because right now, I don’t think they are getting the education they really need if they want to preserve our way of life” (Barry 2012:11:39). To address the concerns with the youth population, we need to strengthen this Elder: youth relationship.

Addressing The Challenges

Based on the four identified challenges, assimilation, westernization, and globalization are in our face. Critically, though these observations present a dark reality, they do not denote bleakness. I base this argument not only on the data, but also from my own participant observation. This information does not present the entire social and cultural climates. I say this because even though participants have observed challenges, they each embrace our cultural values and try to incorporate these ideals into their daily practice. Further, we are able to discuss our culture; if it was fully lost, we could not identify values. We are all trying to reconcile how to apply these values in the Twenty-First Century and the frustration derives in that we do not want to lose touch with our traditional identity. I spoke to Lisa Young at Unama’ki Institute of Natural Resources (UINR) about the role of her organization:

We’re a Mi’kmaq natural resource management organization. When we think about promoting stewardship and environmental awareness we think of course about the link to our culture. Our cultural history tells us you’re supposed to be concerned about the environment and future generations, you’re supposed to be concerned about the welfare of not just yourself, but of all your relations . . . We’re not a cultural organization in that we are mandated to promote and sustain Mi’kmaq culture specifically, but by promoting our culture, we’re also promoting the idea of stewardship and responsibility, and so that’s the approach we take . . . but how many people actually practice that culture? . . . someone played devil’s advocate once and said
to me, we’ll you’re going around and trying to promote this First Nation perspective on natural resource management, but is that what it is today? Does it still exist? And I said ‘well what you asked me to do is contribute to the document the traditional perspective of Mi’kmaq culture. And that is it. That is our tradition. I’m not saying its actively practiced today by everyone, but that’s what it is. Right? It’s not lost, it’s still there” (L. Young, personal communication, March 25, 2013).

As I interpret her words and apply them to the general discussion, culture is not lost but the difficulty is in trying to achieve this cultural presence practically, in our daily lives, behaviour and actions. I argue that culture is not lost because our chiefs speak of it on the political stage. Secondly, organizations, like UINR and the Mi’kmaq Conservation Group (MCG) oratorically promote it, developing policies and programs to strengthen and revitalize traditional knowledge, stewardship and culture (please see MCG 2013; UINR 2013). Individuals can still criticize these people, arguing that they are not doing enough, but at the same time community members have to do their part. The Mi’kmaq are a collective society, and so in order for the society to thrive, every individual has to make a contribution (see more of this discussion in chapter six). Some may advocate that organizations and leaders have to do more, and the next section in this chapter will discuss this topic, yet under this point what I am trying to articulate is that Mi’kmaq organizations do exist with the mandate to protect and support Mi’kmaq traditional knowledge and Mother Earth, and so as long as the culture is being promoted it is not lost.

Despite the perspective just provided, community members (participants) presented challenges and these challenges need to be discussed by the Mi’kmaq, in our communities and by our leadership. Even with cultural activities, our traditions and culture have still been impacted. Our overall identity (even if it is only within certain demographics) is still shifting. Later in this work I will explain why such a shift is not healthy, productive or beneficial.
RELATIONS

Reciprocity and consideration of others are principal Mi’kmaq values and as a holistic society, community benefit overrides individual desire. With the impact of westernization on the individual, this will influence the collective as well. Westernization and ethnocentricization can, and is, impacting representation and the decision-making process. Participants observed a number of internal challenges in the current political and socio-economic climates. This section will present these challenges and argue that if un-discussed or not addressed, these issues will impact aggregate management, coordination and harmonization. Our unity is what gives us an advantage when dealing with the state and has enabled us to get the point of self-governance discussions that we are at. As stated in the introduction of this thesis, our unity is derived in part from our unique geographical positioning; we are the only tribe in our jurisdiction. There are opponents to the Made-in-Nova Scotia Process and so they may say we are not unified or that our positioning is not strong with the state. This is a matter of having different perspectives, insights and experiences.

**Challenge 1: Overrepresentation**

Many participants feel coordination within communities and between communities is weakened (Daisy 2012:06:19; Lance 2012:13:49; Harold 2012:18:50; Abigail 2012:18:58). I feel this is due, first, to the very complex political and bureaucratic environment we operate in. In some instances the same organizations provide overlapping services. In other cases, different services are provided by different organizations and it is impossible even for those working within the system to sometimes grasp what the differences are, or in some instances organizations overstep their roles and responsibilities and impede the role of another organization. Point blank,
there are a lot of organizations providing services to such a small population\(^7\). Part of the overlap is due to a geographical divide. Some of the same services are delivered by different organizations in Unama’ki and the Mainland (Jack 2012:15:58; Daisy 2012:03:07). For instance we have two tribal councils – the Confederacy of Mainland Mi’kmaq (CMM) and the Union of Nova Scotia Indians (UNSI). In Unama’ki the communities have good working relationships, thus ensuring solidarity (Candace 2012:21:52). Yet the level of unity does not extend province wide. “Cape Breton is very strong, their communities are very strong. I find that we don’t have that communication in the mainland” (Abigail 2012:18:58). Geographically, mainland communities are more spread out, and not all mainland communities are unified by language and culture in the same way as Unama’ki (Karl 2012:17:27). This creates challenges for communication (Lance 2012:14:57). Geographical animosity is not productive.

**Challenge 2: Community Independence**

Two overall factors define community independence. The first issue identified by participants is that individuals are advocating solely on the behalf of their community. The second issue is absence and unwillingness to share information. With the first issue, in some instances participants feel the larger or (economically) stronger communities have greater control over decision-making processes. “Big communities are spokespersons for us. They have more power . . . Power meaning resources and economic development.” (Daisy 2012:03:06). Secondly, generally communities do not share wealth or distribute money to the communities most in need (see Lance 2012:13:50-51; Karl 2012:15:22). “All communities should work together . . . We need to look past differences and see similarities. XXX and XXX, why can’t they help the other

\(^7\) There are approximately 15,000 registered “Status Indians” to bands in Nova Scotia, less than two percent of the overall population in Nova Scotia (Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch N.D.). There are at least fifteen different organizations that provide an array of legal, social, political, economic and environmental services to Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq.
communities? We should take the native approach – share, not more is better” (Daisy 2012:03:07). There is a lack of uniformity in the sense that consensus is not always present.

What is the basis of this band individualism? I largely relate it to poverty for the following reasons: First Nations are living in greater poverty than non-natives. According to the Human Development Index (HDI), Canada is currently ranked eleventh in the world (please see MCG 2012; UINR 2013; United Nations Development Programme [UNDP] 2013), while Aboriginals were ranked thirty-second in 2001 (Carino 2009:23). We are not living under equal standards to other Canadians. Even the more economically prosperous communities are contending with health care needs (e.g. diabetes, overcrowding), lack of employment and low education levels. The government does not provide enough support to ensure that communities can function fully. Without thriving economies (see the next two chapters) we are forced to think about our personal needs. With this, the chiefs are elected to represent their specific communities, so when they go out, this is what they do, they look out for their reserve, which given our socio-economic situation and the divide and conquer philosophy this is what survival is in the capitalist sense (carrying for one’s own wellbeing).

Mistrust has impacted relations (Candace 2012:24-25:66) between communities and within communities. Money and resources are not the only subjects of discussion. Information and knowledge is not shared. There is this feeling that “if you share it they might want to steal it, and you know they’re gonna get above you or advance you.” (Jack 2012:19:71). To explain Jack and other participants, communities are apprehensive to share knowledge (e.g. fishing techniques)

---

8 According to the 2006 census, the unemployment rate for Aboriginals is higher than the unemployment rate for all Nova Scotians (9.1%), unemployment on reserves is almost 25%. Further 27% of Aboriginals have not completed high school (versus 19% of the overall population in the province) and only 12% of Aboriginals have a university degree, which is less than 20% for the general population (Office of Aboriginal Affairs 2013).
because maybe the other community will have more success. With the lack of wealth distribution, communities may feel jealous of the economic prosperity of those they have helped, they may want money shared with them or they may feel that the knowledge they can give will take from their competitive edge.

At the personal level, within communities, community members do not trust specialists, like fishery guardians. “No matter what you say or do, you still have individuals out there that don’t believe in what you say. They won’t follow you, but not like follow you. They won’t obey the rules . . . That’s what it is – mistrust.” (Jack 2012:15:58). For instance, “we tell people they can’t fish like salmon in the rivers around here because there’s not enough salmon to replenish themselves, but they ‘oh they’re just taking orders from DFO’ [Department of Fisheries] or whatever. The problem is there’s not enough fish.” (Ed 2012:10-11:26). It is commonly viewed that individuals work for their personal benefit. Such behaviour, whether true or not, is not a recognized Mi’kmaq value. Participants relate this to behaviour to systemic oppression. As Karl explains, “the divide and conquer concept works well, dealing with that small groups of people and we’re losing the strength” (Karl 2012:15:23). Based on this information, poverty and systemic oppression creates liberal individualism.

**Challenge 3: Western Hierarchy**

Western hierarchy enhances mistrust in First Nation communities. In the western system, knowledge and specialization are ranked in terms of prestige. It is a class structure (Little Bear 2000:82) where individuals with the greatest prestige (e.g. chiefs) are the only ones that people want to engage with. The western system prefers to speak to those they consider at the top of the pyramid and not to others, even our specialists:

> With non-natives they have this hierarchical system, with top and bottom, and if they consider you not to be near the top or
even if you’re equal, but you’re not above them, they ignore you completely. They only want to talk to the chief or someone else. You know? They don’t really care what anyone else says and their the same with among each other, but that’s their culture. Usually, what I was taught among with our people, everybody’s E\textit{QUAL} even though one might have a better job than another person . . . you go to a lot of these meetings we go to they won’t tell you, they’ll ignore you completely. (Ed 2012:09:05).

In connection, I argue that the system (not the people) is the problem. As discussed by many development theorists this type of practice is exclusionary (see Ferguson 1994:193; Hayden 2003:368; Igoe 2005:117; Li 2007:139; Matzeke & Nabane 1996:67; Mosse 2004:83). As David Mosse explains, hierarchical relationships delegitimize local (Mi’kmaq) specialists and local cultural practices (2004:83). Academics in development discourse explain that such behavior can cause or exacerbate internal tensions (Li 2007:83: Shiva 1991a:82). With the challenges discussed thus far and with more data to be presented in this and the following two chapters, the case in Nova Scotia supports these claims.

\textbf{Challenge 4: Frustration With Leadership}

Some of the participants expressed dissatisfaction with the chiefs. In addition to the lack of wealth and benefits’ sharing between communities, some participants, like Felipe, argued that our chiefs are greedy, keeping wealth and not distributing it to the people in the bands: “… those that control or those that are in power, should be the ones to be leading, leading our resource management and trying to teach our traditional ways, but it seems those that are in power and those that have money . . . these are the ones that are abusing the system” (Felipe 2012:04:08). In correlation to challenge three, I argue in response that our leaders do not always appear to represent communities because the hierarchical structure of western bureaucracy prevents egalitarian practices of representation. For Paul Nadasdy, bureaucratization (the dominant order) “forces [us] to accept, at least implicitly, a set of Euro-Canadian values and assumptions that
constrain the ways in which it is possible to think and act” (2005:226). Personally, I think anger should be aimed at the system and not at individuals. The comments of Pamela, Candace and Gabrielle further illustrate that the system is at fault and not individuals.

Gabrielle (2012:3:7), Candace (2012:11:16) and Pamela asserted that our chiefs are working for our culture and communities. Why do their opinions differ from others? Two of these women work in positions that interact daily with the chiefs. These women witness the chiefs as advocates of the Mi’kmaq and as representatives of their culture. These women are also privy to the challenges the western system creates. Western bureaucracy is complex, slow and complicated. Nothing is instantaneous. I make this statement because I have worked in the bureaucratic system for eight years. It does not make me an authority, but I certainly do have experiencing working in it and dealing with it. The difference between these women and the rest of the population is information. The women, like myself, have access to inside information.

There is a huge communication gap between the leadership and the community members. THAT I think is just lack of capacity. Not only capacity to make that communication flow well, but the chiefs are dealing with community issues but they are also expected to be away from their community a lot to deal with leadership issues. Not always does that information get back to the community members in a form that they are able to contribute and understand.” (Pamela 2012:05-06:13).

An information dissemination gap is what I target as being the reason why my views along with the women just discussed may differ from other Indigenous peoples or individuals observing our society from the outside. Communication is an important problem that needs to be addressed.

**COMMUNICATION**

The information gap was not only recognized by me, but by many participants. Many participants supported the need for a communication strategy. This section discusses these results. Information dissemination is only one piece of the communication strategy. The second aspect
must focus on bridging relationships and enhancing solidarity and coordination. We need to reinforce that we are all L’nu. In some ways this is already happening (Candace 2012:24:64) through conferences (Jack 2012:10:69), pow-wows (Ina 2012:10:69), Mawiomi (gatherings) and the summer games (Gabrielle 2012:20:91). There needs to be greater opportunities for a genuine sharing of ideas (Jack 2012:10:69), where individuals can interact socially and dialogue personally. “Let’s move forward, get this stuff done . . . Like it all comes down to the right personalities, and the right people at the table. If you have one person that is just gonna drag everyone down then it’s not gonna happen” (Candace 22012:05:65). With that, communication strategies will not work if individuals do not consciously recognize the challenges discussed and work to over come it. As participants observed, and from personal experience, when people are negative, there will be no change, at least in the sphere of relations and work. To say that we need to overcome mistrust, individualism, disaggregation, and that we need to enhance traditional values of sharing and support is quite obvious. I understand that articulating an argument is seemingly easier than turning that argument into action. The challenge is to find a method(s) that assures information is being seen, understood, that there are individuals working in the communication field, and that individuals are being brought together and truly valued for their contribution.

CONCLUSION

We have a holistic culture that is based on relationships; this culture supports cyclical development. Our cultural values define our traditions and create Mi’kmaq identity. Importantly, this identity is not a homogenous model. Our traditional practices give us tools for living on this planet, amongst each other and with Mother Earth. Tradition is constantly changing, so the methods of application (of our values) will change over time. In the Twenty First Century, as long
as these values are present, the Mi’kmaq identity will be present in the Modern Day Indian. When these values are absent, when culture, nature, and relations are not supported, what is our identity? Are we still Mi’kmaq? Things are happening that is worrisome. Our language is reduced, our Elders and the land are not always respected, we do not give like we used to or share. The unity, individually and collectively, is not the same. It could be stronger. We have to react and be proactive especially with our youth. If our culture is lost with them then is it lost forever? Our youth follow by example. Our communities have to work together; we have to encourage cultural practice. We do this by reducing competition. Divide and conquer is hurting us. Poverty and oppression is reducing our cultural values. The absence of these values is worrisome when discussing care for Mother Earth and relations between individuals and communities. We just need to remember who we are. We are one nation. We are Mi’kmaq.
Chapter 5: Zones of Influence

Resource management speaks to control over decision-making processes and access to physical space (territory). It is about what “zones” we as First Nations can influence and it is about understanding why this influence is so critical. In the previous chapter I argued that Mi’kmaq identity, culture, knowledge and relations have all been impacted by the west, and I presented some of the challenges as a result of the impact. This chapter aims to give greater context for understanding this shift. Overall, this chapter looks at the topic of control and influence because land use and natural resource management speak to access and rights. In their interviews many participants discussed dependency and control as factors influencing and impacting true implementation of FNNRM. This chapter is framed around these results. This chapter aims to further illustrate the impact the west had and still has on the Mi’kmaq. It asks how has the west influenced us and how can we influence it? The questions asked were based around natural resource management, but the responses connect to power and decision-making overall.

In order to make my argument I break this chapter into three main sections. The first section is about loss. It sets the ground in order to understand participant statements about dependency and to give a greater understanding of the challenges discussed earlier. FNNRM is important to Indigenous peoples, but why? This section is all about our loss of self-determination. Please note that for the scope of this paper, there are a number of historical details and outcomes that will be omitted. I will only touch on those aspects that are the most significant to FNNRM. Section two is about gain. It establishes the theoretical importance of FNNRM. Although it may appear I am already responding to my broad research questions, I am not. This section only
means to examine FNNRM. In development, a blueprint or plan is created to address a problem. This is what I am doing, presenting the blueprint to the problems in section one. Once I present this “plan,” section three will discuss quickly what is the situation in Nova Scotia with natural resource management and will lead to section four where I present participants’ discussions on some of the practical limitations we face in context to the state. These results are revealing as they give relevance to the motivation behind First Nation requirements for economic development. Working with their results, I discuss the concept of control and start to engage more with the discussion on economic development, capitalism and neoliberalism. In chapter six I will eventually argue against western capitalism. Chapter five sets this groundwork.

OUR COLONIAL HISTORY

First Nation management of natural resources is important for re-strengthening communities and ecosystems. As Special Rapporteur Stavenhagen states, these spaces have become damaged due to the effects of oppression and colonialism, leading us “into destitution, deprivation and dependency” (2004:2). This section will rely on the works of historians to provide the historical understanding that is needed to give context around participants’ statements.

The Mi’kmaq first had contact with the Norse in 1000 A.D (Francis et al. 2006:16; Wien 1986:1), and later the French (in the 1500s) and the English (Mahaffie Jr. 2003:136-137). A strong trading relationship was established with the French, it impacted traditional ways of living and created dependency: the Mi’kmaq adapted their living practices so that they could engage in the fur-trade industry. Instead of living over half the year on the coast, they spent the majority of their time inland. They no longer had the food they gathered in the summer to live off of in the winter. Instead, they were dependent on dried foods from the French (Francis et al. 2006:33). By
the time the British took control, the fur trade had caused significant natural resource depletion; the resources the Mi’kmaq depended on for survival were, for the most part, gone (Reid 1995:42; Wright 2004:1196) This created a greater dependency on others for survival.

When the British arrived in Nova Scotia they saw a land of uninhabited wilderness. In their perception, the Mi’kmaq had no claims to ownership because they were transient (Reid 1995:31-32). The land was *terra nullius*. The British were influenced by Lockean property theory, where unused or unfarmed land is considered wasted (Porter 2010b:56); humans have a duty to work the land and assure their self-interest and survival (ibid.). This cosmological difference between the British and the Mi’kmaq served as an exclusionary tool. Given that the Mi’kmaq did not think like the British, they were seen as the “Other”. The west uses the Other to establish their superiority (Neumann 1997:567; Said 1978:1) The practices and culture of the “Other” is devalued and undermined (Said 1978:3). Edward Said discusses this concept of the “Other” in relation to Orientalism, but his argument applies in this context as well, as the British utilized the representation of the “Other” to develop policies to marginalize and oppress the Mi’kmaq. This prejudice advanced dependency.

Poverty, a lack of economic opportunity, the reserve system, and the *Indian Act* are some factors that caused British dependency. With the complete defeat of the French, the Mi’kmaq no longer had their trading partner they could depend on for aid (Paul 2000:182; Plank 2001:109). Unwelcomed and unliked by the British (Dickason 2002:206; Miller 2004:260; Paul 2000:73; Plank 2001:123; Reid 1995:59; Geisner [1847:25-26] in Whitehead 1991:151-152) the Mi’kmaq were largely blocked from making contributions to the British settler economy (Wien 1986:14; Paul 2000:167). In turn, by the late 1800s, the Mi’kmaq were living in poverty, badly malnourished and almost nearing extinction (Paul 2000:189-90; Wien 1986:14; Dickason
Although the Canadian state started to deliver support to the Mi’kmaq, it did not include economic opportunities or enable self-sufficiency. Instead we were placed on reserves, where lack of resources and food created an even greater dependency on the state.

The British issued acts of land allocation to the Mi’kmaq in the early 1800s, but consistently non-native squatters invaded (Dickason 2002:206-207; Paul 2000:179). It was not until 1859 with “An Act Concerning Indian Reserves” that the Mi’kmaq were sincerely given land (Dickason 2002:207). The land was limited, often poor and was a means to separate Amerindians from the general public (Paul 2000:180; RCAP 1996b:494). As Abigail explains, “they didn’t give us much land, and when they did put the First Nations on land, they put them on some of the worse land in Nova Scotia” (Abigail 2012:12:38). The premise was to isolate the savage. “Governmental officials saw the reserves as training grounds for entrance into the larger society” (Francis et al. 2006:265). According to RCAP, reserves (relocation) have impacted our relationship to land, environment and culture (1996b:490) altering social structures (ibid.:502), and also transforming economies due to loss of resources or limited access to resources and causing isolation from settlement areas and employment (ibid.:494). This produced economic dependency and supported trusteeship.

Dependency was strengthened through the Indian Act. As the “Other”, we were not given equal rights as the rest of Canadians. First Nations were viewed legally under the Indian Act “as minors or special wards of the Crown without citizenship privileges” (Francis et al. 2006:265). As Pamela explains, “that whole fiduciary duty, I think has put the Mi’kmaq people in (pause) in an unfortunate position. I think that’s limited. I think it’s been limiting. (Pamela 2012:11-12:36).

Three other participants (Harold 2012:09:26; Abigail 2012:10:27; Karl 2012:04-05:07) share these same sentiments. Below are some of their observations:
You look at how did we get to this point that we are so dependent on the federal government. What was the process that made that happen from two hundred and sixty years ago, when some of the first Peace and Friendship treaties were signed, which assured certain things will be enshrined for First Nations to make sure they have their livelihoods in tact. And so somehow that all got twisted around and thrown into this big pot under this federal legislation and it kinda came out the other end like processed meat (small laugh), came out the other end all meshed together in forms of social assistance all this other stuff (Karl 2012:04-05:07).

The government’s been supporting us, and now a lot of people just continued onto the next generation for the last fifty years. And you know, when they started giving out blankets and sugar and things like this, that helped the natives, but then there became a dependence. Now a lot of them just depend on the income they get from the band and they don’t go out and participate and try to maintain even heat in their house (Abigail 2012:10:27).

To summarize, dependency created in the colonial era continues to impact Mi’kmaq communities today.

Contact has also caused a loss of culture. According to Neva Collings, dispossession or forced removal from traditional lands and sacred sites has eroded the relationship between Indigenous peoples and their environment (2009:94). What are some examples of this loss? As discussed in chapter four, cultural loss impacts our identity and our wellbeing. Changes to traditional living practices and alcoholism did cause some cultural breakdown but the most significant and invasive has been the residential school system. In fact it has been labeled by the Aboriginal Healing Foundation (AHF) as “one of the most damaging and destructive forms of assimilation strategies in the history of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal relations” (2006:60). Its effects have had a generational impact extending up to today. Residential schools ultimately resulted in a cultural genocide of Canada’s Aboriginal nations. The effects of these schools are extensive, resulting in a loss of cultural and personal identity, as well as feelings of inferiority. In
many cases the effects of residential schools are the roots of several social problems, including our relations with Mother Earth. FNNRM is one of the remedies to our situation. Section two will discuss this.

FIRST NATION NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

This section will provide the broad concept of FNNRM from the perspective of (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) planners and developers, and relate it to the statements made by participants. It argues that natural resource management is an important tool for re-building and re-strengthening communities and counter-acting the effects of colonialism. Through a triangulation of data, a consistent position is given. Absent from the discussion is how this can work practically in a western democratic setting (see next section) and how it relates and works practically in Nova Scotia (see next chapter).

As said by Naomi Kipuri, Collings, and UNPFII members, without access to land, the survival of Indigenous peoples cultures is threatened (Collings 2009:95; Kipuri 2009:54; UNPFII 2007:2-3). In Special Rapporteur Stavenhagen’s report on Canada, “obtaining guaranteed free access to traditional land-based subsistence activities such as forestry, hunting and fishing remains a principle objective of Aboriginal peoples to fully enjoy their human rights” (2004:2-3). In the last chapter I argued traditional knowledge, identity, relations and Mother Earth are all connected. According to Kipuri, these concepts are all “directly linked to the concept of self-determination” (2009:65; also International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs [IWGIA] 2012:13). Based on these opinions, FNNRM supports identity and strengthens culture.

It also enables us to develop economies and provides our own control of our income and sustenance (see Jack 2012:04:13). To explain, access to land and the ability to benefits from these lands will reduce the disparities between the general public and First Nations, and the lack of
recognition of this right “is probably the main obstacle to real economic development among First Nations” (Stavenhagen 2004:26). Thus, when governments sincerely engage First Nations in the management of the resources, it supports self-sufficiency and true recognition of Indigenous rights (Dorough 2009:192). However, economic development framed by neoliberal concepts is still damaging. In the next chapter, I will argue that these economies need to be truly based on our cultural values to eradicate dependency and to ensure wellbeing.

A third benefit of FNNRM is that Indigenous techniques support ecological well-being. For Carino, Nadasdy and LaDuke, FNNRM is important for protecting biodiversity, as it ensures ecological sustainability for all (Carino 2009:42; Nadasdy 2005:215-216; Laduke 1994). For FNNRM to benefit all communities, management practices cannot be confined to the reserve, but must also influence non-native zones of control. Despite the advantages of First Nation natural resource management, practical implementation is difficult. Realistically, there are internal limitations (to discuss in the next chapter) and limits to what zones we can influence. The section four will discuss this latter point, but first I will divert and explain to-date the Mi’kmaq journey to FNNRM and self-governance.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: DISPUTES AND THE ROAD TO RECOGNITION

The Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia have not yet achieved full recognition of title and treaty rights from the Crown. We are in the process of moving towards implementation, but the road is slow. This section will explain the current situation in Nova Scotia in terms of natural resource management and rights.

Under the Indian Act, First Nations are wards of the state. Historically, this colonial legislation has enabled the Crown control over our territories with no engagement with First Nations in Nova Scotia and little or no flow of benefits to the people and communities. Further,
the state did not recognize our rights under the *Peace and Friendship Treaties*. In 1973 and in 1976, the Union of Nova Scotia Indians (and the Grand Council in 1976) submitted claims to the Province of Nova Scotia and later to Canada asserting our right to hunt and fish (Mi’kmaq Rights Initiative [MRI]:N.D.). These claims were rejected. In 1990 in the case of *Denny, Paul and Sylliboy*, the Nova Scotia Court of Appeals deemed that the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia have a right to fish for food, and this right was protected under section 35(1) of the *Constitution Act, 1982*. Later, even though the *Marshall* decision affirms Mi’kmaq rights to fish, the implementation of these rights have not yet happened (see Barsh 2002). Throughout the Twentieth Century, the Mi’kmaq have been vocal about treaty and title rights. Protests have ensued and it has not been without violence, especially in the time period surrounding Marshall. To avoid such dispute, the Made-in-Nova Scotia Process is the forum where the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia, Canada and the Province resolve issues related to Mi’kmaq treaty rights, Aboriginal title and Mi’kmaq governance. Through this process, a Framework Agreement was signed in 2007 that sets the process for negotiation. The goal is to work towards a final accord for the implementation of these rights. It does not mean that parties cannot leave the table or that individuals cannot be taken to court.

Currently, there is a consultation process in place for any government or proponent activity that impacts natural resources, the land, our culture, identity, language and education. There is a *Terms of Reference* in place, and the *Mi’kmaq Ecological Knowledge Study Protocol* (MEKS) explains the process and procedures that should take place when any research or work will impact us. Significantly, the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia affirmed our nationhood over the land and waterways in 2008 when the thirteen chiefs signed the Nationhood Proclamation (Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia Nationhood 2008). Our chiefs are working for the implementation of our rights.
and to prevent further theft of the resources. As explained in the last chapter, fishing and hunting are very important to the Mi’kmaq historically (and today), but stewardship is not limited to these resources only – the Mi’kmaq protect all of Mother Earth; as Chief Gerard Julian iterated, “our primary concern is to ensure that our lands and waters are protected” (MRI 26 June 2013; see also MRI 2 May 2013; MRI 28 April 2011). The Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia have not yet achieved FNNRM, but they are working diligently for full recognition and are vocal when consultation and engagement does not occur.

**CHALLENGES PREVENTING INDIGENOUS MANAGEMENT**

First Nations have a number of hurdles to overcome before we can successfully manage the resources the way we want to. This section is intended to give a greater understanding as to why the Mi’kmaq road to recognition is slow. There are technically formal documents in place that establish our rights. In Canada there are historic agreements like *the Royal Proclamation* (Office of Aboriginal Affairs 2013; Statistics Canada 2009) and the *Peace and Friendship Treaties* (RCAP 1996b:720-725; Peace and Friendship Treaty 1752; Peace and Friendship Treaty 1760-61), government legislation like the *Constitution Act, 1982* (*Constitution Act 1982*: s 35) and supreme court decisions (R v. Marshall 1999; Haida Nation v. B.C. [Minister of Forests] 2004; Taku River Tlingit First Nation v. B.C. 2004; Mikisew Cree First Nation v. Canada 2005) iterating the rights of the Mi’kmaq (and other First Nations) in Canada. This is in addition to the agreements signed by parties under the Made-in-Nova Scotia Process (Umbrella Agreement 2002; Framework Agreement 2007; Terms of Reference 2010). Our rights are also fortified in international documents (International Labour Organization 1989; UN General Assembly 1948; United Nations 2008). Formally, each of these documents and/or decisions support First Nation involvement in natural resource management.
The Crown only consults on issues of little importance or little significance to the Crown and its proponents. One may question this statement given that the state has a legal duty to consult with the Mi’kmaq on issues related to treaty rights, governance and title, but this is not enforced and interpretation is vague (Newman 2009). Specifically, participants feel consultation is more engaged when it does not impact public opinion or state economic wealth. It is a case-by-case scenario (Candace 2012:17:38). The level of involvement we have on an issue is based on how important it is to the Crown, and if it is important to them, the formal documents are overlooked (ibid.). Secondly, involvement is not always meaningful or truly participatory (ibid.:43; Nadasdy 2005:215-216). Despite our rights to the land, our inherent connection to it and the value our management techniques could provide overall, the government continues to reject these rights and limit our access. “There are no signs that attitudes/perspectives within the Canadian government has fundamentally changed. The government continues to put forward positions that undermine the meaning and effect of the UNDRIP” (IWGIA 2012:50; see also Porter 2010:22). This is a form of neocolonialism.

We face this conflict because natural resource exploitation provides significant revenue to the Crown. It supports state economic growth. According to Kipuri, land is one of the most contentious issues we (Indigenous peoples) have to struggle over (2009:54). For Porter, “land use planning was the principle instrument of state control of land, and therefore of state rule and economic growth . . . in the context of settler states this has meant that planning has been, and remains, integrally involved in dispossession” (2010b:51). Special Rapporteur Stavenhagen reported, “the uneven negotiating power between the parties tends to tilt the balance in favour of the interests of the federal or provincial governments. This is especially true for the long-term extinguishment of Aboriginal rights to land and resources” (2004:8). James Ferguson explains
why this happens. His argument is that development is anti-political (1994). My interpretation is that solutions meant to address inequalities never work because they never address the power relation between beneficiaries (e.g. the Mi’kmaw) and donors/funders (e.g. the Crown), and these donors do not (or cannot) address this problem. Based on all this information and the data to follow, I argue that Crown control limits implementation, and we will not have FNNRM unless we find a way to get control and power.

The Mi’kmaw do not have control. Power is in the hands of the Crown. Ed cited lack of control as the greatest challenge for Mi’kmaw of Nova Scotia (Ed 2012:07:19; see also Gabrielle 2012:07:45-46). As Elder Harold stated, “it’s almost impossible for us to do (First Nation management), because the non-natives have got control and we have no control. As long as they have control, they can do with it [the land] what they want” (Harold 2012:06:17). He is implying that this control enables governments to behave as they like, behaving like dishonest dictators, doing as they wish, despite their legal obligations.

Individuals like Tom Flanagan (2008) and Melvin Smith (1995) may contest my argument and say that it is not an issue of control, but of democracy. The basis of democracy in the simplest sense is the common good, or the will of the people (Mintz, Close and Croci 2006:79). In Canada’s representative democracy that typically translates to majority rule, the government looks to what the general Canadian public would support. But in a western democracy, power can be achieved in another way. Power and control in a liberal society – as participants have witnessed – more likely means economic and monetary strength. According to Mintz and colleagues, “the liberal ideal, particularly in its classic form of favouring the free market, does not necessarily challenge the concentration of economic and social power in the hands of a few” (ibid.:85). The philosophies of classic liberal Adam Smith (Heilbronner 1999), and
neoliberals like Milton Friedman (1962) and Fredrich Hayek (1948) very much fall under this statement. With this, my interpretation and how I understand the words of Mintz, Close and Croci is to mean that realistically, decision-making is limited to those with money (see also Daisy 2012:03:04; Karl 2012:06:02). “Whoever has the most power, the most dollars they’re the ones that get listen to” (Oliver 2012:11:10). Similar to arguments I present, Porter states that Indigenous peoples are not seen as partners or the original inhabitants of this territory, but are only recognized as stakeholders (2010a). This concept (of stakeholders) is very capitalist and neoliberal. Under neoliberalism, as a stakeholder, our opinions and needs are based off how great a percentage of a claim we have. This is based on the level of importance each case is to the state. The more interested (meaning economically endowed) partners involved, the more our rights are cast to the side. This is how I think the Crown recognizes authority and how they base engagement with First Nations.

A third argument is that Indigenous peoples concept of natural resource management creates an ontological struggle to western concepts of natural resource management. According to Arturo Escobar, Indigenous traditional knowledge “[has] the potential to denaturalize the hegemonic dualisms on which the liberal order is founded” (2008:1). Escobar’s statement was intended for the Indigenous Peoples in Latin America, but it is still very much valid in Canada.

Land control is a contentious subject of discussion because what we theoretically propose to do with the land and how we see land fundamentally contradicts western (Lockean) land management, as our attitude is not to exploit and deplete. This third argument is valid. Theoretical FNNRM challenges the dominant order and its economic nature. If on the ground the Mi’kmaq base natural resource management and economic development on Mi’kmaq traditional values
First Nation management of natural resources is difficult given the current situation, our lack of power and control (Ed 2012:03:06; Harold 2012:06:17; Gabrielle 2012:07:45-46). Currently, most Amerindian communities do not have the funds. How do we get it? As the next chapter will discuss, many participants feel economic development is a prerequisite to sustainable communities. Therein, I argue that economic development is not only an important component in relation to access and development of natural resources, BUT it is needed to achieve control. Ergo, economic development extends beyond the natural resource management dialogue and impacts the overall governance discussion.

CONCLUSION

FNNRM is an important concept to the Mi’kmaq. We need to protect the resources to ensure the well-being of our people, our culture and the land. Natural resource management is also an important component for creating independence and for addressing overall ecological concerns. Yet its implementation is complicated, slow and difficult. Despite formal agreements in place, the state system continues to support cultural erasure, oppression and poverty while down casting self-determination and preventing our access to enshrined human rights. The state system continues to view us as the “Other.” They are fearful of our ideas and how our benefits will impact them. Mi’kmaq implementation of FNNRM cannot happen unless we gain some form of power. Although partnerships are a good tool to utilize, for this paper, many felt that control comes from having wealth; this is power. Thusly, economic development is a crucial component for achieving natural resource management, for eradicating dependency and possibly for ensuring the revitalization of our culture.
Chapter 6: Sustainability

The concept of sustainability concerns how a society (human/ nonhuman) conducts its right to support its survival and well-being. There are multiple understandings of the term sustainability and that definition depends on the context (time, space, situation) of a given society and its members. An individual’s perspective may change and different community members may have varying interpretations based on their experiences. Definitions of sustainability are influenced by values, morals and real-life observations. We need to understand how individuals define sustainability to understand their goals, objectives and actions. This chapter looks at how Mi’kmaw participants define sustainability and ultimately aims to understand what is/should be the relationship between (the modern definition of) economic development and Mi’kmaq concepts for caring for Mother Earth.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine understandings of economic development, resource management, and traditional knowledge and cognize how participants relate these terms – this will provide a concept of Mi’kmaq sustainability, while ultimately aiming to answer the broad research question. I will utilize a step-by-step process, building on the results, considerations and knowledge gained at each step to reach a conclusion. Step one is to determine participants’ definitions of Mi’kmaq sustainability. Step two will express participants’ theoretical definitions of Mi’kmaq management of natural resources, and will compare it to their personal observations of Mi’kmaq (practical) management. Are we doing as we described theoretically? Why? Why not? Step three will express how participants’ viewed the modern concept of economic development, how these views relate to definitions of sustainability, and how all these concepts relate back to First Nation management of natural resources and traditional knowledge. Finally, step four will answer what is the relationship between economic development, natural
resource management and traditional knowledge, and propose what this relationship should be, and if it is achievable. This will connect to a definition of Mi’kmaq sustainability.

A JAGGED PATH OF CONTRADICTIONS

We (Mi’kmaq) are living with a jagged worldview (Little Bear 2000:84). “Aboriginal consciousness [has become] a site of overlapping, contentious, fragmented, competing desires and values” (ibid.:85). How we understand the world is convoluted when we have been impacted by both western and Mi’kmaq thought. In some cases we are able to reconcile difference and morph ideas to create new innovative ways of thinking, an “ambidextrous consciousness” (ibid.). Yet in the case of nature, western Eurocentric thinking clashes with Mi’kmaq traditional ecological management techniques (Escobar 2008:1) Even the concept of sustainability is interpreted differently. For example, under neoliberalism, sustainability would be framed around self-interest and the market (Tauli-Corpus 2006:19). Differently, mainstream environmentalists would argue environmental preservation is sustainability, concentrating solely on non-human needs (see LaDuke 1994:137; Bullard 2007:261). Indigenist theorists would support a community-based idea that includes nature, local economy development and tradition (Tauli-Corpus 2006:16; LaDuke 1994:141). With such polarity, how did participants situate themselves within this debate? Participants strove to decipher and define ideas not only of sustainability, but also economic development and management, and how these different terms work together. In essence, worldviews were colliding (Little Bear 2000). One reason for the incongruity is (some) participants’ personal perspectives and viewpoints changed when their scoop of analysis widened to communities and the individuals within these spaces. Challenges occurred when trying to connect theory to application, a common problem criticized in development (Ferguson 1994; Li
With these challenges present, it had affected what participants feel can be achieved practically.

**Long-Term Success: Defining Sustainability**

In the interviews I asked participants how they envisioned long-term success. In essence I was asking how they formulate sustainability. Do they feel Mi’kmaq ecological practices are important or do they solely focus on self-interest like many western theorists? I wanted to understand what values (culture, land, community, individualism, money, etc.) appear to be most significant. The responses provided were very personal, based off their own visions. Long-term success was viewed under two umbrellas: (1) ecological sustainability and (2) self-sufficiency. Ecological sustainability concentrated on Mother Earth, and the role and importance of our traditional (environmental/ecological) knowledge. Different form mainstream environmentalism, this approach is inclusive of humans. The Mi’kmaq have a duty to protect the Earth. We are the stewards of Mi’kma’ki. Mi’kmaq ecological practices can secure our ecosystem from grave depreciation. We must teach others this knowledge (Harold 2012:15:39). It provides the tools to care for the Earth and to address the environmental problems impacting everyone (RCAP 1996b:634). As Abigail explained, “we also have to look at the big circle, because our circle is only small. We probably could make you know our own natural resources within our own community, but we still gotta go outside and get the things we need.” (Abigail 2012:08:19). Although Abigail is speaking in the context of trade and self-sufficiency, her statement also illustrates that we are living in open spaces. She explains later, “You know keep your environment very clean so we won’t have these problems. Although we are still gonna have them because you got smog, you got stuff floating in the air from” (ibid.:17). Even if we control what happens within our own communities, we are still affected by what happens outside. As
introduced in chapter five, sharing (Mi’kmaq) traditional knowledge with other peoples is significant, because our practices can help reduce impact on Mother Earth.

Environmental protection was a key topic of discussion especially overhunting and the impact of toxins on our food sources and on nature overall (Karl 2012:12:16; Barry 2012:02:03; Harold 2012:19:56). Even if we try to live holistically, our communities will be impacted by the actions of others. We cannot control where animals feed, nor what is placed in the air and in the water. Even more so, our control is limited to our jurisdictions (reserves). Mi’kmaq ecological knowledge must be passed and shared with others to ensure the protection of natural resources. Sioui and Little Bear explain that when one species is negatively impacted in the circle of life, we are all touched (Sioui 1992:18; Little Bear 2000:79). Supporters of this paradigm encourage the development and implementation of holistic programs. For Indigenist thinkers like Little Bear and Sioui and for participants, ecological sustainability implies recognition that we must ensure the sustenance of our resources for our survival and for future generations. It is a form of lived ecological stewardship. It is not simply about protecting nature, but how to live harmoniously with nature.

Secondly, long-term success was seen as achieving “self-sufficiency” (Oliver 2012; Daisy 2012:03:04; Lance 2012:02:07). “To me, it’s a way to make money. And you gotta have some economic development in every community, you just (breathes in) I don’t think you can just rely on the handouts from the government. Soon you’ll have to do, figure out how to make your own money for your communities” (Felipe 2012:11:28). Aboriginals are the most impoverished, least prosperous population in Canada (Flanagan et al 2010:3; White, Beavon & Spence 2007:6; Carino 2009:22). According to Stavenhagen, “The Canadian Human Rights Commission views the social and economic situation of Aboriginal people as among the most pressing human rights
issue facing Canada” (2004:7). We need to address disparities between the general population and ourselves, and overcome dependency. In connection to the last chapter, continuously relying on the government for aid does not encourage long-term success. For André Gunder Frank, “underdevelopment is not original or traditional” (1988:109). It is a result of the uneven relationship between the “metropolis” (powerful) and “satellite” (subordinate). Economies can only develop if independent of relations with the “metropolis” (ibid. 1988). Though different from the context I am applying it, I view the Crown as the metropolis and First Nations as satellite states. We will continue to be underdeveloped so long as we rely on the federal government.

Dependency and need will persist as long as communities cannot care for themselves. Yet, “we have to be real, we need a certain amount of money, to keep things flowing and moving” (Karl 2012:02:06; see also Oliver 2012:11:10). I think Karl’s statement is an especially important one to discuss. As a traditionalist, Karl is critical of neoliberal capitalism and I would argue that epistemologically his philosophy closely resembles discussions by Alfred (1999; 2005). Yet even still, Karl is conscious of real-world pressures, and as I interpret him, his opinion is that we have to find a balance that incorporates our self-determination into processes of sufficiency. As discussed in Zones of Influence, self-sufficiency is a means to achieve control and power. At the same time, as Abigail recognized, self-sufficiency is one of our greatest challenges (Abigail 2012:12:36). Linked to economic development, the self-sufficiency definition can be interpreted as economic-based sustainability.

Reserves were seen as the antithesis of sustainability and development. Most reserves lack an economic base and lack natural resources. “. . .They have got to start thinking too how much economic development they can put up there [on the reserve]. But some of them people
need that, need to get off the reserve and work. They have to! Because they just can’t depend on
the reserve. No not enough land, you don’t have the land base. That’s what you need, the land
base to have something” (Harold 2012:21-2:62). There are few opportunities for individual
success and partnerships, as “certain levels of success can happen on the reserve, but . . . I think
that’s limiting . . . I do think in terms of economic development than those partnerships need to
be achieved off the reserve as well” (Pamela 2012:08-09:23). In addition to the social,
geographical and economic challenges caused by the Indian Act on reserves, it also limits First
Nations politically (RCAP 1996c:809). Title ultimately rests with the Crown, and with the Crown
having subsurface rights (ibid.) Economic sustainability and ecological sustainability are both
limited. Housing needs infringe on nature growth (ibid. 1996a:365) and many communities
already have limited resources and goods to sustain a population (RCAP 1996c:801). For
participants, economic development is viewed as something that happens outside the reserve and
prevents development. Elder Harold explains reserves as psychological fences – “take a place like
XXX, those people are caught in a trap up there and can’t get out. That reserve was put way back
in the woods like that. I call it a psychological fence, around that community holding that
community in because there's no jobs there. They shouldn’t be building houses up there when
there is nothing for them to do” (Harold 2012:7-8:22). Even though Harold is speaking to some of
the physical limitations of reserves, economic and ecological oppression causes spiritual and
emotional degradation.

Effects from residential schools have also caused societal problems within First Nation
communities. Alcoholism, drug abuse, and poverty are linked to psychological oppression or the
“psychological fence”. Monture-Angus describes this fence as thinking that is colonized.
Reserves “predispose us to leading a life of oppression” (1995:47). “There’s no, no incentive to
work harder. There’s actually an incentive to do nothing” (Ed 2012:15:39). There is a dependency on welfare (Felipe 2012:15:38; Daisy 2012:04:13). “They don’t see a future for themselves” (Daisy 2012:04:13). With this, “there's no way that we can be sustainable within the boundaries of the reserve . . . we have to assure that it expands beyond that, for us to survive” (Karl 2012:02:03). Thus, economic methods of sustainability should also fundamentally address societal barriers to ensure self-sufficiency is collectively sustainable.

Mi’kmaq sustainability (for participants) is seen as incumbent on: the health of Mother Earth, and/or on self-sufficiency and economic development. With these two definitions, one relates to traditional knowledge and traditional ways of caring for the Earth, while the other is centred on human needs in the Twenty-First Century. In some societies, these two definitions of sustainability contradict each other. In western terms, economic sustainability naturally implies nature degradation (Shiva 2007:273, Tauli-Corpus 2006:19). Yet in Mi’kmaq culture, there is no black and white, right or wrong. Both definitions are valid. Participant responses illustrate that both are essential for the welfare of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq, both are needed in tandem for true (holistic) sustainability. The plausibility of such achievement will be discussed shortly.

A VISION OF MI’KMAQ MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Development is commonly criticized for being homogenous and developed by elitists or individuals unaware of the specific needs of the community its impacting (Cowen & Shenton 1996:80; Ferguson 1994:80; Hayden 2003:361; Li 2007; Mosse 2004:83; Neumann 1997:565; Shiva 1991:173). Theory or policy does not reflect what the needs are or is not inclusive of local specialists and technicians (Mosse 2004:83). Natural resource management practices fit under this. Environmental planners (for example Sarah Radcliffe and Nina Laurie, Marcus Lane and Michael Hibbard, Leonie Sandercock, Libby Porter) and politicians are speaking to concepts of
First Nation natural resource management, while bureaucrats like the Department of Fisheries and Aboriginal Affairs (see Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development 2012; Aboriginal Communal Fishing Licenses Regulation Amended April 1, 2009) are developing documents speaking to resource management, but a model of Mi’kmaq management cannot be based on the ideas of people who are not L’nu. A theoretical definition of management of natural resources must reflect “the grassroots.” In the last chapter, I presented the theoretical advantages of a FNNRM strategy. In comparison, this chapter looks deeper into the development of this idea practically. How do different Nova Scotia Mi’kmaw demographics envision natural resource management? Participants were asked to interpret, or describe, Mi’kmaq natural resource management. They all provided a similar response directly or indirectly: Mi’kmaq management of natural resources means taking only what one needs (see Lance 2012:01:01; Abigail 2012:07:17; Barry 2012:22:82). Karl explains: “It’s really weird because I don't think in terms of ownership. It's kind of like how do you design your community around the resources and how do you manage people and not the resources, and how do you make sure things are intact and our people have access to them. But that they use them in a very respectful way” (Karl 2012:02:06). Resource management is working with the resources, not against. (Pamela 2012:02:07; Lance 2012:01:01). Therein Mi’kmaq natural resource management is composed of two principles: take only what one needs (the individual), but at the same time resources should not be taken if it will deplete them and/or affect harmony and balance (the community).

It is quite significant that the participants gave definitions reflecting Mi’kmaq-based literature on this subject (see ANSMC 2007). Even more significant, is that all participants have the same idea, illustrating a prevailing Mi’kmaq standpoint on natural resource management. Our
cultural values are theoretically tied to how we care for the land. These values should establish the methods for ecological sustainability. However, practice does not necessarily follow theory.

The two values in tandem, are intrinsic to a traditional strategy of Mi’kmaq natural resource management, and are the theoretical underpinnings of Mi’kmaq ecological sustainability. In theory this is how management should occur, but participants observed that some Mi’kmaw are not respecting **both** values. “They gotta start seeing the natives practicing that [ecological stewardship] too” (Ed 2012:10:26). Gabrielle explains her perspective, “It’s like, it’s almost accepted around here. It seems like people would rather have the money myself included, than try and preserve (pause) land” (Gabrielle 2012:02:04). She later discussed more: “They say they do [care about the Earth], but nobody is really showing that they do. Do you know what I mean? They are talking the talk, but not walking the walk” (Gabrielle 2012:03:10; see also Abigail 2012:10:26). (Some) Mi’kmaw are over harvesting. This contradicts traditional ways of caring for the land. Mi’kmaq natural resource management should reflect traditional knowledge, support egalitarian practices like community, reciprocity, sharing and availability of resources for all. It is a balance structure between need and desire. The next section will discuss in detail the practical internal challenges we face implementing Mi’kmaq natural resource management practices due to neoliberal capitalism.

**Practical**

The Mi’kmaq are not the same people they were one thousand years ago, one hundred years ago or fifty years ago, and as already discussed, this is expected because no culture is static. At the same time poverty, colonialism and neocolonialism have impacted how we think and behave. Participants have observed that some Nova Scotia Mi’kmaw are very individualistic. The criticisms they provided in their discussions are criticisms of capitalism. Natural resources are
being used to support individual need without consideration of the impacts on other people, Mother Earth and on future generations. Some individuals’ actions can be somewhat defensible out of need or necessity, while for others they have had a metamorphosis into the “White Indian.” They are guided by greed (Barry 2012:19:69; Abigail 2012:14:44-45; Lance 2012:01:03; Felipe 2012:03:05). Whatever the factors influencing their actions, this behavior is not “Mi’kmaq.” When personal desire overrides community benefit, a person has transformed into a Eurocentric-liberal thinker. Overall I argue behaviour is caused by a western co-opted means of survival and/or as a way to exercise their rights and equality.

Traditionally, wealth accumulation and materialism in the capitalist sense were not important factors of most First Nation cultures (Newhouse 2001:81), including the Mi’kmaq. Yet today “we just get caught up in this materialistic vision” (Karl 2012:25-26:33). This “materialistic vision” (capitalism) is inescapable. Newhouse has described English as the “lingua franca” (2000:56) but really I would say it is money and objects. “The modern day Mi’kmaq people [are] trying to grow. Because the old days where you could hunt and fish off the land, make a living are pretty well gone” (Oliver 2012:04:01). These ways cannot cover objects we need for shelter, survival and clothing. We need employment to have money to attain the objects of necessity our families require (Oliver 2012:02:01; Lance 2012:12:13; Gabrielle 2012:18:78). Given the lack of employment opportunities in First Nation communities, some individuals resort to harvesting the resources as a means to generate wealth. Individuals are viewing Mother Earth and her gifts as objects and commodities. “A lot of men sell the animals. They don’t do it for their families, but it’s done for survival because individuals do need the money, but they are taking advantage of this” (Daisy 2012:04:12). I feel part of this comes out of terminology of the Marshall Decision.
The Mi’kmaq concept of “take only what you need” was translated into neoliberal terminology as “a moderate livelihood.” In the Supreme Court reading it states,

> The accused’s treaty rights are limited to securing “necessaries” (which should be construed in the modern context as equivalent to a moderate livelihood), and do not extend to the open-ended accumulation of wealth . . . what is contemplated is not a right to trade generally for economic gain, but rather a right to trade for necessaries . . . Catch limits that could reasonably be expected to produce a moderate livelihood for individual Mi’kmaq families at present-day standards can be established by regulation and enforced without violating the treaty right (R v. Marshall 1999).

I present this reading, because one could use the language in it to refute my statement. One could argue that the limitations by the Supreme Court coincide with “take only what you need.” Yet, for some Mi’kmaq who are harvesting economically (fishing or the like), they feel that their actions are out of necessity (self-need). It is within the limits of what they consider a moderate livelihood. Overall, what is problematic about this decision is that the Mi’kmaq concept of Netukulimk is omitted. It (the decision) is a western Eurocentric anthropocentric interpretation of Mi’kmaq management. It creates a definition solely based on self-interest and individualism. These non-native created regulations omit and oppose our concepts of conservation and management (Barsh 2002:35), creating an environment of overconsumption.

Secondly, we fear if we do not exercise our treaty rights, we will lose them. It is not just that we need to assure our rights are not lost, but it is a matter of establishing our identity and our presence. European resource depletion and exploitation created the current need for conservation measures (Barsh 2002). There are a number of endangered species that cannot be touched to

---

9 There are other limitations to Marshall – as already stated, Marshall have never been fully implemented, which has created a significant area of tension and confusing; part of the Made-in-Nova Scotia Process is working towards this implementation.
ensure their survival (see Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources 2009). In relation, assumedly as a protective measure, the Department of Fisheries determines what species and the number of species we can harvest in our fishing agreements. For example, the salmon is endangered (Atlantic Salmon Federation 2012), it is not always a species we can access under our treaty rights. This is contentious because the rules are not applied equally to the entire population. For example, salmon tags can be purchased to fish in specific areas (Nova Scotia Fisheries and Aquaculture 2013:6-7), yet through our treaty rights under Marshall we are restricted. Thus, western conservation terms are forced on us, but not others. It is unfair, and is a double form of oppression. Such practices are exclusionary, oppressive and perpetuate poverty. They also create tension and a mentality that if they (non-natives) can do it, I can (see also Barsh 2002). This also creates anger because the destruction(?) or depredations against? of nature and species like the salmon were due to colonial exploitation and not a result of Mi’kmaq sustenance. There remains little incentive to conserve (ibid.:34) and many incentives to compete.

All of this behavior is not condonable, yet much of it is understandable. The behavior can be rationalized as behavior out of necessity. We need to find methods to prevent such actions and we need to aid people who are behaving out of need. Largely the answer is in economic sustainability and economic development. The question is what FORM of economic development will achieve the desired ends.

**DEFINITIONS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Economic sustainability is fundamental for Mi’kmaq long-term success. Economic development is also a crucial element for achieving Mi’kmaq control and meaningful involvement in natural resource management. Yet (the modern definition of) economic development is a Eurocentric term. Participants saw it as a negative concept. Participants (Abigail...
associated this concept with greed, individualism and wealth accumulation, and the destruction of the land. This does not embrace Indigenous traditional and cultural practices. According to Lance and Indigenous scholars Neva Collings and Victoria Tauli-Corpus, modern economic development undermines Indigenous economic systems and production (Collings 2009:88; Tauli-Corpus 2006:19) and does not consider future generations (Lance 2012:01:03). Secondly, individualism prevents sharing and wealth distribution (see Barry 2012:19:69). Under this, egalitarianism and holistic practice do not exist. Humans dominate nature. This in combination with “more is better” encourages the exploitation of resources. The modern definition of economic development contradicts our traditional values.

Participants were also conscious that economic development implies employment and job creation (Lance 2012:02:07; Gabrielle 2012:18:78; Daisy 2012:03:09), a means to lessen or eradicate poverty. Unemployment is almost three times higher among Mi’kmaq than in the general population (Office of Aboriginal Affairs 2013). With a growing youth population and high unemployment, job creation is critical (Stavenhagen 2004:18). Thus despite condemnation, participants (almost) consider economic development a necessary evil. “It’s necessary, I mean we’d be fooling ourselves if we think, you know that, it doesn’t need to happen. I mean people need to make a living, right?” (Candace 2012:04:05; see also Felipe 2012:11:28) As said by Newhouse, we already are living within a capitalistic system, so it is impossible to resist being a part of it (2001:78). It is inescapable not only due to its omnipresence, but also it is needed for economic sustainability and sustenance.

We would appear to be in a predicament. There is an obvious tension between the modern definition of economic development, and our traditional values, and it seemed
participants felt there is only one form of economic development. My argument is that the concept of community sustenance comes in many forms and is contextual to a time, space and culture. The reason “economic development” is naturally assumed to be homogenous is that literally this terminology, “economic” and “development”, is a western creation. The confusion with “economic development” is the word “development”. This term is inherently Eurocentric (Cowen & Shenton 1996:5). Largely I equate anything with the word “development” in it as being based off Rostow’s model of modernization where mass consumption and materialism is the apex of success (1956). Thus “economic development” is not a naturalized Mi’kmaq term. Other understandings do exist that are not so negative and would still support our need for economic sustainability, including employment. The Mi’kmaq have our own understanding of economic development (meaning community sustenance), yet they view it through a different process.

I asked some participants to define a concept of Mi’kmaq economic development. For Abigail, Mi’kmaq economic development should focus on “community development, bringing your people together and getting the community there” (Abigail 2012:11:34). In Daisy’s view, “the white people, for economic development, they wouldn’t consider Mother Nature in decisions. They use land any way they can for their own benefit. For us we feel if we harm the environment, it has consequences” (Daisy 2012:03-04:10). As Karl explains “I think economic development, in my understanding is being resourceful but being respectful and I think only take what you need” (Karl 2012:27:31). Barry also defined Mi’kmaq economic development as taking only what is needed (Barry 2012:19:70). If one were to compare these definitions to explanations of Mi’kmaq natural resource management, they would find they are one and the same. From this data, I would argue that traditionally our management of the resources, the way we use Mother
Earth was our version of economic development. Economic development in Mi’kmaq terms simply means, “sustaining one’s community”.

The Mi’kmaq did have an economy, but it was not thought of in such terms because we did not compartmentalize our lives in the way the west divides up society. Community members worked to support the maintenance of the community – the economy. For example we had crafts people, healers, hunters, gatherers. All of these roles of community contribution can be described in western terms as “employment” or “jobs.” Now I am not advocating for the Mi’kmaq to return to their traditional lifestyle; as Oliver said, this is not possible. What I am merely trying to establish is that we had economies and a type of economic development. The main difference between Mi’kmaq economic development and what is happening today is the role of culture, Mother Earth and community. For natives, it seems like we have to follow the western model, but we can do things in our own way while ensuring economic sustainability.

It is possible to have a balance to develop and sustain communities economically without compromising culture and traditional knowledge. There were some participants (Lance 2012:01:02; Gabrielle 2012:14:56-57) who feel this balance is not achievable. Other participants (Abigail 2012:1:43; Ina 2012:03:11; Candace 2012:09:12) argued that balance is possible and the protection of Mother Earth is “paramount” (Pamela 2012:09:04; see also Daisy 2012:02:04). “Without resources there will be no job creation. There will be no economic development” (Pamela 2012:09:24). To ensure our wellbeing and that of future generations, we need to establish this balance.

**WHAT DO WE NEED TO DO, TO DO WHAT WE WANT?**

Mi’kmaq sustainability, natural resource management and economic development are all inherently tied. When these concepts are based on cultural values and traditional knowledge we
can achieve success for ourselves. Job creation is possible without being unethical. We can have healthy, successful communities if we follow certain values, like those identified in chapter four. When we focus solely on economic sustainability, overlooking culture, this supports resource exploitation. Balance is lost and poverty will grow, not decrease.

The modern definition of economic development does not respect the land. As just iterated, under this model nature is not protected, there is no balance between Mother Earth and economic needs. As Tauli-Corpus explains, “the mechanistic worldview of industrialization and globalization regards humans and other living beings as machines that should be manipulated to function with ever increasing efficiency and productivity. Nature, in this view, is inert, dead, manipulable matter that has value on as a commodity” (2006:15). Similarly, Vandana Shiva states that this marketization “generates a scarcity condition for ecological stability” (2007:278). Traditional knowledge is not an aspect of this paradigm. Resource management is simply about exploitation. Is this really what we want for ourselves and for our future? There are Mi’kmaw who are behaving under this mindset. How do we address this? If this future scares us, how do we start making a shift away from this happening universally to our people? We need to be careful that our exploration of self-sufficiency and control does not contradict our sacred teachings. Economic development is crucial for achieving control and power but if we transform into a White Indian, we will lose power. Not only does this mindset hurt our Earth and overlook traditional knowledge, our communities cannot heal either because the culture is intrinsic to healing and countering hegemonic oppression. Additionally, as discussed earlier in this paper, under capitalism, wealth is concentrated to a minority of elite, so even if cultural revitalization was not important to us and if we wanted western economic development, we have to be
conscious that under this philosophy with wealth concentration and accumulation, poverty will still persist in Mi’kma’ki.

We, Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq, have achieved the success we have as far as self-governance, title and treaty rights and resource management, because despite some disunity, we work as a nation and assure our culture is present (even if it is not always iterated). If we embrace western economic development fully, than we will work individually and the power we had as a group is lost. The “self” in self-sufficiency should not imply liberal individualism. From an Indigenist standpoint, it implies autonomy. We are not autonomous when we adopt western methods of natural resource management. The assumption that development processes will increase goods and services available and reduce poverty is not correct (Shiva 2007:278). With self-interest, and the hierarchically nature of western thinking, wealth will be accumulated into the hands of a minority and not distributed to the rest of the population.

The relationship between community sustenance and traditional knowledge should be based on the concept of Mi’kmaq sustainability. It should be a balancing act between individual need and community benefit. When traditional knowledge and culture are at the centre of our thoughts and actions, Mother Earth will be managed in a holistic way. To support the statements by participants earlier, I would argue that we can use the resources and benefit from it monetarily, but in order for it to be holistic there are resources we cannot touch, including areas where our traditional medicines are located (Barry 2012:10:34). We have to be wary of the type of activity we engage in, activities that contaminant and affect our food sources (Karl 2012:11:16; Barry 2012:1-2:1-3; Abigail 2012:05:9). Pamela’s opinion is:

If you’re gonna have a project that ultimately is going to irreversibility . . . damage the Earth, the resources and the habitat in that area then NO I don’t think that’s something that should even be considered. Umm and I can’t see any First Nations
finding that acceptable but once again I think that First Nations have to find that balance. That’s the difficulty. That’s the difficulty I think is finding the balance in when they can enter into ventures knowing that the resources can be still be rejuvenated or replaced (Pamela 2012:04:10).

I understand that this may be a bit hypocritical. As discussed by Lance and Oliver, we say we should not economically engage in the extractive industries, but yet we depend on petroleum-based transportation (Lance 2012:08:26; Oliver 2012:12:12). This is a challenge. However, looking to the angst towards toxins and resource depletion, as well as the basis of a Mi’kmaq natural resource management strategy and our traditional values, extractive industries is something that we as a collective should not engage in. It is not the Mi’kmaq way. These industries harm the Earth, they oppose our traditional knowledge and it impacts our children and our future children.

As the Modern Day Indian, we also need to ensure we are progressing and that we are not stagnant. We do not have to fit into this western mould, but the benefit of globalization is that we can learn techniques and ideas from others, share knowledge while making it wholly Mi’kmaq. This is true self-determination. There are new innovative projects we can be involved in, namely certain fields of renewable energy (Pamela 2012:02:07; Lance 2012:09:29). Already, we are partnering in Wind Energy and participants feel renewable energy endeavours are in line with a Mi’kmaq management strategy. Crucially, we cannot reduce impact completely, but it is about mitigating issues and doing the least amount of damage to Mother Earth that we can. Under this philosophy, there are employment opportunities. With this, we have to create strategies of developing the community with the land, so Mi’kmaq sustainability strategies should include holistic approaches to employment. I say this because employment was a recognized need by
participants and so any strategies moving forward need to make sure to address all the needs of the community.

Some traditionalists and Indigenists like Alfred would be critical of the types of approaches I discuss. Alfred states, “an ideology of accumulation, even if it’s collective rather than individual plays right into the consummative commercial mentality” (1999:139). From these words, I think he would say that the strategy I propose would support a slightly less harsh capitalist approach, albeit still capitalist in nature. The entire purpose of this research was to look at the practicality of these concepts and to see how they work on the ground. A decolonized approach cannot work; even Alfred does not oppose economic self-sufficiency so long as it supports cultural values and traditional knowledge (1999:139). LaDuke makes a similar argument to Alfred in support of economic self-sufficiency (1994:129). Given the challenges discussed in chapter four and earlier in this chapter, community sustenance is about culture and Mother Earth and supports discussions by Alfred and LaDuke. The Mi’kmaq have to collectively discuss and develop these ideas. Importantly, readers must understand that the terminology I use (e.g. employment) may be capitalist, but are the only terms that I can find to try to describe similar non-western concepts.

In summary, all of the above points speak to how we interact with the land, but there is also the aspect of economic development as a strategy for achieving land management, meaning we need economic development in our communities as a means to generate money and change the power relationship with the state. There are limited natural resources on our reserves to sustain us. Mi’kmaq resource management cannot be limited to the reserve. Community sustenance is a needed tool for achieving true recognition and meaningful involvement in other zones. These economic opportunities should still be based on concepts of Mi’kmaq sustainability,
supporting culture and traditional knowledge. Not all economic projects directly interact with Mother Earth, but they do all have an indirect impact. Respect the land; do not destroy it just to create industry. Not only this, but culture is needed in all aspects of our life to ensure the knowledge is passed on and kept alive. Economic development is not only a critical component for achieving FNNRM, but it is also a part of the impetus behind the natural resource framework. We have to remember that access to the resources for harvesting and creating industry is not the leading reason behind FNNRM. The importance derives in that our management techniques affirm ecological sustainability, as well as cultural strengthening.

CONCLUSION

Mi’kmaq sustainability includes ecological sustainability and economic sustainability. Long-term success is a balance between the individual’s need and overall community survival. Mi’kmaq First Nation natural resource management reflects this balance and is a direct reflection of community sustenance, a Mi’kmaq holistic version of economic development. In order to balance the relationship between traditional knowledge and economic development in natural resource management, we need to base our techniques on Mi’kmaq sustainability and economic strategies of community sustenance. Presently, this does not always happen. Western economic development is being utilized, but this type of behavior devalues Mother Earth as an object of ownership. For Mi’kmaq sustainability and health, this cannot be our idea of progress.
Chapter 7: Moving Forward

The purpose of this research was to examine what is and what should be the association between (the modern definition of) economic development and the application of traditional knowledge in nature management for the Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous peoples. The research looked at how these concepts interact from an aggregate, intermediate level. It is difficult to conduct targeted research in Indigenous communities, because in holistic settings everything is interconnected (Sioui 1992:8; Little Bear 2000:79). Under this overarching research umbrella, concepts like identity, sustainability and power were discussed. To follow is a brief update of events that took place after my interviews were completed and the impact these events have on this work. Subsequently, I will discuss the overall contributions, conclusions, and implications of this work. Lastly, I will reflect on some of my limitations and steps moving forward.

AN UPDATE

Since the start of this research a few fundamental events have happened in Canada that have had implications on the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq. The first was the passage of the Job and Growth Act, 2012. This legislation was not only an illustration of the conservative government’s deep-vested neoliberal foundations, but was a blatant illustration of Crown neocolonialism. It has direct impacts on Indigenous human rights, especially in the context of this research on natural resource management and our treaty rights. “The Assembly [of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq Chiefs] . . . is angered . . . ‘we were not consulted on the changes that will affect our lands and waters . . . the federal government has side-stepped their obligations to the Aboriginal peoples of Canada’” (Kwilmu’kw Maw-klusuaqn 13 December 2012). In tandem, the Idle No More movement swept across Canada and later the globe. There were a number of events locally in Nova Scotia and from my perspective it appeared to have the support of the Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq
Chiefs. At some point things took a negative turn – the sentiment from some of the local *Idle No More* campaigners were against the chiefs and the work that has happened to this date on governance and the implementation of treaty and title rights, including resource management.

From this, communities have had engagement sessions and I think this is a positive step forward, because this has illustrated, as participants iterated, the need for greater communication. Yet at the same time, it has boosted collective disunity and tensions. I believe dialogue sessions have been a great means to create awareness and dialogue, but the dissension is the actual lack of involvement. There is the problem of apathy. How do we overcome this to ensure everyone is engaged, accurate information is being provided and channels of communication are collaborative and reciprocal?

**CONTRIBUTION AND IMPLICATIONS**

Theory and policy iterate the importance of Indigenous natural resource management as a form of governance and involvement. There is real benefit to the knowledge we possess and the preservation of the Earth. Yet, what do we do when our own people are not embracing these value systems? This is not simply a Mi’kmaq problem. It is a challenge for all Indigenous peoples. Indigenous peoples in other places are living in greater poverty than us and transnational corporations are offering lucrative deals (IWGIA 2012). This is when personal need to live outweighs community benefit. For the Mi’kmaq our values are still present, yet we are seeing a shift within our population, a greater assimilative metamorphosis. Collectively we have to address these problems and as a community decide how to tackle this new age challenge. Secondly, economic development plays a larger role than originally anticipated. It is not simply something that comes with resource access, but it is a needed pre-condition for greater access and control.
However, for the Mi’kmaq, certain industries devalue our culture and contradict our traditional knowledge. Our economic and management strategies have to reflect this.

Due to these challenges, we need to plan and extensively discuss management (and overall governance) strategies. We may have some such under Marshall, but these rights have never been fully implemented (Barsh 2002:34). To really make Mi’kmaq management strategies work and for Mi’kmaq sustainability to be truly possible, we need long-term planning. The Crown needs to respect this. We cannot be rushed by their timelines or try to fit their agendas. This process needs to be done the Mi’kmaq way. This is our human right (see Articles Three, Four, Eight, Twenty-One, Twenty-Three, Twenty-Six, Twenty-Nine of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples). Communication is critical for creating thriving collaborative, trusting relationships. If the state has a goal to end its fiduciary duty then it needs to genuinely understand that the White Man’s way will only perpetuate greater Amerindian poverty. Respectfully, understand that our processes and our ways will truly have long-term benefits. We have to really focus on building solid policies and procedures that interconnect and relate to identity.

At an international level, the need for these processes of discussion still remains. Yet, we are still fighting the orthodoxy of development (Simpson 2001:140). The challenge of asserting our position is increasingly more difficult without unity. The Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq, despite SOME internal tensions, are still strong and stand as a nation. This has enabled us to achieve as much as we have, through the Made-in-Nova Scotia process. It becomes more difficult for nations and societies that lack these pre-conditions, or are living in an environment where violence is a used mechanism of terror and control (for example Guatemala, Palestine and Bangladesh). Importantly, to establish these pre-conditions, Indigenous peoples need internal unity.
Before we can engage in partnership conversations and coalition building, we have to work together internally. Ferguson discusses the anti-politics machine of development, how policies often fail to work on the ground because they do not address power relationships, externally and internally (1994). This research has tried to tackle this issue, by exploring some of our internal challenges with hopes that we can utilize this knowledge to build on. Aggregate governance and management is not specific to natural resources, but relates to the whole concept of self-governance. In order to make these processes work we have to work together. Communication cannot be overlooked. The research only begins to examine some of the internal challenges we have, but it is still working to overcome this anti-political machine. It is a tool to fight the divide and conquer philosophy. Yet, as I said, this is a limited examination. A researcher has to be careful that they do not overstep their place and that they go through the proper channels of approval and review. Fundamentally, an insider should conduct this type of examination, as they are conscious of the internal issues, even despite their own subjectivity. To overcome personal bias, the researcher must ensure responsibility to the community of study.

**REFLECTING BACK AND MOVING FORWARD**

This research has only touched the surface of a multifaceted issue. Yet it can feed into work by post-colonialists, critical race theorists, and indigenists. There are also some lessons learned, which are useful for future development and work.

I support collective processes of communication. It is important to be as representative and diverse as possible (Louis 2007:131; see also Scheyvens, Scheyvens & Murray 2003; van Blerk 2006; Momsen 2006) We are not homogeneous and research has to respond to the differences within a given society. I did not have participants from four communities. Every single community is different and I would have liked to have those viewpoints reflected in this
research. Also, I chose interviews as my primary method of data collection to ensure that each individual I engaged with had the freedom to share their thoughts and opinions without fear of regress or intimidation. In some cases, group interviews limited the information I was able to collect. Lastly, even though I had interviews with youth, which I quantify as someone under the age of thirty, the youth I interviewed were all female and none of these women were young adolescents. As Jack explained, “A lot of them [youth] what they want to do is learn. I think they’re too young to be – political or think like that. But ahh, right now they’re trying to learn the ways” (Jack 2012:11:37). Often a young person’s perspective is untainted by politics; this is refreshing. At the same time, men and women can have different positionalities; having a male youth perspective would increase diversity. This is the same issue with representation from Elders. I had male representation, but not female. As I reflect, another important demographic is our urban population. The relationship to the land is different for urban-Amerindians, but the need is still there. This perspective could have shifted the results.

Looking to the future, there are a number of different avenues this work can go in. Fundamentally, for it to be useful it has to be disseminated to the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq population and they have to provide feedback on their reactions. The work now has to shift from data collection at the individual level to the collective. I think focus groups are important for planning and developing strategies for the future. Focus groups have to be at the community level and also at the provincial level. It is quite positive the position we are in in relation to Crown-Indigenous relations. Yet to move forward with implementation, we, as Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq have to be clear what we want that implementation to look like. This is not simply the implementation of management strategies, but governance and development overall.
There are a number of branches this research can move forward in. Winona LaDuke (2004) discusses indigenous economies, but you need to have the pre-conditions in place to have this happen. In the context of economically prosperous communities in Nova Scotia, it is about innovation and leadership. “Like I said a lot of these, some of these guys [chiefs] are dreamers. And if you can’t look ahead in the future, you’re just gonna be stagnant in one place . . . you gotta be able to see an opportunity and then go for it” (Ed 2012:13-14:35). Others (Pamela 2012:15:50) stated it was about location. The relation between these two things, the independent variable: pre-conditions. So how do we get out of this cycle? This needs to be a critical step of investigation.

The reserve system has to be included in this discussion. With that, I am adamant that this research has to be done by Indigenous peoples. I am conscious that the federal government has tried in the past to eradicate reserves without looking at the underlying cause and the rationale behind the criticisms. The government CANNOT be the ones to determine what should or should not be done. Second, more research has to be done on Indigenous economic systems. Winona LaDuke (1994; 2005), David Newhouse (2000; 2001; 2004) and Wanda Wuttunee (2004) all discuss these concepts. We need to research what is a holistic economic strategy for the Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq. It needs to examine the local industries in the area and could include a comparative analysis of Indigenous economics in other parts of Canada. At the same time, there is so much knowledge and value in practices being done by other societies. It is valuable to have these dialogues and research what other Indigenous groups are doing and how they are balancing western development with their own traditions.

The most fundamental aspect that was overlooked in this research was the importance of coalition-building and partnerships. This was a limitation of my research because it is such an expansive topic. I wanted to focus this research specifically on internal relationships. It is critical
we focus on ourselves before going outside our circle. Yet partnerships are a fundamental tool for social movement and creating anti-hegemonic shifts (Escobar 2008). It interconnects to research on economic systems, because it encourages partnerships not only locally, but also internationally with other oppressed groups – Indigenous, non-Indigenous and/or anti-hegemonic. The Arab Spring and now *Idle No More* support the need and importance of social movements in making change. We have to look at how this research can support such shifts and how it can feed into work on this. It also supports my Indigenist positionality and the value I see in post-colonial arguments by theorists like Edward Said (1978) and Arturo Escobar (2008).

Lastly, is the issue of identity: we are living under a “jagged worldview” (Little Bear 2000:84-85) and it is transforming our identity. Colonial impressions of the romanticized “Other” have supported our erasure and have somewhat stigmatized our view of who we are. It is normal to change. We are not static, but how to prevent inadvertent ethnocide? The Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq are having a profoundly existential challenge. Who are we, and what is our identity? Critically, the Mi’kmaq need to discuss this. Do we view ourselves under a romanticized image and is this creating a binary between progress/innovation, and the historic? Globally, Indigenous peoples are fighting a primordial idea of who they are and some are resisting change for fear of assimilation. How do we move forward without losing ourselves? We did it in the past before the arrival of Europeans, but how do we do it now when we are faced with the Hegemon. These discussions really refer to paradigm shifts (meaning to development and progression with the paradigm, not a changing of paradigms). It is not something that happens overnight. This goes outside the question of how others view us (Taylor 1994), but is about how we view ourselves. This relates to research in health and how self-image can impact mental and spiritual wellbeing. This area needs further research, here and globally.
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You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example you must report changes to the level of risk, applicant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures. To make an amendment, access the application at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Amendment to Approved Study Form. These changes will automatically be sent to the Ethics Coordinator, Gail Irving, at the Office of Research Services or irvingg@queensu.ca for further review and clearance by the GREB or GREB Chair.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Yours sincerely,

Joan Stevenson, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
General Research Ethics Board

cc: Dr. Richard Day and Dr. Graham Whitelaw, Faculty Supervisors
    Dr. Susan Soederberg, Chair, Unit REB
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Appendix B

Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq Chiefs Acceptance of Research – Minutes from October Assembly Meeting

ASSEMBLY OF NOVA SCOTIA MI’KMAQ CHIEFS
-at-
Membertou Heritage Park
Membertou, NS
October 25th, 2012

“Proposed Negotiation AGENDA”

- Opening Prayer

- Approval of Proposed Agendas

T-1 Approval of the September 20th, 2012 Negotiation/Consultation Minutes
   - Business Arising

- Introduction to RESOLUTIONS:
   - Refer to Book 2 – Consultation Resolutions

- Motions to Support:
  - Whitman
  - Marshall

T-2 Made-In-Nova Scotia Process
   - Canada’s new approach to negotiations

T-3 Debert Update

- OTHER

T-4 Zabrina Whitman – Presentation

T-5 NS Tripartite Forum Justice Committee—Marshall Review Forum
ASSEMBLY OF NOVA SCOTIA MI’KMAQ CHIEFS
October 25, 2012
Negotiation/Consultation Minutes
-at-
Membertou Heritage Park, Membertou

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chief Deborah Robinson                   Acadia First Nation
Chief Janette Peterson                  Annapolis Valley First Nation
Chief Frank Meuse                        Bear River First Nation
Chief Leroy Denny                       Eskasoni First Nation
Chief Wilbert Marshall                  Chapel Island (Potlotek) First Nation
Chief Sidney Peters                     Glooscap First Nation
Chief Robert (Bob) Gloade               Millbrook First Nation
Chief Terrance J. Paul                  Membertou First Nation
Chief M. Gerard Julian                  Paqtnkek First Nation
Proxy, Councillor Dominic Denny         Pictou Landing First Nation
Chief Roderick A. Googoo                Waycobah [Wekoqmaq] First Nation
Grand Chief Ben Sylliboy                Ex-Officio
Kji Keptin, Andrew Denny                Ex-Officio
Mr. Morley Googoo                       Ex-Officio, AFN Regional Chief, NS/NFLD

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Roderick Francis                          District Chief, CMM
Reg Maloney                                District Chief, UNSI
Viola Robinson                             Lead Negotiator
Eric Zscheile                               Associate Negotiator
Joe B. Marshall                            Senior Mi’kmaq Advisor
Janice Maloney                              Executive Director (KMKNO)
Priscilla Beadle                           KMKNO
Eric Christmas                             KMKNO
Twila Gaudet                                KMKNO
Jennifer MacGillivary                       KMKNO
Melissa Nevin                               KMKNO
Chrystal Dorey                              KMKNO
Jean Knockwood                              KMKNO
Heather MacLeod-Leslie                      KMKNO
Debbie Paul                                 KMKNO
Tanya Johnson-MacVicar                      KMKNO
Eleanor Bernard                             MK
Cheryl Maloney                              NSNWA
Zabrina Whitman                             Glooscap Community Service
Cheryl Cardinal                             Dir. National Energy Business Ctr of Excellence
Lynn Calf Robe                              Mgr, National Energy Business Ctr of Excellence

“Confidential, privileged and under the protection of the February 23, 2007 Mi’kmaq-Nova Scotia-Canada Framework Agreement.”
Regrets:

Chief Andrea Paul
Chief Jerry F. Sack

Pictou Landing First Nation
Shubenacadie First Nation

OPENING PRAYER

The meeting was opened with a prayer by Grand Chief Ben Sylliboy
Chaired by Chief Gerard Julian
Quorum 12: Meeting called to order.

Approval of the Proposed Negotiation and Consultation Agendas.

T. 4) First Nation Management of Natural Resources – Zabrina Whitman

▷ Zabrina presented her research thesis on First Nation Management of Natural Resources.
▷ Looking for permission to go into your communities to conduct interviews. Will report back to the communities and the Assembly.
▷ At this time Mi’kmak Ethics Watch Committee is delayed. Will continue efforts in obtaining approval.
▷ Looking for support.

MOTION # 4 [The Assembly supports Zabrina Whitman in conducting interviews.]

Moved by Chief Roderick Googoo
Seconded by Chief Wilbert Marshall
Vote on Motion: 12 in favor.
Against: 0 Abstentions: 0
Decision: Motion carried.
Appendix C

Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch – Ethics Approval

October 5, 2012

Zabrina Whitman
75 Middle Road
Lawrencetown, NS
B0S 1M0

Dear Ms. Whitman,

I wish to inform you that the Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch committee has reviewed and approved “Indigenous Management of Natural Resources: A First Nation Perspective—Is it possible to assure traditional knowledge is at the forefront of management, and to have economic development? A case study of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaw First Nations from 2007 to 2012.”

As your project moves forward with the approval of the Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch, I must note that individual communities have their own perspective on research projects and it is your responsibility to consult them to ensure that you meet any further ethical requirements. Governments, universities, granting agencies, and the like also have ethical processes to which you might have to conform.

When your project is completed, the Mi’kmaq Resource Centre at Unama’ki College would be pleased to accept the results in a form that could be made available to students and other researchers (if it is appropriate to disseminate them). Our common goal is to foster a better understanding of the Indigenous knowledges.

If you have any questions concerning the Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch review of your project please do not hesitate to contact me and I will forward them to the committee members.

Sincerely,

Rod Nichols, PhD
Dean of Arts & Social Sciences
Acting Principal, Unama’ki College
Cape Breton University

P.O. Box 5300, 1250 Grand Lake Road, Sydney, Nova Scotia, Canada B1P 6L2
www.capebretonu.ca