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Abstract

This research examines the process of memorialisation around the Indian Residential School System in Canada to draw connections between the fields of transitional justice and professional urban planning. For over a century, government and churches in Canada operated a system of residential schools that removed Indigenous children from their families and communities. Today, many Indigenous communities struggle with the intergenerational impacts of this system, and as a society we are attempting to heal the damaged relationships that have resulted.

This research presents a comparative case study of two processes of memorialisation surrounding the residential school system. Through site observations, interviews, and analyses of documents, this research examines the transformation and memorialisation of the Mohawk Institute, a former residential school, into the Woodland Cultural Centre, a First Nations-run centre located in Brantford, Ontario. I compare this example with the national Commemoration Fund, set out in the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (2006), which settled lawsuits filed by residential school survivors against the federal government of Canada and several church organisations.

This research underlines some tensions inherent in memorialising the human rights abuses experienced in the residential schools. A significant difficulty is establishing balance between leaving ownership of stories of the residential school experiences with survivors, while acknowledging the responsibilities that the whole of society must carry if reconciliation is to be achieved. I conclude that the process established through the Commemoration Fund does not adequately reflect this balance, leaving a heavy burden on survivors and their communities without providing adequate support. I further argue that the timelines established through this
fund do not allow for the longer-term evolution that may characterize effective memorialisation projects.

These themes link to theories around collaborative planning, and considerations of social justice and procedural fairness. In recent decades, collaborative planning has been seen as a way to make planning practices more inclusive. However, in the context of planning with Indigenous Peoples, collaborative processes may not be a sufficient response to rights claims. This has important implications for professional planners, as we work towards decolonization, reconciliation, and establishing just-relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations in Canada.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

For well over one-hundred years the government and church organisations in Canada operated a system of residential schools that removed Indigenous children from their families and communities. The purpose of these schools was to educate these children as a way to assimilate them into the settler population of Canada. Today, this goal seems ludicrously immoral, especially since there is now evidence that children in these schools often faced poor living conditions and abusive treatment. Today, many Indigenous communities continue to struggle with the intergenerational impacts of the residential school system and, as a society, Canada is attempting to heal the damaged relationships that have resulted.

This thesis examines the memorialisation processes surrounding the Indian Residential School System (IRS) in Canada, from the perspective of professional urban planning. Memorialisation can be understood as a facet of transitional justice, where society tries to rectify the damages from past injustices in order to reach reconciliation. As with all public policy fields, urban planning must operate within the context of history, existing relationships, and power dynamics. In recent decades, processes of collaborative planning have gained in popularity as a way to make the practices of planning more democratic and inclusive. Planners work collaboratively with First Nations communities in the conservation of heritage spaces to contextualize First Nations histories as an addition, or an alternative to already recorded settler histories. However, in the context of planning with Indigenous Peoples, adopting collaborative processes may not be a sufficient response to rights claims. Collaborative planning consistently situates Indigenous Peoples as one of many ‘stakeholders’, with the planner acting as a facilitator. The category of
‘stakeholder’ does not adequately reflect the claims or aspirations of Indigenous Peoples, nor does it acknowledge the ‘colonial culture’ of planning (Porter, 2010).

This thesis has sought answers to the following research questions:

- What are the processes that inform planning for the memorialisation of residential schools in Canada? (i.e., processes as they are mandated and conducted at the national level).
- How does the process of First Nations memorialisation (as a form of transitional justice) emerge from the grassroots level?
- What role can planners play in this context?

I have approached this research as a comparative case study of two processes of memorialisation surrounding the residential school system. Drawing from interviews, site observations and a review of documents, I have presented the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC), a First Nations-run cultural centre located in the buildings of the Mohawk Institute, and a former residential school in Brantford, Ontario, as one example of a process of memorialisation. I compare this example with my examination of the on-going national process of memorialisation that is occurring through the Commemoration Fund set out in the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA)(2006). The IRSSA settled the lawsuits filed by residential school survivors against the federal government of Canada and several church organisations. Looking at the settlement agreement as a negotiated document, and considering that commemoration funding is structured through a community-led model, I show how it is possible to consider this national process an example of the collaborative processes advocated by collaborative planning theorists.

I provide evidence that the national process established to distribute the commemoration funding is unlikely to produce a permanent and meaningful network of memorials, and that it is not clear that all communities will feel that they have benefitted from the programme. This research points
to the struggle within residential school system transitional justice projects to balance respecting survivors’ ownership of the residential school history and ensuring that the ‘burden’ (Canada, 2008) for reconciliation and healing is not left entirely to survivors and their communities. It is not clear that an appropriate balance has been achieved, since the non-monetary remedies found in the IRSSA are largely designed to be community-led initiatives. These initiatives are funded through the agreement, but the onus is on communities to conceptualize and realize the projects. Giving this responsibility to communities is empowering, but it may be once again, relying unfairly on communities to shoulder the burden for reconciliation. These themes link to theories about collaborative planning, and to considerations for how to best balance issues of social justice and procedural fairness in the context of Indigenous rights claims.

The case study of the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC) further shows that memorialisation is a long term process. In the case of the WCC, the way the centre acts as a memorial is continuing to evolve even today, forty years after the centre was founded. Based on this finding, I conclude that the timeframes established for commemoration funding are too short to constitute a strong commemoration programme.

The applications of this research to the profession of urban planning are twofold: first, to the conversations around the decolonization of the practice of planning, and second, as a case for consideration by planners who are working with sites that have a complex or troubling history. I conclude that the profession of planning must look beyond the processes of collaborative planning if it is to establish post-colonial relationships from which to work.

Following this introduction, Chapter 2 provides background and context, including a brief overview of the history of Indian Residential Schools in Canada as well as the history of the Woodland Cultural Centre site. This chapter also provides the theoretical context of the project,
primarily consisting of a literature review around transitional justice, memorialisation, and urban planning. Chapter 3 presents the methodology I employed, which relied on literature and document review, site observations, and semi-structured interviews. The final sequence of chapters consists of findings and analysis followed by a brief discussion, and conclusions which include suggestions for further research.
Chapter 2. Literature Review and Background

Indian Residential Schools and Reconciliation in Canada

Overview of Residential School System and Legacy

Indian Residential Schools (IRS) have been described as “the laboratories and production lines of the colonial system” (Manuel & Posluns, 1974, p. 63). The residential school system removed Indigenous children from their families and communities to ‘educate’ and prepare them for lives in mainstream Canada by “stamping out the Indian” in them (Aboriginal Healing Foundation (AHF), 2008). The Indian Residential School System in Canada represented a policy of forced cultural assimilation for Canada’s First Nations, Inuit and Métis Nations. This policy was pursued by the federal government in partnership with various church denominations for over 150 years, with the first school opening in 1831, and the last closing in 1996 (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007). In that year, there were over 100 000 people living in Canada that had attended these schools (AHF, 2008).

During the decades where attendance at residential schools was mandatory for Aboriginal children, every child in a community from the age of five to sixteen would be moved to a residential school (Flisfeder, 2010). Indigenous children were often forcibly removed from their families and communities, and while in the schools were forced to adopt the language, culture and religion of the Christian, settler society. The violently assimilative intentions of the IRS are inherent in the language used to describe the policy. The goals were to “kill the Indian in the child” and ‘sever’ the relationships between children and their families and communities (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP), 1996: II, 10.3).
In addition to disruption of culture and community, neglect, physical and sexual abuse were widespread in the schools (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007). Furthermore, the schools were consistently underfunded, meaning that students lived in poverty, and were used as free labour in projects to keep the schools solvent. These projects were often prioritized over education (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007). Throughout the era of residential schools, internal reports and inspections constantly pointed to problems including: poor nutrition and overcrowding leading to alarming rates of disease and death; instances of severe corporal punishment and physical abuse; and poor levels of educational attainment compared to other schools (RCAP, 1996). These reports were received by the Department of Indian Affairs, but seldom led to anything beyond intentions for reforms. These intentions would at most lead to unenforced standards that were passed down to the IRS principals, or to the restructuring of funding that provided few additional funds. More often, the reports of poor conditions in the schools prompted no response at all (RCAP, 1996).

In addition to the direct effects of underfunding on the children, the working conditions and salaries for staff at the schools were also poor. These poor working conditions, combined with the isolation of the schools from both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities, contributed to, and enabled the systemic abuse suffered by so many students (RCAP, 1996). The original intent of the schools was for graduates to find jobs in settler communities rather than move back to Aboriginal land reserves. Racism, combined with the poor level of education provided by the schools, meant that employment upon graduation was rarely the outcome. Instead, graduates often found themselves trapped between the two cultures, unwelcome in settler-Canada, and having lost, and been taught to despise, the languages and cultures of their communities of origin (RCAP, 1996). Intergenerational impacts of the IRS such as alcoholism, drug dependence, poor
relationship skills, violence, suicide, and patterns of abuse continue to be felt in Indigenous communities throughout Canada (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007).

**Attempts to Resolve Residential School Survivors’ Claims Outside of the Courts**

Reports of abuse at the residential schools began to enter the public arena in the early 1990s. It quickly became clear that the courts would not be an effective mechanism through which to address claims for compensation. At the peak, in the early 2000’s over 13 000 residential school survivors were litigating through the courts in individual and class action lawsuits. The federal government was spending millions of dollars each year on defence lawyers, and several churches were afraid they would go bankrupt (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007). Worse, more and more survivors were dying while waiting for their cases to be heard (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007).

For these reasons, the federal government was forced to look for an alternative means of resolving the disputes surrounding the residential school system. In general, some reasons for pursuing alternative dispute resolution processes are that they can be more efficient than the courts, and that they can lead to greater participant satisfaction, empowerment, and social justice, including opportunities for community organizing (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007). Further, the courts are not an appropriate place to address mass violence or to improve broken relationships (Flisfeder, 2010). While the courts did address actions related to physical and sexual abuse, they did not address actions related to loss of culture; this is especially true since courts attempt to create redress at the level of the individual, while cultural loss is a loss at the level of the community (Flisfeder, 2010).

In this context, the government, churches and Indigenous communities needed to find an alternative to litigation surrounding the Residential Schools issues. In 2006, Indigenous
communities, churches and the federal government reached a negotiated agreement, known as the *Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA)* (2006) to settle all the class action lawsuits of residential school survivors. In fact, this was the second attempt of the federal government to establish an alternative dispute resolution process for residential school survivors. The first alternative dispute resolution (ADR) process established by the federal government included the release of a widely critiqued *statement of reconciliation* (see for example, Corntassel & Holder, 2008), the creation of and funding for an Aboriginal-run Aboriginal Healing Foundation (AHF), and the creation of a claims settlement process known as the National Resolution Framework (NRF) (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007). A clear indication that this framework was inadequate came when less than 10% of litigating survivors chose to participate in the process (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007).

Before the NRF was established, the government held a number of ‘exploratory dialogues’ with survivors across Canada. Through these dialogues, a set of shared principles and survivor goals were established to guide the development of an ADR process. Though the NRF claimed that these principles were embedded in their ADR process, Funk-Unrau & Snyder (2007) argued that the government merely co-opted the language of these dialogues in order to give false legitimacy to a process that did not address the concerns of survivors or embody the potential of a good ADR process. In their 2007 article, Funk-Unrau & Snyder used the principles and goals identified in the ‘exploratory dialogues’ to assess the NRF process.

The goals and principles identified by residential school survivors in the dialogues were (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007, p. 291 and 295):

- Self-design of process by prospective users
- Full community participation in process
• Flexibility
• Consensus based decision-making
• An appropriate range of non-monetary remedies
• Build relationships through mutual respect and understanding
• Obtain holistic and comprehensive government response recognizing and addressing all the harms committed in and resulting from the residential schools
• Raise public awareness of the harms done to Aboriginal peoples through the Indian Residential Schools System
• Heal individuals and communities from the destructive impacts of the schools over several generations
• Reconcile all parties involved, and,
• Develop a timely process to meet the needs of elderly survivors

Though the government claimed that the NRF process represented the earlier consultation with survivors, the process itself was developed internally, and seemed to ignore or directly counter, the goals and principles from the exploratory dialogues (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007). Funk-Unrau & Snyder (2007) found that the process for claiming monetary compensation was unnecessarily slow and complex, and that the amounts of financial compensation available were not adequate. Perhaps the most troubling shortcomings of the NRF, when compared with the goals established in the dialogues, were that it included few non-monetary remedies, and that it only contained individual remedies, no remedies designed to heal communities.

While the NRF process was meant to be non-adversarial, it was inherently so since the main focus was on proving or disproving the claims made by survivors. Many survivors cited re-victimization through this process and the reinforcement of negative relationships. The complexity and slowness of the process was also seen as a sign of the reluctance of the government to engage with survivors and of disrespect towards survivors (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007). Further, the confidentiality requirements of the process left survivors feeling isolated, made it difficult for survivors to criticize the process, and limited the involvement of the community and the potential for public education (Funk-Unrau & Snyder, 2007). Finally,
survivors were compensated only for physical and sexual abuse, while claimants were required to release the government from potential liability for loss of culture, language, or violation of treaty rights (Flisfeder, 2010). The IRSSA, a negotiated settlement reached between the federal government, several churches, and representatives of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis communities replaced the NFR. While many of the critiques of the NFR could also be applied to the 2006 agreement, the negotiated agreement did address the inadequacies of the first reconciliation framework.

On May 8, 2006, the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement (IRSSA) came into effect, ending the class action lawsuits brought by residential school survivors against the Government of Canada and several church denominations. The settlement allocated money for reparations payments for all individuals who attended the residential schools, with additional compensation for individuals who suffered abuse. The IRSSA also set out the mandate and funding for a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), renewed funding to the Aboriginal Healing Foundation (AHF) for five years, and provided funding for commemoration initiatives.

As discussed above, Funk-Unrau & Snyder (2007), point out a number of specific ways the earlier framework failed to address the goals and needs of survivors as identified in the exploratory dialogues. While still limited, and facing many challenges, the IRSSA better meets the goals of survivors. Here are a few examples of ways the IRSSA addresses the identified goals:

- As a negotiated agreement, it represents self-design of the process, especially because of the level of detail included in the agreement. The agreement includes the full process for applying for and receiving reparation payments, and even provides drafts of the application forms to be used (Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA), 2006).
• The main form of reparations payment, the Common Experience Payment (CEP) is provided to all former students of the residential schools, leaving aside the question of abuse (IRSSA, 2006).

• The agreement also sets out a number of non-monetary reparations, including a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), a museum to house the findings of the commission, and another fund for commemoration initiatives (IRSSA, 2006). These elements of the agreement are assessed in more depth below.

• Another important element of the agreement is that timelines are attached to each step of the process. For example, it includes a commitment that a minimum of 2,500 Individual Assessment Process (IAP) claims will be processed per year (IRSSA, 2006). Though there are downsides to these timeframes, it ensured that more of the aging survivors would be able to benefit from the agreement.

A further positive indication for this agreement was that few survivors chose to ‘opt out’ of the agreement, and a very high percentage of eligible recipients applied for, and received Common Experience Payments. As of August 2008, 95,000 individuals had applied for reparations, and over 68,000 payments had been issued (International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ), 2008). This also shows that the timelines laid out in the IRSSA were being adhered to.

The historical and on-going relationship between Indigenous Peoples and Canada’s government is such that many survivors continue to view this agreement and the reconciliation process with suspicion (Corntassel & Holder, 2008). Specific to this relationship, the government and church groups fought against survivors’ claims for years, and the original NFR further eroded trust. In addition, Corntassel and Holder (2008) argued that the amounts of compensation are still too small to make up for the loss of culture and abuse suffered. The challenge of providing adequate reparations for mass human rights abuses remains ever-present. The number of victims involved will make it unlikely that reparations will be able to compensate individuals at the same level as would be expected through the courts. Also, no matter the level of compensation, putting a price
tag on human suffering is inherently problematic (De Greiff, 2004). This is why the agreement tried to provide a balance of non-monetary remedies.

**Since 2008: A National Apology**

In 2008, to coincide with the launch of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), Prime Minister Stephen Harper issued an official apology to the survivors of the Indian Residential Schools System (Flisfeder, 2010). A genuine, authentic apology can be surprisingly powerful (Corntassel & Holder, 2008). Harper’s 2008 apology acknowledged the racist goals of the system and the profound negative impact it had, and continues to have, on Indigenous communities. In addressing First Nations Peoples across Canada, Harper stated, ‘the burden of this experience has been on your shoulders for far too long, the burden is properly ours as a government, and as a country’ (Canada, 2008). The apology promises that now we (Canadians) will join you (those First Nations impacted by the system) on the journey to recovery (Canada, 2008).

Activities of the TRC include organizing national and community events as a forum for sharing experiences and educating the public. The TRC is mandated to prepare a complete historical record of the residential school system and the conditions from which the system emerged. The TRC will create a report of the commission’s findings and will include recommendations. The TRC is also required to create a research centre and archives that will act as a lasting resource for Canadians about the residential school system (Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), 2012). On February 24, 2012 the TRC issued an interim report and an historical document entitled *Canada, Aboriginal Peoples, and Residential Schools: They came for the children* (TRC, 2012b).
Funding for the Aboriginal Healing Foundation (AHF) as provided by the IRSSA, expired in 2010 and the federal government chose not to renew this funding. The AHF still exists but is no longer able to fund the network of community-based healing initiatives that it helped to foster (AHF, 2010). The commemoration aspect of the IRSSA will likely be distributed in the 2012 and 2013 fiscal years, and two calls for proposals were issued in January of 2011, and 2012 (TRC, 2011; TRC, 2012d).

To be successful, the TRC must promote reconciliation within the whole of society, and involve Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities (Flisfeder, 2010). There are many definitions of reconciliation, but no easy-to-follow roadmaps that show how to achieve it (Flisfeder, 2010). The TRC has an enormous task, but a limited budget and timeframe. One important measure of the TRC’s success will be how well it is able to manage the expectations of stakeholders, so that individuals and communities view the process as beneficial. The TRC faces other limitations including a restriction on naming or identifying individuals accused of wrong-doings (Rice, 2011) and the ‘divergent understandings of history’ that divide the ways that Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities within Canada understand the legacy of the IRS (Flisfeder, 2010, p. 15). The last and most serious threat to the reconciliation process will come once the commission delivers its recommendations. If there is no response to this truth-telling and reconciliation process, then there is a high risk that the relationships this process is designed to heal, will be further damaged (Flisfeder, 2010).

This paper will further assess and examine the IRSSA and its outcomes, especially surrounding the TRC and the commemoration funding.
The Mohawk Institute and the Woodland Cultural Centre

As a way to explore the transitional justice processes around the residential school system in Canada, I use the case study of a former residential school site. This thesis is based on a case study of the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC), in Brantford, Ontario. I use the Woodland Cultural Centre, a First Nations-run museum and cultural centre, as an example of a community led memorialisation initiative. It is located on the site and in the buildings of the former Mohawk Institute. The Mohawk Institute was a residential school in operation from 1831 until 1970. The school was operated by the Anglican Church and funded by a society known as the New England Company (Graham, 1997). At its largest, in 1955, the school held 185 students. The school burnt down, and was rebuilt twice, it burnt most recently in 1903. The current school building dates to 1904. A working farm was owned and operated by the school, using the labour of the male students from 1860 to 1963 (Graham, 1997).

Like other residential schools, the Mohawk Institute had strict rules around language and religion, was designed to promote assimilation, and the school was chronically underfunded. At different time periods the school experienced different levels and types of management, and in turn, discipline was stricter or more lenient (Graham, 1997). Survivors of the Mohawk Institute report use of inhumane punishments and mental, physical, cultural and sexual abuse. Survivors also talk about the loneliness of being small children at the school and the shock of the change from what their lives were like with their families and in their communities, compared with their experiences at the Mohawk Institute (WCC, 2005).

In 1965, the school building was sold to the Government of Canada, and in 1969, the Government of Canada concluded that the Mohawk Institute was no longer needed, since, of the ninety-six students at the school, only twenty-three came from the Six Nations community. The
rest of the students were from Northern communities where new schools were being built (Graham, 1997). The Mohawk Institute was closed at the end of the 1969-1970 school year. When the school was closed in 1970, the school buildings and associated lands reverted to the Six Nations on the Grand River land reserve (Anglican Church of Canada, 2008). The site is not connected to the Six Nations land reserve, but is within the City of Brantford; it is about a fifteen-minute drive from Six Nations, and a ten-minute drive from downtown Brantford (see Figure 1: Woodland Cultural Centre Relative to Brantford and Six Nations Land Reserve).

Figure 1. Woodland Cultural Centre Relative to Brantford and Six Nations Land Reserve

![Map of Woodland Cultural Centre Relative to Brantford and Six Nations Land Reserve](http://mun.ca/cayuga/cayuga/faq.php)

The WCC was established in 1972 by the Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians (WCC, 2012) and was funded by the federal Cultural Educational Centres Programme and nine support communities. The Six Nations on the Grand River Council agreed to allow the WCC use of the former Mohawk Institute school buildings (Hill, 1972). When it opened, the mandate of the WCC was “To collect, store, and research; provide information on Woodland First Nations, and provide education” (Hill, 1972, p. 1). The four original departments that made up the WCC – the audio-visual department, the library, the museum, and the publications department – reflected this mandate (Hill, 1972).
The WCC has evolved significantly over the last 40 years. Two of the original four departments, the library and museum, are still operating, while the audio-visual and publishing departments no longer exist. Today, the centre has an education and tours department, as well as a language department that has done ground-breaking work in preserving and promoting First Nations languages (WCC, 2012b). The WCC is still largely funded by the Cultural Educational Centres Programme, an Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) programme that currently provides funding to 116 centres across the country (Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC), 2009).

Today the centre receives funding from only three of its original eight support communities: Six Nations on the Grand River First Nation, Wahta First Nation, and Tyendinaga First Nation (WCC, 2012) (see Figure 2: Woodland Cultural Centre: Support Communities). The reason identified for why some communities no longer choose to provide support to the centre is that they wanted funds allocated for programs to be used within their own communities (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012). Today the centre has twelve full-time staff as well as a number of part-time and contract staff (WCC, 2012).
The programming and activities of the WCC are constantly evolving. Some events have been held annually since the centre opened, including a number of festivals and a well-respected juried art show that annually displays works of new and established Indigenous artists from across North America. More recently, in 2011, the museum held an exhibit on land claims that attracted record numbers of visitors (WCC, 2012b). To provide an example of the community programming, when I last visited in March, 2012, the centre was hosting a dance-themed March break camp for youth aged 9-13 years. The camp taught a variety of dance styles including hip-hop and ceremonial dancing (WCC, 2012a).

During my site visit on November 14-15, 2011, I photographed and prepared a detailed observation of the centre and its relationship to the other buildings and adjoining land uses. I have documented the visit in an annotated map (see Figure 3: Woodland Cultural Centre: Site Map). The centre is located on Mohawk Street, which partially runs alongside the Grand River.
Across the street from the centre is a medium-density residential area that appears clean and safe. There are a number of industrial uses nearby, including several industrial buildings adjacent to the WCC and a municipal landfill a few minutes’ drive along the road. The industrial buildings do not seem to create noise or disruption for the centre. It is clear that many of the buildings are not currently in use, and during my visits I only once saw a truck leaving one of the buildings. The centre is also well sheltered by wood-stands on each side. The expansive grounds mainly consist of manicured lawns, but there are also tiny patches of wilderness along the east side and the back of the grounds which back onto what appear to be floodplains of the river. There is also a row of mature evergreen trees along the west side of the grounds, separating the front driveway and the museum from the neighbouring industrial buildings. Another interesting feature of the grounds is a blocked off gas pump, a remnant of the school farm that was closed in 1963. The gas pump is located in the northeast corner of the grounds, beside which there where at one time two barns (WCC, 2011).

Visitors who approach the centre must travel a long driveway with an apple orchard on the left that dates back to the residential school. The main building that was formerly the Mohawk Institute is directly situated at the end of the driveway. It is an imposing industrial-looking three-storey red brick structure, with a white cupola and large, pillared front porch. Since its construction in 1904, the building has had small wings (with staircases) added to either side, as well as a large addition in the back that contains the kitchens, cafeteria, boiler room etc. These renovations were done in 1950s, in the same era as the erection of the building that now houses the museum and administrative offices of the WCC. The museum building is long and low to the ground, and the front has been decoratively paneled with wood. The third and final structure on the grounds is a small brick house that is part way up the drive towards Mohawk Street. At one
time this was the school principal’s dwelling, it is currently being rented to a member of the WCC staff.

The museum building is situated perpendicular to the former school building, approximately 100 metres to the west. There is parking located both in front of the school building and to the west, nearer the museum building. While the landscaping and wood panelling along the front of the museum building make it quite aesthetically pleasing, the height and size of the former school building, as well as its commanding architecture, make it the visual focal point of the site.

The museum building is currently undergoing renovations, including to the roof which has been leaking heavily, and even putting some of the centre’s collections at risk. The Mohawk Institute building is also in need of repairs, visible to the casual observer the foundation is crumbling, and boards and some pieces of shingle have fallen from the roof.

My research findings (in Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis), include an examination of the ways that the WCC represents a memorialisation of the Mohawk Institute and the residential school system. I will also explain the ways that the history of the site is understood by the individuals I interviewed, and interpreted for the public.
Theoretical Context

Canada’s on-going experience with transitional justice refers to the projects surrounding the *Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA)* (2006). This in turn can be understood in the context of the need for reconciliation through developing just relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous governments and peoples. This section will explore theories of transitional justice and decolonization as two parallel processes that are both necessary to approach just relations and reconciliation.

Providing the necessary theoretical background involves: 1) exploring the goals of transitional justice and how they apply to the context of a colonial, settler state; 2) developing an understanding of what memorialisation is, and how it fits into the broader context of transitional justice; 3) linking the practices of urban planning to transitional justice, specifically focusing on the literature concerning heritage conservation, which is a direct intersection of planning and history; 4) investigating the location of colonization in the history and culture of professional planning. This last point, in particular, must be addressed if planners are to have a positive role in the transitional justice process in Canada. Suggestions about ways to decolonize planning practices come from (post)colonial planning literature.

**Transitional Justice and Reconciliation**

Transitional justice is “an overt engagement with a major political transformation” (Huggins, 2009, p. 336). It can be defined as measures taken to redress massive human rights abuses; these measures typically include prosecutions, truth-telling, reparations, and institutional reform (Duthie, 2009). Truth and reconciliation commissions as well as memorialisation are some of the initiatives that fall into the category of truth-telling (Bilbijia, Fair, Milton & Payne, 2005).
Transitional justice measures can change how populations expect to interact with the state, and can contribute to establishing trust between governments and their citizens. Transitional justice measures can be an acknowledgement that the government has been responsible for human rights violations, and can indicate that this is being taken seriously by the current government, and/or the international community (De Greiff, 2009).

The complexity of dealing with the aftermath of massive human rights abuses mean that transitional justice measures must be undertaken with great sensitivity, and attention to context and detail. A transitional justice measure can never be completely successful, since past injustices can never be undone or fully compensated. The best possible outcome of transitional justice is to help pave the way for a more just future. In Latin America, many transitional justice projects work under the phrase ‘nunca mas’, or ‘never again’ (Bilbija et. al, 2005). An unsuccessful transitional justice program can re-victimise individuals or groups, and further contribute to feelings of marginalisation or disenfranchisement (see for example, Corntassel & Holder, 2008, Flisfeder, 2010). An unfortunate possible outcome for the transitional justice projects in Canada is that once the terms of the Indian Residential School System Agreement (2006) have been met, the Federal Government of Canada will have fulfilled its liability for the systemic cultural, mental, physical, and sexual abuses of the residential school system without making notable progress towards reconciliation or just relations with Indigenous populations.

Unless peoples’ lives improve after the implementation of transitional justice, the transitional justice measures can be seen as worthless (De Greiff, 2009). Transitional justice measures are often very expensive, for example, a number of the ‘special courts’ that have been established by the international community to prosecute the parties responsible for human rights violations, have budgets that are comparable to, or even higher than the total national justice budgets of the
countries in which they are located (De Greiff, 2009). In the case of Canada, the total cost of the IRSSA, was in excess of 2.1 billion dollars, not including legal fees. Since governments and international donors have limited resources, there is always a need to balance resources spent “dealing with the past” against the other urgent needs of the population (De Greiff, 2009, p. 31). But when trying to establish a new normative system, there is no such thing as a ‘new beginning,’ as victims and non-victims must coexist (De Greiff, 2009, p. 31). In this way, transitional justice works towards reconciliation.

Getting to a place of reconciliation is about achieving a reality where “relationships will not be haunted by the conflicts and hatreds of yesterday”; it is hoped that this can be achieved by addressing the past, and rebuilding relationships (Corntassel & Holder, 2008, p. 469).

At the core of reconciliation, is coming to a place where people are prepared to share a future (Corntassel & Holder, 2008). Inherently, this implies that existing relationships are not healthy, and thus need to be transformed or ‘healed’ (Corntassel & Holder, 2008, p. 467). Reconciliation is about building trust, figuring out differences, and looking for ways to change the relationships of the past, so that lasting future relationships are possible. Meaningful reconciliation is not about ‘forgive and forget’ but about ‘remember and change’ (Flisfeder, 2010, p. 10). This is an important distinction, because the acts of forgiving and forgetting place responsibility for action with the individuals and groups against whom injustice was perpetrated. Reconciliation based on remembering and changing is instead the responsibility of every member of society.

*Reconciliation in a Settler State: Reconciliation is Decolonization is Reconciliation*

It is not enough to look at the Indian Residential School System (IRS) without considering the broader historical context of colonialism (Flisfeder, 2010). Transitional justice around the residential school system has to be considered within broader calls for justice, since, the
residential school system was only “one prong of a much more comprehensive policy of Aboriginal dispossession, exclusion, and forced assimilation” (Jung, 2009, p. 4).

While I agree that “the Truth and Reconciliation Commission cannot effectively address the Residential School System without considering the context of other problems faced by these communities” (Flisfeder, 2010, p. 1), I think it is important to address the IRS as a separate piece of the overall relationship between Aboriginals and non-Aboriginals in Canada. This system was a unique interaction of the broader policy regime of assimilation that enabled gross abuse of power at the individual level. Abuse in institutional settings is common (psychiatric hospitals, prisons…) but the racism inherent in this system further undermined the accountability that the people running the schools should have had to the parents and communities of the children that were their wards.

An important theme in the literature around the Canadian transitional justice project is that the language of reconciliation can be co-opted, and where this occurs, it represents a further injustice against the people who have been wronged. Some examples of how this can occur include: where colonial injustices are on-going (Corntassel & Holder, 2008); where the truth is told and there is no response (Flisfeder, 2010); or where reconciliation is emphasized above accountability (Huggins, 2009). Furthermore, Funk-Unrau & Snyder (2007), argued that the Government of Canada’s earlier attempt at a national framework for reconciliation represented an example of a damaging co-option of the language of reconciliation.

If it is impossible to achieve reconciliation in the absence of just relations (Corntassel & Holder, 2008), it is equally impossible to achieve just relations in the absence of transitional justice. There are two reasons for this; the first is that without an understanding of the injustices of the
past, it is difficult to define new, more positive relations. The second reason is that the past is always present, whether or not it is directly addressed (Porter, 2010).

One of the (if not the) key areas of change needed for reconciliation to occur between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities in settler states is through decolonization (Corntassel & Holder, 2008). Decolonization can encompass, decolonization of institutions (such as planning), of land, of power relations, and of public memory and history. Corntassel & Holder (2008) argued that the core of decolonization is recognition of the inherent right of Indigenous Peoples to self-determination. They use the definition put forward by James Tully that self-determination is “the right of a people to govern themselves by their own laws and to exercise jurisdiction over their own territories” (Tully, in Corntassel & Holder, 2008, p. 471). This understanding of decolonization calls for a recovery of homelands and regeneration of cultures and community, in contrast to colonial processes which serve to “disconnect indigenous people from histories, landscapes, languages, social relations, ways of thinking, feeling and interacting with the world” (Tuhiwai Smith in Corntassel & Holder, 2008, p. 471).

Similarly, Porter (2010) indicated that sovereignty and self-determination for Indigenous Peoples is essential in order to counter marginalisation. She notes that these rights are inherent to Indigenous Peoples based on their status as the original inhabitants of a territory and, in some cases, based on the existence of treaties. Porter defined sovereignty as having control over territory, in terms of the rights to use and enjoy the land, to control access to it, and to determine its management. She further reminds us that gaining sovereignty over territory was also the goal of colonialism (Porter, 2010).

To explain the relevance of decolonization to reconciliation, Corntassel and Holder (2008) pointed to the limitations of transitional justice in the colonial context. For example, initiatives
such as truth commissions often search for unity. This can be an overt or implicit exercise in nation building, which could be seen as forwarding assimilative goals, and so run counter to goals of decolonization (Corntassel & Holder, 2008). The conceptualization of “reconciliation as re-colonization” (Taiaiake Alfred, 2012) is profoundly troubling, and may be a sign that the current reconciliation project in Canada is failing. Inherently, reconciliation and transitional justice in Canada must mean decolonization. If transitional justice is “an overt engagement with a major political transformation” (Huggins, 2009, p. 336), then a transition must have occurred, or be occurring. In the case of Canada then, transitional justice must be an engagement with the transition from a colonial, to a (post)colonial reality. Therefore, transitional justice in Canada must come through decolonization. To complete the argument, Taiaiake Alfred’s statement that “reconciliation is re-colonization” is a revelation that transitional justice is not being practiced in Canada because the major political transformation (to a (post)colonial) society has not materialised.

Sandercock (2004) suggested that, if colonialism is the age of European empires, then (post)colonialism officially refers to the dismantling of colonial institutional arrangements, through the official moments of decolonization and racial desegregation. But she noted that in actuality, a colonial mentality and governmentality has lingered on in other forms and that institutionalised racism persists in liberal democracies (Sandercock, 2004, p. 119).

The connection between decolonization and achieving reconciliation is important throughout the literature around the IRSSA. Corntassel and Holder (2008) identified decolonization and restitution as the necessary elements for reconciliation. They further suggested a model of reconciliation that involves looking for ways to decolonize existing relationships (Corntassel & Holder, 2008). Flisfeder (2010), who does not directly focus on decolonization, still addresses it
when he noted that, “without reconciliation, the public will learn about past mistakes while continuing to make new ones” (p. 20). In this sentence, decolonization processes are implicit in the call to make the changes necessary in order to avoid making such mistakes in the future. It has also been suggested that transitional justice practitioners in general need to pay more attention to longer standing injustices, including those that date back to colonization (Huggins, 2009).

Huggins (2009) sees the work of reforming the social fabric of society, as involving “the gradual process of ‘unmaking’ violence and of enabling new, non-violent decision making processes” (p. 336). He further suggested that changing the rule of law is insufficient while unjust structures and dynamics of decision-making are still in place. He also calls for more work to be done in exploring this. The necessity of decolonization to produce reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Peoples in Canada provides an impetus to forward the decolonization of the profession of urban planning, this is discussed in detail below.

Public Memory and Memorial in Reconciliation

The idea of public or shared memory, involves the collective understanding we hold of our history, or our story as a community (Anderson, 2002). Considering public memory in this context is important because a part of transitional justice is about changing public memory to bring about societal acknowledgement of past abuses and recognition for the individuals and groups who were subjected to injustices (Cobián & Reátegui, 2009).

Public memory is significant because the way that it shapes our image of ourselves and of others within society can also unite or divide society (Bolton, 2009). Public memory can “form images that, through repetition, attain the value of truth, even if they deviate from fact” (Bolton, 2009, p. 145). But it is also flexible and can change over time, either organically, or because of deliberate
efforts. For example, since 1990, Canadian museums have worked under a policy to improve the Aboriginal content of existing institutions and to ensure Aboriginal institutions are eligible for funding programs (Bolton, 2009).

Public memory is created and reshaped in a multitude of ways, these can include: through the media, the education system, museums, truth commissions, public memorials and heritage conservation. At the core, the goal of truth commissions is to transform intergroup relations (Corntassel & Holder, 2008). One element of this is to change attitudes amongst the general public as a way to target the cultural aspects of the social changes needed to overcome violence (Cobián & Reátegui, 2009). One critique of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) hints at the importance of collective memory to reconciliation processes, is the suggestion that the commission has not done enough to engage with the non-Aboriginal public (Flisfeder, 2010).

Recognition through heritage preservation and memorialisation are also ways of shaping public memory. Official recognition for historic sites can impact the politics of memory, and be a powerful act of witness for claims for redress of injustices (Dubrow, 1998). Moreover, ‘heritage sites’ become a part of people’s everyday encounters with history, they exist in people’s communities and can be something that people look for when they visit other places. In this way, “collective memory is embedded” in cultural heritage sites (Mansfield, 2008, p. 275). Further, the official recognition of a significant site is an act of power. It represents authority over what can, and cannot be considered valuable (Porter, 2010). More significantly, of what is or is not considered valuable.

Corntassel and Holder (2008) identified three questions (based on Hayner, 2001) that can be asked to determine whether or not reconciliation is occurring:

1. Is the process driven by the communities that are affected by the injustices?
2. Is the process inclusive of all affected communities?
3. Is the process transparent and accountable to the communities it aims to engage?
1) How is the past dealt with in the public sphere?
2) What are the relationships between former opponents?
3) Is there one version of the truth, or many? (Corntassel and Holder, p. 470).

The first and third questions directly relate to public memory. Looking at the way the past is addressed through heritage conservation and memorialisation would provide one way to look for answers to these questions.

Memorials devoted to the victims or the history of past injustices have powerful impacts on the way that events are remembered, interpreted and acknowledged. Memorials can create a permanent physical presence for history and memory, and invite visitors to act as witnesses to injustices that have occurred (Mookherjee, 2007). In considering public memory, it is important to remember that memory is not history. Memory involves personal recollection and reconstruction of past events, while history is society’s official explanation of the past. Memory involves forgetting, while history involves exclusions (Abramson, 1999). Abramson (1999), critiqued what he sees as the supremacy of memory over history in contemporary memorialisation practices. He argues that memory can be overly self-centred and passive. Unlike history, memory cannot be used to debate the agency and causation that link the past to the present and the future (Abramson, 1999).

That said, the witnessing power of memory, is particularly important in instances where the goals of a memorial involve reconciliation and redress for past human rights violations (Bilbija et. al, 2005). Therefore, an effective memorial must engage both memory and history, allowing for both personal acknowledgement and debates about the connection between the past, present, and future (Abramson, 1999). Memorials have also been a way for marginalised groups to register claims for acknowledgement and respect. Examples of this include the Power of Place project in Los Angeles that memorialises ethnic and female histories (Abramson, 1999) and the Queer
Spaces project in New York City that acknowledge sites that have been important in the gay rights movement (Dubrow, 1998).

One example of a powerful memorial is the Vietnam War Memorial in Washington, D.C. designed by architect Maya Lin, which combines modernist memory and traditional history (Abramson, 1999, p. 80). The ways people interact with the monument have made it a place of profoundly personal experiences, and of trauma therapy. At the same time, it is linked to the past through its orientation towards other nearby monuments, and it provides a cautionary lesson about the costs of war (Abramson, 1999).

Badly done memorials on the other hand, can create and further entrench divisions within society. For example, in 2000, the Prime Minister of Australia announced his plan to create a Reconciliation Place in the parliamentary triangle in Canberra as a symbol of reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations. This announcement came without any consultation with Indigenous groups, and was seen as profoundly insulting given the official stance of the government towards other reconciliation projects at the time (Corntassel & Holder, 2008). A comparable example opens the introduction to the book *The art of truth-telling about authoritarian rule* (Bilbija et. al, 2005). In this case, a municipal government in South Africa sponsored a memorial at the site where seven children were shot by Apartheid security forces. The community was angry because the memorial had been built at the wrong location on the road. This was seen as robbing the community and future generations of an accurate record of an event that profoundly impacted the community. Instead of the memorial the city intended to create, the site became a symbol of deception (Bilbija et. al, 2005). In both these cases the memorialisation was done on the governments’ terms instead of on the terms of the affected communities (Bilbija et. al, 2005; Corntassel & Holder, 2008).
Heritage Conservation and Public Memory

Heritage preservation has changed in recent decades to recognise the cultural processes that constitute the practice of preservation, (Mansfield, 2008) and to be more inclusive of minorities, and reflect social justice issues (Dubrow, 1998). The field used to belong mainly to the privileged, and was based largely on aesthetics and a narrow understanding of what was important in history and in the built environment (Dubrow, 1998). While heritage conservation is still critiqued as being elitist (Mansfield, 2008), the field has shifted to become more democratic and inclusive, and to involve itself in issues of social justice (Dubrow, 1998).

Where heritage conservation becomes interested in issues, such as those around social justice, is where heritage conservation sites can be understood as memorials. Macdonald (2009) explained the evolution of heritage preservation in Nuremberg, Germany after certain sites of Nazi architecture were granted heritage designation. Because of the way heritage designation ‘cements’ the past of a place to its future, a debate emerged around whether such designations risked conferring on those Nazi sites the sort of “positive evaluation that heritage designation usually implies,” or whether designation could acknowledge fascist architecture and provide witnessing of the past (Macdonald, 2009, p. 124-125). At first, the city of Nuremberg ignored the heritage designation of the Nazi sites, choosing instead to focus on preserving other, more comfortable eras of built heritage. Over time this came to be seen as a repression of Nuremberg’s Nazi past. In Nuremberg, and elsewhere, sites of past atrocities came to be seen as a specific type of heritage conservation that serves the function of providing a warning from the past. In this spirit, safeguarding the heritage is a way of safeguarding the future by informing the public about the past in the hopes of averting future atrocities (Macdonald, 2009).
A parallel interpretation of national and state (provincial) level heritage legislations and designations has been to look at it as a potential wedge for recognition of Indigenous Peoples’ rights claims. There are opportunities in this, but limitations as well (Dubrow, 1998; Porter 2010). One potential for inclusion of Indigenous Peoples is that the designation of a traditional cultural property (in Ontario this would be designated a cultural heritage landscape) codifies an alternative type of value that can be used to off-set arguments about the economic value that could be extracted from the land (Dubrow, 1998). In addition, as mentioned above, official recognition of heritage sites can impact public memory, it can also affect politics by bearing witness to group claims for redress of injustices (Dubrow, 1998).

Porter (2010) presented several limitations of using heritage preservation as a vessel for forwarding Indigenous rights. Her main arguments are: that it risks perpetuating the racist categorisation of Indigenous cultures as primitive or as part of the past, and that it conflates Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies of land into mainstream, colonial, conceptualisations of land, especially in terms of the separation of land-use designations. Porter (2010) argued that if too much of the emphasis of Indigenous rights claims centres around cultural heritage, it can perpetuate the attitude that Indigenous culture does not have contemporary relevance. This can, she argued perpetuate the “colonial essentialisms of primitiveness, authenticity, and cultural loss” (p. 107). The notion of cultural heritage inserts the cultural significance of a place into a fixed time period, typically pre-contact, which can then situate Indigenous culture as a relic, or be used to judge contemporary culture for authenticity (Porter, 2010). Porter (2010) noted that heritage preservation often attempts to enshrine and conserve designated sites, and that this is to deny any contemporary relevance and even to limit current cultural use. Furthermore, it can be difficult to get acknowledgement for cultural sites with contemporary significance. Porter (2010)
also noted that often, especially in nature parks, locations of Indigenous significance are equated with natural features (to your left we see a river canyon, to your right some rock art). Such interpretations can have a profound impact on the ways Indigenous Peoples are understood, especially where Indigenous cultural history is a draw for tourists, as it often is (Porter, 2010). Dubrow’s (1998) comments on the evolution of the field of heritage preservation provide hope that such planning can be helpful for sites of continued significance. Heritage planning should be able to include alternative conceptions of history and be a useful tool for a variety of interests and pursue different goals. However, heritage preservation as an opening for rights claims by Indigenous Peoples, and may be problematic where it fails to connect the past with the present, and if excludes Indigenous Peoples from other discussions (Porter, 2010).

At the same time, Porter (2010) suggested that Indigenous claims to cultural rights can be profoundly ‘unsettling’ to the colonial land system. Inherent in claims of sacred places is a ‘differently valued’ nature, which challenges the mainstream concept that land can have value only based on resource extraction, or because it has been preserved as ‘untouched wilderness’ (Porter, 2010, p. 98). Porter (2010) suggested that acknowledgements of sacred places unsettles the mainstream conceptions of land use and challenges our understandings of the ways that nature and culture interact. However, she worries that heritage-planning practices use the tools and techniques of planning to resettle the land that has been unsettled through such claims of sacredness. States are able to ‘settle the sacred’ by defining what is sacred and where it is located, thereby returning certainty to capitalist land markets (Porter, 2010, p. 108). This is problematic because it contains the sacred to specific, delineated sites, and reduces culture to material objects (Porter, 2010). Further, the registers that list these sites, are owned and controlled by governments, and sites are numbered and located on a map (Porter, 2010). To be
transformative, cultural heritage management must be approached in a way that changes spatial ontologies and epistemologies (Porter, 2010). Porter (2010) used an example from New Zealand where the concept of Tōpuni has been enshrined in law. This concept indicates areas where the Ngāi Tahu\(^1\) extend mana, or protection, over a person or area. This legal tool is not used to change the existing status of the land, but to ensure that Ngāi Tahu values are recognized and provided for. For example, this is the basis of the co-management of Aoraki mountain (Porter, 2010).

**Planning**

As has been shown, a key theme for states that are trying to renegotiate relationships with Indigenous Peoples is to carefully consider how to redress past injustices. Porter (2006) points to the importance of the recognition of problems and the willingness to engage with them, even where it is painful to do so. Recently, planners have been called on to acknowledge the colonial roots of urban planning and to work to decolonize the profession (Porter, 2010; Sandercock, 2004). Porter (2010), somewhat vaguely, stated that the decolonization of planning “must proceed as a complex negotiation of values, knowledge, meaning, agency, and power between planning and indigenous peoples, and within planning itself” (p. 153). Despite this initial ambiguity, Porter goes on to make some recommendations for how planners can approach their practice in a way that honours the need for decolonization. These recommendations will be described later in this chapter.

These calls for decolonization are part of a reaction by some urban planning theorists to the popularity of collaborative planning by the profession of planning. Transitional justice emerged

---

1. The principal Māori tribe of southern New Zealand.
2. Porter (2006) also explains an ironical situation in Victoria, Australia. The observations translate well to the Canadian context. In Victoria, Indigenous people are seen as less ‘traditional’ or ‘indigenous’ since
as a response to the transitioning of countries from authoritarian rule to democracy, but has since become important in post-conflict and post-colonial contexts (De Greiff, 2009). I believe the ethics and perspective of transitional justice can be applied in this way: to forward our understanding of how to decolonize the profession of planning. Huxley and Yiftachel (2000) point to the role of planning theorists in extending theories from other disciplines to the practice of planning.

Another compelling argument for acknowledging the colonial legacy of/in urban planning is the importance of agency to the profession of planning. Beauregard (1998) pointed to an example where planning historians in South Africa tried to minimize the role of planners in the apartheid regime. This came just prior to the transition from Apartheid with the election of Nelson Mandela in 1994. The spatial and logistical scale of apartheid policies makes it obvious that planners would have been key actors in creating the ‘apartheid city’ of “separate and unequal environments”, but these histories suggested that the work of planners followed a course that was fully determined by politicians (Beauregard, 1998, p. 189). Beauregard (1998) argued that by evading responsibility for Apartheid, the planning profession missed an opportunity for critical reflection, confession, and reconciliation. But, perhaps even more damaging, these histories make urban planning and planners seem inconsequential (Beauregard, 1998).

Beauregard (1998) defines planning as “facilitating collective action by linking knowledge to action” (p. 187). In order to plan, practitioners must believe that it is possible to change the world, and that they can contribute to those changes (Beauregard, 1998). This belief must extend to the past as well. Planning histories should, therefore, portray a complex world with events that were not inevitable, but that could have turned out differently (Beauregard, 1998). Beauregard (1998), and others (including Porter, 2010; 2006; Watson, 2006) create a space for planners to
acknowledge historical, and even more importantly, on-going injustice. In Canada, this means the colonial framework that has led to hundreds of years of injustices towards Indigenous Peoples.

**The Colonial Roots of Urban Planning**

The history of colonialism is the foundation of the relationship between Indigenous Peoples and national governments. Consequently, historical and contemporary injustices performed on First Nations and other Indigenous individuals and Peoples have created a unique set of ethical dilemmas for planning practitioners and for Canada as a nation. This section will describe the colonial roots of urban planning to show how these roots are embedded in the culture of planning. That planning has a colonial culture is a core reason why collaborative planning approaches are not an entirely adequate response to calls for justice and rights for Indigenous Peoples. I will describe three arguments that are used to show the way that collaborative planning techniques fall short in the context of relations between Indigenous Peoples and nation states. The three arguments are that collaborative techniques: 1) assume that the state and the planner are neutral, 2) rely on the goodwill of participants where often racism persists, and 3) place Indigenous Peoples as one of many ‘stakeholders’ which does not always reflect; their aspirations, their unique position as the original inhabitants of the land, or inter-group difference.

For her discussion, Porter (2010) defined planning as “the social practice of spatial ordering,” and in the contemporary context as “state-based land use or spatial planning” (p. 2). Another explanation that accurately explains the practice of planning defines it as facilitating collective action by linking knowledge to action. In this way, it is the role of the planner to imagine different futures, explain this vision to others, and attempt to determine what actions are required to realise these visions (Beauregard, 1998). In this definition, it is possible to see that the role of the urban planner within society is linked to the collective understanding we share of our
community (Anderson, 2002). This definition also highlights the connections between the past, present, and future. Because of these roles, it is crucial to understand that planning is culturally specific and spatially bounded; it is an activity and set of practices that comes from a particular worldview (Porter, 2010). Based on the work of Henri Lefebvre, Porter (2010) presented three ways that space is produced, as 1) “perceived” space, 2) “conceived” space, and 3) “lived” space (p. 45). Porter suggested that colonialism can be understood as the imposition of dominant European conceived space, over the lived space of Indigenous Peoples, though she noted that both Indigenous Peoples and Europeans produce all three types of space (Porter, 2010). I would suggest instead, that colonization is the imposition of all three forms of European space, onto all three forms of Indigenous space. In particular, the focus on Indigenous lived space seems misplaced, at least in the early years of colonization, lived space, the everyday interactions of people with space were likely unchanged. Perhaps the focus on the imposition of conceived spaces onto lived spaces comes from Porter’s focus on planning, which is largely a production of conceived spaces (Porter, 2010). I suggest it would be possible to find, for example, many instances of the imposition of conceived space directly over conceived spaces. The most obvious example that comes to mind is the colonial practice of constructing churches directly over the sites of Indigenous places of worship. For example, Cusco, Peru, as the former centre of the Incan Empire has a disproportionate number of churches and other colonial institutions, each built on the foundation of an Incan palace or tomb. In a specific example, the main cathedral, the Cathedral of Santo Domingo, was built directly on the foundations of the Inca palace of Viracocha (UNESCO world heritage listing, City of Cusco, http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/273).

A dominant British understanding of land was based on John Locke’s labour theory of property. He suggested that land was given to all men by God and that ownership was derived from the
‘improvement’ of that land through man’s labour (Locke in Porter, 2010, p. 53-56). This theory was taken to mean that uncultivated land had no value or owner, and was used by Europeans to claim that land was empty where it did not contain familiar use patterns or cultivation (Porter, 2010). The position that land was empty was sometimes disingenuous, as colonizers would simultaneously acknowledge the presence of Indigenous Peoples and even comment on their ownership or cultivation, while considering the land empty (Porter, 2010).

An important exercise for identifying the colonial heritage of planning has been in examining the planning tools that were used in colonial processes. The work and “spatial technologies” (Sandercock, 2004, p. 118) of planning were fundamental to the colonial settlement of territory, through projects such as city building, land clearing, and resource extraction (Porter, 2006, Sandercock, 2004). Porter (2010), pointed to the earliest descriptions of European explorers that talk about places in terms of their suitability for human habitation, possible uses, and potential resource extraction. The early colonial practices for spatial ordering consisted of surveying, selection, mapping, naming and town building (Porter, 2010). On arrival in new land, the British government would send out surveying expeditions to generate as much knowledge as possible about the land. These findings were later translated into maps. In these ways, spaces were reproduced so as to be ‘known’ to Europeans, and thus available for settlement (Porter, 2010).

Another spatial mechanism of colonial dispossession was the land reservations system. These reserves contained Indigenous People, and therefore cleared other land for European settlement. This spatial containment was also used as an opportunity to teach Christianity and to conduct large-scale social experiments around how to turn the reserve occupants into “good citizens” (Porter, 2010, p. 75). Today, the outcomes of this policy of spatial containment are still the basis of relationships between Indigenous Peoples and nation states (Porter, 2010). Similarly, colonies
were treated as *tabula rasa* for new development, in a way that was not possible at home in Europe. Colonies were used to experiment with town layout, land use formations and patterns (Porter, 2010). Land reservations and colonies were used in these ways to test ideas, so they could be developed and reshaped, or abandoned. Porter argued that these processes of colonization were constitutive of the practice of planning, that they produced “the spatial sensibilities, legal and administrative technologies and materiality” that now make up professional planning (Porter, 2010, p. 52). To strengthen this argument, it would have been beneficial for Porter to provide some examples of the ways these practices returned to Europe and informed urban planning there.

In focussing on the cultural and historical position of planning, Porter (2006, 2010), argued that in (post)colonial settings, planning practices and structures must be understood in terms of their colonial origins. She defines colonialism as: “the process and material effects of appropriation of territory by foreign power, and the construction of a racialised hierarchy of difference within and through the appropriation such that the myriad, locally constituted relationships between colonizer and colonized become embedded within structures of economy and power as well as embedded in frames of meaning” (Porter, 2006, p. 383). Porter argued that spatial cultures, and the imposition of these onto Indigenous societies are what reified the dispossession of colonialism (Porter, 2010, p. 45). Colonies can be understood as an attempt to impose European sensibilities in a place that is new to those sensibilities (Porter, 2010). These colonial processes disconnected Indigenous People from “histories, landscapes, languages, social relations, and ways of thinking, feeling and interacting with the world” (Smith in Corntassel & Holder, 2008, p. 471).
**Implications for Contemporary Planning of its Colonial History**

In the case of urban planning in colonial settler states, planning occurs with “the colonial pasts fully present” (Porter, 2010, p. 149). Porter argued that “to be ‘post’ colonial is to be always and forever implicated, though in constantly shifting ways, in colonialisms enduring philosophies” (Porter, 2010, p. 16). The past and colonial histories do not go away, instead, being (post)colonial means being “within and beyond” colonialism (Porter, 2010, p. 40). In this spirit, Porter’s stated goal is “to make visible the colonial logic embedded within planning philosophy and practice” (Porter, 2010, p. 16). She suggested modes of recognising and institutionalising protection for difference within the liberal framework such as: native title, treaty negotiation, cultural heritage legislation, and consultation in planning practice as first moments towards a more ethical (post)colonial practice (Porter, 2010).

The last thirty years have seen major changes in approaches to land management, including through approaches like joint management programs, shared ownership, and partnerships between Indigenous Peoples and governments (Porter, 2010). These approaches, Porter proposed, can be seen as evidence of a shift in urban planning towards a more collaborative, community-based model (Porter, 2010). Collaborative planning has been a dominant theory in the planning profession, for at least the past fifteen years. Collaborative planning describes a planning technique based on a process of decision making whereby all concerned parties are brought together to negotiate a decision.

Healey (2006) has been influential in articulating and promoting these new trends in planning. She promotes a communicative approach to governance, and particularly to planning, that is based on collaborative and consensus-based decision-making. Healey (2006) portrays collaborative planning as a way to share power, within a public policy system that traditionally
excludes the assertions of many concerned individuals and groups. Collaborative planning is based around recognition that knowledge is socially constructed, and that knowledge development and communication of knowledge can take many forms. This leads to the conception of planning as a social process that is constructed by those who participate in it. Therefore, to be efficient and accountable in the context of democracy, planning must draw on multiple forms of knowledge, through collaborative and consensus-based approaches (Healey, 2006).

According to Healey (2006, p.288-289) new processes in planning that follow this collaborative model should:

1. Recognise the range and variety of stakeholders concerned and the existing power relations.
2. Acknowledge that much of the work of governance occurs outside the formal agencies and seek to spread power.
3. Open opportunities for informal invention and innovation.
4. Foster inclusion.
5. Be continually and openly accountable.

The ‘collaborative turn’ in planning, that has become prominent in recent decades, is frequently and effectively critiqued based on the continuing location of these collaborative processes in the context of persistent power relations (Huxley & Yiftachel, 2000) that have been established and perpetuated through (colonial) history (Porter, 2010). Three arguments, based on Porter (2010), that support this critique of collaborative planning in the context of state-Indigenous relations are that: 1) the state and urban planners are falsely portrayed as neutral; 2) persistent racism undermines collaborative processes; and 3) ‘inclusion’ of Indigenous Peoples as ‘stakeholders’ is inadequate.

Porter argued that simply creating collaborative planning processes does not release planning from its cultural foundation; she calls on planners to acknowledge their colonial culture and
histories. Planners must look critically at supposedly ‘neutral’ planning techniques and identify the ways that planning continues to assert ‘colonial domain’ over landscapes (Porter, 2006). Porter hopes that by acknowledging the cultural position of planning, it will be possible to find ways to transcend it (Porter, 2006), hence, a decolonization of planning, or release of it from its colonial roots.

Through her case studies in protected area planning (i.e, as part of environmental planning), Porter (2010) identified and critiqued three areas where she has seen increased involvement of Indigenous Peoples in planning. She primarily focuses on collaborative planning, but also discusses increased emphases on traditional ecological knowledge (TEK), and the area of cultural heritage planning. In all three areas there is potential to create tremendous opportunity for acknowledgement of Indigenous rights, but there is also the danger that they will be used to contain Indigenous rights, worldviews and aspirations within existing power structures, and ontologies and epistemologies (Porter, 2010).

Especially where Indigenous Peoples are instrumental in developing new arrangements, these new techniques have been successful in empowering Indigenous People, and are an advance on expert-driven, top-down decision making (Porter, 2010). But collaborative planning is not enough. As was shown through the literature on transitional justice, it is difficult to create a just present without considering the injustices of the past. This is because one may not understand what made the past unjust, or how those injustices continue to influence the present.

In her article, *Deep Difference: Diversity, Planning and Ethics*, Watson (2006) outlines a detailed critique of collaborative planning processes that attempt to reach decisions by consensus. The basis of Watson’s (2006) critique is that differences between the worldviews of groups can be fundamental, making consensus impossible. She described two types of differences that are
concern to planners: intergroup differences brought about by material, ethnic, racial and other differences; and state-citizen differences which frame the relationship between hegemonic state structures and the everyday concerns of citizens (Watson, 2006).

One of the important aspects of the theoretical critiques of collaborative planning by authors such as Porter (2010) and Watson (2006) is to argue that the processes and theories of planning are not culturally neutral. Watson points out that all reflection takes place in relation to where the reflector is situated, within their personal assumptions, language, traditions etc. (Watson, 2006). Watson explained that liberalism rather than neutrality is the philosophical position of planning processes. She pointed out several reasons why the collaborative process will not always produce outcomes that will satisfy all participants. In the context of post-apartheid South Africa, she pointed out that collaborative processes assume that the state is a neutral party and is capable of ensuring that citizens have the freedom and equality necessary to make decisions. It also assumes that free and equal citizens are able to reach fair and just decisions. In addition, it ignores the power dynamics that will be involved in any deliberative planning process (Watson, 2006). Even the creation of complete equality within a deliberative process does not change the positions from which different parties enter the process. Porter (2006) underlined this point explaining that in many cases, more inclusive processes can serve to marginalise Indigenous (and other) groups, based on historical and current power dynamics.

A second critique of collaborative processes is that the bringing together of different parties to make decisions is also reliant on the goodwill of all present, and especially of those who have greater power. In the context of Indigenous Peoples these processes can be a false start where racism, rather than goodwill, is the starting point of discussions (Porter, 2010). Racism is still an important factor in the relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Racism
towards Indigenous Peoples often has to do with the romanticising of them as being primitive or more connected to the land, this in turn positions European Settlers as “entrepreneuring…bearers of civilization” (Razack, 2002, p. 3). Indigenous Peoples are also alternatively or simultaneously portrayed as having lost their culture through modernisation (Porter, 2010).

Identity for Indigenous Peoples in (post)colonial settings is further complicated by the issue of external imposition of identity, by colonizers in a historical context, and by the dominant culture in the contemporary setting. Porter (2006) explained this ironical situation in Victoria, Australia, but the observations translate well to the Canadian context. In Victoria, Indigenous Peoples are seen as less ‘traditional’ or ‘indigenous’ since they do not lead a ‘classical’ lifestyle, as a result of the colonial expropriation of their lands. They are seen by mainstream settler society as having ‘lost’ their culture and being ‘corrupted’ by ‘modern society.’ This is a continuation and slight perversion of the colonial portrayal of Indigenous people as ‘primitive’ (Porter, 2006, p. 391). In Porter’s (2006) example, the perception of the Indigenous People as having lost their traditional culture manifests in planning as a discomfort and reluctance to prioritise the cultural traditions at the same level as conservation of natural resources (Porter, 2006).

Porter (2010) pointed out that the romanticising of Indigenous cultures as being more natural, or spiritual constructs Indigenous Peoples as being without capacity to change or to “survive modernity in any authentic way” (p. 37). Similarly, Jojola (1998) described the “poetic or literate” minds (of colonial/settler populations) that refused to acknowledge that “Indians could successfully adapt and transform” (p. 101). These persistent stereotypes are a challenge in trying to close the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations (Flisfeder, 2010).
The description of the potential for exclusion in even well-intentioned attempts at inclusivity can raise a number of issues. For example, Porter (2006), problematises the practice of labelling Indigenous communities as ‘stakeholders,’ as this places them as one voice among many and denies their unique claims as the original owners of the land. A further assumption of collaborative planning is that Indigenous people are looking for inclusion, which does not adequately reflect the aspirations of most Indigenous Peoples (Porter, 2006). Indigenous Peoples have been trying to reverse “foundational injustices and dispossessions”, and are often struggling for recognition and sovereignty (Sandercock, 2004, p. 119). In that way, inclusion and participation are not a contention; rather, Indigenous People are concerned about asserting their rights, and about deriving the material benefits from those rights (Sandercock, 2004). A second problematic aspect of ‘inclusion’ is its maintenance of the state or planner as the gatekeeper into the decision-making process. In this way, control over where and how groups are included remains with the state, and planners who exist because of the institutions and processes of colonialism (Porter, 2006). Collaborative planning is a model for procedural justice, but it falls short where other injustices are present (Porter, 2010).

(Post) Colonial Justice and Ethics for Planning

Based on the connection between decolonization and reconciliation, Porter’s calls for a transformation of planning culture (Porter, 2010) can also be understood as calls for justice and renegotiation of unequal power relations.

Two ways of practicing justice are through recognition of difference, and through distribution of resources (to combat inequality). It is important not to contravene one type of justice while trying to address the other (Rankin, 2009). Planning needs to work toward a post-colonial ethic by reforming planning around accountability to marginalised people and groups (Rankin, 2009).
Porter (2010) reminded us that the reason planners and theorists think about and discuss ways to reform the practice of planning is because it is unethical to allow spatial practices to continue where they produce unjust outcomes for Indigenous Peoples. She recommends three ways in which the practice of planning can be decolonized; through 1) recognition and justice; 2) ‘unlearning’ the privilege of planning; and 3) bringing love into planning practice (Porter, 2010, p. 153). The first two suggestions return to many of the themes already discussed above, so I will just touch on them briefly before exploring the third suggestion, of planning with love.

Recognition and justice mean recognising the unique position of Indigenous Peoples, and recognising that histories and past injustices are still present (Porter, 2010). It can also mean protecting and institutionalising Indigenous rights, including treaty rights to self-determination and land. Recognition also requires recognition of our own positions, and that many conflicts between Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups centre around land use and natural resource management, underlining the role that urban planning has played and continues to play in dispossession (Porter, 2010). Finally, it means looking for moments where everyday forms of recognition can open the way for new conversations (Porter, 2010).

“Unlearning the privilege of planning” is accomplished by exposing, as Porter (2010) and others have done, the colonial logic that is embedded within planning’s philosophy and practice (Porter, 2010, p. 16). We must also look critically at the prejudices and learned responses that we carry within ourselves. Exactly how this colonial logic can be exposed, and how long-standing prejudicial practices can be confronted is less clear. Porter (2010, 2006) used individual cases where she saw decolonization occurring to illustrate her arguments. Perhaps decolonization of the practice of planning must take place one instance at a time, leading to a gradual shift in the culture of planning.
“Love as a radical practice” (Porter, 2010, p. 153) sounds inane, but is defined through the ethics of approaching our work with selflessness, humility and compassion. Consider that (colonial) processes of “domination, oppression and injustice are the products of hate and violence, not only the maldistribution of rights and goods” (Porter, 2010, p. 157). Love counters these social relations by the connection it creates. While we must acknowledge our positions, we should also remember that we are more than just our positions (Porter, 2010), and that the connections we feel, beyond the analytical, with suffering and injustice, are also important.

Working within a white settler society, and given the persistent colonial culture of planning (Porter, 2010) asserts that professional planners must work to find ways to ensure that their practice as planners does not perpetuate unjust relations. In Canada, the current attempts at reconciliation around the abuses of the residential schools system provide parallels to look for ways to create new just relations and decision-making processes. In turn, planning must be implicated in its role in colonization and on-going colonialism. The role of the institutional framework of planning in the social relationships, including those of colonialism, produced and reproduced by planning must be acknowledged by planners and the profession as a whole. Post-colonial states have now been forced to acknowledge that their national creation stories are myths that deny the violent reality of colonial projects that were made possible only by attempting to erase or contain the people who inhabited these territories at the time of encounter (Razack, 2002). Mythologies and national stories of origin enable citizens to think of themselves as part of a community, in this way defining who belongs and who does not belong to society. The mythologies of white settler societies assume that Europeans were principally responsible for developing the land, and that Indigenous people are mostly dead or assimilated; specifically, in North America, the fantasy is that the continent was peacefully colonised (Razack, 2002).
fact, the origins of these white settler societies lie in the dispossession of Indigenous populations. White settler mythologies therefore, deny the conquest, genocide, slavery and exploitation of labour (of colonialism) (Razack, 2002, p. 2). The history of the residential school system in Canada and the inherent violence of its assimilative goals and the way it attempted to ‘sever’ the links between children and their communities and families (RCAP, 1996: II, 10.3) can be seen as an example of a history that undermines this mythology.

By examining on-going attempts at transitional justice as a collaborative process, using the case of the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC), I will draw out the persistent inadequacies that exist within this process, and within collaborative planning practices.
Chapter 3. Methodology

Case Study Research

I have chosen to use a case study, as it is an effective research method for attempting to capture a holistic understanding of complex phenomena (Yin, 2009). This case study methodology is based on the processes laid out by Yin (2009), in *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. A case study is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth, and within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2009, p. 18). I am using a critical case (Yin, 2009) to assess the memorialisation aspect of the *Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA)* (2006) with a particular example of one case of memorialisation that has already occurred. One effective example of this technique, is *Museums taken to task: Representing First Peoples at the McCord Museum of Canadian History*’ by Stephanie Bolton (2009). Bolton (2009) uses the case study of the McCord Museum of Canadian History to assess national policies around the portrayal and inclusion of Aboriginal Peoples by Canadian museums. In this way, a concrete and specific case study can be used to assess a broader context. In this case, as well as in the work of Bolton (2009), the specific case studies are used to assess the impacts of a broader national policy context. My two units of analysis, or research subjects (Yin, 2009) are 1) the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC), and 2) the iterations of the IRSSA.

Multiple Sources of Data

The key to conducting effective qualitative research is the use of multiple sources of data to triangulate findings (Yin, 2009). Pursuant to this, I have drawn data from, academic literature, site visits, document analysis, and semi-structured interviews. Many of these elements were used
in the context of both of my two research subjects, the WCC and the IRSSA. Table 1: Data Sources, outlines the methods used in the collection of data for each segment of the research. The data collection techniques are described separately and in more detail below. The literature review provided a theoretical foundation for the data collection and analysis (Yin, 2009).

Table 1: Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Review of literature: designed to contribute to theory development by linking theories around the decolonization of professional planning, to the field of transitional justice through discussions about heritage planning, and memorialisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodland Cultural Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Direct Observation: site visits to the grounds and museum, as well as a guided tour of the Mohawk Institute building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Preliminary Interviews: with staff at the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC) helped me gain a background understanding of the activities of the centre, and how my research relates to their current projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Document Review: that describe the processes leading to the formation of the WCC were accessed at the WCC Research Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Semi-Structured Interviews: with staff and others affiliated with the WCC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commemoration Fund of the Truth and Reconciliation Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Literature Review: including academic information about the residential school system and transitional justice projects in Canada.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Observations

After my preliminary site visit to the Woodland Cultural Centre in August 2011, I visited the centre three more times for the purpose of conducting observations. On the first visit in November, 2011, I systematically walked over and photographed the grounds and the permanent museum exhibit *Healing the Legacy of Residential Schools* (2006). I followed this method again when I observed the temporary exhibit *40: Four decades of the centre, 1972-2012* (February, 2012) on my third visit. My second visit consisted of taking the guided residential school tour provided by the WCC.

To acquire the necessary background research for the WCC case study I used observation techniques at the site of the WCC to explore its current layout and uses, and especially the public interpretation of the site’s history. I used photo documentation as a way to focus my observations and notes as I familiarised myself with the site. The site observations and analysis were grounded in the framework for visual methodologies outlined by Rose (2007).

Rose (2007) identified the following framework for examining where visual objects exist and how they are encoded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Gillian Rose’s Visual Methodology Framework (2007, p. 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sites:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The image itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modalities (defined as particular ways that information is encoded for humans):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data sources examined based on this visual methodology were:

1. The physical site of the WCC, including the buildings and grounds,
2. The government of Ontario historic plaque that stands in the front of the former residential school building, and
3. The museum exhibit that addresses the residential school system.

The photo documentation of my site visits involved systematically taking photos based on a pre-generated ‘shooting script’ derived from my research questions (Rose, 2007, p. 243). Field notes with factual information as well as commentary were catalogued in association with the photos. These photos provide a unique source of evidence that can be used to either support or supplement research. I have intended for these photos to convey texture, and to add credibility to the arguments that I make (Rose, 2007).

My shooting script (see Appendix A: “Shooting Script”: Site Visit One to the Woodland Cultural Centre in Brantford, Ontario, carried out by Christina Hovey, on November 14-15, 2011) and agenda for data collection was based on the descriptions of discourse analysis suggested by Rose (2007) as an effective way to study institutions such as museums. In this way, I was able to look at the ways that the history of the buildings is interpreted by the WCC and to examine how this might impact visitors. To execute this methodology, I examined the way that displays are presented, and notice how these factors produce a certain type of visitor (Rose, 2007). I also looked at the way the buildings are oriented toward one another (i.e. how one building is viewed from the front door of the other), and the first images that visitors see on arrival at the centre.

Discourse analysis is grounded in the theories of Michel Foucault, who focussed on the ways that practices and institutions define what it means to be human (Rose, 2007). A discourse can be defined as a group of statements that structure our understandings, and thus our actions (Rose, 2007). Discourses can become dominant through truth claims, which are, in turn, reliant on an intersection between power and knowledge. Accordingly, which discourses are dominant will change over time, and discourses are often specific to a time and place (Rose, 2007).
Discourse analysis, as proposed by Foucault, is an appropriate methodology to interpret an institution like a museum, as it involves examining the institutional technologies and apparatus for the ways that they create power and discipline subjects. In the context of museums; ‘culture’, surveillance, and claim to scientific knowledge are some of the primary tools of social management (Foucault in Rose, 2007, p.173-175).

In the case of the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC), discourse analysis exposes a change in the dominant discourse as produced through the site. Formerly dominant, was the discourse that produced the site as the institution of the residential school. It can be seen as having been replaced by the discourse produced at the site as the institution of the WCC and museum. So, especially interesting, is the way that the centre has interpreted the former institution.

Rose (2007) reminds researchers that the interpretation and analysis of discourse is also a form of discourse. She suggests that a common failing of discourse analysis is a lack of modesty in researchers’ analyses and calls on researchers to be aware that their interpretations represent only one possible interpretation. Discourse is inherent to research, since research creates one construction or interpretation of materials instead of revealing an absolute truth. Rose (2007) therefore has suggested that researchers consider their work modestly, acknowledge that other interpretations are possible, and recognize that any analysis research project emphasises some materials while others are ignored. By recognizing the subjectivity of ones own analysis, one is implicitly recognizing that other interpretations are possible (Rose, 2007). My aim was to mitigate the bias of my own standpoint by considering some of the different standpoints that existed in the interpretation of the WCC site and museum exhibit space.

While I initially collected this data in the spirit of Foucault and discourse analysis, I soon came to the realization that these theories were limited in their application for this case study.
Foucault’s theorization is focused on dominant institutions and is criticized for not paying
enough attention to the ways that dominant discourses are subverted (Rose, 2007). This makes it
an awkward fit for analysing an institution that can be understood as a subversive institution: that
through its existence and work, is challenging the dominant discourse. The WCC has been
presenting the history and culture from the point of view of its member Nations since 1972,
decades before Canadian museums began to look critically at the way Aboriginal Peoples and
histories were portrayed (Bolton, 2009). I then moved away from Foucault’s conception of
content analysis and elected instead to analyse this data from this visit using more flexible
content analysis (Marsh & White, 2006). As will be noted below (in section 5, Content
Analysis), the use of content analysis for this collected data allowed me to more smoothly
incorporate my observations into the overall data analysis for the project.

Semi-structured Interviews

A total of six semi-structured interviews were conducted with nine individuals for the purposes
of data collection and validation of findings (Yin, 2009).

Participants

Three interviews were conducted with staff, or former staff, of the Woodlands Cultural Centre
(WCC). Two of these interviews were one-on-one, and the third interview was conducted with a
group of three individuals. All but one of these participants were members of the Six Nations of
Grand River community. The participants have been affiliated with the centre since between
2005 (the newest), and since before the centre was founded in 1972 (the longest). One interview
was conducted with a survivor of the residential school, who attended the school for ten years
beginning in 1942. He was active in one of the class-action lawsuits in the 1990s and also
organized a survivors group for several years. I also conducted two short interviews with
heritage planners, one who worked for the City of Brantford and one who has done consulting work in the Grand River area. I made several attempts to contact the employee of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) who is primarily responsible for the commemoration initiative, however I was unable to schedule an interview.

Recruitment

Interviews with individuals affiliated with the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC) were facilitated by the WCC co-ordinator who provided introductions to the people who she thought would be best to talk to. While this may be seen as a source of potential bias, it provided me with access to the individuals who were likely to know the most about what I was interested in, and whom she thought would be willing to talk with me.

The planners and individual from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) were contacted via publicly available e-mail addresses and phone numbers. In the case of the TRC, I phoned the commission’s 1-888 number and was re-directed when I asked to speak with someone about the Commemoration Fund. All participants received a copy of a letter of information (see Appendix B: Letter of Information and Consent Form) electronically before the interview occurred. They also received a paper copy of the letter at the time of the interview. Participants reviewed the letter, and were given an opportunity to ask questions before signing the consent form, or providing oral consent. I also confirmed verbally that the participants were comfortable with me digitally recording the sessions. One participant asked that their interview not be recorded. Two participants gave their consent orally, one as a preference, and the other because the interview was over the telephone.
Interviews

Based on my preliminary research and in consultation with my research supervisor, I prepared interview guides with key questions derived from my research questions to ask during the interview (Yin, 2009). Different guides were prepared for each category of interview subject: heritage planners, and individuals affiliated with the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC) (see Appendix C: Sample Interview Guide).

The interviews were semi-structured, so I encouraged participants to answer the questions any way they chose, and allowed my questioning to be guided by their answers and interests. I provided an opportunity at the end of each interview for the participants to address any issues that they felt were important that had not yet been covered. This allowed interview subjects to reveal unexpected insights, or offer different lines of inquiry (Yin, 2009).

All interviews were conducted in person and digitally voice recorded, with the exception of the interview that was conducted over the telephone, for which the participant requested that the call not be recorded. Notes were taken during the telephone interview, and the notes were promptly expanded upon and transcribed after the interview. The interviews lasted between twenty and ninety minutes. The interviews with planners lasted about twenty minutes each, while the other interviews all lasted over an hour. The digital recordings of the interviews were transcribed verbatim, resulting in approximately seventy pages of single spaced text for analysis.

Data Analysis

Documents, interview transcripts, and data gathered from site visits were all analysed using content analysis. I used the well-established techniques of content analysis (see for example; Berg, 2009; Krippendorff, 2004; & Yin, 2009) as laid out by Marsh & White (2006). Content analysis is a research method that can be used to “make replicable and valid inferences from
texts to the context of their use” (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 18). Researchers employ rules of inference to look for the answers to research questions in their data sources (Marsh & White, 2006, p. 27). Qualitative content analysis is iterative rather than deductive, so analysis and coding happen simultaneously and feed into one another (Marsh & White, 2006). The analysis is approached with mindfulness that the text is unique and that multiple interpretations are possible (Marsh & White, 2006).

First, all the materials were separated based on the two research subjects, the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC) and the national reconciliation process. I then scanned the materials for each of my research subjects, highlighting key phrases and items that seemed important or unexpected. After the initial overview I approached the analysis using the ‘constant comparison approach’, where theories and patterns were tested as data was compared (Marsh & White, 2006, p. 37). As suggested by Marsh & White (2006), I kept a record of the analysis through two types of notes: ‘concept memos’ of how concepts were phrased, and my interpretations, and ‘theory memos’ which highlight relationships between concepts, or between concepts and the academic literature (Marsh & White, 2006, p. 37). The emerging analyses were then compared across the two subjects (see Appendix D: Methodology Figure) and compared to the theoretical foundations that were outlined in the literature review (Yin, 2009).

**Research Ethics**

This project received ethics approval required for research using human subjects, through Queen’s University’s General Research Ethics Board (GREB), after a full review (July, 2011) (see Appendix E: Research Ethics Approvals). The GREB application was submitted with my research supervisor Dr. Leela Viswanathan who had applied for Queen’s Senate Advisory Research Committee (SARC) funds to assist me in conducting this research. In August 2011, I
met with Executive Director, Janis Monture, of the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC), where we discussed my research idea, and she indicated that the centre would be willing to participate. Because the WCC is located on land that belongs to the Six Nations on the Grand River Council, it was also necessary to obtain permission from the Council Ethics Committee to conduct the research; this permission was granted on September 27, 2011 (see Appendix E: Research Ethics Approvals). At the time of my site visit, prior to taking photographs, I signed an agreement requiring me to give credit to the WCC when any photographs are used.

**Feedback and Verification**

After the completion of a full draft of this document I sent each interview subject an e-mail containing a brief summary of my findings, and requested that they reply with feedback. In addition, as per the commitment I made in my letter of information each participant was sent any section of text where they were quoted directly so they could indicate if they wanted the quote attributed to them, left anonymous, or removed. I also presented my research findings at the 2012 annual Six Nations Research Ethics Conference, as well as at the 2012 Congress of the Association of Geographers held in Waterloo in May 2012. According to my ethics agreement with the Six Nations on the Grand River Council, I will provide them with two copies of this thesis and any subsequent publication. I will also provide copies to the library of the WCC.

**Limitations of the Research**

As with any qualitative case study research, it will not be possible to use the findings to make generalizations about broader research topics. However, some of the analytical and theoretical conclusions of this research should have applications for broader discussions (Yin, 2009). Otherwise, the limitations of this research are based on the scope of the work, the moment in
time that it attempts to capture, and on my position as an outsider to the Woodlands Cultural Centre and Indigenous communities.

In terms of the WCC case study, my research would have been significantly strengthened had I spoken with more Mohawk Institute survivors in the community, and to Six Nations Council Members to gather more perspectives on the impact of the WCC as a memorial, and on the potential future of the site. However, the timeframe of my project made this unrealistic to include in the project. I do know that, while none of the individuals I interviewed spoke on behalf of anyone else, the staff at the WCC do have many interactions with people from these groups.

Although I believe it is an effective method for gaining an understanding of the impacts of the national process, drawing comparisons between a case study and the national process is a potential source of bias. Whereas the case study information is rich in detail, and linked in my mind on a personal level to a physical place and to individuals who I met, the information associated with the national process comes exclusively from official publications and academic literature. Worse, I was unable to conduct a single interview with representatives of the TRC, or the Commemoration Fund, although I had made many attempts through e-mails and telephone calls to connect with a representative from these key organizational bodies.

To compound this, the commemoration funding, which was my primary interest, is still being distributed, and at this time there is very little information about the impact that it is having on diverse communities of First Nations Peoples. Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) will be posting on their website, summaries of the commemoration projects that received government funding in 2010 (Personal Communication, March 12, 2012), but unfortunately this was not yet available at the time of writing in spring of 2012.
Because of these complications, it was crucial to this research that I sought alternative interpretations, both from other critical sources and through the process of analysing the research findings. By exploring multiple sources of information, and triangulating my data sources, I remained committed to mitigating these potentials for research bias (Yin, 2009).

A final important limitation is based on my position as an outsider to the WCC community and the Six Nations of the Grand River community. As a non-Indigenous university researcher, my historical and contemporary position made it likely that I carried certain biases, cultural misunderstandings, and other differences into the research. The short time frame of the project also made it difficult for me to overcome my position as an outsider in any meaningful way.

Throughout the research process I experienced some anxieties about whether my behaviour and research were acceptable to the community members who I spoke with, and whether misunderstanding could undermine my research directly, or by causing tension in my relationships with individuals that I encountered. To address this, I attempted to approach my research from the (post)colonial ethic advocated by Porter (2010), of selflessness, humility and compassion, and to remember that, as vital as it is to be mindful of my position, it is not all I am (Porter, 2010, p. 157).

Two other factors made this research possible despite my position as an outsider. First, was the generosity of the individuals at the WCC, who made me feel welcome, and shared many stories. The second, was a personal realization that came when I first visited the WCC. I learned from a museum exhibit that the Six Nations of the Grand River settled along the Grand River after the American Revolutionary War. They had fought with the British and were granted the Haldimand tract along the Grand River. My father’s family settled in New Brunswick under the same circumstances. I felt a sense of connection with the history of the Six Nations’ community when
I learned this. There are of course, countless shared histories between individuals and communities that inhabit the same spaces for years and hundreds of years.
Chapter 4. Findings and Analysis: Ownership of History, the ‘Burden’ of Reconciliation, and Community Led Initiatives

This chapter analyses three related themes that emerged from my exploration of issues regarding the memorialisation at the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC); these are: ownership over the history of the residential school system; the “burden” (Canada, 2008) for reconciliation that is linked to this ownership; and the way that the community led initiatives of the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA) (2006) address issues of ownership and responsibility. I draw from interviews, documents, and academic literature in my examination of these themes.

A theme in my discussions with the people who work with the WCC was to emphasize that they do not represent the survivors, or the school, or the community. Also emphasized was the importance of the role of the WCC to share the history and culture from the perspective of the community. The people I talked with were careful not to appropriate anyone else’s voice. This was also repeated in my discussions with heritage planners and this theme is somewhat present in the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC).

In contrast to the desire to allow people to tell the stories that belong to them, is the theme within the Canadian national reconciliation process, that Canadian society as a whole must assume its share of the burden for reconciliation and healing that has been unfairly carried by Indigenous communities. It is not clear that this is reflected in the non-monetary remedies found in the IRSSA that are designed to be community-led initiatives. These initiatives are funded through the agreement, but the onus is on the community conceptualise and realize the projects. Giving this responsibility to communities is empowering, but, it may be relying on communities to unfairly shoulder the burden of reconciliation. These themes link to theories around collaborative
planning, and to considerations on how to best balance issues of social justice and procedural fairness in the context of Indigenous rights claims.

Ownership of the Residential School History: A Caution Against Appropriating Voices of Survivors

A theme in this research has surrounded ownership of the residential school history. In laying out the mandate for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), the IRSSA states, “the Commission shall recognize that ownership over IRS [Indian Residential School System] experiences rests with those affected by the Indian Residential School legacy” (Settlement, 2006, Schedule N). This statement can be interpreted as a deferral to the people affected by the residential schools, and to placing priority on the knowledge that comes directly from people sharing their own experiences. It can also be recognized as a caution to the TRC not to appropriate the stories and voices of the residential schools experiences of survivors and their communities, and that the TRC is not a body designed to represent those groups.

At the WCC, the people I spoke with often specified that they did not speak for anyone except themselves, not for the community, and not for the residential school survivors. In the words of one staff member, when asked about what should be done with the former school building: “I don’t speak for the community, I only speak for myself… I’m trying to think about the wider, broader aspects of it… but I just go back to me as an individual” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012). Another person told me that on the day Prime Minister Harper made the national apology, there were a number of journalists and camera crews who showed up at the centre, hoping to get images of the school and interviews. Instead of talking to them, she called on some of the residential school survivors who had worked with the WCC and asked them to come in to address the journalists. She noted:
I remember the day the apology happened, we had so many camera crews and TV stations here, because they wanted the image of the school, they wanted the interview. And I was like… “Don’t interview me!” And I literally just, I called up survivors we work with a lot in our programme and they actually spoke to them, and I said, I don’t want you to say it’s Woodland, because like, I wasn’t here. And I didn’t go to the school, so I can’t really, it’s hard for me to comment’ (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).

Further to this, some interview subjects mentioned that the public does not always understand that the WCC is not connected with the former residential school, and that they sometimes receive visitors who expect them to have the school’s records. As noted by one participant: “From the community we’ve had people that still think there are records here or documents and they want to come in here and take them… we don’t have anything like that, from when it was a school” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 3, February 27, 2012). These types of public requests and the lack of archival information, present challenges, as was noted by another participant:

We don’t have the records. I think that’s one of the biggest challenges we’ve run into, because we were the former residential school, we occupy the buildings, right? But we don’t have the records… we have a couple of collections, of photographs… we have a registrar’s book… it was only like, two years and it’s not even whole. So, yeah, we don’t have a lot, and that’s a problem… people come and ask (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).

This leads into a discussion on the meaning of the building and how it has changed over time. The WCC now occupies the space that was formerly the residential school, but the meaning of the space has not fully transitioned in everyone’s minds.

Beyond the issue of appropriation and mistaken identity, a common understanding is that the stories of the residential school experience are more powerful when they come directly from survivors. The one survivor I spoke with, when talking about getting asked to give tours, said that, they “want a person that was actually here… they feel like it’s a better tour… they want to
hear it more or less from the horse’s mouth, right from the experiences” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 7, March 15, 2012). A staff member confirmed this saying, “it’s a lot stronger when a survivor’s here telling their stories on the tour. The impact is so much more. And we’re very fortunate that survivors, some people, have stepped up and said, yeah I’ll do tours... who will come out, share stories, will talk to students” (Personal Communication, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).

At the same time, the centre does take a certain ownership of the experiences of the children who attended the Mohawk Institute. For example, during the residential school tour, our guide would often use possessive pronouns when talking about the students, as in they would take “our children,” away from their families and communities (WCC, 2011). A major strength of the WCC, as compared with non-Indigenous museums and art centres in Canada, is its ability to communicate the history and culture of the Six Nations from the perspective of the Six Nations. One staff member repeated this aspect several times, speaking to the centre’s mandate, “Woodland is here to present an accurate image of First Nations people as we understand it. In that image, we want to highlight the culture, history, the arts, but all from our perspective” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012). When talking about sharing the residential school history, she said, “I think we want people to be aware... and hear our side,” as well as, “our purpose is to educate people about the history, our side of the history” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012). There is also an acknowledgement that, although many of the survivors are still young, and/or in good health, that it will not be possible for them to tell their stories forever:

There will come a time when we can’t call up those students anymore, as we get older, so that’s the part that’s very hard. Because, right now, we can have those first-hand accounts, and the stories are all different. Every student, the people that came here, we call them survivors, because that’s what they did, they survived it. But they still have a
lot of memories. But there will be a time when we can’t call upon them, so, just always listen to what they say, is going to be really important, so we can pass on those stories, as much as we can, in a respectful and accurate manner (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).

The importance of allowing people to tell their own stories was also repeated in my two conversations with heritage planners. When asked if they engage with First Nations history, a heritage planner from the City of Brantford replied that, “the City doesn’t engage with the history of the Residential School. As you see the Woodland Cultural Centre is here, and is staffed, so they are able to tell their own history” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 6, February 27, 2012). That it is best to let the Six Nations tell its own stories was a theme that arose throughout the interview with this planner who noted “We always let them speak for themselves” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 6, February 27, 2012). Similarly, when discussing the WCC with another heritage planner, the planner identified that the power of the place was in “the extent to which Indigenous People, in this case, have some control over both the site, and the way in which it is interpreted. I mean, this is a basic issue for First Nations across Canada, the extent to which they control their place” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 1, February 16, 2012).

Porter (2010) used a detailed example of Gariwerd (Grampians) National Park in Australia to talk about ownership over history and the issue of Indigenous cultural appropriation. The park is a major tourist draw, in part because of its connection with the Indigenous People of the area. The interpretation of the connections between the land and the Indigenous communities by the National Parks Service has been a point of contention for two reasons. First, because the interpretation done by the Parks Service was seen as being racist because of the way it portrayed
the Indigenous culture as a part of pre-history (pre-contact) with little contemporary relevance.\(^2\) Second, the interpretation was seen as an appropriation of the histories and stories that belonged to the Indigenous community. Recently, an Indigenous cultural centre has entered into partnership with the park, and has taken over all retail aspects of the park, including interpretation (Porter, 2010). While this is a big step away from the racism and cultural appropriation represented by the earlier interpretation paradigm, there are still on-going issues surrounding how to deliver interpretation programmes. Specifically, the centre does not want non-Indigenous staff to be interpreting the Indigenous aspects of the park; however, an area of concern is that there are not enough Indigenous staff to meet the demand for tours from the enormous number of visitors (Porter, 2010). This example from the planning literature reveals the relevant themes of ownership and appropriation of Indigenous cultures and history and is mirrored in the experiences of interview participants involved with the WCC.

Racism is still a factor present in some relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Racism towards Indigenous Peoples often has to do with classifying them as being primitive or as having lost their culture by modernising (Porter, 2010) instead of recognizing that Indigenous cultures, like all cultures, can and have adapted. This racism also presents a challenge for collaborative processes that are based on assumed goodwill. Porter’s (2010) identification of

---

\(^2\) Porter (2006) also explains an ironical situation in Victoria, Australia. The observations translate well to the Canadian context. In Victoria, Indigenous people are seen as less ‘traditional’ or ‘indigenous’ since they do not lead a ‘classical’ lifestyle, as a result of the colonial expropriation of their lands. They are seen as having ‘lost’ their culture and being ‘corrupted’ by ‘modern society.’ This is a continuation and slight perversion of the colonial portrayal of Indigenous people as ‘primitive’ (Porter, 2006, p. 391). In Porter’s (2006) example, the perception of the Indigenous people of having lost their traditional culture manifests in planning as a discomfort and reluctance to prioritize the cultural traditions at the same level as conservation of natural resources (Porter, 2006).
this type of racism as an on-going problem, especially in the context of public education programmes, was also identified by several of my research participants.

For example, one interview participant at the WCC talked about First Nations being treated as archaic as part of her experience going to school in Museum Studies:

> It was really hard for me when I was going to school in Museum Studies, because… we’d do all these projects around ancient civilisations and Native people were always in that. And I’m like… Okay, wait. We’re not! It is ancient in that we’ve been here a long time, but we’re still here. And I remember saying to my one professor, “You know what? I’m not a person that’s living under glass” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).

Another participant spoke about the expectations of school children who come for trips:

> I think that for decades we’re always going to have to counteract the preconceptions of what it is to be a First Nations, just, person. One of the examples I always give is when I used to give tours, I’ve had kids come into the foyer and say “When are we going to get to see the Indians!”… and these are, you know, third graders, or sixth graders, so it’s not going to go away any time soon… for us it’s almost like an old record player. Having that struggle, like, we’re here, this is what we are today, you know, we’re not this romanticised crap… that’s kind of nice and cosy to believe or, you know whatever, even if they’re negative associations of what it means to be First Nations, but there’s always going to be something you’re going to have to tackle whether it be quote-on-quote ‘positive’ or ‘negative’. (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 3, February 27, 2012).

These experiences of being ‘othered’ were confirmed by another participant, who spoke of frustration about the way Indigenous Peoples are often viewed in the contemporary setting:

> People used to ask me ‘what do you want us to take away from the visit?’ And I would always say: “that we’re not extinct. We’re still here!” And just because we don’t wear buckskin and feathers anymore doesn’t mean that we’re not still Native People with our own Clans and our own Nations. And I kind of get – not offended – I don’t know, it’s frustrating when people see us not dressed traditionally that they assume were acculturated (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012).

This led to a statement that closely matches Porter’s (2006, 2010) argument, that: “Everybody is always judging Native People, but they’re not judging other people. And the criteria that they judge Native People by, they couldn’t possibly pass those standards themselves” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 5, February 27, 2012).
Similarly, participants discussed this racism in the context of the way the centre’s annual First Nations art exhibition has combated stereotypes:

It’s really significant as well because it gives the outside viewer visiting the galleries a chance to look at our culture in a contemporary way… As a First Nations artist… there’s almost this sense that people want to pigeon-hole your work. And this is what ‘Indian Art’ is supposed to look like, and First Nations [art exhibition]… gives people a different perspective of what really it is to be First Nations and to be slash, artists, or to just stand on your own and not necessarily be First Nations artist all in one, right. (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 3, February 27, 2012).

And, “thirty years ago there was no such thing as a First Nations Artist, unless they were making, you know, sweet-grass baskets, that was like an old kind of craft form, but they weren’t seen in a contemporary context” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012).

Given the on-going prevalence of stereotypes towards Indigenous Peoples it is not surprising that Indigenous groups, including those working in Gariwerd National Park, would be hyper-aware of issues around cultural appropriation. Although it is critical to allow people to have ownership over their own stories and histories, there are two potential problems with taking this perspective to an extreme. First, in the context of the residential school system, an over-reliance on Indigenous communities to tell the story of its harms and legacies, may represent a denial of a shared history, or a refusal to carry one’s own share of the burden. Second, allowing people to tell their own stories may not accurately reflect those people’s aspirations. This relates to the critique of collaborative planning that suggests that inclusion may not reflect the aspirations of the Indigenous Peoples being labelled as ‘stakeholders’ (Porter, 2006). Similarly, allowing people to tell their own stories may not reflect the aspirations of the people who are being allowed ownership over their stories, and so this becomes a form of exclusion.

At the core, that one party is in the position to allow another party to speak for themselves, might hint to an imbalance of power. Even within that imbalance of power, where people are telling
their own stories, it can be a mistake to assume that through a partnership, both sides will feel equally represented. For example, a planner from the City of Brantford mentioned that the city was partnering with Six Nations for the celebrations around the bi-centennial of the war of 1812. The planner used this as a positive example of a partnership by noting that, “we’re doing the celebrations in conjunction with Six Nations” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 6, February 27, 2012). This example was presented by the planner to demonstrate the way that the City of Brantford was careful not to appropriate the history of Six Nations and provided opportunities for them to ‘speak for themselves’. In direct contrast to this, one of the participants from the WCC used the 1812 bi-centennial celebrations as an example of the ways that mainstream society refuses to acknowledge the rights claims of Indigenous Peoples:

[T]hroughout history what you see too, is how we’ve always had to compromise our values. We’ve always had to accommodate others… When we try to stand up and say, “No more development,” or, “You’re not going to be throwing our artefacts in the garbage anymore.” They’re like, “How dare you!”… challenge the mainstream… as long as we’re sitting there, shutting up and not bothering anybody, then we’ll survive in Canada, but as soon as we have our grievances, or want redress… A lot of these issues are resurfacing with the whole 1812 thing, because Canada sees it as a celebration, whereas we’re still waiting for our justice… So we can just say, “we were here, we won significant battles…” There’s still people in the community that have ancestors back to 1812. So, it wasn’t just something that happened 200 years ago that doesn’t affect us today. All these things intertwine in who we are, and that’s what shapes us… We can either be apathetic, or we can be forward-thinking and trying to make a difference for our grandchildren (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012).

This serves as a reminder that even when an attempt is made to share multiple versions of history, one cannot assume that the attempt has been successful; it also might be interpreted as a partnership where one party does not feel they are being equally represented, and where the other party is not aware that this dissatisfaction exists. As noted by Porter (2010), in the case of Gariwerd National Park in Australia, though the Indigenous group was happy with the existing partnership, they were looking for greater control over the park and decision making, especially around land-use management. The cultural centre brings expertise in the one area around culture,
and a business arrangement exists, but the Indigenous group has clear aspirations to co-manage
the park (Porter, 2010). Porter (2010) argued that the two identities of the park, as Gariwerd
(based on its Indigenous identity) and Grampians (based on its settler identity) are able to co-
exist, though sometimes with tension (Porter, 2010, p. 132). I would argue that the WCC has a
similar dual identity, where it is the site of the former Mohawk Institute, but it is also
simultaneously the WCC.

**Picking up a Share of the ‘Burden of Reconciliation’**

In the 2008 apology, as well as in TRC documents, emphasis has been placed on the strong
healing work that has been done within Indigenous communities, and that these communities
have been doing this work with little support from broader society. It is possibly a contradiction
then that a number of the funding commitments made in the IRSSA are meant to originate with
communities. Though in one sense this can be seen as democratic and empowering, in another
sense it leaves the burden with Indigenous communities to develop the community capacity (if
not the ideas and additional money) to undertake healing, and reconciliation activities.

In the 2008 apology made on behalf of all Canadians, Stephen Harper said, “The burden of this
experience has been on your shoulders for far too long. The burden is properly ours as a
Government, and as a country… You have been working on recovering from this experience for
a long time and in a very real sense, we are now joining you on this journey” (Canada, 2008,
Paragraph 9, [http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644](http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644)). This reinforced the sentiment
expressed in the IRSSA (2006, Schedule N) that “reconciliation is an ongoing individual and
collective process and will require commitment from all those affected…” Similarly, the interim
report of the TRC states that, “people and communities have been left with the burden of pain
and the responsibility of healing. It was left to the former students and their families to regain
their voice. Thousands of them have launched what they refer to as healing journeys” (TRC, 2012c, p.6). They give these survivors credit, that after surviving abuse, “they were still standing. Many have reclaimed their culture, are relearning language, and are practising traditional spirituality” (TRC, 2012c, p.6). But, the Commissioners also remind that “all Canadians need to engage in this work” (TRC, 2012c, p.6). These statements explain that significant healing and reconciliation have taken place in relation to the legacy of the residential school system, but that survivors and their communities have taken responsibility for this legacy, rather than the Canadian Government or society as a whole.

Recall that meaningful reconciliation is not about ‘forgive and forget’ but about ‘remember and change’ (Flisfeder, 2010, p. 10). The difference being that the acts of forgiving and forgetting place responsibility for action with the individuals and groups against whom injustice was perpetrated, while reconciliation based on remembering and changing involves every member of society. At the core, the goal of truth commissions is to transform intergroup relations (Corntassel & Holder, 2008). One element of this is to change attitudes amongst the general public as a way to target the cultural aspects of social change needed to ensure that the conditions that enabled human rights abuses to occur no longer exist (Cobián & Reátegui, 2009).

It has been suggested that Canada’s TRC has not done enough to engage with the non-Aboriginal public (Flisfeder, 2010). The TRC also identifies a continued lack of awareness around the residential school system and its legacy as a barrier to the TRC’s work and to the goals of reconciliation in its statement that “the Commission continues to face huge challenges in raising awareness, among non-Aboriginal Canadians, of the residential school history and legacy. This presents an enormous limitation to the possibility of long-term understanding and meaningful reconciliation” (TRC, 2012c, p.9). In relation to this, the commissioners suggest that “Canadians
have been denied a full and proper education as to the nature of Aboriginal societies and the history of the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples” (TRC, 2012b).

Many Canadians have taken initiative to learn about the residential school system, and it is being taught in schools and through the popular media. This excerpt is from a textbook from 2000 that is still used in Grade 10 History classes in Ontario:

One of the easiest ways to assimilate the Aboriginal People was to take their children from reserves to government-established residential schools, where the children would be far from their cultures. This approach was part of a policy of “aggressive civilization.” Anything that connected students to their Aboriginal heritage was excluded in residential schools. Traditional religious practices were forbidden, and if the children spoke their own language they were severely punished. They were dressed in European clothes and groomed to become English-speaking Canadians (Newman, et al., 2000, p. 186).

While this hardly represents a comprehensive education around the residential school system, it shows that it has been included in the mainstream curriculum, to a degree, for over ten years. At least in some cases, teachers are choosing to provide more detailed lessons. I was given an example of one Ontario high school teacher who chooses to spend a full week discussing the residential school system in her Grade 10 Civics class (Personal Communication, May 4, 2012). She provided me with the materials she uses which include the publication/exhibit Where are the children? (Legacy of Hope, 2003), and the Project of Heart, a healing art project that was featured in the CBC documentary The 8th Fire (2011). These materials are distributed by the Project of Hope Foundation with support from the Aboriginal Healing Foundation (AHF) and the Library and Archives of Canada (Project of Hope, 2003). The piece around residential schools in the 2011 CBC documentary film series The 8th Fire, also provides an example of the residential schools history and legacy being discussed in the popular media (http://www.cbc.ca/doczone/8thfire).
The residential school tour at the WCC has also become more popular in recent years. One participant from the WCC told me, “we see it more now; a lot of high schools bring students here, for the most part to talk about that history, because now it’s getting more and more known, ever since the apology, and the TRC establishment,… it’s been getting more and more media attention” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012). Another echoed this, saying “I know we’ve gotten a lot more tours, in the tour department, this is the only place you can visit a real, actual residential school” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012). The increasing popularity of these tours can be interpreted as a reflection of the increased awareness within Canadian society and an increased effort to include the residential school history into school curriculums.

**Community Initiatives**

“In a very real sense,” promised Harper in 2008, “we are now joining you on this journey” (Canada, 2008). However, responsibility for the success of the IRSSA may still rest disproportionately with residential school survivors and their communities. Both the community level events of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the commemoration aspect of the IRSSA are based on programmes that fund proposals submitted by communities. This structure relies on communities to realize their own commemorative projects. It is not clear how evenly the IRSSA will distribute funding across the country or to what extent it will provide publicly accessible, permanent memorials.

In the case of the TRC’s community events, “it is intended that the community events will be designed by communities and respond to the needs of former students, their families and those affected by the IRS legacy including the special needs of those communities where Indian Residential Schools were located” (Settlement, 2006, Schedule N). The target here seems to be
healing events rather than reconciliation events, since, inherently, reconciliation must occur between two or more parties. Who, in this case, is the community reconciling with? The only interaction this specifies is the sponsorship of the event by the TRC. Further, how can the TRC ensure that they are spending the money in such a way that it is all used, and that every community feels like they have benefited from it?

The described goals of the national events also place a heavy emphasis on the role of communities. The national events are “an opportunity for communities in the regions to share their experiences as they relate to the impacts on communities and to share insights from their community reconciliation processes” (IRSSA, 2006, Schedule N). Again, this refers to the reconciliation projects that have been done independently within communities or by survivor groups. In this description, the definition of reconciliation seems to again have been conflated with that of healing. This statement also seems to de-emphasize, that in many cases, healing has not concluded; in other words, healing is an on-going process. A positive aspect is that it does acknowledge that lessons around healing can be shared across different communities.

In the description of national events, the IRSSA also notes that they should include in their programmes, “Expressions of Reconciliation – opportunities for individual organisations and representatives of the parties to the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement to make statements, presentations, or apologies directly to survivors” (IRSSA, 2006, Schedule N). Again, there seems to be confusion around what is meant by reconciliation; here, reconciliation is manifest through gestures from organisations responsible for harms. These can be better described as apologies than as moments of reconciliation. While apologies can be powerful, and a fundamental precondition for reconciliation (Corntassel & Holder, 2008), to call apologies ‘expressions of reconciliation’ again confuses the meaning of reconciliation. While the definition
of reconciliation is not concrete, a common thread is that it involves two or more parties coming together to work on their relationship (Corntassel & Holder, 2008). In contrast, apologies are one-sided.

**Commemoration Funding**

The IRSSA sets aside $20 million for commemoration of the IRS and its legacy. The funding is being distributed through two calls for proposals issued in January of 2011, and 2012 (TRC, 2012c). In the IRSSA, commemoration is defined as:

Honouring, educating, remembering, memorialising and/or paying tribute to residential school former students, their families, and their communities, and acknowledging their experiences and the broad and systematic impacts of the residential school system... Commemoration may involve the creation of, or improvements to existing, permanent memorials and commemorative structures, or ceremonies or other projects (IRSSA, 2006, Schedule J).

Programme objectives include to “memorialise in a tangible and permanent way the residential school experience” (IRSSA, 2006, Schedule J). These definitions and programme objectives laid out in the settlement agreement do not include a role of public education, although the literature suggests that public consciousness and memorial are intertwined (Bolton, 2008; Corntassel & Holder, 2008).

Similar to community events, commemoration funding is distributed through a granting programme where community and survivor groups make proposals for commemoration and the chosen proposals are granted funds. This structure highlights four potential outcomes. First, it might mean that well-established organisations are favoured to receive funding. Second, the structure also allows for a scenario where multiple groups within a community are in competition for funding. Third, this model of commemoration it may not achieve its core objective and result in a strong network of publically accessible and permanent memorials. Finally, this structure
may not be compatible with the commemoration initiative as being a transitional justice measure. Each of these possible outcomes is addressed separately.

**Favours well-Established Groups**

The way that proposals are evaluated as well as the short timelines for commemoration funding make it likely that the funding will mostly benefit well-established organisations. The following are the criteria used to evaluate proposals for commemoration funding, according to the *Call for Proposals Guide*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commemoration Program Objectives</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and Partnerships</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Component</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/Reach</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Proposal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The emphasis placed here on the quality of the proposals and, on collaborations and partnerships, seems to favour groups that are already well-established. This factor compounds with the decision to distribute the funding over a two-year period, instead of over a longer period of time, thus further disadvantaging newer, emerging groups. Some more informal, or grassroots organisations might not have found this to be enough time to formulate a proposal for what they thought would be an effective memorial.

Through this programme, there is no support for groups who want to submit a proposal but who may not have the capacity to do this, or who may require professional consultations to determine what the costs of the commemoration project are likely to be. The programme allows “[e]ligible expenditures for commemoration projects … [including] rental of a suitable hall or public venue, publishing, printing, accounting and legal costs… professional fees and material costs related to the design, management and construction of plaques, monuments or other memorials” (*IRSSA,*)
2006, Schedule J). The organisation applying for commemoration funding must determine the amount of money they need before they submit a proposal. However, what the costs of materials or construction, for example, of a memorial might be difficult to estimate, especially for an inexperienced group. One way to do this would be to consult with contractors or architects, however, any initial investment in such professional fees, before a proposal received funding, would need to be paid by the group submitting the proposal.

It would also be up to the communities submitting proposals to finance any community consultations around what would be an appropriate project. These steps would likely have to be completed before the submission of a proposal, if the application for funding was unsuccessful, these investments of time and money would have been wasted. Even for a successful application, the one-time funding structure means that any unanticipated costs exceeding the amount of the grant would also be the responsibility of the applicant.

As mentioned, although anyone may submit a proposal for commemoration funding, the criteria by which proposals are evaluated may favour well-established organisations. However, well-established organisations may not be the most important for this funding to reach. One of the many reasons given to me by a participant for why the WCC chose not to apply for commemoration funding was that they wanted to see the funding reach grassroots survivors’ organisations. One interview participant noted, “We thought [the funding] should go to the survivors at a grassroots level. If there was a grassroots organisation, that they should get the money… I can look for other sources of funding. For some of the other grassroots organisations, they don’t really get that opportunity” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).
Again, if the intention was for this funding to largely benefit grassroots organizations, it might have been better to structure the funding over a longer time period, and to include supports in the programme to ensure that small, grassroots organizations would not be at a disadvantage in applying. At the same time the WCC also noted a willingness to work with grassroots organizations to help them implement their projects.

**Potential for Divisions within Communities**

A further problem with the proposals for grants system in this programme is that it may create division within communities if multiple organizations are competing for funding. There is no funding for pre-proposal activities such as community consultation or consensus building, which would likely be a necessary element to ensuring that a project had legitimacy and support within the community from the start. When discussing with participants at the WCC what should be done with the former Mohawk Institute building, some people indicated that it was difficult to determine what the prevailing opinions were within the Six Nations and survivor communities, and that some sort of consultation or consensus-building activity would have to take place before any other steps were taken. Participant 3 noted, “[w]e have never had a formal invitation to come and discuss … what’s the consensus, what’s the feeling about doing that with this place” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 3, February 24, 2012).

The TRC commemoration programme attempts to mitigate the potential to create divisions within communities in two ways. First, the criterion for the evaluation of proposals gives 20% weight to the collaborative elements of the proposals (See Table 3:Criteria for Evaluating Proposals for Commemoration Funding). Second, the funding structure grants $50 000 per applicant for community initiatives, meaning that one way to access more money for a project is for multiple organisations to submit a joint proposal (IRSSA, 2006, 3.04). Even with these
components, this formula does not seem to promote a version of collaboration where all concerned parties would come together to develop a solution (Healey, 2006). It seems likely that instead of multiple organisations developing a memorial project together, an organisation would have to look for partners once they already had a project in mind.

*Will this Model Create a Network of Permanent, Widely Accessible, Memorials?*

The goal of creating commemoration projects that will impact broader communities, or Canada as a whole, seems disconnected with the activities that are emphasised by the TRC, many of which are event-oriented rather than memorial-oriented, and the funding levels which specify a $50 000 maximum per group applying.

Examples of eligible activities given in the TRC’s *Call for proposals guide* for commemoration funding (TRC, 2012e, p. 4) include:

- Lasting legacy initiatives – leaves a legacy or educates
- One-time events – should have a lasting or permanent component
- Cultural components “Examples of these types of activities are, Aboriginal history workshops, traditional activities workshops (such as drum making, regalia making… taping of elders speaking their own language, cultural camps, etc.).”

The latter two examples both focus on events rather than permanent installations, although with a lasting component. The description of what types of activities would be considered as cultural expresses a narrow definition of culture. In addition, neither this document, nor the description of commemoration funding in the IRSSA, lays out a clear link between funding cultural activities and commemoration of the residential school system. In the words of one person affiliated with the WCC, “when you start dealing with culture, the residential schools immediately come into focus” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 8, April 6, 2012). While there is poignancy to the promotion of Indigenous cultures as juxtaposed with the history of assimilative policies, cultural events cannot inherently be considered to be commemorative of the residential
school system. Cultural events, including those identified by the call for proposals, could also be expected to occur as stand-alone events, outside of the context of commemoration.

It further surprises me that the criteria for the evaluation of proposals (see Table 3: Criteria for Evaluating Proposals for Commemoration Funding) weighs “collaboration and partnerships” (20 points) as well as a “cultural component” (20 points) equally with the “impact and reach” (20 points) of the proposed project. The way a proposal meets the “commemoration program objectives” (30 points) is only weighed slightly more heavily (TRC, 2012e). This likely reflects an attempt to derive multiple benefits from each IRSSA initiative, emphasising collaboration to promote reconciliation, and emphasising a cultural component to counteract the legacy of the residential school system (IRSSA, 2006, Schedule J). However, it is not clear how these criterion will ensure that effective, permanent commemorative projects are established.

As mentioned, there are a number of reasons why the WCC chooses not to apply for funding, and several of them relate to the way that funding is structured. One issue was the $50 000 funding cap. This was not seen as being enough money to create a residential school exhibit. To access more money than that, an organisation is required to apply jointly, or apply as a national project. Commemoration funding is intended for “both national commemoration and community-based commemorative projects” (IRSSA, 2006, 3.04). The maximum funding amount for national commemoration projects is $2 million (TRC, 2012e). Besides the different funding levels, it is not clear what the difference is between a national and a community project.

One interview participant indicated that the funding cap was too low for it to be worthwhile to put together an application, and that it was not clear who the WCC could partner with to increase the funding amount. Yet another individual seemed confident that they could have received
funding if they had applied, “I don’t know how anybody could argue against our case. That’s an insanely strong case we could make” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 3, February 27, 2012). In response to this, the underlying concerns of another participant seemed to be that the application review process might not actually be fair, and that there is discomfort with associating the WCC with the TRC: “But, do you want to identify with the, (laughs) colonisers and oppressors, that try and set you up to fail” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012). This in turn supports the statements of Corntassel and Holder (2008) who pointed out that some transitional justice initiatives such as truth commissions can be understood as nation building exercises, running counter to goals of decolonization.

When talking about the funding cap, some commented that the projects that would be selected would not have meaningful or permanent impacts: “I’m sure it’s all, therapy sessions, or group healings, and conferences. It’s not sustainable” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 3, February 27, 2012). “It’s the fluff. Just to appease” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012). In contrast, when I talked with an individual about the potential for the WCC to apply for commemoration funds (i.e., this individual had been involved with a past proposal to turn a part of the Mohawk Institute building into an exhibit on the residential school) he said, “Well they should get ready and do it!” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 8, April 6, 2012). But he also indicated that the exhibit he had proposed would have cost about $200 000, and this was several years ago (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 8, April 6, 2012).

Clear Link between Commemoration and Transitional Justice?

Another potential danger is that the link between the commemoration programme and transitional justice might be lost, if it comes across as being no different from any other grant
programme. As discussed above, many of the eligible activities for commemoration funding are more event than memorial-oriented, and may not lead to permanent commemoration. The ambiguity of this programme may disassociate the programme from the transitional justice efforts around the residential schools system. As De Greiff (2009) expressed when discussing the use of development programmes as transitional justice measures, it is vital that a clear link be maintained between the human rights abuses and the justice measures that make up the response to those abuses.

Alternatively, if the commemoration funding is closely connected in people’s minds with other transitional justice measures including the TRC, their opinions about commemoration funding will be linked to their opinions about these other things. The conclusion of this is that communities and groups might feel excluded if their proposals are not selected. This could be most troubling, as mentioned above, where multiple groups within a single community apply, and only one proposal is selected, or where a community does not receive funding for any proposals.

If commemoration is successfully linked with the transitional justice project, then people’s feelings about other elements of the IRSSA will likely influence whether they invest their energies and lay their hopes on the commemoration programme. Several individuals who I spoke with at the WCC expressed scepticism around the transitional justice project, for example, by questioning the independence of the TRC, and indicating that they did not feel represented either by the TRC or in the IRSSA (2006).

As a negotiated agreement involving multiple parties, it might be possible to view the IRSSA as a collaborative effort. In this spirit, several of Watson’s (2006) cautions about the limitations of
collaborative planning techniques seem applicable to the case of the IRSSA process. One of Watson’s (2006) critiques is that collaborative processes assume that the state is a neutral party. There is evidence that this is the perspective of the IRSSA, even though this assumption becomes even more problematic in this context, where the IRSSA is designed as a remedy for state sponsored human rights violations (Corntassel & Holder, 2008).

For example, the ‘trustee’ of the agreement is Her Majesty in right of Canada, represented by the federal government (IRSSA, 2006, p. 17-18). The trustee is responsible for holding the money set aside for the settlement, and for a variety of other aspects of the agreement implementation including “installing and implementing systems and procedures for processing, evaluating and making decisions respecting CEP [Common Experience Payment] Applications” (IRSSA, 2006, 10.01). It is interesting that some parts of the settlement defer responsibility to the trustee, and elsewhere to Canada, when both ‘trustee’ and ‘Canada’ refer to the federal government. The federal government has the final say in a number of other issues, for example, they appointed the Interim Executive Director tasked with setting up the TRC, and they also had the right to approve the TRC budget before releasing the bulk of TRC funding (IRSSA, 2006, 3.03).

There have been questions about whether the TRC is at sufficient arms-length from the federal government. Many of these questions were first posed after the resignation of Justice Laforme, the original commissioner of the TRC. He resigned in October 2008, less than six months after the commission was struck. He resigned stating that “the Commission’s independence had been compromised by political interference, and that conflict with the other two Commissioners regarding his authority made the Commission unworkable” (TRC, 2012c, p. 2). The other two commissioners resigned shortly thereafter, hoping that a fresh group of commissioners would be the best thing for the project (TRC, 2012c). The TRC interim report noted that re-establishing
credibility after this event has been a significant challenge (TRC, 2012c). Concern about this challenge was echoed by at least one participant at the WCC who noted that,

As much as they liked it to be arms-length, the government still holds the purse strings... and it’s had some issues already, with several board members resigning... there’s this level of instability already on it, people wonder... I think people, when they initially signed up to do it the first time, had really good intentions, and then found out, this isn’t really what I want to do. It’s not going to be as arms-length as I thought. But, like I said, it’s hard to be arms-length when government is what’s funding you (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).

Another participant said that she did not feel represented by the TRC; she hoped that it would be able to accomplish something, and would have liked to see a benefit from it, but was skeptical, and still waiting to see how it would turn out. She noted, “So we’ll just see with the TRC, I don’t see them as being a part of our life… it just seems like they’re this obscure group that has their own agenda that doesn’t necessarily reflect the best interests of who they’re supposed to be representing” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012).

A Mohawk Institute survivor I spoke with felt similarly unrepresented by the IRSSA. He noted that although his lawyer was present at the negotiations, he did not feel like he had a part in them, nor did he like the settlement or feel represented by the prominent Indigenous negotiators:

No we weren’t there, just our lawyer, he would just make a report every once and a while, and bring us up to date on what’s going on... Besides, Phil Fontaine, he was supposed to be the big chief ... I don’t know, we don’t recognize him down here at the Six Nations, the Band Council might, but the traditional people we don’t like that guy, and he’s the guy that came up with all that stuff... just give them $10 000 for being there, and then $3000 for each year that you were there after (Personal Communication, Participant 7, March 15, 2012).

This perspective on the IRSSA hints at two things: first to a broader problem of legitimacy for some First Nations governance structures, and second to the implications of ignoring inter- and intra- group difference can have for outsiders working with Indigenous communities (or any
community of which one is not a part). On the first point, for example, the self-guided tour book for the WCC acknowledges this tension, saying:

The Ogwehonweh of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century underwent several transformations of great political and social distress... Politically, the Canadian government ceased to recognize the Confederacy’s traditional government and imposed an elected system upon the Confederacy and its adherents. The Confederacy chiefs and their supporters were driven underground and are still not recognized as the political and civil representatives of the Ogwehonweh people (although their supporters far outnumber the people who vote in band elections) (Froman, 2010, p. 6).

On the implications of this for outsiders, such as urban planners, or people working with the TRC, it might be helpful to consider a clear example given by Porter in her 2006 article. Porter (2006) described a situation where a government department in Australia needed to consult with the Wotjobaluk group who are the traditional owners of an area of land. Instead, the department spoke with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Officer who was not a traditional owner of the land in question. That the government consulted with the wrong person, and that this heritage official chose to speak for the traditional owners, rather than redirecting the consultation, created division and hurt within the community, and damaged trust with the government department. The damage done to the relationship took years, and significant innovation to overcome (Porter, 2006). Again, this points to a major shortcoming in the commemoration funding structure by not creating a process for consultation and consensus based decision-making around how to best use the funds.

Outcomes of Commemoration Funding?

Nine million dollars of projects were recommended from the 2011 call for proposals, leaving $11 million dollars for the 2012 call for proposals (TRC, 2012d). In the 2012 call for proposals, approximately 200 proposals for a total of around $30 million have been received (TRC, 2012a). Unfortunately, at the time of writing (as of May, 2012), the successful applications from the 2011 call for proposals had not yet been made public.
As previously indicated, community-led commemoration efforts can often be more creative and powerful than anything spearheaded by government (See Bilbija et. al, 2005). At the risk of being overly critical of the IRSSA’s commemoration initiative, perhaps another strategy for commemoration would have considered the needs of under-engaged communities. It remains to be seen what the community level, and cumulative outcomes of the commemoration initiatives will be. Perhaps it will be successful in that it results in a nationwide network of lasting memorials that are meaningful to the individuals and communities impacted by the residential school system, as well as to other Canadians. In the words of one participant:

I’m definitely interested to find out the findings of what these commemorative projects turn out to be, what impact it has on those communities… I’m just worried that it’s going to be one of those things that looks good on paper, and that’s not really going to pan out at the end of it… there’s a lot of things that throwing money at stuff does not fix. But, throwing money at the right types of things might work… Because that’s really important to me, to build on those successes, if certain projects worked, then why don’t you transplant them to a couple of other communities and see what it does (Personal Communication, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).

This further suggests that a longer time period for funding would have created greater opportunities for learning.

As has been shown, one crucial element for reconciliation will be Canadian society as a whole taking some ownership and responsibility for the residential school history; this was expressed in the official apology in 2008, and has been repeated by the TRC of Canada. That this must be done seems non-controversial, but it must be done respectfully, so as not to appropriate the voices of survivors and their communities. Further, it is not clear that such a sharing of this burden is being accomplished through the IRSSA. In particular, the community events of the TRC and the commemoration funding programme, still place disproportionate responsibility on residential school survivors and their communities.
Chapter 5: Discussion

This research focussed on the commemoration and memorialisation processes surrounding the Indian Residential School System (IRS) in Canada, based on two case studies. The two cases of commemoration, the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC), and the Commemoration Fund of the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA) (2006) provide two very different examples of ways the residential school system in Canada is being memorialised. The aim of this research was to draw connections between the fields of professional urban planning and transitional justice. The use of the two case studies of memorialisation around the residential school system were intended to highlight these connections and also to provide a space to consider approaches to the decolonization of planning practices in the Canadian context.

Woodland Cultural Centre as a Memorial

The reuse of the residential school, which was designed to suppress First Nations cultures, by the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC), designed to promote and celebrate these same cultures, is not only a poetic contrast, but also, through its physical occupation of the space, a type of memorial to the harms of the IRS. The WCC acts as a memorial to the harms of the Mohawk Institute residential school in a number of ways. The first way is through the direct juxtaposition of the mandates of the WCC and the residential school system. The second way is through the public education done by the centre around the residential school system with visitors and school groups. The third way the WCC acts as a memorial is as a physical place that survivors return to, where remembering and sharing of experiences takes place in a way that some survivors find healing.
The WCC acts as a memorial to the Mohawk Institute because its mandate and work are in direct juxtaposition with the goals of the residential school system. The WCC has been directly involved with the renaissance of Indigenous cultures in Canada, through its support of the arts as well as through other programmes, significantly by its language department. In contrast, the goals of residential schools were to sever the link between Aboriginal children and their culture (RCAP, 1996: II, 10.3). Furthermore, children at the residential schools were typically forbidden from speaking Aboriginal languages. This juxtaposition is inherent in the work of the WCC, but it is also regularly acknowledged in the publications and statements of the centre, as well as through discussions with the centre’s staff.

For example, a profile of the WCC, published around 1990 states that,

> Formerly the Mohawk Institute, the Centre was originally established as a residential school to provide a rudimentary education and training in manual skills for Indian children while isolating them from the influences of their own cultures, heritage and languages. Today, the Centre stands as an affirmation of the beauty, distinctiveness, richness and diversity of the cultures of the First Nations of the Eastern Woodland area (WCC, 1990, p.1).

The interpretive panel in the museum’s permanent exhibit on the Mohawk Institute finishes by directly asserting this juxtaposition, perhaps to conclude the visitor’s education on a positive note:

> The Mohawk Institute, a residential school operated by the Anglican Church, was established, yet failed, as a means to destroy traditional Six Nations Culture and families… The continuing survival of such Six Nations traditions as the longhouse ceremonies, despite the attempts of church and state to eradicate them, confirms the failure of the Mohawk Institute as a weapon of assimilation (WCC, 2005).
The historic plaque in front of the building also notes that the Mohawk Institute was an assimilative tool, while the WCC has been a force for cultural renaissance (Heritage Ontario, 1996).³

I asked staff at the WCC about whether the history of the site impacts the work they do and how this fits into the mandate of the centre. Several staff responded that, for as long as the centre exists on the site of the former residential school, working to counter this history would inherently be a part of their mandate, while the residential school history would probably not be raised as frequently if they were located somewhere else.

Some said that the residential school history is always in the back of their minds as they work, and that working in the buildings of the residential school provides an on-going call to action. One participant said, “currently because of where we are located, I think the mandate of the Woodland Cultural Centre is to counteract what the mandate of the Mohawk Institute was… that’s what our guiding message is” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 3, February 27, 2012). Another participant explained, “It’s not our [WCC’s] identity, but as long as we’re in the building we’re kind of enmeshed in it” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012). This participant later went on to state, “I’m glad it’s here, and I think it’s a reminder, every morning when you drive up the laneway, and that’s how it gives us the impetus to make it better, to make today better” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012).

³ The Mohawk Institute was established in 1831 for children of the Six Nations Iroquois living on the Grand River. Children from other communities in Ontario attended the school as well. Like all Canadian residential schools, the Mohawk Institute tried to assimilate its students into the rapidly growing Euro-Canadian society. To that end, it disregarded native cultural traditions and stressed instead Christian teachings, English language instruction, and manual labour skills. This building was constructed in 1904 after fire destroyed the previous school. When the Institute closed in 1970 the building reverted to the Six Nations of the Grand River. It then became a centre for the renaissance of First Nations cultures (Heritage Ontario, 1996).
The second way that the WCC acts as a memorial is through its public education programmes around the residential school history. The WCC educates the public about the IRS in a number of ways. They incorporate the residential school history into all tours that they offer and they run tours that specifically focus on the residential school building. A portion of the museum’s permanent exhibit is also focussed on the Mohawk Institute, and the topic has been raised through special exhibits in the museum and gallery. Finally, there is an historic plaque in front of the building that describes the history of the site. Questions about the former use of the buildings also come up frequently in discussions between visitors and staff.

While all of these elements are in place to educate visitors about the history of the site, it is not an overt message that all visitors will internalize before leaving the centre. I asked interview participants whether most visitors arrive to the WCC already aware of the history of the site, and whether, or how, they are made aware. While emphasis is placed on the residential school history in all tours, staff indicated that it is largely up to visitors to make the connection between the buildings and the residential school history. For example, it is up to visitors to take the time to walk across the parking lot and read the historic plaque:

Sometimes it comes down to where they park… if they park on that side in front of the dormitory which was the residential school building… they’ll see there’s a plaque out there that talks about that this was the Mohawk Institute and the dates it ran… So I think if they park over there, and they see that, they recognize that, and they go, ‘Oh, that’s what this building is.’… The building is very striking… a lot of people will, interestingly enough, go: ‘was that a hospital? Or was it a school?’ those are the two things that they ask. Sometimes they’ll ask, ‘Oh, what was that building.’ So, I think they’re interested, but depending on where they’re parking, they don’t always realize. As a casual visitor, they will walk away with the understanding that it was a school at one point, I just don’t know the impact that has on them. As you go through the museum permanent display there is a section devoted to the Mohawk Institute. Whether that makes a connection to them, I’m not sure. Versus the guided tour where it’s right in your face from the start, it’s

---

4 It was noted that most of the visitors who come from the Six Nations on the Grand River Land Reserve are aware of the site’s history (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 8, April 6, 2012).
hard to say… they’re interested by it, but I don’t know if they necessarily see the connection (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).

Talking about this impact on visitors did raise some discussions about whether the way the site’s history is interpreted for visitors should be modified. For example, one participant, in answering my question, addressed her co-worker part way through her answer, asking if she thought this was a problem that they needed to address: “If, I think they’re the casual visitor, I don’t think they get that background, because it’s not even in the tour guide book, right? So, maybe that’s something we should… should we look at it? And address that?” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 3, February 27, 2012). This consideration of altering the impact of the centre on visitors, as well as discussions around possible improvements to the residential school component of the museum, show some ways that the WCC as a memorial is continuing to evolve.

A final way that the WCC acts as a memorial is as a physical space that survivors return to where they can remember and share their memories. This function was mentioned repeatedly by interview participants when they spoke about their encounters with survivors of the Mohawk Institute. Participants told stories about the profound impact that visits to the building had had on particular survivors. This impact is, in turn, used by WCC staff as something that encourages them to continue their work, especially the work on public education around the IRS which can be painful. For example, during the residential school tour, our tour guide told us about doing tours for survivors who have said that doing the tour has helped them to heal and move on (WCC, 2011). Another participant explained:

  A lot of issues come with this place. And we have dealt with people who were students here, and I mean, they’ll just show up whenever, you don’t know, they don’t make appointments… I mean they just… ‘Do you mind if I go through the building?’ And the staff is kind of prepared for it, but you’re never really prepared, because everyone has a different reaction, especially if it’s their first time back since they’ve been here. It’s very
hard. You’re just there. You just kind of walk them through... And I’ve had a few that were hard, I’ve had a few that I’ve gone through and I’ve been like: that was the hardest thing I’ve ever had to do. There’s been some that were really tough. And then there’s others that will tell you stuff that is hilarious. Like stuff that they used to do to teachers, or do to other students. Like, just funny things, stuff kids would do (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 27, 2012).

She also told one specific story about a Board Member of the WCC who had gone to the school as a child:

I remember one of our Board Members, she went here, and the first board meeting that she came to, it was her first time since she’d left. And it was really hard for her, and she was just really quiet, and I didn’t know! She didn’t tell me that she came here before, so it wasn’t until after the meeting, and I was like: “Oh, it’s so nice to finally meet you, I’m looking forward to having you on the Board.” And she says “Did you know that I used to go here.” And I was like, “Uh! No… is this your first time back?” and she goes “Yeah, it was really hard for me to walk through that door.” And I said to her “We don’t have to have the meetings in this building, we can go to the other building.” And she goes “No, it’s good for me, it’s good for me to walk through, because I have a different place, I have a different power versus when I was a kid.” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).

This participant referred back to this function of the centre when talking about the future of the building: “There is a lot of healing that still needs to be done, and although some people may never want to set foot through those doors, there are many who have to. And there are many who still have to, and they just haven’t gotten the chance yet” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012). Another participant mentioned his initial worries about the centre having this function for survivors:

I can remember, an American actually, came in, and she wanted to go back to where she’d gone to school and she got as far as the orchard and she couldn’t go in any farther. We invited her into the museum, and she wouldn’t go into the museum, she wouldn’t go into the building, but yet she had to come back to the school. And she ended up crying in the orchard. And I mean; are all our visitors here going to end up crying? My god! What kind of a, that’s one of the things I was thinking was, what kind of a shop are we running?!

But we were always very cognisant of their feelings having gone through that experience... We would do tours of the whole building then... Some people were very excited, they would say “I’m glad this is happening”, they were willing to give us money,
and, you know “I’m glad there’s now a museum”. And others just couldn’t deal with that… (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 8, April 6, 2012).

These stories also show the powerful impact that visiting the site can have, as well as some of the diversity of reactions of different survivors to the WCC, especially as a memorial to the residential school. This also hints at some of the tensions that go with this role, and the difficulties that might surround any attempt to change or amplify the way the centre acts as a memorial.

One proposal that came up in my conversations with people at the WCC involved the possibility of turning a part of the former school building (see Figure 3: Woodland Cultural Centre, Site Map) into an exhibit on the residential school system. Given the powerful impact of the residential school tour of this building, it seems likely that such an exhibit could be very hard-hitting. This option might be raised again in the next few years as this building requires major renovations and upgrades (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012). When I spoke with one of the individuals who had been involved with conceptualizing this original proposal he identified two reasons why the project had not gone forward. The first was that such an exhibit would be quite expensive and the funding could not be easily secured, and the second was that there were divisions, even within the Board of Directors, about whether it was something they would want to pursue. He said:

So after that reunion… there was a move by some of the residents that this should be a memorial to the residential school, and that was given to our board, but nothing happened… They knew that there was this desire to make it into a memorial… particularly with other residential schools that had already begun to be torn down, or were used for something else… And I remember… the chair of this committee who said, you know, “I went to this school in the 30s and the 40s”, and he said, “it’s not for me, I, in fact, I have problems with it, the experience was negative”, but he said, “it should be

Another consideration, which has not been explored here, is the possibility that focusing more on the residential school history might create a trade-off, reducing the centre’s ability to fulfill other parts of its mandate.
memorialised for all Canadians to go in and see the place, in Canada, in our history, and how some of these children, not all of them, but how some of these children were treated” and many of the people nodded and some were of course looking at him, you know, where did he come from?...

I had proposed that the downstairs be renovated to the residential school experience, they would go in front door, they’d go past the director’s office, go down into the cafeteria then go through rooms of what life was like at the residential school, and then out to the side… And, of course that never happened because there was such a reaction, of by some of the Board…

Everyone wasn’t behind it 100% and I always felt like you had to have the people behind this 100%, because, when you run into difficulty you need all of those people standing behind you (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 8, April 6, 2012).

This again hints at difficulties and the potential divisiveness that surrounds attempts to memorialise the residential school system, and human rights abuses more generally. The people I spoke with generally reacted positively to discussions about the need to renovate the former school building and the proposal to turn a portion of the building into a museum for the residential school. However, they often spoke of others in the community who they thought would oppose such memorials. For example, one participant told me, that when discussing the struggle to secure funding to renovate the building, some people have said: “Why don’t we just blow it up!” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012).

Another participant described comparable reactions:

I’ve talked to some people that have said “I don’t know why they’ve got that building up there. The Mush Hole, they should burn the whole thing right down. And get that memory out of my mind.”…You know… “Why are they keeping that thing there, every time I go to Brantford… I’ll think about that school.”… If you’re with somebody, they’ll see that school and it just comes rushing back. But if it’s not here then it’s just kind of like a memory… But you can actually come to the room where you went to school, and where you got a strapping or something in here (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 7, March 15, 2012).

And similarly:

There’s a lot of people who would like to see it bulldozed. Flattened. My feeling is, what would have happened if they had just done that to Auschwitz, or to the other concentration camps in Germany? There’s a lot of power to having something where
people can come in and feel that energy when you walk into the physical structure. To me, bulldozing it serves less of an impact, of the potential impact that it can have. Having this, there’s no denying that it’s here. So, that’s the camp I’m in (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 3, February 24, 2012).

This potential for controversy again reveals the complexity of planning for the memorialisation of human rights abuses. In this case, the physical building is connected in many people’s minds with negative experiences from their own, or loved ones’ pasts. The same history that gives the space power as a memorial, makes memorialising it painful for some people, and specifically for some of the people who the memorial is designed to honour. Recall that one participant felt that a residential school exhibit should not proceed unless everyone was “100% behind it” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 8, April 6, 2012). Based on this standard, the goal when planning for memorialisation must be to find a memorial that will satisfy everyone, though this ideal will not always be possible to attain.

Another interesting response to the conversation about what should be done with the building was to point out that the WCC really does not have a clear understanding of what the community, and survivors in particular, would like to see happen. For example, one participant said:

I don’t know much about how the community feels in terms of supporting or not supporting, it’s kind of a 50/50 split. And I don’t know, we have issues with trying to get surveys out to the community: people not voting, rule by consensus. So, to do an actual survey of a percentage of support, I don’t think we’d be able to gauge… Unless it’s an issue, if it’s negative, then we’ll get bombarded by fifteen people, which seems like a lot, because… if we say, we want to build on a wing, and what do you want to see? We tend to get five opinions, outside of the centre (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 4, February 27, 2012).

When talking about people’s reactions to the proposal to create a residential school exhibit, some participants suggested that it’s difficult to know what opinions there are within the community without people coming together to discuss it as a group. One participant noted, “we have never had a formal, invitation to come and discuss what our, what’s the consensus, what’s the feeling
about doing that with this place” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 3, February 27, 2012).

This uncertainty around what the community and survivors would like to see happen to the building provides evidence of an opportunity that was missed by the Commemoration Fund of the IRSSA which could have created a space to have such a discussion.

For the WCC, one possibility for trying to determine a course of action that would satisfy the community and survivors might be to engage groups and individuals using techniques grounded in collaborative planning theory. As discussed above, collaborative planning can be problematic in (post)colonial contexts, especially where an Indigenous community is included as one of many stakeholders (Porter, 2006). Perhaps collaborative planning techniques are more useful and satisfactory in this context, where a discussion and decision are being reached within a community. If this is correct, it might indicate that collaborative planning is best suited for bridging differences within communities, and less appropriate for bridging gaps across communities, as is argued by Watson (2006). If all participants of collaborative planning processes must consider themselves as part of a single community for the processes to be unproblematic, this indicates again, that collaborative planning does not in itself offer a de-colonized version of planning.

**Memorialisation as an On-Going Process**

That the ways the WCC acts as a memorial continues to evolve even forty years after its creation confirms that memorialisation is an on-going process. This in turn provides a further critique of the limited timelines of the government programme for commemoration. Jung (2009) suggested that the perspective of the federal government has been to use the IRSSA as an endpoint, drawing
a line between the past and the present and indicating that past injustices have been remedied, whereas for Indigenous communities the agreement is seen as a starting point, and a way to begin to draw connections between past and current injustices. Further, as established, the IRS has on-going implications for individuals and communities, most strikingly, for some survivors it continues to be a part of their everyday experience. “Some people still find themselves reliving the moments of their victimisation. For them, residential schools are not part of the past, but vivid elements of their daily life. Sights, sounds, foods, and even individuals can trigger painful memories” (TRC, 2012c, p.6).

I began my research thinking that the Woodland Cultural Centre would provide an example of a fully formed memorial that could present an alternative to the current memorialisation process being undertaken through the Commemoration Fund. Instead, I found that the way the WCC acts as a memorial continues to evolve and faces on-going tensions and challenges. Given the forty-year history of the WCC, it is difficult to see how a two-year window for commemoration, established through the Commemoration Fund, can effectively address the complexities and sensitive issues around memorialising the IRS.

Timelines were built into all aspects of the IRSSA, while this has been important in the context of survivors who are aging and passing on, the restrictiveness of the timelines might make the agreement less effective in other ways, and is often understood as a sign that the actions of government to remedy the harms of the residential school system are not sincere. For example, when asked about the potential impact of the TRC, one participant stated that the residential school system “had a lot of negative impacts. Impacts that I see, first hand, from artists who come here to show their work but don’t set foot next door… it’s really hard to say: so you only have a mandate until 2014. Like, are you just waiting for people not to remember? That’s what I
don’t get, because really, if you really wanted to fix things you wouldn’t put a deadline on it” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 2, February 24, 2012). The Mohawk Institute survivor I spoke with also indicated that the timeframes laid out in the IRSSA were not adequate: “I mean everything…had a time limit. So, you have five years of counselling …we probably need counselling for the rest of our lives. Is what I kind of think … two years of counselling: What’s that?” (Personal Communication, Interview, Participant 7, March 15, 2012).

My intention in beginning this research was to compare the processes informing the memorialisation of residential schools in Canada at the national level to those at the grassroots level, and to look for the roles that urban planners could play in this context. Instead my findings discovered and examined ways that memorialisation is being defined through the national process. Looking at the ways that the WCC represents a form of memorial allowed me to examine some of the strengths and weaknesses of the national memorialisation process represented through the commemoration funding of the IRSSA. The IRSSA as a whole, and the Commemoration Fund in particular, incorporate the processes advocated by the theories of collaborative planning. In turn, examining these on-going programmes provides a window for exploring the claims of collaborative planning theory as well as the claims of its critics.
Chapter 6. Conclusions

The foundation of this research is an examination of the processes of memorialisation around the Indian Residential School System (IRS) in Canada as a way to draw connections between the fields of transitional justice and professional planning. I have been able to explore some of the ways that the residential school system is being commemorated based on two case studies, of the First-Nations run Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC), and of the national process for commemoration represented by the Commemoration Fund established through the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA) (2006).

My research at the WCC underlined some of the challenges and tensions inherent in attempting to memorialise the human rights abuses represented by the IRS. A significant difficulty is establishing a balance between being careful not to appropriate the stories of residential school survivors, while acknowledging the responsibilities that the whole of society must carry if reconciliation is to be achieved. I conclude that the process established through the Commemoration Fund does not adequately reflect this balance, instead leaving too heavy a burden with survivors and their communities without providing adequate support. I further argued that the timelines established to fulfill the commitments to memorialisation do not allow for the longer-term evolution that may characterise effective memorialisation projects.

If the national process around memorialisation can be understood as an example of the use of collaborative planning approaches, then this research suggests that it is not safe to assume that such approaches will produce just outcomes. This finding has important implications, including for professional planners, as we work towards decolonization, reconciliation and establishing just relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations in Canada.
A subsequent research project would be to examine the outcomes of the Commemoration Fund projects, and their impacts on the communities that host the projects. This could be done as part of consideration of the broader impacts of the IRSSA. The Commemoration Fund is an element of the agreement that is important, but that might be easy to overlook because of its small size relative to the overall agreement, and, again, because of the way the funds were distributed. The implementation of the IRSSA will impact the future relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations in Canada, and so should be watched carefully, including by planning professionals whose work is, and should be reliant on this relationship. At the international level, looking at the outcomes of these memorialisation initiatives will provide lessons for transitional justice measures, specifically for the sensitive processes around how to memorialise human rights abuses.

Research could also be conducted to look at trends in the current uses and ultimate fates of other residential schools. For example, many residential schools, such as the one in Fort Albany, Ontario, have been burnt down (Bartleman, 2010). This is an act that can be understood as cleansing or vengeful. It would be interesting to discover whether the destruction of the schools has led to a lasting sense of catharsis for the communities and individuals who chose this action.

Another facet for future research could be to look at the implications of the heritage designation of the former Mohawk Institute building and the obligations that this entails. As discussed above, heritage legislation might present a potential tool for decolonization of planning. Recall that Dubrow (1998) said that heritage designation can provide an alternative type of value to economic value that is readily understood through the western worldview. However, Porter (2010) pointed to the limitations of this where it characterises Indigenous Peoples as pre-modern. One way to examine this question might be to look at what kinds of buildings and landscapes
Indigenous communities are choosing to designate using heritage legislation. When I presented this research at the 2012 Canadian Association of Geographers Conference (May 29, 2012), one individual suggested that there might be a trend in Aboriginal communities in Canada to grant heritage designation to more elements of the built environment in addition to cultural landscapes.

To reiterate, the core of this project was to consider an empirical example that could be used to consider how planning can become (post)colonial and overcome its colonial culture and history. This research shows that the profession of planning must continue to challenge its own culture and history and to question the governmental structure and policy regime in which it operates, even including the programmes that are designed to remedy past injustices. Additional examples are needed to more clearly illustrate how the colonial culture of planning permeates the everyday practice of planning and to show how this can be changed. Further to this is the question of whether we, as urban planners, have a special accountability to First Nations and other Indigenous communities? If, as I believe, we do, then how can we honour this responsibility?

To engage meaningfully with attempts to decolonize professional planning and establish just relations, one must have the courage to reach out to people despite knowing that an outcome may be being forced to change deeply held assumptions and practices. Porter (2010) called on planners to expose the colonial logic that is embedded within urban planning’s philosophy and practice (p. 16). One way to accomplish this is simply through asking for feedback from the individuals you are working with and listening carefully to their comments and perspectives. The moments where you hear views that surprise you, or challenge your assumptions can highlight areas where a colonial culture persists, and may represent opportunities to identify the subtle ways that planning can contribute to ending on-going injustices. When, as a planner, one
identifies a critique or flaw in the common practices of planning, it becomes a duty to look for opportunities to share and spread these critiques within the profession.

A final important reminder for planners working in contexts of historic and on-going injustices between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations is that we must recognize, and be mindful, that the work of a professional planner can lead to positive change, but it can equally cause harm (Beauregard, 1998). Perhaps unexpectedly, this is something I find reassuring to keep in mind when the pace of change seems frustratingly slow: incremental change is still change, and it leaves more time and space for learning lessons and continuing to shift course.
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Appendix A: “Shooting Script”: Site Visit One to the Woodland Cultural Centre in Brantford, Ontario, carried out by Christina Hovey, on November 14-15th, 2011

A ‘shooting script’ is a list of sub-questions generated from the research question to guide photo-taking (Rose, 2007, p. 243). It describes,

- What photos to take, and more importantly:
- Why you are taking them (Rose, 2007, p. 243).

Research (sub) Questions:

1. How is the history of the site currently interpreted for the public?
   a. Overtly (as through the exhibit and the plaque)?

2. How/Does this memorialise the residential school system?
   a. Less overtly (what other impacts does the site have on visitors)?
   b. What things do I notice about the site from my perspective as a researcher? I may know more about the site and the history of residential schools than many other visitors…. Would I notice the same things if I was someone else? Are there other things that I might notice if I were someone else?

Photos of the grounds:

- Photos of the approach to the buildings from the main road:
  o What does the visitor first see?
- Photos of the edge of the maintained grounds:
  o How does the site interact with its surroundings?
- Photos of the signage.
- Any other points of interest?
  o Outdoor art installations,
  o At the road,
  o At both buildings.
Photos of the former Mohawk Institute (MI) building:

- Of the historic plaque.
- Of the main entrance.
- Of the building as a whole.
- Of architectural details (the building was constructed in 1904):
  - Including building materials.
- To situate the building in relation to the museum building:
  - Including a picture of the museum from the main entrance of the MI.
- Of the inside of the building:
  - Layout,
  - Current uses,
  - Architectural details.

Photos of the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC) museum building:

- To situate the building in relation to the MI building:
  - Including a picture of the MI from the main entrance of the museum.
- Of architectural details (renovated to a museum in 1971):
  - Including building materials.
- Of the interior:
  - The main lobby,
  - The layout of exhibit spaces.

Photos of residential school exhibit:

- Of the overall exhibit:
  - For analysis of the exhibit as a whole,
  - To show how things are placed in relation to each other, and
  - How things are presented.
- Of the context of exhibit:
  - What comes before? After?
- Of individual items:
  - Artefacts,
- Photos,
- Interpretations (ie. labels).

During the site visit, field notes were taken using the following form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo: Field Note Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title/Label:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Letter of Information and Consent Form

LETTER OF INFORMATION

“Planning for the Memorialisation of the Residential School System: A Case Study of the Woodlands Cultural Centre, Brantford (ON)”

Investigators: Christina Hovey
School of Urban and Regional Planning, Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
(613) 533-6000
c.hovey@queensu.ca

Professor Leela Viswanathan
School of Urban and Regional Planning, Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
(613) 533-6000 X 75038
leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca

Research Sponsor: Queen’s University

The purpose of this letter is to introduce you to the content of this research project and to provide the information you need to make an informed decision about whether or not you are willing to participate. This research is being conducted by Christina Hovey under the supervision of Professor Leela Viswanathan, in the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario.

What is this study about?
This research will look at the sites and buildings that were formerly ‘Indian Residential Schools’, based on the premise that the current/potential use of the site can be a form of memorial, and can provide some redress for the injustice of the residential school system. The research will focus on the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC) as a case study. The WCC is a First Nations educational centre and museum in Brantford, Ontario, that is housed in a building that was formerly the Mohawk Institute, a residential school. The site holds history of tensions, violence, and cultural erasure of First Nation cultures and peoples. At the same time processes of memorialisation, represented by its transformation into the WCC can be seen as a form of transitional justice, and offer hope for conciliation of past injustices.

The purpose of this research is to improve our understanding of the role of memorialisation of the residential school system in the evolving relationship between First Nations and Canada’s government structures. A related purpose is to develop planning theory that helps the profession of planning move beyond it’s ‘colonial culture’ and to create as space for learning between First Nation and non-First Nation communities, including planners.

What are you asking me to do?
As part of this research I would like to interview a number of individuals from WCC. I would like you to participate in this research by agreeing to an interview on the study topic.
The interviews would be expected to last between 45 and 90 minutes. The interview will take place in your office, or if you prefer, we can arrange to talk at an alternative location, such as a meeting room at the public library. With your permission, I would also like to record the interview with a digital voice recorder. There is a space provided on the consent form where you can indicate whether or not you give permission to be recorded. The recordings will only be available to the researchers. The recording will be destroyed within 5 years. If you do not want to be recorded, we can still go forward with an unrecorded interview.

Here are some examples of questions you might be asked:

- Are visitors to the centre usually aware that the building was formerly home to the Mohawk Institute?
- Was there any debate about what should be done with the former Mohawk Institute building (when ownership was transferred to the community)?
- Do you often think about the history of the WCC building?

I would also ask that you be available by phone for brief follow-up questions after the interview is completed.

**Are there any risks to participating?**

You should be aware that there are minimal risks involved with participating in this study. Two possible risks have been identified:

1) The interviews will be focused on the subject of the residential school system. This is a topic that might have painful associations for many people of Aboriginal descent, and is an uncomfortable subject for almost any person living in Canada. For this reason, these interviews might cause an emotional reaction. Also, considering the history of the WCC building may change the way you feel about the building.

2) In addition, because you are part of a small community, it is possible that you may be recognized in publications by other community members. Every effort will be made to ensure that you cannot be recognized, or that you have reviewed any section of the report that quotes you directly.

**Are there any benefits to participating?**

Participating in this research will give you a chance to reflect on the history of the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC) and to celebrate the resilience of the Six Nations culture. These benefits also extend to the whole WCC and Six Nations of the Grand River communities.

By participating in this research you will also be contributing to the broader goals of the research. These include:

1) Creating a basis for theory development. Specifically, for the planning community to explore a legacy of a “colonial culture of planning” and to draw connections across different professions and academic disciplines like planning, and transitional justice.

2) Improving the understanding of current transitional justice processes. Little analysis has been done on the memorialisation element of the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement (2006), though the settlement includes $20 million for ‘commemoration funding’. This research will provide an assessment of the commemoration model that is being pursued.
What if I change my mind about being in the study?
Although your full participation would be greatly appreciated, your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you do participate, you can still choose not to answer some of the questions.

You can also decide to withdraw from the study at any time, even after signing the consent form, or part-way through. If you decide to withdraw, there will be no consequences to you, and any data you have provided will be destroyed unless you indicate otherwise. To withdraw from the study, just inform Christina Hovey or Leela Viswanathan that you no longer wish to participate, you can do this by phone, e-mail, letter, or in person.

Who will know what I said in the interview?
Only Leela and I will have access to the audio files and transcripts of the interviews. The data will be contained on digital sound files (i.e. a digital voice recorder will be used – with permission) as well as Word documents. The tapes will be kept in a locked file cabinet and word documents will be password locked. All tapes and transcripts will be destroyed either two years after the completion of the project, or once all publication opportunities have been exhausted (to a maximum of five years).

The research will be published as a Master’s thesis, as well as in journal articles and/or presented at a conference. Every effort will be made to present the research in a way that protects your confidentiality and privacy. We will not use your name or any information that would allow you to be identified. However, since your community is small, others may be able to identify you on the basis of references you make. Please keep this in mind in deciding what to tell us.

If we want to quote you directly, you will have a chance to see your quotes in the context of the report, and decide whether you want it attributed to you, left anonymous, or removed.

How do I find out what was learned in this study?
I expect to have this study completed by approximately April of 2012. If you would like a summary of the results, please let me know. In addition, copies of all publications will be given to the Woodland Cultural Centre Library and to the Six Nations Council.

What if I have concerns?
Any questions about study participation may be directed to the researcher, Christina Hovey, at c.hovey@queensu.ca, or (613) 929-4842, or to the research supervisor, Leela Viswanathan, at leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca, or (613) 533-6000 x 75038. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or 613-533-6081.

Again, thank you. Your interest in participating in this research study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Christina Hovey

This study has been granted clearance by Queen’s University and the Six Nations Council Ethics Committee, according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines.
CONSENT FORM

I have read the information presented in the information letter about a study being conducted by Christina Hovey and Leela Viswanathan, of Queen’s University. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about my involvement in this study and to receive the additional details I requested. I understand that if I agree to participate in this study, I may withdraw from the study at any time. I have been given a copy of this form. I agree to participate in the study.

In addition:

1. I agree that the interview can be audio recorded with a digital voice recording device:
   
   ... Yes Initials: ______.
   ... No

2. I would like to receive a summary of the study’s results.
   
   ...Yes, please send them to this email address _______________________________ or to this mailing address _______________________________.
   ...No

3. I want my identity kept confidential.
   
   ...Yes
   ... No, I prefer to be identified or have a pseudonym used. Please refer to me as ________

4. I agree to be contacted about a follow-up interview, and understand that I can always decline the request.
   
   ... Yes. How to contact me______________
   ... No

Signature: ________________________________

Name of Participant (Printed) ________________________________
Appendix C: Sample Interview Guide

Separate interview guides were created for interview participants who were heritage planners and for participants affiliated with the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC). The following is the interview guide that was prepared for interviews with individuals affiliated with the WCC.

Interview Guide for Individuals Affiliated with the Woodland Cultural Centre:

Prepared February, 2012

After reviewing, answering questions and signing the consent form:

“To get us started I’m going to tell you about the broad themes that I want to talk about here. I’ve prepared some questions, but if you have other things that you think are important to these topics I hope we can talk about them too.

So, I want to talk to you generally about:

1) The impact that the Woodland Cultural Centre (WCC) has had on you, on the communities it represents, and on visitors.

2) How/If the WCC relates to the national reconciliation processes (represented by the IRSSA and the TRC) at all. And,

3) What is coming in the next few years for the WCC.

Part 1: Impact of the Woodland Cultural Centre

You

How long have you been involved with/working for the WCC?

Do you ever think about the history of the WCC building? Can you share some of those thoughts?

The community

What communities does the WCC represent?

What has been/is the impact of the WCC on the communities that it represents?
How/Do you think that the fact that the WCC was once the Mohawk Institute has changed the impact that it has had on the community? (Positive? Negative? Eg. Has the WCC in any way helped the community recover from the Residential School Experience?)

How have the implications of the history of the WCC site as a residential school changed over time/across generations?

*Visitors*

Are visitors to the centre usually aware that the building was formerly home to the Mohawk Institute? When they arrive? If not, are they made aware? How?

Can you please describe the intended impact of WCC on members of the public who visit?

*What knowledge and feelings are you hoping to elicit in visitors?*

What can you tell me about the mandate of the WCC?

In your view, how do the activities that educate people about the Mohawk Institute/IRS fit into that mandate? Are these important elements of the mandate?

What are the contemporary relationship building practices between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities?

*How do you build the connections between the past and the present (and the future)?*

**Part 2: Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the National Process**

Are you aware of the activities of the ongoing Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) on the residential school system?

In what (if any) ways is the TRC relevant to the activities of the WCC?

What does reconciliation mean?

What needs to be done to achieve reconciliation?

What does it look like?

What (if any) role does/can/should the WCC play in achieving reconciliation?

Who is responsible for reconciliation?

Do you think the residential school system should be remembered? How?

The Commemoration Fund, run by the TRC has $20 million dollars to spend on projects to commemorate the residential school system... Is that something you could see applying for? Do you have any thoughts on the potential impacts of this commemoration programme?
Part 3: What’s next for the Woodland Cultural Centre

What happens next to the building? The centre?

The former Mohawk Institute building seems to need repairs… What happens next with the building? Restore it (as an exhibit to the IRS, as has been formerly proposed)? Build a new building? Let it fall down?

PART 4:

At the end I’ll ask you if you have anything else you would like to share, any questions that you think I should have asked…

Part 5: Turn off Recording Device…. 

Ask again if there is anything else you would like to share or ask about.

Can you suggest anyone else you think I should try to approach to interview?
Appendix D: Methodology Figure

- Literature Review
  - Theoretical Concepts
  - Transitional Justice/Residential School System in Canada
  - Woodland Cultural Centre Case Study

- Data Collection
  - Memorialisation at the National Level
  - Woodland Cultural Centre Case Study
  - Site Observations
  - Documents
  - Interviews

- Content Analysis
  - Memorialisation at the National Level
  - Woodland Cultural Centre Case Study
  - Compare and Contrast

- Final Document
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