From Indigenous Economies to Market-Based Self-Governance: A Feminist Political Economy Analysis

RAUNA KUOKKANEN   *University of Toronto*

Throughout history, Indigenous peoples[1] have developed a vast array of systems to govern themselves in distinct societies and to make use of natural resources for their living and subsistence. These systems, however, have been seriously undermined as a result of colonization and today, the possibilities of practising these systems of governance and economies are very limited. The contemporary reality is that existing Indigenous self-government structures and models are largely grounded on principles of global capitalism, such as economic development based on large-scale resource extraction and privatization and commodification of the land. Joyce Green notes:

> The world of globalized capitalism drives not only colonial governments, but, increasingly, Aboriginal ones. Some pursue profits and capitalist methods like union-busting. Some seek an accommodation with capitalist development that might benefit Indigenous communities, an example being the current agreement between the James Bay and Quebec (arguably environmentally problematic) hydro development. Those who would choose non-capitalist alternatives are at odds with the dominant culture, political ideology and economic structure. (2002: 32)

In Canada, there are several First Nations communities hailed as economic success stories. Whether the Osoyoos Indian Band in interior British Columbia (see Anderson et al., 2006), the Membertou nation in Nova Scotia[2] (see Johnstone, 2008) or First Nations cooperatives in which women play key roles (see Findlay and Wuttunee, 2007), all of them emphasize the significance of community well-being and cultural val-

Rauna Kuokkanen, Department of Political Science and Aboriginal Studies Program, North Borden Building, 563 Spadina Avenue, University of Toronto, Toronto ON, M5S 2J7, rauna.kuokkanen@utoronto.ca

ues, in other words, economic development based on Indigenous values and knowledge as well as principles of sustainability and conservation, or as some put it, "capitalism with an Aboriginal face" (Newhouse, 1993). Today, "Aboriginal capitalism" means ensuring that control, revenues and profit are in the hands First Nations communities but also the establishment of corporate alliances, involvement in the global economy and international markets and even sending trade missions to China. It also means enabling Indigenous elites (often male) to position themselves as the main beneficiaries of the profits derived from resources and businesses on Indigenous territories and in Indigenous communities while neglecting social issues affecting particularly women: domestic violence, lack of adequate housing and social services (Altamirano-Jimenez, 2007; Fontaine, 2002; Irlbacher-Fox, 2009).

Parallel to the growth of "Aboriginal capitalism," there is an increasing number of Indigenous people calling for stronger international and national efforts to promote Indigenous peoples' governance structures and economies. This follows the calls of the recently adopted UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, 2007) for the greater recognition and support of Indigenous peoples' political and economic institutions.[3] One of the reasons for contemporary Indigenous advocacy of their traditional systems of governance and forms of economy is the destructive effects of global capitalism characterized by trade liberalization and export-oriented development involving exploitation of natural resources by multinational corporations, such as mining, logging, hydroelectric construction, or oil exploration on Indigenous peoples' territories. These development projects are usually accompanied by environmental degradation and sometimes also militarization and violence[4] that endanger traditional livelihoods and the maintenance of Indigenous peoples' own social and cultural institutions. Deregulation of national resource extraction laws and regulations has also resulted in a serious undermining of international instruments, constitutional provisions, national laws and policies safeguarding Indigenous rights (for examples, see Mander and Tauli-Corpuz, 2006; United Nations, 2009). The central right, Indigenous peoples' right to self-determination, has often been questioned and undermined as national governments bind themselves to new global economic treaties.

The purpose of this paper is to probe the apparent contradiction between the current tendency of many Indigenous groups and their political institutions to embrace the capitalist economic model as the one and only solution in establishing contemporary Indigenous self-governance and the detrimental force of the market economy in Indigenous societies, past and present. The question initially prompting this paper emerged from surveying historical literature on Indigenous societies and economies in North America, especially during the period when

Abstract. This paper examines the apparent contradiction between the current tendency of many Indigenous groups and their political institutions to embrace the capitalist economic model as the one and only solution in establishing contemporary Indigenous self-governance, on the one hand, and on the other, the detrimental force of the market economy on Indigenous societies, past and present. The starting point is the following question. If the global market economy historically played a significant role in the loss of political and economic autonomy of Indigenous societies and women, how meaningful or sustainable is it to seek to (re)build contemporary Indigenous governance on the very economic model that was largely responsible for undermining it in the first place? Shouldn't this history be taken into consideration when discussing and shaping models and policies for contemporary Indigenous governance and hence be more critical of the standard economic development frameworks hailed as the path toward self-governance?

Résumé. Cet article examine l'apparente contradiction entre la tendance actuelle de nombreux groupes autochtones et de leurs institutions politiques à adopter le modèle économique capitaliste contemporain en tant que seule et unique solution pour constituer une autonomie gouvernementale autochtone d'une part, et de l'autre, les forces néfastes de l'économie de marché dans les sociétés autochtones, passées et présentes. Au départ, se pose la question suivante : si l'économie de marché mondiale a historiquement joué un rôle important dans la perte d'autonomie politique et économique des sociétés autochtones et des femmes, jusqu'à quel point est-il pertinent ou viable de chercher à bâtir ou à rebâtir l'autonomie gouvernementale contemporaine des peuples autochtones sur le même modèle économique qui a été largement responsable de la saper en premier lieu? Cette dimension historique ne devrait-elle pas être prise en considération lors de l'examen et de l'élaboration des modèles et des politiques de gouvernance autochtone contemporains et, par conséquent, inciter à une vision plus critique des cadres de développement économique convenus qui sont salués comme le chemin vers l'autogouvernance?

the capitalist economy was first introduced to these societies. One of the main themes surfacing from this body of literature was the significant role of the capitalist market relations in not only altering and radically undermining political and economic structures but also often compromising women's individual political and economic autonomy in these societies. The underlying question thus is if the global market economy historically played a significant role in the loss of political and economic autonomy of Indigenous societies (as collectivities) *and* women (as individuals), how meaningful or sustainable is it to seek to (re)build contemporary Indigenous governance on the very economic model that was largely responsible for undermining it in the first place. Shouldn't this history be taken into consideration when discussing and shaping models and policies for contemporary Indigenous governance and, hence, when opting for a more critical stance toward the standard economic development frameworks hailed as the path toward self-governance?[5]

In the light of the UNDRIP and its call to strengthen Indigenous economies, it is striking how little attention is paid to the continuing significance of subsistence-based economic activities and household production when discussing the creation of greater self-governance in Indigenous societies.[6] For example, a report prepared for the Inter-Nation Trade and Economic Summit held in Toronto in March 2009 does not men-

tion the role of traditional economies in contemporary Indigenous communities at all, despite the fact that subsistence economy accounts for 30 to 80 per cent of all production and income, especially in many northern Indigenous communities (Elias, 1995; Natcher, 2009). Delineating the general outlines of the changes that have taken place over the past 40 years in First Nations economy, the focus of the report is solely on employment and income levels and the creation of businesses. Relying on statistics and countless charts, the report concludes that "the socio-economic position of the First Nations population has improved over the past 40 years" in the areas of education and employment or income (Wien, 2009: 113). However, in comparison to the Canadian population the education, employment and income gaps have often increased: "As often as not in the period to the mid-1990s, the rate of positive change on the available indicators has been greater for the Canadian population than it has been for the First Nations population. As a result, the gap in education levels, for example, and on some indicators of employment and income has widened rather than narrowed" (Wien, 2009: 113).

This paper seeks to shed light on issues that thus far have been largely glossed over or ignored entirely in scholarship on Indigenous governance. It argues that, in the context of Indigenous governance, there is a need for a more critical approach to economic development models embedded in global capitalist paradigms, an approach that considers the role of Indigenous economies such as subsistence and household production in contemporary settings in addition to usual "economic development." The paper does not suggest that economic development discourses or approaches have no role to play in advancing Indigenous governance. No doubt business and corporate partnerships have improved circumstances, for example, by reducing the unemployment levels in some First Nations communities (Perkins, 2010; Wien, 2009). As many Indigenous people attest, however, the continued significance of Indigenous economies extends well beyond receiving a livelihood to matters such as the maintenance of social organization and kinship structures as well as systems of values and knowledge and thus these structures and systems need to be counted for in contemporary governance models.

Second, the paper argues for a gendered analysis of Indigenous governance. Many indigenous women have argued that current models of Indigenous sovereignty merely replicate masculinist and patriarchal political structures and ideologies, marginalizing women and their needs (Denetdale, 2006; Eikjok, 2000; Green, 2004; Mihesuah, 2003; Monture-Angus, 1995; Smith, 2005b). Moreover, from the perspective of Indigenous women, it is unclear whether economic development in Indigenous communities has had any fundamental impact on their well-being, and if so, what kind. Has it, for example, decreased the levels of poverty, abuse,

violence or ill-health, all issues that continue to disproportionately affect Aboriginal women in Canada?

The discussion in this paper will proceed in three parts. The first section provides an overview of the historical processes of incorporating Indigenous societies into the global market economy in North America. It also considers the gendered effects of this shift. This analysis is not meant to be comprehensive but rather demonstrative of the nature and scope of the socio-economic transformation of Indigenous societies as the result of their integration into the market economy. The second part examines contemporary neoliberal discourses in shaping structures of Indigenous self-governance and land claims negotiations in Canada. This section argues that neoliberal, market-driven self-governance creates new forms of dependency, not self-sufficiency as some have argued (Slowey, 2008a). Especially from a point of view of women, the neoliberal model cannot be regarded as a solution to Indigenous governance. This forms the argument of the third part, which considers concerns and criticisms of market-driven economic development models and land claim processes raised by Indigenous women in Canada.

The Historical Loss of Political and Economic Autonomy

It can be argued that historically, the loss of collective autonomy of Indigenous peoples and individual autonomy of Indigenous women occurred simultaneously. This process was sparked by the capitalist market economy and its accompanying creation of dependency. The creation of enforced dependency and incorporation into the global economy of Indigenous peoples took place particularly through trade driven by colonialism. In some instances, Indigenous people entered into trading relationships by autonomous participation but often the entry occurred through coercion in which the stakes were the land and resources of Indigenous communities (Porter, 1996). Replacing subsistence with trade and relations of sharing with market exchanges led in many Indigenous societies to the collapse of traditional economies, loss of collective and individual autonomy, starvation, poverty and ecological imbalances, for example, overhunting due to pressures of trade (Becker, 2004: 47; White, 1983). According to Richard White, economic and political autonomy of many Indigenous societies in North America were undermined most forcefully by credit and alcohol. "Credit put the Indians quickly into debt and furthered the traders' control. When given full reign, the credit–liquor combination could lead to ... the institution of market economy, the growth of market relations inside the society" (1983: 318–19). This outcome resulted in material, political and social conditions where practising self-determination was very difficult. Another outcome was that

women often changed their labour patterns and economic activities in their attempts to mitigate the effects of traders' control. Wilma A. Dunaway notes:

> To meet village debt obligations, women increased their allocation of labour to deerskin processing. As a result, their subsistence agricultural cultivation and their craft production became more erratic. Villages that once marketed surpluses now purchased British foodstuffs at exorbitant prices. Women had avoided indebtedness for nonfood household essentials through their craft production and through exchanges in the informal sector. However, that form of household subsidy disappeared, as their commodity production declined. (2000: 200)

This is not to suggest that Indigenous peoples did not trade with one another or have trading relations prior to colonization. Nor is it to say that trade and trading practices with settlers and other colonists always resulted in obliteration economic and political autonomy of Indigenous communities or Indigenous women. In the Canadian context, scholars have demonstrated the key function Aboriginal women played in the fur trade which in some cases even enhanced women's position, autonomy and authority, that fur trade could not be properly understood without taking account women's contributions and roles (Anderson, 1987; Littlefield, 1987; Van Kirk, 1980). Yet others have argued that the fur trade in northern Canada was premised on the subjugation on Aboriginal women (Bourgeault, 1983).[7] In other regions of North America, however, such as the Cherokee territory, women's contribution to trade and the deerskin market remained invisible, thus making women "unpaid employees" of the men in their clans. At the same time, women's subsistence and household production were increasingly devalued by Cherokee men (Dunaway, 2000).

The restructuring of Indigenous societies from subsistence production into a market economy dependent on trading goods has had far-reaching political and cultural transformations in Indigenous societies. Processes of colonization and incorporating Indigenous societies into the capitalist economy have been highly gendered with many gender-specific consequences. It has displaced Indigenous women from social production and, in many cases, resulted in the simultaneous loss of status and an increase in the workload of women (Albers, 1983; Anderson, 1991; Buenadventura-Posso and Brown, 1980; Dunaway, 2000; Klein, 1983; Leacock, 1980; M'Closkey, 2004).[8]

Further, the new trading practices usually reshaped communal work practices and introduced a new, gendered division of labour. Hunting and warfare required not only more male labour time but also increased efforts by women in the form of preparing the furs, meat and skins. Despite women's involvement in the fur trade, trading practices changed from being a communal affair into a male-dominated activity. In some regions,

the fur trade caused environmental degradation, thereby further altering women's working conditions. For example, in Cherokee communities, deforestation—a practice taken up by Cherokee men to facilitate deer hunting—made gathering firewood more difficult and eradicated various plants used for food and medicine. The importation of horses and cattle threatened open corn fields and mulberry trees tended by women (Dunaway, 2000). With the expansion of the fur trade, male crafts unrelated to deer hunting or warfare were put aside while men increased their consumption of European luxury goods (including alcohol), which in turn increased the debt of Indigenous communities (see, for example, Dunaway, 2000). Specialization of labour that followed the fur or hide trade increased women's workload while at the same time decreased their control over goods that carried status with them. As Alan M. Klein argues, "the overall prosperity concealed an erosion of women's position through her being increasingly circumscribed to a few tasks related to processing and domestic production" (1983: 156).

In Canada, the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) was central in creating dependency in and altering the subsistence-based economies of many Indigenous communities. The James Bay Cree, for example, were self-sustaining and politically and economically independent until the sixteenth century. The HBC began establishing trading posts in Cree territory after the mid-seventeenth century and in 1670 the HBC was granted exclusive trading rights by the king of England for an area of approximately three million square miles. In the eighteenth century, the HBC started hiring Indigenous people as servants and supply men. The company also appointed "Indian lieutenants," also called "captains," whose role was to spread the trading system to their people and to recruit hunters for a particular post for trading. This led to a situation in which the families of the hired men become dependent on the trading post and were in many cases forced to set up camps outside the fort. The HBC sought to regulate this situation by limiting the number of dependents through restrictions on men's freedom to marry. In the early nineteenth century, the HBC began assigning land to hunting families in addition to trading posts previously assigned (Gagné, 1994; see also Ray, 1974). According to Marie Anik Gagné,

> This arrangement not only benefited the company and consequently rearranged the social organization of the Natives. The HBC's division of land had little regard for the previous traplines or for non-monogamous families.... The HBC redistributed the land to monogamous families, creating a number of dependent women and children who had been the second and third wives. (1994: 40)

The HBC also disregarded the Cree beaver conservation practices and introduced new regulations. The sole focus of these rules was economic activity rather than the respect for the beaver as had been part of

the Cree practice. All these new arrangements radically altered the social and economic organization of the James Bay Cree and allowed the HBC to control the credit of the hunters and their families. The Cree adapted and altered their economies, such as hunting practices, to suit the needs and requirements of the HBC (Gagné, 1994; see also Feit, 2005).

Some scholars have argued that the trade between the James Bay Cree and the HBC was not unequal and that initially it created mutual dependency between the Cree and the HBC (Francis and Morantz, 1983: 25). Others maintain that the Crees' traditional means of production were not entirely eradicated but rather, "reproduced in distorted form under capital, thereby giving the appearance that communal (traditional) society continued unabated" (Bourgeault, 1989: 92). However, the establishment of the HBC trading posts in the area marked the beginning of the social and economic transformation that eroded self-sufficiency as well as political and economic autonomy of the James Bay Cree. The subtle transformation of social means of production enabled the exploitation of the Cree labour force and it was particularly detrimental to the autonomy of women. According to Ron Bourgeault, the foundation of "the subjugation of Indian women's autonomy was the conquest of their labour power" (Bourgeault, 1989: 104).

The changes in the social and economic organization of the James Bay Cree are not of course necessarily identical to other Indigenous communities or regions even within Canada. Many studies indicate that while the early contact with traders and European colonists transformed social relations in Aboriginal societies, it did not eradicate them (Ray, 1974; Ray and Freeman, 1978; Trigger, 1985). Furthermore, in some cases, such as the Cree in northern Manitoba, communities succeeded to varying degrees in resisting the imposition of control over trade and labour relations by fur traders (Thistle, 1986). On the northwest coast, Indigenous women were not only involved in but often in charge of managing trade (Klein, 1980; Littlefield, 1987). However, what the above examples do illustrate is that replacing subsistence-based economies with, and the gradual integration of Indigenous societies into, the capitalist market economy often signified considerable changes in the social and economic organization of these societies and, in some cases, led to the disintegration of traditional economies and local autonomy. These processes also introduced a new gendered division of labour which undermined women's position in social production which, in turn, often resulted in the concomitant loss of status and increase in the workload of women in their communities.

The undermining of traditional economies and the economic integration of the Indigenous people, especially in Northern Canada, have continued in the more recent times in the form of "welfare colonialism" (Paine, 1977). Welfare colonialism is characterized by a reversal of the

colonial drain of the old days and the placing of Indigenous people on unemployment benefits. According to Robert Paine, welfare is employed as the means for a way of "governing at a distance" through exercise of a particularly subtle and dependency-generating form of neocolonial social control. This pre-empts local autonomy through "well-intentioned" and "generous," but ultimately "morally wrong" policies (Paine, 1977). Further, other scholars have noted how welfare policies and regulations not only fail to eliminate conditions of poverty but effectively undermine various forms of household production and activities often central in make a living. Welfare policies have also always had gender-specific effects, "especially where top-down policies operate with little knowledge or regard for kinship or gender relations" (Berman, 2004: 140).

Self-Governance in the Era of Neoliberalism

Today, it is widely recognized that the welfare dependency and the *Indian Act* regime have not alleviated the poverty and often dismal social conditions in Indigenous communities. Many First Nations are actively looking into alternative options, such as self-government agreements, traditional or other governance or co-management arrangements, which would replace the paternalistic and colonial *Indian Act* policies and governance structures to create greater local self-sufficiency and economic self-reliance. What is striking in these initiatives, however, is the absence of any consideration of the historical processes that led to the disintegration of self-sufficient local economies with high levels of political autonomy. Discussing the era of the establishment of reserves and the accompanying common rhetoric of breaking the dependency of Indigenous people on outside support, Anthony Hall notes, "It is ironic how the proposals for generating self-sufficiency among Indian people were based almost invariably on the idea of integrating them more deeply into those systems of market relations that had been instrumental in their earlier loss of autonomy" (2003: 193). It is even more surprising that this trend continues today when, as a result of already achieved self-government and co-management agreements, many Indigenous societies and community leaders are increasingly in charge of forging the path toward new forms of local control and governance.

The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development is often mentioned in First Nations contexts and by the First Nations leadership as a model for viable Indigenous self-governance and an effective approach to alleviate poverty in Indigenous communities (for example, Cornell, 2005; Cornell et al., 2003; Satsan, 2007; Wien, 2009). The Harvard project outlines sovereignty, institutions, culture and leadership as the key "determinants of tribal economic success." It illustrates the

close relationship between self-governance and economic development and emphasizes the critical importance of "practical sovereignty," the ability for effective and actual governance, in establishing successful long-term conditions for economic development in Indigenous communities (for example, Cornell and Kalt, 1998). However, the Harvard project is plagued by the same problem as many other current considerations of Indigenous economies: the narrow focus on fairly standard economic development (that is, entrepreneurship and creation of businesses) while "traditional" economic activities and their continued significance are rarely discussed. This contributes to the common practice of making these economic activities invisible and thus non-existent in current considerations. The Harvard project model also falls short in considering some of the key factors that have played a major role in economic development and change in general in Indigenous communities. Martin Mowbray contends:

> because the Harvard Project approach is linked to the fundamental precepts of economic fundamentalism, analytic concepts that followers of other schools of thought find important are excluded from the analysis. For example, the concepts of state, class and even race or racism are discounted. So is gender. This means that the Harvard Project analysis does not take into account some explanations for the outcomes of past government interventions. (2006: 100)

The key precept of economic fundamentalism—that the markets solve all problems in society—informs neoliberal policies and governance models, including neoliberal Indigenous self-governance structures. In promoting privatization, restructuring and downsizing the government and its services, deregulating the economy and emphasizing individual responsibility and choice, neoliberal governance dismisses calls to address growing systemic socio-economic, gender and other inequalities. Instead, it naturalizes poverty as an unfortunate circumstance and destiny and obscures the interconnectedness of gendered poverty and violence (Coulter, 2009).

Yet for some, the objectives of Indigenous self-government and neoliberalism are not only reconcilable but a good match. Gabrielle Slowey argues that neoliberal values, especially self-reliance, are ideal for First Nations self-determination because they disrupt the "unhealthy dependency on the state" (2008a: 17). The reasoning behind such an argument is that neoliberal government policies can also serve as a positive force for Indigenous self-governance as it creates unprecedented economic opportunities for communities to manage their own affairs.

The case for the compatibility of neoliberal and Indigenous values is made by using the Mikisew Cree First Nation as an example. The Mikisew Nation is located near Fort Chipewyan, north of Fort McMurray and the oil sands in northeastern Alberta. In 1986, the Mikisew signed

a treaty land entitlement agreement (TLE) with the federal government and the provincial government of Alberta, which assigned 12,280 acres of land and $26.6 million to the nation. Initially, the claim had included the oil sands lands but the Mikisew had to drop it in order to reach a deal. The agreement was not considered victory only for the Mikisew but also for Alberta: "An important goal of the province had been achieved, evident in its interest in settling the claim and ensuring unfettered resource development. The TLE was thus necessary to protect the integrity of Alberta's economy" (Slowey, 2008a: 34).

Following the signing of the agreement, the Mikisew Cree First Nation leadership set forth to restructure its key institutions of governance and management to enhance economic development. These decisions were partly influenced at the request of Syncrude, the local oil sands corporation. The Mikisew leadership has expressed its desire in active participation in the oil sand development projects but the community has been only partially successful in doing that. While the oil sands have created jobs for the Mikisew Cree First Nation members, many feel that they are not quite enough and argue that the kinds of jobs and opportunities corporations offer are very limited. Social development has been uneven and poverty remains a serious concern as do the serious concerns about health problems created by the extreme form of resource development (Timoney, 2007; Timoney and Lee, 2009; Woodford, 2007; see also Clarke, 2008). As elsewhere,[9] the market-driven resource-based economy has widened the gap between the haves and the have-nots. "The increase of material wealth is not shared equally, dividing band members even further apart by accentuating already acute levels of financial disparity" (Slowey, 2008a: 6).

However, Slowey argues that the Mikisew Cree First Nation "has benefited from neoliberalism" because it has decreased the direct dependency from the government (2008a: 53). "First Nation self-determination, with its focus on increasing band responsibility for health, housing and welfare, fits comfortably in the free market philosophy of a minimal state and non-government provision of services" (xv). Such an analysis fails to recognize that while the dependency of the Mikisew from the government might have decreased to some extent, it has only created a new dependency on corporations exploiting the natural resources in the Mikisew territory. Calling the world's attention to their situation, chief Rozanne Marcel of the Mikisew Cree announced, "Our message to both levels of government, to Albertans, to Canadians and to the world who may depend on oil sands for their energy solutions, is that we can no longer be sacrificed" (cited in Thomas-Müller, 2008: 13). Rather than providing self-sufficiency, partnerships between Indigenous peoples and corporations mimic colonial relationships which often are the only model available for economic development in Indigenous communities (Irlbacher-Fox, 2009).

Moreover, analysis that argues the compatibility of Indigenous self-determination and free-market ideologies disregards the deep-seated ontological differences between neoliberal ideologies and Indigenous philosophies based on a close interaction with the land and emphasizing individual and collective responsibilities of taking care of the land. Darlene Rude and Connie Deiter point out that "Indeed, the Aboriginal world view, values and inherent rights fit poorly within an international free trade framework that sees natural world—the land and its resources—solely as commodities to be harvested and exploited" (2004: 11). This discrepancy between neoliberal, corporate ideology and Indigenous land-based worldviews is also recognized in the *Report of the Alaska Native Review Commission* (1985) which considers the detrimental consequences of implementing a profit-driven governmental structure on Alaska Native communities. John Berger notes:

> The imposition of a settlement of land claims that is based on corporate structures was an inappropriate choice, given the realities of Native life in village Alaska. The serious changes that ANCSA [Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act] has introduced to Native life are becoming ever more apparent with the passage of time. ANSCA has affected everything: family relations, traditional patterns of leadership and decision making, customs of sharing, subsistence activities, the entire Native way of life. The village has lost its political and social autonomy. (1985: 45)

While it might be the case that "the rise of these neoliberal forces has ushered in a new era of political interest in Aboriginal self-determination" (Slowey, 2008a: xiv), it often is only because there is an increased pressure to further exploit the natural resources on Indigenous peoples' territories. As the Task Force to Review Comprehensive Claims Policy pointed out, there has been a tendency to achieve a self-government agreement "only when the federal government [is] eager to facilitate an economic development project" (Coolican, 1986: 13). The federal and provincial governments are often pushing for modern treaties and land claims agreements only to create a stable investment environment and to serve corporate interests, not to redress historical inequalities (Altamirano-Jimenez, 2007; Green and Voyageur, 1999). Irlbacher-Fox observes:

> Economic development choices for Indigenous peoples are often no choices at all. Given the rampant social suffering in most communities, economic development opportunities are more akin to lifelines that cannot be refused.... Meanwhile, Indigenous peoples are forced to exploit their resources and lands according to the interests of multinational resources developers in an attempt to provide their people with basic needs, opportunities for a comfortable life, and support for those who still wish to live a land-based lifestyle within an ever-encroaching economic and social interests of the dominant capitalist society. That is the fundamental problem with land claim and self-government agree-

ments. They embed colonialism as the structure regulating Indigenous–state relations. They do not undo ongoing injustices. (2009: 168–69)

Considering that Canada's current land claim and self-governance policy is premised on the extinguishment of Aboriginal rights and Aboriginal title in exchange for the rights included in the new settlement or agreement (reflecting the surrender provisions of the post-Confederation treaties), it can be difficult to see modern treaties and agreements as steps toward greater self-reliance. For many, the Canadian Aboriginal self-government policy represents a subversion of sovereign governments into segments of the colonial state (Alfred, 1999; Venne, 1999; see also Walkem and Halie, 2003) or as June McCue (1998) puts it, the "conquest treaty model." Hence, to argue that "improving the situation of First Nations communities and individuals is a neoliberal priority, since it focuses on strengthening First Nations participation in the economy" is, at its best, a naïve and misguided reading of neoliberal and corporate ideologies and policies.

Economic Development and Indigenous Women

Another significant shortcoming of current economic development programs embedded in neoliberal policies and driven by corporate agendas is the lack of attention to gender or to women's economic activities. It is unclear, for example, to what extent women are participating in the creation of businesses and the emergence of the new class of Aboriginal entrepreneurs. In some communities, Aboriginal women have been successful in establishing co-operatives (Findlay and Wuttunee, 2007). While Aboriginal women's involvement in small business ownership has increased in the past couple of decades, in 2001, Aboriginal women still comprised only 1 per cent of women owning a small business (NWAC, 2004). According to the Native Women's Association of Canada, "economic opportunities are completely outside the reach of far too many Aboriginal women in Canada" (2004: 2).

Although the unemployment level of Aboriginal women in general tends to be lower than that of Aboriginal men, more Aboriginal women are unemployed than non-Aboriginal women. Especially status Indian women living on reserves tend to have much higher unemployment rates than that any other group of Aboriginal women. Moreover, employment rates alone do no tell the full story as women's vital yet unacknowledged role and work in survival and development of Aboriginal families and communities often remain unpaid or unremunerated (Stout and Kipling, 1998). Even organizations such as the Native Women's Association of Canada has paid surprisingly little attention to women's economic contributions and do not consider other than standard economic develop-

ment in creating opportunities for Aboriginal women (NWAC, 2008) in spite of many studies indicating that it is often Indigenous women who, against all odds, continue to engage in subsistence and mixed economies (for example, Berman, 2004; Pickering, 2000).

Indigenous women are marginalized and vulnerable in other ways. They continue to experience considerably higher rates of violence than any other group in Canada. The female mortality rate among Indigenous women due to violence is five times higher than it is for Canadian women in general. Significantly, Amnesty International's 2004 report on violence against Indigenous women in Canada argues that the acts of violence are not isolated incidents but rooted in society's general attitudes reflected widely across institutions that are established to protect citizens, such as the police. The report contends that that violence against Indigenous women has not yet been recognized and addressed as a human rights issue in Canada. Another reason for the high female mortality rate is extremely high rates of suicide among status Indian women, particularly in the age group between 15 and 24. The morbidity rate is considerably higher for Aboriginal women than for Canadian women in general, the former group being more likely to "suffer from a range of diseases and with worse prognoses than is the case among non-Aboriginal women" (Stout and Kipling, 1998: 16).

Further, Linda Archibald and Mary Crnkovich argue that the self-government negotiations and land claims processes tend to sideline Indigenous women. Their needs, perspectives and concerns are often left out of land claims negotiations. A land claims policy that prioritizes and focuses on large-scale resource development neglects the socio-economic and cultural implications that often disproportionately affect women in the form of disruption of family and social relations. Also jobs created by resource development projects are mostly for men. Further, the requisite land use and occupancy study usually focuses on activities traditionally recognized as male, such as hunting, fishing and trapping (Archibald and Crnkovich, 1999). By focusing on male activities on the land, land use studies and land claim negotiations in general do not take into account Indigenous women's roles as custodians of the land, kinship and other social relations, or the specific relationships with and responsibilities women have toward the land in, for example, gathering and agriculture (Anderson, 2000; Monture, 2004).

Neoliberal policies and economic globalization operate in highly gender-specific ways, disproportionately affecting women by systematically dismantling the structures, services and institutional support in sectors such as health care, education and housing. Feminization of poverty is a widely reported phenomenon and result of the neoliberal economies worldwide (Bakker, 1994; Barndt, 1999; Beneria, 2003; MacDonald, 1999; Marchand and Sisson Rynyan, 2000; Sassen, 2000; Wallis and

Kwok, 2008). This is no different in Indigenous communities where women, as providers in the subsistence sector and primary caregivers to their extended families, often bear the brunt of the negative effects of corporate-driven development. Resource development projects are often seen as threats to their personal and family lives, to the integrity of their communities and the essence of their cultures (Archibald and Crnkovich, 1999; Martin-Hill, 2008). Studying First Nations women's views and concerns related to forestry industry in British Columbia, Rude and Deiter note:

> First Nations women are deeply concerned about the pace and manner in which trade in timber has been undertaken. Many rely on forests as their traditional home, providing both sustenance and spiritual connection. Clear-cut logging and other forms of economic development have wreaked environmental damage, directly impacting their lives and the activities that are central to their identity as First Nations people. The contamination of land and water, and the decline of trees, animals, fish and berries leave women in these communities worried for the future of their children and grandchildren. (2004: x)

Speaking of the Lubicon Cree, not far from the Mikisew Cree in northern Alberta, Dawn Martin-Hill maintains that the human cost and social impact of resource extraction and land claim struggles can be best demonstrated through the experiences of the women. Yet she points out that "there is an eerie absence of women's voices in the literature on the Lubicon, and what is not there speaks the loudest" (2008: 128). The disenfranchisement of Indigenous women and disregard for their views, concerns and interests was also pointed out by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples report, noting that in spite of the significant contributions and roles they play in their communities, Indigenous women are often excluded "from their home communities, from decision making, and from having a say in their future and their children's future" (1996: 95).

First Nations communities are often divided about the issue of resource development on their territory and partnerships with corporations (Rude and Deiter, 2004; Slowey, 2008a; Slowey, 2008b). While these divisions are not necessarily along gender lines, Rude and Deiter argue that in the case of logging in British Columbia, they often are. There are situations where women opposing the logging activity are married to men who work in forestry. Some men are supportive of women's active opposition, while on other occasions women are ridiculed by men. Often women feel being silenced and excluded from the decision making, noting that "the largely male Indian leadership neither consulted nor reported back to them" (Rude and Deiter, 2004: 30). The inability to count on the support of the male leadership has prompted the establishment of a recent network by First Nations women leaders from northern British Columbia. The group, called "First Nations Women Seeking

Responsible Mining," seeks to attract the attention of industry in order to create sustainable and shared land use planning and decision making. The group's main priority is to protect their communities, territories and future generations but also to call attention to the marginalization of women, manifested in their tokenistic inclusion or campaigns aimed at discrediting and intimidating women even in their own communities. What is striking is the group's strategy to use personal ad style gendered discourse to draw the attention of industry: "First Nations women seek sensitive mining companies for meaningful long-term relationships" (FNWSRM Press Release, 2010). On the one hand, such a strategy points to the widespread understanding of the gender dynamics of economic development and natural resource extraction on Indigenous territories and to the conscious attempt to make use of this dynamic for one's own purposes. On the other hand, it raises questions about the continued obstinate and indifferent approach of corporations toward Indigenous peoples' concerns to the point where one has to resort to unconventional methods of framing Indigenous rights issues in terms of heterosexual romantic relationships in order to attract attention. It is to be seen whether this unorthodox approach will garner desired results.

Another striking aspect about the gendered processes of resource extraction is that in British Columbia, it is women elders who are in the forefront in resisting logging or other destructive economic development on their lands. They are often compelled to get involved because of their roles as elders and caretakers of their children and grandchildren. As a Mount Currie woman expresses it, "I really look at this as the second chance to save our lands" (Rude and Deiter, 2004: 30). The involvement in resistance, such as blockades or camps and other action, however, limits women elders' time and possibilities to engage in their critical role of primary transmitters of culture (Hull, 2006). Women elders are particularly concerned "how they will teach their children and grandchildren about their culture if more and more land is permanently altered" (Rude and Deiter, 2004: 27). Further, women often experience increased levels of stress not only because of the destructive social, cultural and environmental impacts of aggressive resource extraction but also for being arrested, charged and jailed (Rude and Deiter, 2004; see also Manuel, 2003; Martin-Hill, 2008).

Contemporary self-government agreements may restore a degree of autonomy in Indigenous communities. Yet market-driven self-government structures create new forms of dependency and pose a serious threat to land-based economies, worldviews and practices. They definitely do not restore the political and economic autonomy Indigenous women had prior to the historical incorporation into the market economy. Economic development does not guarantee improved socio-economic circumstances for

Indigenous women. Self-government and economic development based on neoliberal market models tend to neglect Indigenous women who often are already politically and socio-economically marginalized in their communities.

Conclusion

The historical and contemporary processes of integrating Indigenous societies into the global market economy have drastically limited the possibilities for Indigenous peoples practicing their own forms of governance and economy. These same processes have also considerably affected women's autonomy and position by altering the gender and labour relations in their communities. The incorporation into the market economy often signified the creation of dependency that took economic, social and political forms. In more recent times, dependency has continued in the form of "welfare colonialism," which has failed to address conditions of poverty and undermined subsistence activities and traditional economies in many Indigenous communities. Although the incorporation of Indigenous societies into the global capitalist system is discussed mainly as creation of dependency which continues today in many ways, it is not to suggest that dependency theories are the only way to understand the colonial history of Indigenous peoples. This history is much more complex than a dialectic of development and underdevelopment.

In attempts to break the cycles of dependency, poverty and dire socio-economic circumstances in their communities, many Indigenous groups and institutions have, as a part of their self-governance efforts, embarked on the path of neoliberal economic development which has often meant further exploitation of the natural resources in their territories, now in the form of joint ventures and in partnerships with corporations. What is surprising in these contemporary political efforts is that very little attention has been paid to the economic processes that played a significant role in creating dependency historically or linking the historical dependency creation to the contemporary forms of dependency on corporations and their conditions for partnerships which may include restructuring key institutions in Indigenous communities.

The paper does not suggest that the conventional economic development approach should be entirely rejected in pursuing greater self-reliance for Indigenous communities. Instead, it argues that there is a need for a broader and more critical approach which includes a historical understanding of the role of the market economy in altering political and economic autonomy in Indigenous communities and a gendered analysis of these processes both in past and present. There is also a need for a closer

scrutiny of Indigenous economic "success stories" particularly through a gendered analysis.

Notes

1   This paper employs the terms "Indigenous" and "Aboriginal" interchangeably; however, the preferred term is "Indigenous." "Aboriginal," the official term in Canada for First Nations, Inuit and Métis, has been criticized for racializing and glossing over cultural, political and other differences and for the state constructing an artificial legal identity (for example, Alfred, 2005).

2   The Membertou nation, part of the Mi'kmaq First Nation in the city of Sydney, is particularly interesting in its recent success, considering its tragic history. An urban First Nation community with approximately 1000 members, Membertou was previously known as the Kings Road reserve. The community was forcibly relocated on several occasions in early and mid-twentieth century with disastrous social consequences (see York, 1990).

3   Settler societies of Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand were the only four countries that initially voted against the adoption but have since recanted their position. Canada was last to adopt the Declaration in November 2010.

4   For gendered effects of violence and militarization on Indigenous women in North America, see Smith (2005a) and Kuokkanen (2008).

5   There has been a long and ongoing debate on the assumed incompatibility of Indigenous peoples' collective (cultural) rights and Indigenous women's individual (sex equality) rights (see Cornet, 2001; Fiske, 2008; Green, 1985; McIvor, 1995; Moss, 1990; Nahanee, 1993; NWAC, 1991). Although somewhat related, the scope of the paper does not allow to address this issue here.

6   On the tenacity and continued significance of subsistence or mixed economies in Indigenous communities, see, for example, Elias (1995) and Poppel (2006).

7   See also Bourgeault's critique (1989: 112) of Van Kirk's work as Eurocentric and for not taking relations of domination and exploitation in consideration.

8   Fiske points out that the impact of the colonial processes of displacing women "is more obvious when contrasted to known exceptions" (1988: 190).

9   See, for example, Harder (2003), Bezanson and Luxton (2006), Cohen and Brodie (2007) and Brodie (1995).

References

Albers, Patricia. 1983. "Sioux Women in Transition: A Study of Their Changing Status in a Domestic and Capitalist Sector of Production." In *The Hidden Half: Studies of Plains Indian Women*, ed. Patricia Albers and Beatrice Medicine. Lanham MD: University Press of America.

Alfred, Taiaiake. 1999. *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, Taiaiake. 2005. *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Peterborough ON: Broadview Press.

Altamirano-Jimenez, Isabel. 2007. "Indigenous Peoples and the Topography of Gender in Mexico and Canada." In *Remapping Gender in the New Global Order*, ed. Marjorie Griffin Cohen and Janine Brodie. New York: Routledge.

Amnesty International. 2004. *Stolen Sisters: A Human Rights Response to Discrimination and Violence against Indigenous Women in Canada*. Ottawa: Amnesty International.

Anderson, Karen. 1987. "A Gendered World: Women, Men and the Political Economy of the Seventeenth-Century Huron." In *Feminism and Political Economy: Women's Work, Women's Struggles*, ed. Heather Jon Maroney and Meg Luxton. Toronto: Methuen.

Anderson, Karen. 1991. *Chain Her by One Foot. The Subjugation of Native Women in Seventeenth-Century New France*. New York: Routledge.

Anderson, Kim. 2000. *A Recognition of Being: Reconstructing Native Womanhood*. Toronto: Second Story Press.

Anderson, Robert B., Leo Paul Dana and Teresa E. Dana. 2006. "Indigenous Land Rights, Entrepreneurship, and Economic Development in Canada: 'Opting-in' to the Global Economy." *Journal of World Business* 41(1): 45–55.

Archibald, Linda and Mary Crnkovich. 1999. *If Gender Mattered: A Case Study of Inuit Women, Land Claims and the Voisey's Bay Nickel Project*. Ottawa: Status of Women Canada.

Bakker, Isabella, ed. 1994. *The Strategic Silence: Gender and Economic Policy*. London: Zed Books.

Barndt, Deborah, ed. 1999. *Women Working the NAFTA Food Chain. Women, Food and Globalization*. Toronto: Second Story Press.

Becker, Marc. 2004. "Indigenous Communists and Urban Intellectuals in Cayambe, Ecuador (1926–1944)." In *Popular Intellectuals and Social Movements: Framing Protests in Asia, Africa, and Latin America*, ed. Michiel Baud and Rosanne Rutten. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beneria, Lourdes. 2003. *Gender, Development and Globalization: Economics as if All People Mattered*. New York: Routledge.

Berger, Thomas R. 1985. *Village Journey: The Report of the Alaska Native Review Commission*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Berman, Tressa. 2004. "'All We Needed Was Our Gardens': Women's Work and Welfare Reform in the Reservation Economy." In *Native Pathways: American Indian Culture and Economic Development in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Colleen M. O'Neill and Brian C. Hosmer. Boulder CO: University Press of Colorado.

Bezanson, Kate and Meg Luxton, eds. 2006. *Social Reproduction: Feminist Political Economy Challenges Neo-Liberalism*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Bourgeault, Ron. 1983. "The Indian, the Metis and the Fur Trade: Class, Sexism and Racism in the Transition from 'Communism' to Capitalism." *Studies in Political Economy* 12 (Fall): 45–80.

Bourgeault, Ron. 1989. "Race, Class and Gender: Colonial Domination of Indian Women." In *Race, Class, Gender: Bonds and Barriers*, ed. Jesse Vorst. Toronto: Between the Lines and Society for Socialist Studies.

Brodie, Janine. 1995. *Politics on the Margins: Restructuring and the Canadian Women's Movement*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

Buenadventura-Posso, Elisa and Susan E. Brown. 1980. "Forced Transition from Egalitarianism to Male Domination: The Bari of Colombia." In *Women and Colonization: Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. Mona Etienne and Eleanor Leacock. New York: Praeger.

Clarke, Tony. 2008. *Tar Sands Showdown: Canada and the Politics of Oil in an Age of Climate Change*. Toronto: James Lorimer.

Cohen, Marjorie Griffin and Janine Brodie, eds. 2007. *Remapping Gender in the New Global Order*. New York: Routledge.

Coolican, Murray. 1986. *Living Treaties, Lasting Agreements. Report of the Task Force to Review Comprehensive Claims Policy*. Ottawa: Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

Cornell, Stephen. 2005. "Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Self-Determination in Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States." In *Indigenous Peoples and Pov-*

erty: An International Perspective, ed. Robyn Eversole, John-Andrew McNeish and Alberto D. Cimadamore. New York: Zed Books.

Cornell, Stephen, Catherine Curtis and Miriam Jorgensen. 2003. *The Concept of Governance and Its Implications for First Nations: A Report to the British Columbia Regional Vice-Chief, Assembly of First Nations*. Tucson AZ: Native Nations Institute for Leadership, Management and Policy.

Cornell, Stephen and Joseph P. Kalt. 1998. "Sovereignty and Nation-Building: The Development Challenge in Indian Country Today." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 22(3): 187–214.

Cornet, Wendy. 2001. "First Nations Governance, the Indian Act and Women's Equality Rights." In *First Nations Women, Governance and the Indian Act: A Collection of Policy Research Reports*. Ottawa: Status of Women Canada.

Coulter, Kendra. 2009. "Women, Poverty Policy, and the Production of Neoliberal Politics in Ontario, Canada." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 30(1): 23–45.

Denetdale, Jennifer. 2006. "Chairmen, Presidents, and Princesses: The Navajo Nation, Gender, and the Politics of Tradition." *Wicazo Sa Review* 21(1): 9–28.

Dunaway, Wilma A. 2000. "Women at Risk: Capitalist Incorporation and Community Transformation on the Cherokee Frontier." In *A World-Systems Reader: New Perspectives on Gender, Urbanism, Cultures, Indigenous Peoples and Ecology*, ed. Thomas D. Hall. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Eikjok, Jorunn. 2000. "Indigenous Women in the North. The Struggle for Rights and Feminism." *Indigenous Affairs* 3: 38–41.

Elias, Peter Douglas. 1995. "Northern Economies." In *Northern Aboriginal Communities: Economies and Development*, ed. Peter Douglas Elias. North York, ON: Captus Press.

Feit, Harvey A. 2005. "Re-Cognizing Co-Management as Co-Governance: Visions and Histories of Conservation at James Bay." *Anthropologica* 47(2): 267–88.

Findlay, Isobel M. and Wanda Wuttunee. 2007. "Aboriginal Women's Community and Economic Development: Measuring and Promoting Success." *IRPP Choices* 13(4): 4–26.

Fiske, Jo-Anne. 1988. "Fishing Is Women's Business: Changing Economic Roles of Carrier Women and Men." In *Native People, Native Lands: Canadian Indians, Inuit and Métis*, ed. Bruce Alden Cox. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Fiske, Jo-Anne. 2008. "Constitutionalizing the Space to Be Aboriginal Women: The *Indian Act* and the Struggle for First Nations Citizenship." In *Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada: Current Trends and Issues*, ed. Yale Belanger. Saskatoon: Purich.

FNWSRM Press Release. 2010. "First Nations Women Seek Sensitive Mining Companies for Meaningful Long-Term Relationships." January 18.

Fontaine, Nahanni. 2002. "Aboriginal Women's Perspective on Self-Government." *Canadian Dimension* 6: 10–11.

Francis, Daniel and Toby Morantz. 1983. *Partners in Furs: A History of the Fur Trade in Eastern James Bay, 1600–1870*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Gagné, Marie-Anik. 1994. "Becoming a Periphery: The James Bay Cree from 1600–1920." In *A Nation within a Nation: Dependency and the Cree*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Green, Joyce. 1985. "Sexual Equality and Indian Government: An Analysis of Bill C-31 Amendments of the Indian Act." *Native Studies Review* 1(2): 81–95.

Green, Joyce. 2002. "Decolonizing in the Era of Globalization." *Canadian Dimension* 1: 31–33.

Green, Joyce. 2004. "Cultural and Ethnic Fundamentalism. Identity, Liberation and Oppression." In *Contesting Fundamentalisms*, ed. Carol Schick, JoAnn Jaffe and Ailsa M. Watkinson. Halifax NS: Fernwood.

Green, Joyce and Cora Voyageur. 1999. "Globalization and Development at the Bottom." In *Feminists Doing Development: A Practical Critique*, ed. Marilyn Porter and Ellen Judd. London: Zed Books.

Hall, Anthony. 2003. *The American Empire and the Fourth World*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Harder, Lois. 2003. *State of Struggle: Feminism and Politics in Alberta*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

Hull, Jeremy. 2006. "Aboriginal Women: A Profile from the 2001 Census." In *Report Prepared for Women's Issues and Gender Equality Directorate*. Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Irlbacher-Fox, Stephanie. 2009. *Finding Dahshaa. Self-Government, Social Suffering, and Aboriginal Policy in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Johnstone, Harvey. 2008. "Membertou First Nation Indigenous People Succeeding as Entrepreneurs." *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* 2(2): 140–50.

Klein, Alan. 1983. "The Political Economy of Gender: A 19th-Century Plains Indian Case Study." In *The Hidden Half: Studies of Plains Indian Women*, ed. Patricia Albers and Beatrice Medicine. Lanham MD: University Press of America.

Klein, Laura F. 1980. "Contending with Colonization: Tlingit Men and Women in Change." In *Women and Colonization: Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. Mona Etienne and Eleanor Leacock. New York: Praeger.

Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2008. "Globalization as Racialized, Sexualized Violence: The Case of Indigenous Women." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 10(2): 216–33.

Leacock, Eleanor. 1980. "Montagnais Women and the Jesuit Programme for Colonization." In *Women and Colonization: Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. Mona Etienne and Eleanor Leacock. New York: Praeger.

Littlefield, Lorraine. 1987. "Women Traders in the Maritime Fur Trade." In *Native People, Native Lands: Canadian Indians, Inuit and Metis*, ed. Bruce Aldon Cox. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

MacDonald, Martha. 1999. "Restructuring, Gender and Social Security Reform in Canada." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 34(2): 57–88.

Mander, Jerry and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, eds. 2006. *Paradigm Wars: Indigenous Peoples' Resistance to Globalization*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books and University of California Press.

Manuel, Arthur. 2003. "Aboriginal Rights on the Ground: Making Section 35 Meaningful." In *Box of Treasures or Empty Box? 20 Years of Section 35*, ed. Ardith Walkem and Bruce Halie. Penticton BC: Theytus Books.

Marchand, Marianne H. and Anne Sisson Rynyan, eds. 2000. *Gender and Global Restructuring. Sightings, Sites and Resistances*. New York: Routledge.

Martin-Hill, Dawn. 2008. *The Lubicon Lake Nation: Indigenous Knowledge and Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

McCue, June. 1998. "Treaty-Making from an Indigenous Perspective: A Ned'u'ten-Canadian Treaty Model." Master's thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver BC.

McIvor, Sharon. 1995. "Aboriginal Women's Rights as Existing Rights." *Canadian Woman Studies* 15(2–3): 34–38.

M'Closkey, Kathy. 2004. "The Devil's in the Details: Tracing the Fingerprints of Free Trade and Its Effects on Navajo Weavers." In *Native Pathways: American Indian Culture and Economic Development in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Colleen M. O'Neill and Brian C. Hosmer. Boulder CO.: University Press of Colorado.

Membertou Nation. 2008. *The Success Story of Membertou*. http://www.membertou.ca/success_story.asp (January 31).

Mihesuah, Devon. 2003. *Indigenous American Women: Decolonization, Empowerment, Activism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Monture, Patricia A. 2004. "The Right of Inclusion. Aboriginal Rights and/or Aboriginal Women?" In *Advancing Aboriginal Claims. Visions, Strategies, Directions*, ed. Kerry Wilkins. Saskatoon: Purich.

Monture-Angus, Patricia. 1995. *Thunder in My Soul: A Mohawk Woman Speaks*. Halifax NS: Fernwood.

Moss, Wendy. 1990. "Indigenous Self-Government in Canada and Sexual Equality under the *Indian Act*: Resolving Conflicts between Collective and Individual Rights." *Queen's Law Journal* 15(2): 279–305.

Mowbray, Martin. 2006. "Localizing Responsibility: The Application of the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development to Australia." *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 41(1): 87–103.

Nahanee, Teressa. 1993. "Dancing with a Gorilla: Aboriginal Women and the Charter." In *Aboriginal Peoples and the Justice System: Report of the National Round Table on Aboriginal Justice Issues Canada*. Ottawa: Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.

Natcher, David C. 2009. "Subsistence and the Social Economy of Canada's Aboriginal North." *The Northern Review* 30(Spring): 83–98.

Newhouse, David R. 1993. "Modern Aboriginal Economics: Capitalism with an Aboriginal Face." In *Sharing the Harvest, the Road to Self-Reliance: Report of the National Round Table on Aboriginal Economic Development and Resources*. Ottawa: Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.

NWAC. 1991. *Aboriginal Women, Self-Government and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Ottawa: Native Women's Association of Canada.

NWAC. 2004. *The Native Women's Association of Canada Background Document for the Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable Economic Opportunities Sectoral Session*. Ottawa: Native Women's Association of Canada.

NWAC. 2008. *Leadership Creation: Economic Development and Removing Barriers, Self-Government and Traditional Knowledge/Governance*. Policy Paper. Ottawa: Native Women's Association of Canada.

O'Neill, Colleen M. 2004. "Rethinking Modernity and the Discourse of Development in American Indian History, an Introduction." In *Native Pathways: American Indian Culture and Economic Development in the Twentieth Century*, eds. Colleen M. O'Neill and Brian C. Hosmer. Boulder CO: University Press of Colorado.

Paine, Robert. 1977. *The White Arctic: Anthropological Essays on Tutelage and Ethnicity*. St John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Perkins, Tara. 2010. "First Nations, CEOs Signal New Era."*Globe and Mail* (Toronto), January 19.

Pickering, Kathleen Ann. 2000. *Lakota Culture, World Economy*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Poppel, Birger. 2006. "Interdependency of Subsistence and Market Economies in the Arctic." In *The Economy of the North*, ed. Solveig Glomsrød and Iulie Aslaksen. Oslo: Statistics Norway.

Porter, Robert. 1996. "In Troubled Times: A Vision of Nation-Building." *Native Americas* 13(4): 52–57.

Ray, A. 1974. *Indians in the Fur Trade: Their Role as Hunters, Trappers and Middlemen in the Lands Southwest of Hudson Bay 1660–1870*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ray, A. and D. Freeman. 1978. *"Give Us Good Measure": An Economic Analysis of the Relations between the Indians and the Hudson's Bay Company before 1763*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

RCAP. 1996. *The Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Ottawa: Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.

Rude, Darlene and Connie Deiter. 2004. *From the Fur Trade to Free Trade: Forestry and First Nations Women in Canada*. Ottawa: Status of Women Canada.

Sassen, Saskia. 2000. "Women's Burden: Counter-Geographies of Globalization and the Feminization of Survival." *Journal of International Affairs* 53(2): 503–24.

Satsan (Herb George). 2007. "Afterword." In *Rebuilding Native Nations. Strategies for Governance and Development*, ed. Miriam Jorgensen. Tucson AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Slowey, Gabrielle. 2008a. *Navigating Neoliberalism. Self-Determination and the Mikisew Cree First Nation*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Slowey, Gabrielle. 2008b. "Unfinished Business: Self-Government and the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement Thirty Years Later." In *Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada: Current Trends and Issues*, ed. Yale Belanger. Saskatoon: Purich.

Smith, Andrea. 2005a. *Conquest. Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Boston: South End Press.

Smith, Andrea. 2005b. "Native American Feminism, Sovereignty, and Social Change." *Feminist Studies* 31(1): 116–32.

Stout, Madeleine Dion and Gregory D. Kipling. 1998. *Aboriginal Women in Canada: Strategic Research Directions for Policy Development*. Ottawa: Status of Women Canada.

Thistle, Paul Q. 1986. *Indian-European Trade Relations in the Lower Saskatchewan River Region to 1840*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Thomas-Müller, Clayton. 2008. "Tar Sands. Environmental Justice, Treaty Rights and Indigenous Peoples." *Canadian Dimension* 2(March/April): 11–14.

Timoney, Kevin P. 2007. *A Study of Water and Sediment Quality as Related to Public Health Issues, Fort Chipewyan, Alberta*. Fort Chipewyan AB: Nunee Health Board Society.

Timoney, Kevin P. and Peter Lee. 2009. "Does the Alberta Tar Sands Industry Pollute? The Scientific Evidence." *The Open Conservation Biology Journal* 3: 65–81.

Trigger, Bruce. 1985. *Natives and Newcomers*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

United Nations. 2009. *State of the World's Indigenous Peoples*. New York: United Nations, Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

Van Kirk, Sylvia. 1980. *Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur Trade Society in Western Canada, 1670–1870*. Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer.

Venne, Sharon H. 1999. "The Meaning of Sovereignty." *Indigenous Woman* 6: 27–30.

Walkem, Ardith and Bruce Halie, eds. 2003. *Box of Treasures or Empty Box? 20 Years of Section 35*. Penticton BC: Theytus Books.

Wallis, Maria A. and Siu-ming Kwok, eds. 2008. *Daily Struggles: The Deepening Racialization and Feminization of Poverty in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

White, Richard. 1983. *The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Wien, Fred. 2009. "The State of the First Nation Economy and the Struggle to Make Poverty History." Paper prepared for the Inter-Nation Trade and Economic Summit, Toronto.

Woodford, Peter. 2007. "Health Canada Muzzles Oilsands Whistleblower." *National Review of Medicine* 4.6. http://www.nationalreviewofmedicine.com/issue/2007/03_30/4_policy_politics1_6.html (Jan. 31, 2009).

York, Geoffrey. 1990. "Inside the Reserves." In *The Dispossessed: Life and Death in Native Canada*. London: Vintage.