

ABORIGINAL IDENTIFICATION IN NORTH AMERICAN CITIES

Dr. Craig Proulx
St. Thomas University
Department of Anthropology
Fredericton, New Brunswick
Canada, E3B 5G3
cproulx@stu.ca

Abstract / Résumé

Aboriginal identification processes in cities framed through relatively recent identity theory on self-identification and discursive identification are the major concerns of this paper. The challenges involved in identification from across North American cities through controversies over culture specific versus pan-Aboriginal identification, traditions, authenticity and self-identification versus community acceptance are probed. Also investigated is how identification is affected by stereotypes, gender, rural/urban churn, imposed invisibility, inter-generational and mixed blood issues. Without denigrating difference approaches to identification, this paper promotes an identification approach (Schouls 2003) to understanding how Aboriginal peoples in cities identify.

Le présent article traite principalement des processus d'appartenance à la population autochtone dans les villes, dans le cadre de la théorie relativement récente de l'identité sur l'auto-identification et sur l'identification discursive. Il examine les problèmes de l'identification dans les villes nord-américaines en traitant des controverses portant sur l'identification fondée sur la culture particulière contre l'identification pan-autochtone, ainsi que sur les traditions, l'authenticité et l'auto-identification contre l'acceptation sociale. L'article examine également comment l'identification subit les effets des stéréotypes, du sexe des personnes, des déplacements entre la ville et la campagne, de l'invisibilité imposée, ainsi que des questions transgénérationnelles et de métissage. Sans dénigrer les approches différencielles à l'identification, l'article fait la promotion d'une approche d'identification (Schouls 2003) pour comprendre comment les Autochtones urbains s'identifient.

Introduction

Groundbreaking research on central issues and lacunae for understanding Aboriginal peoples in cities across North America has taken place over the past five to ten years by small number of scholars across various disciplines.¹ I discuss one key area, identity construction, within the current discourse on Aboriginal experience in North American cities. Where relevant, I use my fieldwork with the Community Council Project (CCP), an Aboriginal diversion² project in Toronto, to provide ethnographic insight into this issue.

Before proceeding some definitional matters must be addressed. Many people including myself have used the term “urban Aboriginals” to describe or differentiate them from reserve, reservation or rural Aboriginal peoples. This rift is not clear cut because urban and rural Aboriginal peoples flow repeatedly to and from both contexts. Hence, “‘Urban’ is not a kind of Indian. It is a kind of experience, one that most Indian people today have had” (Straus and Valentino 2001: 86). Using “one generic term” is confusing and ambiguous (Fixico 2000: 29). Dickson-Gilmore and LaPrairie (2005: 25) discuss the different types of Aboriginal urban areas and different sizes of urban Aboriginal populations making any policy talk about “the urban Aboriginal issue” difficult at best. I will, therefore, speak of Aboriginal experiences in cities rather than using the problematic term urban Aboriginals. Secondly, at times the word “Indian” is used while at others the term “Aboriginal peoples” is utilized. This reflects a divide between American and Canadian usage both in academia and across Aboriginal North America. I also use the term Aboriginal peoples in the Canadian context in order to encompass the widest variety of Aboriginal identities from Indian (both status and non-status) to Inuit/Innu to Métis.

It is important to note that I am in no way trying to control or appropriate how any Aboriginal individual, group or community defines identity for themselves. I am simply offering a set of concepts to think through, sets of issues that affect Aboriginal identity and how these need to be taken into account when analyzing processes of identification.

Aboriginal Identity in Cities: Why It Is Important

Aboriginal identity is one of the most important, if not the most important, concern for Aboriginal peoples born in cities, for Aboriginal migrants, for scholars of various stripes and for legal and policy stakeholders. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996 Vol. 4: 52) said that cultural identity is one of the central issues facing Aboriginal peoples in cities and called for measures to enhance cultural iden-

tity for these peoples. Statistics Canada (2005), commenting upon the doubling, and in some cases tripling, of Aboriginal populations in cities from 1981-2001, suggests that the increased tendency of people to identify as Aboriginal has been a major factor in this urban upsurge. Peters (2004: 5) points out that we don't have a good sense of the factors that cause and caused the recent upsurge in self-identification among Aboriginal peoples in cities. The continuing role and intergenerational effects of "colonial projects" (Thomas 1994) upon Aboriginal identity such as the residential schools, forced adoptions, the delineation of status versus non-status, Bill C-31 among others have made "the biggest question in life, 'Who am I?'" for many Aboriginal peoples (Sinclair 1997: 3). It is, therefore, important for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultural, social, political and legal policy, program and community development in cities, to understand why, how, and when individuals in cities identify as Aboriginal.

Identity Theory

There is a temptation to think that Aboriginal peoples only conceive of identification in an objective and "common sense" manner. Here identity is constructed "on the back of a recognition of some common origin or shared characteristics with another person or group, or with an ideal, with the natural closure of solidarity and allegiance established on this foundation" (Hall 1996: 1-2). Cultural origin stories continually told as part of oral traditions, kinship, status and tribal identification cards as well as blood quanturns now are very much a part of common sense objective identification and solidarity in both rural and urban contexts (Proulx 2003; Garrouette 2003; Jackson, Deborah Davis 2002). "The land" and spirituality, for example, also continue to have traditional³ resonance and promote particular forms of identity, agency and solidarity (Rice 2004: 2).⁴ This common sense and objective view of identity, which can determine specific identities, focuses more on previously determined content/boundaries created through continued practice, or in the case of the status/non-status divide and Bill C 31, by legislation. Forms of identity resulting from common sense, objective criteria can also be mobilized in authenticity debates and used against identity claimants unable to establish unambiguous evidence of their relationship to these previously established criteria (Jackson, Deborah Davis 2002:12). Moreover, they can result in an essentialist view of identity which can be manipulated in both positive and negative ways by both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal stakeholders (Kenrick and Lewis 2004; Kuper 2003; Jackson 2002: 114-115, 123).⁵ Hence, all stakeholders must be wary of accepting only common sense objective markers of identity as the sole way to

conceive of and practice identification. Politically expedient or naïve reliance on the above excludes a wealth of alternative possibilities in understanding how identification can proceed in cities.

Opposing common sense and objective understandings of identity are positions which valorize subjective and/or discursive constructions of identity. On one hand, individuals may have the agency/power to consciously *choose* from a variety of resources to construct identities. For example, they may choose to identify through a particular cultural tradition after an investigation revealed that their heritage derived from that tradition. Alternatively, those who know that they are Aboriginal but have no verifiable historical or kinship links to a specific culture may utilize pan-Aboriginal spiritual teachings as a source to build an identity and to gain social acceptance. In contexts of culture/identity loss due to colonial projects such as residential schools, forced adoptions and Indian Act marriage rules, self identification may be the only route for individuals to satisfy their desire to establish or re-claim Aboriginal identity in cities (Proulx 2003; Garrouste 2003).⁶ The nature of these self-identifications may vary over time and space under the influence of desire, material needs, the application of political and legal power and Aboriginal community membership standards. How some of these influences play out in urban North American Aboriginal contexts will be discussed below.

On the other hand, identities/subject positions may be formed within and through historically constituted discursive practices,⁷ rarely consciously understood, which largely limit personal agency in identity construction (Hall 1996). Jackson's (2002) description of the racist and economic/proletarian discursive practices that determined first generation urban Aboriginal identities in Riverton can be seen as an example of this process. First generation Indian peoples in Riverton, confronted by painful and marginalizing non-Aboriginal racist discursive practices, denied their tribal identities and occupied the subject position of "good workers" opened to them through the economic realities of automotive manufacturing in a one industry town. Lawrence (2004; 2003) points to the long-term discursive power of Indian Act legislation to exclude Aboriginal peoples not meeting its legislated identity criteria as a central force in shaping Aboriginal identification in both reserve and urban contexts. Moreover, mixed blood Aboriginal peoples in cities daily confront their White families' often negative assumptions about identity reclamation based upon various non-Aboriginal discourses about what "Nativeness is or is not" (Lawrence 2004: 135). For example, the discourse that "'real' Indians have vanished (or that the few that exist must manifest absolute authenticity—on white terms—to be believable) functions as a constant

discipline on urban mixed-bloods, continuously proclaiming to them that urban mixed-blood indigeneity is meaningless and that the indianness of their families has been irrevocably lost" (*ibid.*) Hence, processes of identification can be mediated within and through discourses.

I do not want to dissolve the subject and the agency of subjects to focus only on the constructions of subject positions within discourses. What is central for my purposes is that identification is always a *process* of construction continually affected by the contingencies of personal agency, *and/or* one's subject position determined by the discursive, material and symbolic resources and the power of the constitutive outside⁸ (Hall 1996). I am skeptical of the view that there is a "stable core of the self, unfolding from beginning to end through all the vicissitudes of history without change; the bit of the self which remains always-already 'the same', identical to itself across time" (Hall 1996: 3-4). However, following Ortner (1995: 187) positioning herself in the controversy over subjects versus subject positions, I am more concerned with the

...projects [that subjects whether individual actors or social entities] construct and enact.... For it is in the formulation and enactment of those projects [in this case of identification rather than resistance] that they [subjects] become and transform who they are, and that they sustain to transform their social and cultural universe. (*ibid.*)

Therefore, I am most interested with how identities are created or appropriated "using the resources of history, language and culture in the *process of becoming rather than being* (my italics): not 'who we are' or 'where we came from,' so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves" (Hall 1996: 3-4). For some, identity may subconsciously sediment over time within the bounds of local materiality, sociality, tradition and ideology adhering to well understood and defended boundaries. For others identity may be a conscious, agentive, continual rewarding/disturbing process of discovery, movement, transgression, incursion, retreat, re-embedding or retrenchment responding to changing individual and social needs. Identification, then, proceeds *both* through consciously acting subjects and through subject positions constructed by discourses. While discourses do, to an extent, control identification my research in Toronto shows that Aboriginal individuals do make pragmatic/strategic/instrumental choices about the identity markers/boundaries they choose. Buddle (2005), in her discussion of how cultural producers in urban Aboriginal radio mediate diverse Aboriginal discursive traditions that can then become an inventory of identity resources available for personal choice, also illustrates the intermingling of personal agency and discursive

sive power in cultural production and identification.

A major part of this process of choice in self representation is reactive objectification. Thomas insists that “self-representation never takes place in isolation and that it is frequently oppositional or reactive: the idea of a community cannot exist in the absence of some externality or difference, and identities and traditions are often not simply different from but constituted in opposition to others (1992: 213-214).” This process could be used to analyze Aboriginal migrants to cities as they “combine cultural repertoires from their places of origin with influences from their destinations to reassemble cultural identities” (Peters 2004: 8 using Hall 1995b; Gilroy 1994). Individuals born into or entering cities consciously react to, accommodate and are shaped by the historic, local, regional and, in some cases, the transnational differences of the constitutive outside. However, they do not just mimic or submissively accept the identities they find in the cities; they also consciously identify themselves in opposition to others such as non-Aboriginal city dwellers, legislated identities, other Aboriginal cultures within cities, the cultural politics that imbue relations between them and Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal discourses on authenticity. Rice (2004) discusses how Aboriginal peoples in cities mediate between Native and Euro-American worlds. Reactive objectification and/or suturing⁹ are, therefore, necessary within the new hybrid contexts that Aboriginal peoples find themselves in.

Relationality in identification is contained to greater and lesser degrees in all the above theories and examples. This is in accord with Anishnawbe ways of becoming and representation encapsulated within the phrase “all my relations.” “All my relations” is a way in which many Anishnawbe peoples have conceived of living and working together in the past and today. In essence, “all my relations,” speaks to the need for appropriate behaviour in the intersection between individuals and community and this, in turn, relates values to interaction (Proulx 2003:30-31). How an individual chooses to interact with others or sutures him/herself into the normative systems that constitute right relations, (essentially a constitutive outside) will largely determine individual and social identities. Cultural interactional ethics and how an individual is hailed to and invests in a subject position or chooses to place him/herself within this relational mix then are central to processes of identification (Proulx 2003; Garrouette 2003; Jackson, Deborah 2003, Schouls 2003).

Hence, I am interested in both the “suturing” involved in identification (Hall 1996: 6) and in how individuals knowingly and pragmatically/strategically/instrumentally choose identity markers (both subjective and objective) in the process of becoming and representing themselves to

themselves and others. Following Lobo (2003: 70) I examine how all of the above plays into three different, yet related levels of meaning with regard to identification: the individual level of what people think and believe, the interaction level of social relations and the institutional level of bureaucracy and public policy. Marcus (1994: 47), in a discussion of "parallel processing...of identity at many sites," suggests that anthropologists should concern themselves with four questions:

- (1) Which identities coalesce and under what circumstances?
- (2) Which become defining or dominant and for how long?
- (3) How does the play of unintended consequences affect the outcome in the coalescence of a salient identity in this space of the multiple construction and dispersed control of a person's or group's identities?
- (4) What is the nature of the politics by which identity at and across any site is controlled?

Aboriginal peoples, researchers and policy-makers attempting to understand processes of Aboriginal identification in cities must be attuned to the above questions. As I illustrated in (Proulx 2003), and continue to indicate below, these questions are useful in understanding the agentic, discursive, often contingent, ever-changing and power-laden contexts within which Aboriginal identification in cities proceeds now and in the future. With the foregoing in mind, I now turn to a discussion of salient identity concerns and practices for and by Aboriginal peoples in cities.

Identification in Cities: Choice, Context, Contingency and Power

It would be a mistake to conceive of Aboriginal identity as a one size fits all understanding and practice sedimented over time. Identity can be multilayered, (Weaver 2001:243) situational and contingent upon social networks, roles, gender and the application of power within and across these domains. Moreover, "different levels of identity are likely to be presented in different contexts" as indicated below (*ibid.*). Lobo sees identity creation as a process rather than an event and provides ethnographic evidence that first, second and third generation Aboriginal peoples in cities construct their identities differently over time using the resources and discourses available to them at the time (2001: 93-94; 170). Lobo discusses first generation urban Aboriginal identities as being constructed during a period of assimilation where non-Aboriginal stereotypes of Aboriginal peoples were internalized leading to shame over Aboriginal heritage, identity denial and silence about their identities (2001: 189-203). Their children, growing up in a time of cultural re-

vival and reclamation take pride in their heritage constructing their identities in a positive light through re-tribalization and using pan-Aboriginal resources (*ibid.*). It should also be noted that processes of Aboriginal identification vary within cities in terms of class (LaPrairie 1994), between cities and regionally depending upon how effectively or ineffectively cosmopolitan non-Aboriginal peoples hide their continuing oppressive colonial projects under a “liberal façade” (Lawrence 2004: 8). Hence, these examples indicate, with reference to Marcus’s (1994) identity questions, that the process of identification varies over time, due to personal choice, politics, class and as a result of discursive change.

Jackson (2002) validates Lobo’s ethnographic evidence. She discusses the intergenerational differences in how Aboriginal identity is constructed in cities as a result of growing up in different social, economic and discursive contexts, through different understandings and practices of traditional Anishnawbe interactional ethics and through different understandings and positionings within, or outside of, continuing kinship relations. The diversity of Aboriginal identities in cities, then, can also arise from different sources, for example ethno-cultural sources or administratively defined sources (Graham and Peters 2002: 25-26) making one size fits all understandings counter-productive.

It is important to note another process which affects Aboriginal identity in cities:

A person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves. Non-recognition or misrecognition can inflict harm; can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted and reduced mode of being. (Taylor 1994: 75 quoted in Weaver 2001:243)

The processes and consequences of the non-Aboriginal *power to define* still negatively effects the process of Aboriginal identification for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples in cities. Aboriginal peoples continue to face major barriers in resolving this dilemma. Coates (1999: 25) discusses the various ways Aboriginal identity has been defined by colonizers, academics, and media in Canada. He also describes the aims of these representations. Coates maintains that, from colonial times to today, “...the Indian was defined in ways that both explained the nature of Indigenous life in terms that Europeans could comprehend, and rationalized the occupation and confiscation of their traditional lands” (*ibid.* 25). This social construct of the Indian continues to be sustained by the dominant society through, among other modes, systems of stereotypes. These stereotypes continue to define Aboriginal peoples in non-Abo-

iginal terms and continue to be a force for Aboriginal social, economic and political exclusion (Proulx 2003). Here are some examples.

Aboriginal peoples in cities still confront long-standing non-Aboriginal misconceptions or stereotypes that "authentic" Aboriginal peoples can only be found on reserves or reservations where they live mystical and ecologically correct lives in the uncivilized, "natural" world (Peters 1996c; Bobiwash 2003). Aboriginal identity cannot be authentic in cities because it is impossible for Aboriginal urban dwellers to live this romantic and essentialized non-Aboriginal vision of Aboriginal peoples (*ibid.*).

This spatially-based romantic savage/authenticity stereotype is compounded through continuing non-Aboriginal generalizations to the larger Aboriginal populations of individual Aboriginal dysfunction, inability and criminality. Non-Aboriginal stereotypes of Aboriginal peoples as lazy, dirty, criminal drunkards living such lives because, for example, they cannot cope with the intricacies of modernity¹⁰ permeating urban landscapes and cross cut social classes throughout North America (Proulx 2003; Jackson Deborah 2002; Lobo and Peters 2001). Moreover, there is a pervasive blame the victim mentality among non-Aboriginal peoples that contributes to this internalization process and is central to "democratic racism" which operates under this set of assumptions:

If equal opportunity and social equality are assumed to exist, than the lack of success on the part of a minority population must be attributed to some other set of conditions. One explanation used by the dominant culture is the notion that certain minority communities themselves are culturally deficient (e.g., lacking intellectual prowess; more prone to aggressive behavior or other forms of deviant behaviour). In this form of the dominant discourse, it is assumed that certain communities (e.g., African Canadian) [Aboriginal peoples] lack the motivation, education or skills to participate fully in the workplace, educational system and other areas of Canadian society. Alternatively, it is argued that the failure of certain groups to succeed and to be integrated into the mainstream dominant culture is largely due to recalcitrant members of these groups refusing to adapt their traditional, different cultural values and norms to fit into Canadian society, and making unreasonable demands of the host society." (Henry and Tator 2000: 294)

Two quotes from CCP Council members effectively illustrate how the non-Aboriginal power to define operates to marginalize Aboriginal peoples and negatively affects self-representation.

The drunken Indian is ten feet tall, but a sober one is invisible. No one notices all the ones that they pass that are on their way to work, on their way home, on their way to committees, whatever. No one notices those ones, but everybody notices the one that is drunk on the street.

The overarching stereotype of the drunken Indian is clearly illustrated here but there is more. Any Aboriginal connection with the work that non-Aboriginal peoples do daily is effaced. Successful Aboriginal business people and community workers etc. cannot be seen by many non-Aboriginal peoples caught up in the above stereotypical regime of truth. Any Aboriginal person who copes well with modern city life is impossible, (or assimilated and therefore inauthentic), and is, consequently, "invisible" as Culhane (2003) illustrates below. The visual evidence of non-Aboriginal encounters with individual Aboriginals on the streets conjoin with this generalizing discursive interpretative repertoire to define *all* Aboriginal peoples in cities as dirty, dangerous, drunken, inauthentic, damaged goods.

The combination of non-Aboriginal romanticism and discrimination has a more insidious effect on the process of identification. As the quote below illustrates, many Aboriginal peoples have come to internalize the negative images of non-Aborigines, about Aboriginals leading them into "self-hatred" thereby splitting how they identify themselves (Alfred 1999: 34; Ponting and Kiely 1997: 171):

To me the source of distress is always the split between what we think we should be and what we actually are, or what society thinks we should be and who we actually are. I think we all, regardless of our race, feel that kind of distress. Native people feel it probably more generally speaking than most people because the stereotypes, both the romantic stereotype and the negative stereotype is so extreme for our people and it's really, really different than who we are. Truth is we're not a very romantic people. Truth is we're not all drunks and alcoholics and sexual abusers and petty criminals. But this is who we're taught to be. And so we end up with this horrible split culturally speaking between the drunk on the street corner and *Dances with Wolves*. Where do we fall between that really? Let's try and find a little bit of reality.... (Proulx 2003: 54)

These quotes illustrate negative forms of suturing operant in both non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal processes of identification. The above indicates how both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples come to occupy subject positions discursively constructed for them. Additionally,

and more importantly, both quotes show how some Aboriginal peoples within the CCP process understand this suturing and expose its inner workings for themselves and for those whom they help to create new, healed, Aboriginal individual self-representations (Proulx 2003). Both of these identity processes must be recognized and understood in order for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal stakeholders to provide clearer urban research, policy and programs.

A major lacuna in the burgeoning literature on Aboriginal identity in cities is that Aboriginal women are largely excluded (Weibel-Orlando 2003: 493). Large numbers of Aboriginal women migrated into cities much earlier than Aboriginal males but “Despite the disparity between women’s and men’s migration patterns, gender has not been central to the analysis of the urban experience of First Nations people”¹¹ (Janovicek 2003: 548). Here I am interested in two areas that are central to Aboriginal women’s identities in cities: Bill C-31 as a domain for necessary future research and stereotypes of inner city Aboriginal women in the downtown east side of Vancouver.

In my Toronto research Aboriginal women living there often spoke of being denied inclusion in reserve communities saying: “If you have a card you are loved; if you don’t you are nobody” (Proulx 2003: 139). A central issue that needs substantive research is how Bill C-31 women who, are denied re-entry into their reserve communities and are thereby forced to reside in cities, identify themselves in cities. Of relevance here is how these women, who know their culture and reserve origins, (or may only now be re-learning them), identify themselves given that their self-identification and re-legislated identities are not accepted by their communities of heritage. They have status but cannot claim the rights that accrue to that status in home communities. How then does this status identity then play out in cities?¹² Which identities are status Aboriginal women in cities claiming given the political positions they find themselves in with regard to their home communities and urban communities? Relatedly, do these women maintain a sense of this culturally specific identification or are they turning to pan-Aboriginal identification in cities? How, and when, are they mobilizing their difference from other non-status Aboriginal women in cities in community and social service contexts? Given that Bill C-31 continues to have major negative effects (Lawrence 2003; Daniels 1998) on Aboriginal lives throughout Canada generally and in cities specifically, long-term research is needed to understand these issues.

A second gender issue is how Aboriginal women tend to be invisible in cities and how, when they do become visible, they are negatively portrayed according to non-Aboriginal, neo-liberal and patriarchal regimes

of truth (Culhane 2003: 595). Culhane discusses how “invisibility” proceeds for some female Aboriginal peoples in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver through “regime[s] of disappearance” a “...neo-liberal mode of governance that selectively marginalizes and/or erases categories of people through strategies of representation that include silences, blind spots, and displacements that have both material and symbolic effects” (2003: 595). Culhane speaks of how Vancouver police and other levels of bureaucracy ignored the fate of Aboriginal women who were being preyed upon by a serial killer or killers simply because they were Aboriginal poor, and stereotypically perceived as disposable sex workers. Culhane illustrates how Aboriginal women in Vancouver countered stereotypes of east end women in Vancouver through a flyer distributed at downtown eastside women’s memorial march:

We are Aboriginal women. Givers of life. We are mothers, sisters, daughters, aunties and grandmothers. Not just prostitutes and drug addicts. Not welfare cheats. We stand on our mother earth and we demand respect. We are not there to be beaten, abused, murdered, ignored. (2003:593)

Both Bill C-31 issues and the treatment of Aboriginal women in Vancouver illustrate the need for further research on how Aboriginal women in cities who, when denied their legislated identities and/or subjected to states of invisibility or stereotypical identification, choose to identify themselves in reaction to Aboriginal widely differing community membership standards and in opposition to non-Aboriginal regime[s] of disappearance.

Another issue salient for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal stakeholders is the continuing dichotomization of rural and urban Aboriginal identities. It is unwise to think, simply because Aboriginal peoples move to the cities, that they sever all connections with reserves and reservations or that they suddenly acquire completely new identities uninfluenced by their rural contexts or migration. Prudence requires that we consider the continuing role that mobility patterns between reserves/reservations play in the construction of urban identities and how these sites are not mutually exclusive in terms of identity creation and maintenance (Graham and Peters 2002; Newhouse 2000). Indeed, Wiebel-Orlando (2003: 494) in her introduction to the special edition on Aboriginal peoples in cities in the American Indian Quarterly (2003), points out how

...the locus of contemporary Indian space and identity is extremely fluid and attenuated. Ties to reservation families, activities, political loyalties, resources and entitlements do not sever with migration to urban centers, even for those

people who relocate thousands of miles away from the reservation or validating locus of Indian identity.

Fixico (2000: 140) suggests there is movement from cities to reservations through which cultural knowledge is gathered by Aboriginal members of tribes in cities is a form of “‘commuting’ [which] helps form a mobile, cross-tribal and pan-Indian ethnic culture.” Indeed, there has been some suggestion that the application of transnational theory (Podlasley 2002: 6-7) might be useful in analyzing this rural-urban “churn”¹³ (Peters 2004: 5; Norris and Clatworthy 2003). For many Aboriginal people, ties to the land remain an important aspect of their identities (Todd, 2000/2001). Mobility and return migration may represent, then, not an inability to adjust, but an attempt to adapt to economic realities and to maintain vital and purposeful community relationships. Therefore, we must not see urban and reserve/reservation identities as distinct from each other. Rather, they are “interconnected in terms of mobility, culture and politics” (Graham and Peters 2002:23). With respect to policy and program development, these continued ties and frequent movements suggest that initiatives focused only on urban areas will not address some of the significant factors at work in urban Aboriginal communities (Graham and Peters 2002: 21).

While reserve and reservation relations play a role for some Aboriginal city dwellers whether through kinship relations and/or through the transmission traditional cultural knowledge this is not the case for all. One of the central problems identified by some Aboriginal peoples in Toronto is that they have no connection to their Aboriginal heritage or culturally specific traditional knowledge and practices (Proulx 2003). Many of the individuals who become involved with the CCP are first and second generation victims of the colonial projects of residential school and forced adoptions. The intergenerational consequences of non-Aboriginal policies designed to eradicate Aboriginal cultures and to assimilate Aboriginal peoples caused forms of cultural amnesia or blind spots in memory for many individuals in Toronto (Proulx 2003). Many CCP clients knew that they were Aboriginal but had little or no understanding of their specific cultural heritage or clear connections to any reserve. This state of affairs is common across urban Aboriginal North America (Rice 2004; Lawrence 2004; Jackson Deborah 2002; Lobo 2003; Lobo and Peters 2001; Fixico 2000).

The issue of how these Aboriginal individuals can identify as Aboriginal for themselves and others is complex. They are not embedded in discursive, relational and interactional contexts arising from reserves or reservations. They have no subject positions within these domains. They have a “hole in their hearts” in terms of their Aboriginal heritage and

self-knowledge (Jackson Deborah 2002). Many have no one to turn to in order to understand who they are as Aboriginal peoples. Those who do have someone to turn to often confront identity denial or silence from the only people who can tell them their heritage: their parents (Lawrence 2004; Jackson, Deborah 2002; Jackson, Deborah 2001: 189). Others begin to discover their Aboriginal identities only when they are sent to prisons through Native Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods (Waldrum 1997). Others discover, re-embed and re-inscribe their culturally-specific and/or pan-Aboriginal identities through Aboriginal mediascapes¹⁴ (Buddle 2005). Here Aboriginal radio, films and television provide Aboriginal city dwellers with opportunities to learn and/or re-learn Aboriginal traditions, to embed themselves within real or virtual community relations and to participate in cultural production (Buddle 23-26). Still others begin their process toward identity discovery and involvement in the Aboriginal community of Toronto through their participation in the CCP healing process:

Whether clients are restored or transformed varies according to the needs and capabilities of the clients. It also varies according to the capabilities and the resources of role models and the community. Clients all indicate that they must first take personal responsibility in order to begin healing. Claiming responsibility and willingness to change are the base from which new states of being and wider sets of relationships can be produced. Once clients have accepted responsibility they can begin to walk a healing path assisted by the CCP. Clients indicate that working through the CCP process, while listening to and emulating council and agency members who have experienced many of the same problems that clients are now facing, produces or re-produces meaning in their lives. The process helps clients to construct or re-construct healthy individual, community, and cultural identities while opening up, deconstructing, and healing negative colonial identities and stereotypical images that have been internalized by clients. The CCP thus helps clients to claim or re-claim the power to define who they are at individual, community, and cultural levels. This is the link between healing and identity. (Proulx 2003: 167)

In all of these instances Aboriginal identification proceeds through "...constructing a history or a personal genealogy or 'placing' oneself with in a cosmological order" and this, according to (Buddle 2005:27), "may be the predominant praxis for producing Aboriginal identification" in cities. Indeed, discursive suturing, reactive objectification and per-

sonal choice/agency situationally commingle within this praxis.

Once many of these new identifiers or identity re-claimants begin this process they often confront Aboriginal authenticity barriers. Many Aboriginal peoples are rightly concerned about cultural appropriation, and ethnic switching¹⁵ and ethnic fraud that can come about through processes of self-identification. Garroute (2003: 85-87) discusses the suspicion that many reservation based Indians have of ethnic switching. Here individuals who have not always maintained or claimed Aboriginal identity or who have passed as non-Aboriginal re-claim "this once discarded or concealed identity" to fraudulently claim both material and cultural capital that rightly belongs to those who have always identified as Indian and are accepted by other Indians as Indian. These "new Indians" or 'born again Indians' can come in the form of New Agers or those who take Indian jobs. Lawrence (2004) discusses how mixed-blood Aboriginal peoples' authenticity as 'real' Natives is contested both by Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal city dwellers creating identity confusion among mixed-bloods as they try to reclaim their Aboriginal identities and re-embed themselves in both culturally-specific and pan-Aboriginal urban communities. Other Aboriginal peoples in cities may be denigrated as "failed traditionalists" who have "failed to preserve the traditions that once defined their difference" (Povinelli 1999:37 in Buddle 2005: 27). They may be seen as assimilated and, therefore, inauthentic. Hence, due to these barriers, newly identifying Aboriginal peoples in cities must go to greater individual lengths to persuade Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal gatekeepers of the legitimacy of their identities and their rights to cultural/social inclusion. It is in this challenging domain that individual agency within identification processes is most evident as new identity claimants struggle to gain acceptance for their choices.

In processes of becoming and self-representation Lobo (2003: 81) suggests that urban Aboriginal identity may be constructed using four sets of resources: ancestry, appearance, cultural knowledge and Indian community participation.¹⁶ Some or all of these four resources may be mobilized in reaction to both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Others to create boundaries within and around urban Aboriginal communities. Jackson Deborah (2002: 3-6) gives an example of how some of these resources were mobilized within Riverton which I consider to be emblematic of the process of reactive objectification. In an urban community meeting Aboriginal peoples, who grew up in rural/reservation contexts, maintained strong Anishnawbe cultural/kinship ties, but who did not actively represent themselves as "Indian" conflict over the direction of a community institution with newly identifying pan-Aboriginal Indians who actively dress and represent themselves as Indians and perceive

the former group as being assimilated. The latter claimed that they were as real Indians as the former while some in the former group disputed this fact asking "Where were *you* when it wasn't popular to be Indian?" (Jackson, Deborah 2002: 6). When the conflict reached a head the Anishnawbe group held up their Indian cards to show the "new Indians" that it was only the Anishnawbe group who had a legitimate Indian identity based on community participation/acceptance and legislation. The struggle illustrates the very political problems Aboriginal peoples in cities may face in trying to determine for themselves who is entitled to claim Aboriginal identity and all the rights that may go along with that identity. It also illustrates how boundaries are created through reactive objectification. Finally, it shows the challenges that some Aboriginal identity claimants or re-claimants can face when self-identification is not acceptable to those in the community who can, using objective legal, cultural and community participatory resources, deny self-identifiers Aboriginal identity and community inclusion/political participation.

Pan-Indian identities taken up by individuals are rejected by many Aboriginal peoples due to the over-valorization by colonialist interests of "generic Indianness as a racial identity" over the "specific 'tribal' identity as Indigenous nationhood" (Lawrence 2003: 5). Many see the acceptance of pan-Indian identity as merely accepting "equality within a settler state framework" (*ibid.*). There is also a concern that pan-Aboriginality dilutes and/or debases authentic cultural knowledge and that, therefore, pan-Aboriginal approaches to identity and community should be avoided at all costs (Proulx 2003). Many Aboriginal peoples in the cities who have maintained a stable cultural identity through strong links to culturally specific knowledge and to reserves and reservations resent and oppose the use of pan-Aboriginal knowledge and practice as another form of false knowledge or as the homogenization of cultural distinctiveness.

There are internal community arguments over which culture-specific or pan-Aboriginal approaches should be utilized in certain situations. I witnessed one instance of this contestation which directed me to issues of legitimacy, community membership criteria, and the role of pan-Aboriginality in community constitution. It also illustrates how questions of spirituality and traditions play out within the community. I attended a CCP Advisory Council meeting where yearly progress was updated and new programs outlined. One of the new programs discussed was Dodem Kanobsa, a lodge built within the local Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) offices. Aboriginal Elders are available there to consult with DIAND office staff and with the community in Toronto. The representative of Dodem Kanobsa offered to help

coordinate these Elders for participation in CCP hearings. This met with general approbation but one council member found fault with the proposal. He asked if there would be Anishnawbe Elders provided for Anishnawbe clients and if Mohawk Elders would be provided for Mohawk clients. He was told that when possible that would happen but overall there could be no guarantees. The Council Member protested, "Well that makes us just like White people. The White people have always treated us like we are all the same and thrown a blanket over us in their responses to our problems and requests. Now we are doing the same thing!" He continued to say that this practice was not satisfactory, that it was dangerous to accept pan-Aboriginal compromises in philosophy and practice, and that there should not be a generic pan-Aboriginal utilization of these Elders. Interestingly, two other Council Members came to the defense of the pan-Aboriginal use of Elders on two grounds. First, there are not enough Elders with culturally specific knowledge to go around so they would have to accept who was available in cities. Second, one Council Member thought that youth could screen-out the messages that they hear from their Elders and Aunties etc. because they become old hat. Hence, using an Elder from elsewhere would provide a new spin on the normative and practical messages being imparted making their uptake by bored youth more likely (Proulx 2003: 142).

At the crux of the pan-Aboriginal and culturally specific issues raised throughout this paper is how to deal with self-identification and community identification/acceptance. The above examples are illustrations of the above academic controversies over the possibility of personal agency/choice in identity construction and identity/subject positions as constructed through discursive practices. Embedded within this issue is the nature of tradition, culture and nation and their continuing role in determining identification and community membership as well as the standards of validity for objective/cultural versus subjective/individual identity criteria. Thomas' (1992: 213-214) concept of reactive objectification is useful in thinking about how Aboriginal actors decide on whether to utilize culturally specific or pan-Aboriginal identity resources in either or both individual or community contexts. These choices may be political reflecting accommodation with those regnant objectifications that are deemed acceptable within the community. On the other hand, individuals choosing pan-Aboriginal resources may be actively resisting culturally specific options that are set before them by powerful actors within these communities. Moreover, many Aboriginal peoples in cities may situationally choose to strategically use both forms of identification during policy or program negotiations with non-Aboriginal stakeholders. Which resources are chosen will largely depend upon social location

both within and outside of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal discourses, communities, the interested positioning of these actors and the specific material, political and cultural needs at issue at that moment. The “*endogenous historicity of local worlds*” (Comaroff and Comaroff 1992:27) as a process “...in which the pieces of reality are woven together through the logic of a group’s own locally and historically evolved bricolage (Ortner 1995: 176) will inevitably be a major fact to consider in all identification from both culturally specific and pan-Aboriginal perspectives as individuals and groups negotiate self-identification and/or social acceptance. This controversy has long played out, in terms of entitlement to community membership and resources, in reserve and reservation contexts (Garroute 2003) and is now appearing in urban contexts (Proulx 2003; Gonzales 2001). The cultural politics of identity cannot be ignored in cities and (Schouls 2003) offers an option to think through the self-identification and community acceptance problematic.

Schouls (2003), influenced by Barth’s (1969) paper on ethnic boundaries and speaking in a reserve context, and is critical of what he calls the “difference approach” which understands identification through objective cultural and national content that does not sufficiently allow for cultural change and personal choice. Instead he proposes an “identification approach” that focuses on identification through social interaction where shared culture and nation are important in the identification process only insofar as they are filtered through the subjective lens of self-identification and individual choice in terms of group boundaries to be occupied.

I do not want to minimize the different approach to identification and community membership criteria. Certainly cultural identification based on difference is a factor for those who maintain long-term connections with reserve and reservation culture/kinship relations that were only minimally affected by colonial projects of assimilation, acculturation and oppression. Identities/boundaries created by groups exhibiting these culturally specific characteristics, heritage and imperatives are crucial to understanding Aboriginal identification within cities.

It is also unwise to ignore how self identification can threaten longstanding material and political interests as stated above. Self-identification/individual choice can exacerbate the cultural politics of identity creating conflict within communities claiming culturally specific and more or less historically intact group identities as discussed above. Authenticity calculations for excluding Others will continue to plague Aboriginal identification processes. Hence, difference in identification will always have to be factored into understanding Aboriginal identities in cities.

However, cultural identity understood and acted upon as the objective, culturally specific, discourse-based and agency-denuded content upon which identification and community acceptance proceed cannot capture the breadth of identification processes for Aboriginal peoples within the hybrid context of cities. I want to make the case that, where community membership and self-identification is concerned, identity criteria can be understood and adapted/adopted flexibly. In processes of identification, it is important to take into account "the individual level of what people think and believe" (Lobo 2003: 70) and how this affects group identities. It is in this context that the identification approach (Schouls 2003) resonates most widely. As stated above, Aboriginal peoples who are not connected to culturally specific identity relations must use whatever resources at their disposal to create or claim Aboriginal identities thereby filling the holes in their hearts. How individuals choose to identify and the resources they choose to use in this process must be understood as flexibly inventive reacting to both internal and external personal and cultural change. Indeed, Aboriginal victims of historically based non-Aboriginal or Aboriginal discursive power need open routes to claim identities torn from, or denied to, them. Rice (2004: 2-3), discussing Aboriginal novels about Aboriginal peoples in cities, outlines how Aboriginal identity politics can be adaptable and flexible in new urban contexts. Aboriginal peoples in cities can choose to utilize traditional identity resources but also utilize many other non-traditional resources in constructing their identities thereby "revealing the transformative nature of contemporary Indian identity (Rice 2004: 2-3). New forms of old ways and completely new ways are being used to identify as a reaction to migration and changing urban contexts. How individual Aboriginal identity claims from the above standpoint are accepted, or not, by groups with established cultural identities will continue to politically, socially and materially shape Aboriginal communities in cities despite the dangers of cultural/material appropriation and authenticity concerns. Aboriginal communities and policy/program workers must now confront identification through social interaction where shared culture and nation are important in the identification process only insofar as they are filtered through the subjective lens of self-identification and individual choice in terms of group boundaries to be occupied (Schouls 2003). How Aboriginal peoples in cities combine both difference and identification approaches must, therefore, factor into all non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal policy and program calculations as a major challenge for building and sustaining Aboriginal urban communities.

Conclusion

Identification processes have been the central concern of this paper. I have discussed how identification proceeds both unconsciously through discourse and consciously through individual subjective choice. I showed how identification processes can be structured through historically based discursive practices arising from legislation, romanticized and essentialized non-Aboriginal notions of Aboriginal authenticity, regimes of truth based upon stereotypes, regimes of disappearance, and culturally specific Aboriginal discursive traditions leading to authenticity concerns. The subject positions and objective identity criteria arising from these discursive practices structure identification through difference. At the same time I have shown how some Aboriginal peoples in cities are actively struggling to create or re-claim Aboriginal identities that were silenced for them or denied them through the above discursive practices. Illustrating the agency of individuals as they break through the barriers created by these discursive practices to identify themselves as Aboriginal was a central concern. How they came to understand their culturally specific heritage or chose to pragmatically identify through pan-Aboriginal avenues illustrates how identification is a matter of personal choice and not simply a matter of occupying subject positions within discourses. Ethnographic evidence across various urban domains was used to illustrate how individuals reacted to and against both non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal discursive practices to reclaim and re-inscribe Aboriginal identities. Additionally, I sketched the politics of identity within which Aboriginal individuals self-identify and how this affects community membership standards suggesting that the “identification approach” (Schouls 2003) opened up the, still contestable, but most inclusive modes for addressing identity politics. This enabled me to suggest how certain identities coalesced under certain circumstances and which types of identities are becoming dominant in hybrid urban contexts (Marcus 1994). It also allowed me to illustrate how all of the above plays into three different, yet related levels of meaning with regard to identification: the individual level of what people think and believe, the interaction level of social relations and the institutional level of bureaucracy and public policy (Lobo 2003: 70). In discussing the above I indicated how identities are a “*process of becoming rather than being* (my italics): not ‘who we are’ or ‘where we came from,’ so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves” (Hall 1996: 3-4). The processes of becoming of individuals as they identify as Aboriginal people in cities and community acceptance of those representations are of paramount importance to all stakeholders concerned with living in socially just and creative ways.

Notes

1. For example, cultural geographers (Peters 2004, 1996 a, b; 1994) Native Studies scholars (Lawrence 2004, 2003; Wuttunee 2004; A1ichel 2002; Newhouse and Peters 2003), scholars of literature (Rice 2004), historians (LaGrand 2002; Fixico 2000), political scientists (Cairns 2000; Cairns and Flanagan 2001), policy analysts (Hanselmann 2003, 2002 a,b, 2001; Podlasley 2002; Seidle 2002; Hanselmann and Gibbons 2001; Richards 2001; LaPrairie 1994), Canadian Studies scholars (Todd 2000/2001) and anthropologists (Buddle 2005; Patterson 2004; Kishigami 2004, 2002; Proulx 2003; Bobiwash 2003; Weibel-Orlando 2003, 1999; Lobo 2003; Culhane 2003 Lobo and Peters 2003; Jackson, D. 2002; Sanderson and Bobiwash 1997).
2. The CCP is an urban diversion program for adult Aboriginal offenders. It diverts Aboriginal offenders from the formal justice system into a culturally appropriate process. The CCP process concerns itself with the underlying causes of the crime and seeks to heal and rehabilitate offenders (hereafter clients). It is intended to serve as a meaningful community based alternative to the present justice system for the Aboriginal people in Toronto.
3. "Confusion over the meaning of tradition is a major problem. Non-Aborigines mistakenly believe that it is past customs "particular cultural practices" (Warry 1998: 174) from pre-colonial times that are being revived without reference to historical and cultural change. Rather, it is "tradition, the appeal to values and actions that sustain customs and provide continuity to a social group over time," (ibid.) that is being revived in new contexts after years of oppression. Tradition is contingent upon the particular culture and the history of change that the culture has undergone. There is not one tradition but many across "Indian country" in North America. Some traditions blend or can become the dominant model that is practiced within a particular context (i.e., Anishnawbe tradition in Toronto). This view of tradition may be in accord with the "incorporative" function of tradition that Raymond Williams (1981: 115) discusses in terms of "selective traditions." A selective tradition is "an intentionally selective version of a shaping past and a pre-shaped present, which is then powerfully operative in the process of social and cultural definition and identification" (ibid.: 115). In this view tradition is not seen as a "relatively inert" remnant of the "surviving past" but, rather as an "actively shaping force" where "a version of the past is used to ratify the present and to indicate directions for the future..." (ibid.

115-6). I am using tradition *emically*, that is, in terms of what stakeholders believe is traditional based upon their understandings of their cultural traditions" (Proulx 2003: 28).

4. However, while "the land" is a predominate resource used in the construction of Aboriginal identities, its use can be problematic in cities. Cities do not have the qualities of "the land" nor the sustaining practices associated with them and therefore are not suitable places of, or resources for, Aboriginal identification (Rice 2004: 2). On the other hand, Aboriginal peoples in cities can still anchor themselves to an abstract largely symbolic sense of the "land" thereby linking themselves to traditions and place despite the fact that they "may occupy materially 'deterritorialized' zones" (Buddle 2005: 9).
5. Space limitations do not permit discussion of the invention/inversion of tradition, strategic essentialism and cultural fundamentalism controversies that have raged over the past decades (For example: Kenrick and Lewis 2004; Kuper 2003; Jackson 2002: 114-115, 123; Briggs 1996; Thomas 1992; Keesing 1989; Hanson 1989; Henige 1984). Following Sahlins (1999: 404), I am less concerned with an instrumentalist or functionalist dismissal of Indigenous peoples' claims to cultural distinctiveness and the "politico-moral judgments" that frame it; I am more concerned here with the "inventiveness of tradition," its "vitality" rather than its imputed "decadence" due to power seeking etc. (408- 9). Indeed, "...the adoption and interpolation of extraneous elements may well be apperceived as a defining feature of Aboriginal 'tradition'" (Buddle 2005: 10). I will not condemn Aboriginal peoples for cultural borrowing and creativity in the process of reclaiming for themselves cultural spaces denied them or taken from them by continuing colonialism. My concern is with understanding cultural production/appropriation and the responsiveness and creativity involved in these processes rather than establishing their authenticity for social scientists, policy makers, or judges who can then utilize "authentic" or "invented" traditions for their own academic, political, legal and cultural capital. I agree with Sahlins (1999: 406), that Indigenous peoples "...have not organized their existence in answer to what has been troubling us lately. They do not live either for us or as us."
6. Garrouette (2003), though not specifically discussing self-identification in urban contexts, provides a nuanced discussion of these and other influences as well as the pros and cons of self identification from individual, tribal and state perspectives.
7. "Precisely because identities are constructed within, not outside, discourse, we need to understand them as produced in specific his-

torical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and practices, by specific enunciative strategies. Moreover, they emerge within the play of specific modalities of power, and thus are more the product of the marking of difference and exclusion, than they are the sign of an identical, naturally-constituted unity - an 'identity' in its traditional meaning (that is, an all-inclusive sameness, seamless, without internal differentiation)." (Hall 1996: 4)

8. As (Hall 1996: 4-5) maintains: "Above all, and directly contrary to the form in which they are constantly invoked, identities are constructed through, not outside, difference. This entails the radically disturbing recognition that it is only through the relation to the Other, the relation to what it is not, to precisely what it lacks, to what has been called its constitutive outside that the 'positive' meaning of the term – and thus its 'identity' – can be constructed (Derrida, 1981; Laclau, 1990; Butler, 1993). Throughout their careers, identities can function as points of identification and attachment only because of their capacity to exclude, to leave out, to render 'outside,' abjected. Every identity has at its 'margin,' an excess, something more. The unity, the internal homogeneity, which the term identity treats as foundational is not a natural, but a constructed form of closure, every identity naming as its necessary, even if silenced and unspoken other, that which it 'lacks'."
9. "...the meeting point, the point of suture, between on the one hand the discourses and practices which attempt to 'interpellate', speak to us or hail us into place as the social subjects of particular discourses, and on the other hand, the processes which produce subjectivities, which construct us as subjects which can be 'spoken.' Identities are thus points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us (see Hall, 1995a). They are the result of a successful articulation or 'chaining' of the subject into the flow of the discourse, what Stephen Heath, in his path breaking essay on 'Suture' called 'an intersection' (1981:106). 'A theory of ideology must begin not from the subject but as an account of suturing effects, the effecting of the join of the subject in structures of meaning.' Identities are, as it were, the positions which the subject is obliged to take up while always 'knowing' (the language of consciousness here betrays us) that they are representations, that representation is always constructed across a 'lack,' across a division, from the place of the Other, and thus can never be adequate–identical–to the subject processes which are invested in them. The notion that an effective suturing of the subject to a subject-position requires, not only that the subject is 'hailed,' but

that the subject invests in the position, means that suturing has to be thought of as an articulation, rather than a one-sided process, and that in turn places identification, if not identities, firmly on the theoretical agenda (Hall 1996: 6)."

10. This stereotypical view can be traced to the influence of older academic and folk understandings of Native identity that have been couched "...in terms of *primordiality*, a state of existence in contradistinction to modernity, whereby language, ways of living, and cultural knowledge as manifested by distinct beliefs, traits and practices, transmitted relatively unbroken lines from a distant past and generally combined with 'racial' purity, have defined membership in a particular tribal group" Lawrence 2004: 1).
11. Some exceptions to this state of affairs have discussed how Aboriginal women were central to the emergence of the Native Canadian Centre in Toronto (Bobiwash and Sanderson 1997), how Aboriginal women can be discriminated against in male dominated restorative justice initiatives (Proulx 2003), Native women's organizing in Thunder Bay (Janovicek 2003), and discussions of female elders in Los Angeles (Wiebel-Orlando 1999).
12. This is particularly relevant in terms of service provision as many Aboriginal service providers move to status-blind philosophies.
13. Churn, simply put, is the back and forth movement from rural to urban contexts (Peters 2004: 5; Norris and Clatworthy 2003).
14. A mediascape comprises "the distinction of the electronic capabilities to produce and disseminate information (newspapers, magazines, television stations and film production studios)...and to the images of the world created by these media" (Appadurai 1996:4 in Buddle 2005: 28 note 3).
15. See also (Gonzales 2001)
16. "Thus urban identity is defined through (4 ways): Ancestry: does a person have Indian relatives and ancestors and function as a member of and Indian extended family? Appearance: Does a person look 'Indian'? Cultural Knowledge: Is the person knowledgeable about the culture of their Peoples and of those pan-Indian values and social expectations shared within the Indian community? Indian Community Participation: Does the person 'come out' for Indian events and activities in the Indian community and contribute to the community well-being? The weight and combination given to these elements vary situationally and, to some extent, are always under community assessment, shifting with the changing times (Lobo 2003: 81)."

References

- Aboriginal Legal Services of Toronto
2001 Fact Sheet October 3, 2001 Gladue (Aboriginal Persons)
Court Ontario Court of Justice-Old City Hall. http://www.aboriginallegal.ca/docs/apc_factsheet.htm
- Alfred, Taiaiake
1999 Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto.
Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Appadurai, Arjun
1996 Modernity at Large, Cultural Dimensions of Globalization. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barth, Fredrik
1969 Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference. Fredrik Barth. (ed.) Boston: Little, Brown.
- Bobiwash, Heather-Howard
2003 "Women's Class Strategies as Activism in Native Community Building in Toronto 1950- 1975." In *American Indian Quarterly*. 27 (3/4), Summer/Fall, 566- 582.
- Briggs, Charles L.
1996 "The Politics of Discursive Authority in Research on the "Invention of Tradition." In *Cultural Anthropology*. 11 (4): 435-469.
- Buddle, Kathleen
2005 "Aboriginal Cultural Capital Creation and Radio Production in Urban Ontario." In *Canadian Journal of Communication*. 30 (1): 7-40.
- Butler, J.
1993 Bodies That Matter. London: Routledge.
- Cairns, Alan C.
2000 "Aboriginal Peoples' Two Roads to the Future." In *Policy Options*. January/February. 31-33 <http://www.irpp.org/po/archive/jan00/cairns.pdf>
- Cairns, Alan and Tom Flanagan
2001 "An Exchange" In *Inroads* 10: 101-122. Reprinted as "Flanagan and Cairns on Aboriginal Policy," *Policy Options*, 22 (7) (September 2001): 43-53.

- Coates, Ken
 1999 "Being Aboriginal: The Cultural Politics of Identity, Membership and Belonging Among First Nations in Canada." In *Futures and Identities*. Michael Bihiels. (ed.) Montreal: Association for Canadian Studies. 23-41.
- Comaroff, John and Jean Comaroff
 1992 Ethnography and the Historical Imagination. Boulder, Col.: Westview Press.
- Culhane, Dara
 2003 "The Spirit Lives Within Us: Aboriginal Women in Downtown Eastside Vancouver Emerging into Visibility." In *American Indian Quarterly*. 27 (3/4) Summer/Fall.: 593 - 606.
- Daniels, Harry W.
 1998 Bill C-31: The Abocide Bill. Congress of Aboriginal Peoples. <http://www.abo-peoples.org/programs/dnlsc-31.html>
- Derrida, J.
 1981 Positions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dickson-Gilmore, Jane and Carol LaPrairie
 2005 Will the Circle Be Unbroken? Aboriginal Communities, Restorative Justice, and the Challenges of Conflict and Change. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Engle-Merry, Sally
 2000 Colonizing Hawaii: The Cultural Power of Law. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Filmcommedia
 2005 Critical concepts some media/communications theory keywords condensed from the original by Aidan Arrowsmith <http://www.adamranson.freeserve.co.uk/critical%20conc=epcts.htm>
- Finnegan, Ruth
 1989 The Hidden Musicians: Music-making in an English Town. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fixico, Donald L.
 2000 The Urban Indian Experience. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Garrouste, Eva Marie
 2003 Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Gilroy, P.
- 1994 The Black Atlantic. London: Verso.
- Gonzales, Angela A.
- 2001 "Urban (Trans)Formations: Changes in the Meaning and Use of American Indian Identity." In *American Indians and the Urban Experience*. Susan Lobo and Kurt Peters. (Eds.) New York: Altamira Press. 169 - 185.
- Graham, Katherine and Evelyn Peters
- 2002 Aboriginal Communities and Urban Sustainability. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Policy Research Networks <http://www.urbancentre.utoronto.ca/pdfs/elibrary/CPRNUrbanAboriginal.pdf>
- Hall, Stuart
- 1996 "Introduction: Who Needs Identity?" In *Questions of Cultural Identity*. Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay. (eds.) London: Sage Publications.
- 1995a "Fantasy, Identity, Politics." In *Cultural Remix: Theories of Politics and the Popular*. E. Carter, J. Donald and J. Squites (eds.). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- 1995b "New Cultures for Old." In *A Place in the World? Places, Cultures and Globalization*. D. Massey and P. Jess (eds.). Toronto: Oxford University Press, 75-213.
- Hanselmann, Calvin
- 2003 Shared Responsibility: Final Report and Recommendations of the Urban Aboriginal Initiative. Calgary: Canada West Foundation. <http://www.turtleisland.org/news/urbanabs1.pdf>
- 2002a Uncommon Sense: Promising Practices in Urban Aboriginal Policy-Making and Programming. Calgary: Canada West Foundation. August. [http://www.cwf.ca/abcalcwfd/doc.nsf/\(Publications\)/A1F71831BD0ADEDD87256C140017E437/\\$file/200208.pdf](http://www.cwf.ca/abcalcwfd/doc.nsf/(Publications)/A1F71831BD0ADEDD87256C140017E437/$file/200208.pdf)
- 2002b Enhanced Urban Aboriginal Programming in Western Canada. _Calgary: Canada West Foundation. January. [http://www.cwf.ca/abcalcwfd/doc.nsf/\(Publications\)/CA2F647636F34B0E87256BD500702A25/\\$file/200202.pdf](http://www.cwf.ca/abcalcwfd/doc.nsf/(Publications)/CA2F647636F34B0E87256BD500702A25/$file/200202.pdf)
- 2001 Urban Aboriginal People in Western Canada: Realities and Policies. Calgary: Canada West Foundation.

- Hanselmann, Calvin and Roger Gibbins
2001 Another Voice Is Needed: Intergovernmentalism In *The Urban Aboriginal Context*. http://www.iigr.ca/pdf/publications/367_Canada_The_State_of_the_.pdf Ottawa: Queens University.
- Hanson, Alan
1989 "The Making of Maori Culture: Cultural Invention and Its Logic." In *American Anthropologist*. 91: 890 - 902.
- Henige, David
1984 "Origin Traditions of American Racial Isolates: A Case of Something Borrowed." In *Appalachian Journal*. (2): 209-10.
- Henry, Frances and Carol Tator
2000 "The Theory and Practice of Democratic Racism in Canada." In *Perspectives on Ethnicity in Canada: A Reader*. Madeline A. Kalbach and Warren E. Kalbach. (eds.) Toronto: Harcourt Canada Ltd. 285-302.
- Jackson, Deborah Davis
2002 Our Elders Lived It: American Indian Identity in the City. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.
2001 "This Hole in Our Heart: The Urban-Raised Generation and the Legacy of Silence." In *American Indians and the Urban Experience*. Susan Lobo and Kurt Peters. (Eds.) New York: Altamira Press. 189-206.
- Jackson, Michael
2002 The Politics of Storytelling: Violence, Transgression and Intersubjectivity. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Janovicek, Nancy
2003 "Assisting Our Own: Urban Migration, Self-governance, and Native Women's Organizing in Thunder Bay, Ontario, 1972 – 1989. In *American Indian Quarterly*. 27 (3/4) Summer/Fall.: 548 – 565.
- Keesing, Roger
1989 "Creating the Past: Custom and Identity in the Contemporary Pacific." In *The Contemporary Pacific*. Spring/Fall. 1 (1-2).
- Kenrick, Justin and Jerome Lewis
2004 "Indigenous Peoples' Rights and the Politics of the Term 'Indigenous'." In *Anthropology Today*. 20 (2): 4-9.

Kishigami, Nobuhiro

- 2004 "Information and Material-Resource Flow among the Urban Inuit: Research from Montreal, Canada." (pdf:40KB)
Revised AAA Session: "Peripherals@the center.com: Inuit in Urban Spaces" at Gifford Room, Kroeber Hall, University of California, Berkeley, 15:00-18:00, 17th, November, 2004 www.minpaku.ac.jp/staff/kishigami/041117.pdf
- 2002 "Inuit Identities in Montreal, Canada." In *Études/Inuit/Studies* 26 (1): 183 – 191. www.erudit.org/revue/etudinuit/2002/v26/n1/009279ar.pdf

Kuper, Adam

- 2003 "The Return of the Native." In *Current Anthropology*. 44 (3): 389 – 402.

Laclau, E.

- 1990 New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time. London: Verso.

LaGrand, James B.

- 2002 Indian Metropolis: Native Americans in Chicago, 1945-75. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Lambert, Carmen

- 1986 "Aboriginal Ethnicity in a Canadian Urban Context." In *Ethnicity and Multiculturalism in Canada*. T Ayabi. Ibaraki. (ed.) Institute of History and Anthropology: University of Tsukuba. 3 - 32.

LaPrairie, Carol

- 2002 "Aboriginal Over-Representation in the Criminal Justice System: A Tale of Nine Cities." In *Canadian Journal of Criminology*. 44 (2): 181 –208.
- 1994 Seen But Not Heard: Native People in the Inner City. Ottawa: Communications and Consultation Branch. Department of Justice of Canada.

Lawrence, Bonita

- 2004 "Real" Indians and Others: Mixed-Blood Urban Native People and Indigenous Nationhood. University of Nebraska Press and UBC Press.
- 2003 "Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States: An Overview." In *Hypatia* 18 (2): 3-31

Lobo, Susan and Kurt Peters

- 2001 American Indians and the Urban Experience. Susan Lobo and Kurt Peters. (eds.) New York: Altamira Press.

- Lobo, Susan
2001 "Is Urban a Person or a Place? Characteristics of Urban Indian Country." In *American Indians and the Urban Experience*. Susan Lobo and Kurt Peters. (eds.) New York: Altamira Press. 73-85.
- Marcus, George E.
1994 "After the Critique of Ethnography: Faith, Hope and Charity, But the Greatest of These is Charity." In *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. Robert Borofsky. (ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 40-54.
- Michel, Karen Lincoln
2002 "Indian In the City: Cultural Survival After Relocation." In *Native Americas: Hemispheric Journal of Indigenous Issues*. 19 (1 and 2). Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Moyer, S. and L. Axon
1993 An Implementation Evaluation of the Native Community Council Project Of Aboriginal Legal Services of Toronto. Toronto: Ministry of the Attorney General.
- Newhouse, David
2003 Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples. Newhouse, David and Peters, Evelyn. (eds.) <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/CP22-71-2003E.pdf> Policy Research Institute.:243-254.
- 2000 "From the Tribal to the Modern: The Development of Modern Aboriginal Societies." In *Expressions in Canadian Native Studies*. R.F. Laliberte, P. Settee, J.B. Waldram, R. Innes, B. Macdougall, L. McBain, F.L. Barron. (eds.) Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Press. 395-409.
- Newhouse, David and Evelyn Peters
2003 "Introduction." *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples*. Eds. Newhouse, David and Peters, Evelyn. <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/CP22-71-2003E.pdf> Policy Research Institute. 5-13.
- Norris, M.J. and S. Clatworthy
2003 'Aboriginal Mobility and Migration within Urban Canada: Outcomes, Factors and Implications' In D. Newhouse and E. Peters *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples*. (eds.) Policy Research Institute. 51-78. <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/CP22-71-2003E.pdf>

Ortner, Sherry B.

- 1995 "Resistance and the Right of Ethnographic Refusal." In *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 37 (1): 173 - 193.

Patterson, Tim W. and Martin J. Whittles

- 2004 Reclaiming Cities: Canadian Aboriginal Urban Stories in Context." In *Opinion Canada Montreal: Centre For Research And Information On Canada* 6 (38) - December 2. www.opinioncanada.ca

Patterson, Tim W.

- 2004 "The "Other" Aboriginal: Reconsidering the Urban Aboriginal Image." In *Opinion Canada. Montreal: Centre for Research and Information on Canada* 6 (3) - January 29. www.cric.ca

Peters, Evelyn

- 2004 Three Myths About Aboriginals in Cities March 25th, 2004 Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences 415-151 Slater Street Ottawa, Ontario <http://www.fedcan.ca/english/pdf/fromold/breakfast-peters0304.pdf>

- 1996a Urban and Aboriginal a Contradiction? The Social Construction of Aboriginal Peoples in Relation to the City. In *City Lives and City Forms: Critical Research and Canadian Urbanism*. Jon Caulfield and Linda Peake. (eds.) Toronto: University Of Toronto Press.

- 1996b "Aboriginal People in Urban Areas." In *Vision of the Heart: Canadian Aboriginal Issues*. David Alan Long and Olive Patricia Dickason. (eds.) Toronto: Harcourt Brace. 305- 333.

- 1996c "'Urban and Aboriginal': An Impossible Contradiction?" In *City Lives and City Forms: Critical Research and Canadian Urbanism*. Jon Caulfield and Linda Peake. (eds.) Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- 1994 Aboriginal Self-Government in Urban Areas: Proceedings of a Workshop May 25 and 26 1994. Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Affairs, Queens University.

Podlasly, Mark

- 2002: 3 Canada's Domestic Expatriates: the Urban Aboriginal Population. In www.newliberalism.ca/resources/Podlasly.pdf

- Ponting, Rick J. and Jerilynn Kiely
1997 "Disempowerment: "Justice," Racism and Public Opinion." In *First Nations in Canada: Perspectives on Opportunity, Empowerment and Self-Determination*. Rick J. Ponting. (Ed.) Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd. 152-192.
- Povinelli, Elizabeth A.
1999 "Settler Modernity and the Quest for an Indigenous Tradition." In *Public Culture*. 11 (1): 19-48.
- Proulx, Craig
2003 Reclaiming Aboriginal Justice, Community and Identity. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Ltd.
2000 "Current Directions in Aboriginal Law/Justice in Canada." In *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*. 20 (2): 371-409.
- Rice, David A.
2004 Mediating Colonization: Urban Indians in the Native American Novel. Unpublished PhD thesis. Storrs, Connecticut: University of Connecticut. <http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/dissertations/AAI3144605/>
- Richards, John
2001 Neighbors Matter: Poor Neighborhoods and Urban Aboriginal Policy. No. 156, November. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute. www.cdhowe.org
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples
1993 Aboriginal Peoples and the Justice System: Report of the National Round Table on Aboriginal Justice Issues. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Sahlins, Marshall
1999 "Two or Three Things That I know About Culture." In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 5: 399 – 421.
- Sanderson, Frances and Heather Howard-Bobiwash
1997 The Meeting Place Aboriginal Life in Toronto: In Celebration of the Native Canadian Center of Toronto's 35th Anniversary. Frances Sanderson and Heather Howard-Bobiwash. (eds.) Toronto: The Native Canadian Center of Toronto.
- Seidle, Leslie F.
2002 The Federal Role in Canada's Cities: Overview of Issues and Proposed Actions. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc.

- Schouls, Tim
2003 *Shifting Boundaries: Aboriginal Identity, Pluralist Theory and the Politics of Self-Government.* Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Sinclair, Murray
1997 Transcript of Presentation: The Historical Relationship Between the Canadian Justice System and Aboriginal People. Ottawa: The Aboriginal Justice Learning Network. 1-14.
- Statistics Canada
2005 "Study: Aboriginal People Living in Metropolitan Areas." In *The Daily*. June 23. <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/050623/d050623b.htm>
- Straus, Terry and Debra Valentino
2001 "Retribalization in Urban Indian Communities." In *American Indians and the Urban Experience*. Susan Lobo and Kurt Peters. (eds.) New York: Altamira Press. 85-94.
- Taylor, Charles
1994 "The Politics of Recognition." In *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader*. Ed.: David Theo Goldberg. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. 75-107.
- Thomas, Nicholas
1994 *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
1992 "The Inversion of Tradition." In *American Ethnologist*. 19 (2): 213-232.
- Todd, Roy
2000/2001 "Between The Land and The City: Aboriginal Agency, Culture And Governance In Urban Areas." In *The London Journal of Canadian Studies* 16: 48 - 66.
- Waldrum, James B.
1997 *The Way of the Pipe: Aboriginal Spirituality and Symbolic Healing in Canada's Prisons.* Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.
- Warry, Wayne
1998 *Unfinished Dreams: Community Healing and the Reality of Aboriginal Self-Government.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Weaver, Hillary
2001 "Indigenous Identity." In *American Indian Quarterly*. 25 (2): 240 – 255.

Weibel-Orlando, Joan A.

- 2003 "Introduction." In *American Indian Quarterly*. 27 (3/4): 491.
 Summer/Fall.
- 1999 *Indian Country, L. A.: Maintaining Ethnic Community in Complex Society*. Revised Edition Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Williams, Raymond

- 1981 *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wuttunee, Wanda

- 2004 *Living Rhythms Lessons in Aboriginal Economic Resilience and Vision*. McGill-Queen's University Press Montreal & Kingston. London. Ithaca.