From Recognition to Reciprosity: Reshaping Indigenous-Newcomer Relations in Canada

Cierra Bettens

Introduction

On June 21, 2021, the Government of Canada formally revised its citizenship oath to affirm the Aboriginal and treaty rights of First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples:

> I swear (or affirm) that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors, and that I will faithfully observe the laws of Canada, including the Constitution, which recognizes and affirms the Aboriginal and treaty rights of First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples, and fulfil my duties as a Canadian citizen (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021a).

The decision to make the change came six years after the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's (TRC's) *Calls to Action* was released in 2015. The 93rd and 94th calls to action, specifically dedicated to newcomers, call on the government of Canada "to revise the information kit for newcomers to Canada and its citizenship test to reflect a more inclusive history of the diverse Aboriginal peoples of Canada," as well as "replace the Oath of Citizenship" with a version that implicates treaty rights in it (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015, 10–11).

Along with the renewed citizenship oath, the Canadian federal government has stated that since 2017, they have been working closely with national Indigenous organizations to publish a revised citizenship guide (Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada, 2019). The previous study guide for the Canadian citizenship test (2013) did not contain any reference to colonization or residential schools, and merely listed Indigenous peoples, among the French and British, as the "founding peoples" of Canada (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 21). The updated citizenship study guide (2021b) includes a slightly more nuanced account of Indigenous peoples in Canada, with reference to residential schools and treaties—words such as "colonization," however, remain absent (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada 10). At the same time, much of the information that newcomers to Canada receive about Indigenous peoples and colonization has been cited as being inconsistent, inaccurate, and even ahistorical (Villegas et al. 2014, 1131). In the spirit of reconciliation, questions surrounding how to equip newcomers with an understanding of Indigenous peoples in Canada and, further, how they may form renewed relationships, have increasingly come to the fore.

This essay reimagines Indigenous-newcomer relations, asking how they may uphold Indigenous self-determination and values of reciprocity and mutuality. From there, it examines how newcomers might resist the reproduction of the settler-colonial project.

Using a case study of an Indigenous-led intercultural initiative, I argue that the intercultural framework provides a strong foundation for the reimagining of Indigenous-newcomer relations that are premised on values of reciprocity and mutual understanding, as well as the recognition of shared experiences such as displacement and assimilation. Further, by shifting away from the ideological threads of Canadian multiculturalism, these intercultural relationships can act as a starting point for newcomers to become conscious of their

position in the reproduction of the settler-colonial project. From there, they may even seek ways to resist it.

Combining both theoretical perspectives on settler-colonialism and Canadian multiculturalism, as well as a case study of an intercultural educational initiative between newcomers and Indigenous peoples, my essay proceeds as follows. First, I give a brief overview of the relationship between the forces of capitalism and colonialism, as well as examine how newcomers are implicated in the settler-colonial project. Second, I make a distinction between multiculturalism and interculturalism. Using the theoretical framework of Glen Coulthard's *Red Skin, White Masks* (2014) and Charles Taylor's essay on multiculturalism (1994), I position Canadian multiculturalism as a hegemonic ideology, and critique its essentializing impact on both Indigenous peoples and newcomers. After that, I analyze a case study of an Indigenous-led, newcomer intercultural initiative based in Winnipeg, Manitoba. Finally, I assess the value of intercultural initiatives in laying a foundation for renewed Indigenous-newcomer relations and, further, the potential for newcomers to resist the reproduction of the settler-colonial project.

To define my scope, I chose to use the term "newcomer" for several reasons. Initially, I had planned to use "im/migrant" to ensure the broadest possible range of categories in Canada's immigration system. Narrowing it down to "newcomer," however, is useful in that I may frame my analysis based on those who are new to Canada and may not have established perceptions about—or even be aware of—Indigenous peoples in Canada. Further, after examining formal programs and initiatives that currently exist (Gyepi-Garbrah et al. 2014; Alidina, Morton & Wirch 2020), it became apparent that the vast majority are catered towards newcomers. In this way, my scope remains broad in terms of legal immigration status (refugees, international students, immigrants, etc.), but narrower in terms of time spent in Canada (under five years).

This essay focuses on the reimagining of social relationships as a way to resist the reproduction of the settler-colonial project. In saying this, I do not analyze the potential for an alternative economic system within the scope of this paper, but rather pinpoint the beginnings of alternative social relationships. For this reason, I refrain from using the term "decolonization," as these transformations are still taking place within a settler-colonial state, and are therefore still entrenched in its structures of dispossession and accumulation. I elaborate on this in the next section.

Capital-colonial relations: Indigenous land struggles and Canada's immigration system

To begin any discussion of Indigenous-newcomer relations, it is necessary to examine how the structures of settler colonialism and capitalism—on which Canada is built—shape Canada's immigration system. What exactly *is* the settler-colonial project? Where do newcomers fit in the settler-colonial project that comprises Canada? Are newcomers settlers? From there, we may also ask whether Canada's immigration system is an extension of the settler-colonial project.

First, however, we must define what the "settler-colonial" project is. In *Red Skin, White Masks*, Glen Coulthard (2014) draws from Marx's theory of primitive accumulation to develop a framework to define and describe the functions of settler colonialism (6–15). In this process, the two key forces of dispossession and accumulation act in tandem: "these formative acts of violent *dispossession* set the stage for the emergence of capitalist accumulation and the reproduction of capitalist relations of production by tearing Indigenous societies, peasants, and other small-scale, self-sufficient agricultural producers from the source of their livelihood—*the land*" (Coulthard 7). In this way, the settler-colonial project cannot be divorced from capitalism—rather, it is deeply embedded in it.

Nandita Sharma and Cynthia Wright's article, "Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States" (2008), provides a compelling look into the dynamics of migrants within the settler-colonial project of Canada. Primarily, the authors consider the problematic aspects of categorizing all immigrants as "settlers," or even "colonizers." The question of agency is central to this: does "settling" or "colonizing" require agency? How do categories of migrant temporality and refugee status challenge this notion of settling and/or colonizing? While Sharma and Wright (2008) cite the "forced movements of enslaved Africans" and "unfree indentured Asians" as examples that challenge this notion, contemporary examples include refugees fleeing conflict—some of whom, as the authors acknowledge, are Indigenous peoples themselves (121). With respect to agency and position in colonial societies, these observations bring into question the utility of "settler" as a category for *all* newcomers to Canada.

Though the question of whether newcomers can be considered settlers—or even colonizers—is important to ask, the question of whether Canada's immigration *system* is an extension of the settler-colonial project itself treads into new territory. While different classifications of newcomers under Canada's immigration system may be implicated in the structures of capitalism in various ways, the fundamental structures of dispossession and accumulation are present in migration as well. The "global migration crisis" can be seen as a "crisis of displacement and immobility organized through capitalist dispossession," as Walia (2021) argues. "Migrants and refugees do not just appear at our borders"; rather, they are created through "systemic forces" of imperialism and global capitalism (Walia 62). Further, one can argue that capitalist dispossession creates global systems of dependency through imperialism and colonialism alike. While Canada's immigration system seeks highly skilled workers for its labour force, it also facilitates the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TWFP) to recruit cheap and precarious

migrant labour (Walia 156). Predominantly, workers in the TWFP are placed in sectors where domestic labour shortages exist, such as farming through the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP) and care work through the Caregiver Program (Walia, 156). Above all—whether it be "highly skilled" or "unskilled" migrant labour— Canada's immigration system has a fundamental commitment to filling labour gaps that allow the structures of capitalist accumulation to function.

Ultimately, what binds the settler-colonial project and Canada's immigration system is their shared proximity to capitalism. Further, it shows that capitalism does not exist in an economic vacuum—in fact, it has a profound impact on social relationships and forms of everyday interaction. In the next section, I demonstrate the role that Canadian multiculturalism plays in facilitating the reproduction of the settler-colonial project through ideological hegemony.

Multiculturalism and Canadian hegemony

Seeking recognition has emerged as a core way that marginalized groups look to see themselves and issues that pertain to them represented in the Canadian state apparatus (Fraser & Honneth 2003, 1). As Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth (2003) argue in the introduction of *Redistribution or Recognition?*, "whether the issue is indigenous land claims or women's carework, homosexual marriage or Muslim headscarves," academics and the greater public "increasingly use the term 'recognition' to unpack normative bases of political claims" (1).

In *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*, Glen Coulthard (2014) critiques the framework of recognition politics as a way of reconciling Canada's colonial relationship to Indigenous peoples. As Coulthard argues,

> Instead of ushering in an era of peaceful coexistence grounded on the ideal of reciprocity or mutual recognition, the politics of recognition in its contemporary liberal form promises to reproduce the very configurations of colonialist, racist, patriarchal state power that Indigenous peoples' demands for recognition have historically sought to transcend. (3)

In many ways, the theoretical framework of the politics of recognition is intricately linked to Canadian multiculturalism. The most popular perception about Canada's immigration system is that unlike the United States' "melting pot" that requires immigrants to rapidly assimilate into "American" culture, Canada is a "cultural mosaic" where immigrants may enjoy their respective traditions, norms, and values.

Since its inception, multiculturalism has asserted itself, both culturally and ideologically, as Canada's definitive identity. Further, it greatly shapes the way that Canadian-newcomer relations are approached. At the same time, multiculturalism remains heavily critiqued for issues ranging from cultural relativism to social segregation (Levrau & Loobuyck 2018, 1).

The debate over the distinction between multiculturalism and interculturalism is continually revisited. Interculturalism is a framework that possesses some similarities, as well as some great differences, in comparison to multiculturalism. In his article "What is interculturalism?" Gérard Bouchard (2011) defines the core intention of interculturalism as desiring "to connect cultures as much as through their roots as through encounters" and that the "central challenge of interculturalism is to smooth over and to alleviate the us/them relation rather than inflaming it" (445-446). In an article on interculturalism in Winnipeg's inner city, Parvin Ghorayashi (2010) argues that interculturalism fundamentally consists of "finding ways of addressing diversity and difference that negate exclusion,

discrimination, inequality, and a fixed notion of Canadian identity" and centre on the importance of dialogue above all (91-92). Gyepi-Garbrah et al.'s (2014) case study of Indigeneity and interculturalism in Winnipeg's inner city asserts that interculturalism must account for the "reality of persistent socioeconomic inequality that affects the material reality of many newcomers and Indigenous peoples, rather than simply become a local or senior government's opportunity to celebrate diversity as a place-maker in the global economy" (1801).

Although interculturalism is by no means a perfect framework, there are notable advantages in using it to guide Indigenous-newcomer initiatives. The intercultural framework tries to understand diversity and difference rather than negate it and promotes dialogue over acknowledgement; it thereby provides an opportunity to understand Indigenous peoples as having distinct rights and histories in what has come to be known as Canada. Thus, while it is impossible to denote a universal definition of interculturalism, many thematic consistencies exist among various interpretations, such as emphasis on dialogue, mutual understanding, and a break from the passive co-existence that is characteristic of multiculturalism.

Before getting into an in-depth discussion of intercultural initiatives, it is necessary to understand the relationship between Canadian multiculturalism, hegemony, and its role in the settler-colonial project. In his seminal essay on multiculturalism, the Canadian political philosopher Charles Taylor (1994) offers an ideological critique of Canadian multiculturalism. Prior to Coulthard's critique of the politics of recognition in *Red Skin, White Masks*, Taylor synthesized the rise of recognition-based politics with the ideological threads of multiculturalism, arguing that "discussions of multiculturalism are undergirded by the premise that the withholding of recognition can be a form of oppression" (36).

Taylor's (1994) main critique of Western multiculturalism is vested in what he characterizes as the contradictory, defining premises of

it: the politics of equal dignity and the politics of difference (37-39). While "the politics of equal dignity is based on the idea that all humans are worthy of equal respect," the politics of difference focus on the "universal potential" for the formation and definition of "one's own identity, as an individual, and also as a culture" (41-42). The problem that arises between these two politics is that the former necessarily ends up coming into conflict with the latter, as a politics of equal dignity and respect "requires that we treat people in a difference-blind fashion" (43).

The most compelling aspect of Taylor's (1994) critique, however, arguably lies in his ability to pinpoint the relationship between multiculturalism and hegemony in Canada.

> Here is another severe problem with much of the politics of multiculturalism. The peremptory demand for favourable judgements of worth is paradoxically—perhaps one should say tragically—homogenizing. For it implies that we already have the standards to make such judgements. The standards we have, however, are those of North Atlantic civilization…. By implicitly invoking our standards to judge all civilizations and cultures, the politics of difference can end up making everyone the same. (71)

In this way, the ideology of Canadian multiculturalism—embedded in the state's institutions as well as everyday relationality—has the effect of homogenizing and essentializing different cultures through the lens of the hegemonic group. The term "Eurocentrism" may be a clearer term to describe the hegemonic ideology of multiculturalism as it relates to settler colonialism than the "North Atlantic civilization" Taylor refers to in defining the hegemon.

For Indigenous peoples and newcomers alike, this has numerous implications. Crucially, the homogeneity of multiculturalism has rendered Indigenous peoples "minorities" in their own lands. At

worst, the principle of universality erases the existence of distinct Indigenous rights, histories, and relationships to the state. Affirming treaty rights, as one example, requires the acknowledgement of non-universal right to uphold Indigenous sovereignty. Taylor's critique of multiculturalism is that it projects the hegemonic Western lens in its interpretation of cultural "minorities"; it follows that it would structurally lead to the erasure of Indigenous cultural practices and ways of being.

Given this observation—that multiculturalism paves the way for the maintenance of the dominant, white settler ideology—we may also concern ourselves with its role in the reproduction of the settler-colonial project. If hegemony is indeed a function of consent, rather than coercion, its power must be vested in a dominant ideology (or ideologies). While the coercive function of reproducing the settler-colonial project through the forces of dispossession (the expropriation of lands) is more materially apparent, the "consensual" function of the settler-colonial project exists in the reproduction of the dominant ideology—in Canada's case, multiculturalism. While colonization began with the coercive forces of dispossession, many of its structures today function through hegemonic consent. In this case, this "consent" is manifested in adherence—whether one is conscious of it or not—to the "common sense" principles and practices of multiculturalism.

Newcomers—particularly those who are racialized—are also deeply implicated in the ideology of Canadian multiculturalism. As Walia (2021) argues in *Border and Rule*, "multiculturalism positions diverse racialized communities as 'distinct cultures' yet problematically homogenizes them as 'immigrants'" (159). Referring to her prior argument on the relationship between Canada's migration system and global capitalism, Walia (2021) contends that multiculturalism "cements white settler coloniality and racial-capitalist political economies by managing racialized communities

and capturing migrant labour" (161). In both cases, it involves a mechanism of assimilation, to varying degrees.

Newcomers and Indigenous peoples alike are subjugated to the ideology of Canadian multiculturalism. Further, Coulthard's analysis of the politics of recognition, which emerged in tandem with multiculturalism, demonstrates the limits to achieving justice through the recognition paradigm of the Canadian state. For this reason, it is evident that future attempts to reimagine Indigenous-newcomer relations and educational initiatives should embody a move away from the homogenizing, passive co-existence of multiculturalism and towards intercultural values of dialogue, reciprocity, and mutual understanding.

Canadian multiculturalism, as both a formal institution through the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1985 and as a dominant social norm, is a core feature and tool of Canadian hegemony. Rather than a "cultural mosaic," the ideological threads of multiculturalism in Canada have an essentializing effect that renders Indigenous peoples a minority on their own lands and fosters the social relationships required to reproduce the settler-colonial project. Further, newcomers are also deeply embedded in these relations— the forces of multiculturalism demand integration by abiding to a hegemonic ideology in order to gain various forms of capital, be it social, political, or economic.

Before leading into an analysis of how newcomers might *reject* the settler-colonial project, I present a case study of a grassroots, Indigenous-newcomer initiative situated in Winnipeg's inner city.

Ka Ni Kanichihk: A case study in Indigenous-newcomer interculturality

Winnipeg's inner city has increasingly become home to many newcomers (Gyepi-Garbrah et al. 2014, 1795-1796). At the same time, Winnipeg also has the largest urban and off-reserve Indigenous population—12.2% of Winnipeg's population, compared to 4.9% of the total Canadian population—out of any major city in Canada, with many residing in the inner city (City of Winnipeg, 2018). Alongside an increasing newcomer population in the area, however, there remains a pressing need to build better relationships between Indigenous peoples and newcomers in the inner city.

Intercultural approaches to Indigenous-newcomer relations have been on the rise among newcomer-serving organizations in Winnipeg. A report published by Immigration Partnership Winnipeg (2020), a survey of existing Indigenous-newcomer relationship-building initiatives, shows that principles of storytelling, organic relationship-building, and land-based learning are increasingly becoming features of attempts to build relationships between Indigenous peoples and newcomers at a more grassroots level (Aldina, Morton & Wirch, 22-23). Accordingly, these principles are consistent with the intercultural pillars of building mutual understanding and dialogue. The following case study pinpoints the early emergence of intercultural programming between Indigenous peoples and newcomers in Winnipeg's inner city.

In their article "Indigeneity, Immigrant Newcomers and Interculturalism in Winnipeg, Canada," John Gyepi-Garbrah, Ryan Walker, and Joseph Garcia (2014) present a case study of an Indigenous and newcomer intercultural initiative spearheaded by the grassroots, Indigenous-led organization, Ka Ni Kanichihk Inc. (KNK). Specifically, the authors focus on the United Against Racism Aboriginal Youth Circle (UAR-AYC), a subprogram of KNK that works to foster mutual cultural awareness and exchange among

Indigenous and newcomer youth (Gyepi-Garbrah et al. 1796). Aside from the UAR-AYC, KNK holds a host of community and cultural programs under their mandate of supporting the urban Indigenous community in Winnipeg and engaging non-Indigenous community members in efforts towards reconciliation (Ka Ni Kanichihk 2021). Primarily, the authors demonstrate that intercultural initiatives can bring mutual understanding, longer-term relationships and, in many cases, acknowledgment of shared histories of colonization, displacement, racism and socioeconomic challenges (Gyepi-Garbrah et al. 1795). Similar to the discussion in the previous section, Gyepi-Garbrah et al. discuss the need to shift from a passive, multicultural approach to an active, intercultural approach.

Drawing on interviews with KNK participants, the article indicates that many Indigenous peoples and newcomers are "beginning their co-existence, mostly in inner city neighbourhoods, with low levels of interaction, mutual misunderstanding, misperceptions, segregation and tension" (Gyepi-Garbrah et al.1795). This is driven by a variety of factors, including but not limited to, misinformation, stereotypes, and perceptions of being in competition for social services and housing supports (1807). The goal of KNK, therefore, was to foster "intercultural urbanism" built on reciprocal awareness, exchange, and understanding (1797).

The interviews with participants referenced in the article reveal several important insights. For one, perceptions of being in competition for resources and social services were redirected into an acknowledgement of shared challenges (Gyepi-Garbrah et al. 1805). From there, deeper connections began to emerge—many newcomers had shared experiences of racism and being subjected to the repressive forces of colonization in the countries they emigrated from (1805). In many ways, the KNK program fostered a fundamental shift in consciousness among both Indigenous peoples and newcomers living in the inner city.

A second observation of the KNK program is the potential for intercultural initiatives to break the pattern of isolation and low interaction among Indigenous peoples and newcomers living in urban settings. Finally, the KNK model fostered opportunities for participants to understand how they are implicated in the settler-colonial project and oftentimes relate to one another through shared histories of colonialism (Gyepi-Garbrah et al. 1803).

The KNK model—one premised on building relations cultivated by self-governing and community-based organizations—is generally rare among initiatives that seek to educate newcomers about Indigenous peoples, histories, and colonialism in Canada (Gyepi-Garbrah et al. 1801). There are several arguments as to why community-based models have not been mainstreamed into formal governmental initiatives. Though community-based organizations like KNK often receive funding from the state, they are not formally implicated in the federal government's immigration programming. Another argument, however, is that the information and education that newcomers receive through these initiatives may "disrupt the narrative of a welcoming Canadian state" (Villegas et al. 1131).

Therefore, it is also important to address the role of the state—if any—in facilitating intercultural initiatives between newcomers and Indigenous peoples. As Villegas et al. (2019) demonstrate, accurate information about the ongoing impact of settler-colonialism may be a detriment to the state and its sovereign power "to 'accept' and incorporate im/migrants" (1132-1133). However, any meaningful attempt to educate newcomers in accordance with the 93rd TRC call to action requires a commitment to including the role of treaties, residential schools, and, crucially, the fact that colonization is a present, ongoing feature of Canada, rather than a historical matter. At the same time, it may be difficult for Indigenous and newcomer organizations to receive adequate funding to facilitate these programs effectively without state resources or soliciting private donors. However, the advantage of intercultural initiatives is that

their participant-focus structure and emphasis on dialogue allow for a more flexible, grassroots approach, rather than a stagnant curriculum. Thus, while it may be difficult to successfully absolve the state of any role in these initiatives, a break away from passive, multicultural approaches and a move towards active, intercultural approaches may increase the likelihood that newcomers receive accurate information about Indigenous peoples, as well as generate a lasting understanding.

Against the passive ideology of multiculturalism, Indigenous-led, intercultural initiatives, such as KNK's UAR-AYC program, bring forth examples of the power of reciprocity and mutual understanding in educating Indigenous peoples and newcomers about each other. While still existing within the context of a settler-colonial state, the intercultural approach can act as a starting point towards rethinking Indigenous-newcomer relations in Winnipeg's inner city and beyond.

Rejecting the settler-colonial project

The final, and perhaps most pertinent, question in this essay is concerned with *how* newcomers, working alongside Indigenous peoples, may resist the reproduction of the settler-colonial project. In saying this, it is difficult to define what "resisting" the settler-colonial project means in practical terms. Similar to "decolonization" as a term, there are, increasingly, inconsistencies about what this resistance entails, and whether it can truly take place in a settler-colonial state. For this reason, I will focus my discussion on the rethinking of Indigenous-newcomer relationships as a stepping stone towards building the collective consciousness needed to start thinking of alternatives to the continuation of the settler-colonial project.

At the heart of Coulthard's (2014) argument in *Red Skin, White Masks* is a profound call to action: rather than working towards affirmation solely from the Canadian state, there is a great need for

"reevaluating, reconstructing, and redeploying Indigenous cultural forms in ways that seek to prefigure, alongside those with similar ethical commitments, radical alternatives to the structural and psycho-active facets of colonial domination" (48-49). What might this look like in practice? Further, given the prior discussion and analysis of this essay, what role could intercultural initiatives play? To examine this, it is necessary to return to a brief discussion of the key functions and structures of the settler-colonial project. If settler-colonialism is premised on the one-sided forces of dispossession and accumulation and implies the structuring of non-reciprocal relations between workers, land, and people, it is arguable that any attempt to *resist* the settler-colonial project must seek to build renewed relationships based on reciprocity and mutuality (Coulthard 7).

Scholars concerned with decolonization often cite a return to the "commons" approach to decolonial practices. Sharma and Wright (2008) argue that "decolonization projects" must aim to "challenge social relations" with the overarching goal of "the gaining of a global *commons*":

By understanding *colonialism* as theft of the commons, the agents of decolonization as the *commoners*, and decolonization as the gaining of a *global commons*, we will gain a clearer sense of *when* we were colonized, *who* colonized us, and *how* to decolonize ourselves and our relationships. (131)

Similar to interculturalism, the practice of *commoning* requires building and upholding relationships of mutuality (Sharma & Wright 131). Second, through an understanding of their place in the settler-colonial project, and oftentimes, through lived experiences of colonization, dispossession, and displacement in the countries they emigrated from, intercultural understanding can act as a pathway to the theory and practice of commoning.

In Gyepi-Garbrah et al.'s (2014) study, the recognition of shared histories of colonization and assimilation was a powerful feature of the program (1801-1803). When newcomers understood the context of colonization and how its historical and ongoing impact is intertwined with socioeconomic issues faced by Indigenous peoples today, their perceptions changed greatly (1804).

Beyond building intercultural social relationships, ensuring newcomers have adequate access to education about treaties and Indigenous cultural values and practices is equally crucial. In their survey of education that precarious legal status (PLS) migrants receive on Indigenous peoples, histories and colonialism in Canada, Villegas et al. (2019) argue that when "migrants feel implicated in treaty relationships, they may be less likely to internalize and reproduce the settler-colonial nation-building project" (1136).

The decision to refrain from internalizing the settler-colonial project can manifest in many ways. In both Villegas et al. and Gyepi-Garbrah et al.'s analysis of Indigenous newcomer relations and education, one such way is to understand how they are implicated in treaties and be welcomed in by the original stewards of the land. Through intercultural relationships, newcomers may ask permission and give thanks to Indigenous peoples, rather than to the Canadian state (Villegas et al. 1145).

Of course, one critique of this may be that actions like these are in some ways limited—albeit a step in the right direction—because they still centre on the individual. Similar to the changes in Canada's Oath of Citizenship, without a dedicated commitment to actively working alongside Indigenous peoples in seeking alternatives to the structures of colonial domination, an act of recognition can soon turn to empty words. Still, the individual choice to do so does signify an acknowledgement of the original stewards of the land who preceded the creation of the Canadian state.

Perhaps what is more important about the deliberate choice to "resist" internalizing the settler-colonial project is the potential for newcomers to become conscious of their own position in the reproduction of the settler-colonial project. This deliberate choice, combined with the elements of intercultural relationships—ones that, as stated before, largely mirror the reciprocal exchanges needed to work towards commoning—can bring attention to the ongoing impacts of settler colonialism and demonstrate their effects on Indigenous peoples today.

At the same time, this shifting of consciousness and relationship can involve not only changes in relationships with people but, crucially, with the land. As Coulthard (2014) argues,

> [the] practice of Indigenous anticolonialism [sic], including Indigenous anticapitalism, is best understood as a struggle not only *for* the land in the material sense, but also deeply *informed* by what the land as a *system of reciprocal relations* and *obligations* can teach us about living our lives in relation to one another and the natural world in nondominating and nonexploitative terms. (13)

By welcoming dialogue and the building of relationships that are centred on understanding and mutuality, intercultural initiatives can lay the basis for renewed social relationships between Indigenous peoples and newcomers. Moreover, they strengthen the potential for newcomers to become conscious of *where* they are implicated in settler-colonialism and *how* they might seek ways to resist it.

Conclusion

In this essay, I have demonstrated that newcomers and Indigenous peoples alike are heavily implicated in the reproduction of the settler-colonial project through the structural forces of capitalism and colonialism. Further, I have demonstrated that working against the

current of passive Canadian multiculturalism, intercultural initiatives provide a viable foundation for the reimagining of Indigenous-newcomer relations that are centred on values of reciprocity, dialogue, and mutual understanding. Finally, through these relationships, Indigenous peoples and newcomers alike may develop a shared consciousness of their place in the reproduction of the settler-colonial project and seek ways to resist it.

As efforts by the Canadian state are made to meet the 93rd and 94th TRC calls to action, further research on the meaning of a "host" in a settler-colonial state and the potential for Indigenous peoples to be given a more hands-on role in Canada's immigration policies and systems is needed. For now, Indigenous-led intercultural relations remain a viable framework and starting point for fostering reciprocal relationships between Indigenous peoples and newcomers.

Bibliography

Alidina, A., Morton, D., & Wirch, J. (2020). *Fostering safe spaces for dialogue and relationship-building between newcomers and indigenous peoples*. Immigration Partnership Winnipeg. Retrieved from https://spcw.mb.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Fostering-Safe-Spaces-for-Dialogue-and-Relationship-building-between-Newcomers-and-Indigenous-Peoples-Report-English-Web-View.pdf.

Bouchard, G. (2011). What is interculturalism? *McGill Law Journal*, *56*(2), 435–470.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2013). *Welcome to Canada: What you should know.* Government of Canada. Retrieved from https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/ircc/migration/ircc/english/pdf/pub/welcome.pdf.

City of Winnipeg. (2018). *City of Winnipeg Indigenous Peoples Highlights*. City of Winnipeg. Retrieved on Dec 8, 2021 from https://winnipeg.ca/cao/pdfs/IndigenousPeople-WinnipegStatistics.pdf.

Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: rejecting the colonial politics of recognition.* University of Minnesota Press.

Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. (2019, Sept 05). *Newcomers to Canada*. Government of Canada. Retrieved on Dec 8, 2021 from https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1524506203836/1557512859985.

Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or recognition?: a political-philosophical exchange*. Verso.

Ghorayshi, P. (2010). Diversity and interculturalism: learning from Winnipeg's inner city. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, *19*(1), 89–104.

Gyepi-Garbrah, J., Walker, R., & Garcea, J. (2014). Indigeneity, immigrant newcomers and interculturalism in Winnipeg, Canada. *Urban Studies*, *51*(9), 1795–1811.

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. (2021a, June 21). *Canada's oath of citizenship now recognizes First Nations, Inuit and Métis rights.* Government of Canada. Retrieved Dec 8, 2021 from https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-

citizenship/news/2021/06/canadas-oath-of-citizenship-now-recognizes-first-nations-inuit-and-metis-rights.html.

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. (2021b). *Discover Canada: The rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship.* Government of Canada. Retrieved from https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/ircc/migration/ircc/english/pdf/pub/discover.pdf.

Ka Ni Kanichihk. (2021). *About Ka Ni Kanichihk.* Ka Ni Kanichihk Inc. Retrieved on Dec 17 from https://www.kanikanichihk.ca/about/.

Levrau, François., & Loobuyck, P. (2018). Introduction: mapping the multiculturalism-interculturalism debate. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *6*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0080-8

Sharma, N., & Wright, C. (2008). Decolonizing resistance, challenging colonial states. *Social Justice*, *35*(3), 120–138.

Taylor, C., & Gutmann, A. (1994). *Multiculturalism: examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton University Press.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to action.* Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. https://ehprnh2mwo3.exactdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf

Villegas, P. E., Barrie, B., Peña, S., Alphonso, J., & Mamoon, A. (2020). Integration, settler colonialism, and precarious legal status migrants in Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration, 21*(4), 1131–1147. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12134-019-00670-3

Walia, H. (2021). *Border and rule: global migration, capitalism and the rise of racist nationalism.* Fernwood Publishing.