British Colonialism and Indigenous Peoples:
The Law of Resistance–Response–Change

Paul Nicolas Cormier

The structures of Canadian society harbour violence towards Indigenous peoples, and although these structures have been consistently challenged, those points of resistance have never resulted in justice. In fact, it seems the result has been a systemic reaction in which colonial powers become increasingly entrenched in their powerful positions of ontological privilege. This paper will introduce "The Law of Resistance–Response–Change" in Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS), proposing three propositions to consider when identifying the etiology of Indigenous conflicts. This paper proposes that all British colonies demonstrate this pattern of engagement and that this pattern must be dissected in order to move towards peace for Indigenous peoples.

Indigenous peoples in British colonial countries like Canada grow up under foreign societal structures and cultural norms.[1] Components of a larger colonial project, these structures have become a normalized aspect of the Canadian fabric and include such well-known systems as the legal system, child welfare system, the education system, religion, health, resource management, and post-secondary education including graduate studies. Canadians often forget that Indigenous peoples "have become part of a political system based not on their own legal traditions but created and defined by Eurocentric traditions."[2] Consequently, the colonization of Indigenous/Aboriginal peoples in Canada and abroad has never ended;[3] assimilation into the State remains the ultimate objective.[4]

In contemporary times Canada has seen an escalation in the number of open conflicts between Indigenous groups and the various levels of government. Seemingly resource based, these conflicts find their origin in a failing colonial project that continues to have as its ultimate goal, the elimination of Indigenous populations to access lands for resource exploitation. Although the majority of these conflicts seldom lead to open violence and may therefore be described as peaceful, some have escalated beyond the typical thresholds of protest. When these conflicts are investigated further, we discover that "Aboriginal peoples will often resort to physical action to prevent others from unjustly assuming rights to access and control their ancient lands, and the Crown will often respond with a show of force."[5] The structures of Canadian society harbour violence towards Indigenous peoples and, although these structures have been consistently challenged by First Nations, those points of resistance have apparently never resulted in any type of justice for Native peoples or "generally resulted in the transfer of land to Aboriginal peoples."[6] In fact, it seems the result has been a systemic reaction in which colonial powers become increasingly entrenched in their powerful positions of ontological privilege. This necessitates the questions: how do human systems become violent? What are the patterns of engagement in British colonial contexts that can help researchers in Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS) understand the contemporary colonial patterns of violence around the globe? How do these patterns result in systemic violence towards international Indigenous communities?

This paper introduces what I call "The Law of Resistance–Response–Change" in PACS as a theoretical framework for the study of conflict etiology in Indigenous contexts using the post-colonial Indigenous peoples in Canada as the frame for discussion. "Post-colonial" in this discussion "emerges from the inability of Eurocentric theory to deal with the complexities of colonialism and its assumptions. Post-colonial Indigenous thought is based on our pain and our experiences, and it refuses to allow others to appropriate this pain and these experiences. It rejects the use of any Eurocentric theory or its categories."[7] Thus, I attempt to frame the discussion from an Indigenous point of view.

A Canadian Indigenous worldview teaches us that there are patterns and cycles to the natural world and despite European colonists elevating themselves to be above other species on our planet, the interconnections argued as integral to an Indigenous worldview suggest humans are as much

a part of the world ecosystem as any other organism. If we assume this to be true, then relational dynamics of the natural world may provide lessons for historical patterns of British colonialism around the globe which I will argue mirror contemporary patterns of conflict. By identifying colonial patterns of resistance, response, change, I suggest three propositions to consider when discussing the etiology of Indigenous conflicts. These are:

Proposition 1: In colonial contexts, Indigenous populations will ALWAYS resist the imposition of foreign structures to their ways of life. The critical points of resistance will occur at the interface of the colonizer/colonized relationship.

Proposition 2: Resistance of any kind, will ALWAYS result in a response from colonial powers. The response will occur at the point of interface using colonial tools and be at least proportional to the degree of resistance.

Proposition 3: The response will ALWAYS result in change. The rate and direction of change will determine the degree of systemic learning and whether the change results in further entrenchment of violence.

If we assume all British colonies demonstrate this pattern of engagement, then it is this pattern that must be deconstructed in order to return from a culture of violence to a culture of peace for Indigenous peoples. I first explain who Indigenous peoples are by presenting a global view of the population emphasizing the connection between Indigenous peoples, colonization, and land. Strategically, land has always been the objective of the colonizer. Thus, it acts as a critical interface between Indigenous peoples and British colonialism that characterizes the conflicting relationship.

Second, I explain strategic theory and systems thinking as a frame for considering land acquisition and exploitation in colonial contexts. Understanding the relationship between the various components of the international system provides researchers the opportunity to consider learning between various levels of organization and how British colonies learn from each other. Strategic theory assists in identifying the point of focus for researchers. If we assume land acquisition and exploitation is the focus of colonialism, the historical record around this subject will suggest relational patterns. This critical interface demonstrates the pattern of Resistance–Response–Change.

Third, I discuss the relationship between resistance, nonviolent action, and change in Aboriginal contexts. I propose that Indigenous peoples have

always used non-violent resistance to resist the imposition of colonialism. I then provide examples of how the pattern of engagement manifests itself in the historical and contemporary record of the relationship between the British colonial government of Canada and Aboriginal peoples.

Finally, I conclude with some suggestions for considering the relationship between Indigenous peoples and British colonial governments around the globe.

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES, COLONIZATION, AND LAND

James Henderson indicates that Indigenous Peoples number about 370 million and are about five percent of the total world population. They embody 80 per cent of the world's cultural diversity, occupy 20 percent of the land surface, and are stewards of 80 percent of the world's biodiversity. They represent over 5,000 languages and cultures in more than 70 nation-states on six continents. Approximately 15 percent of the world's undisputed Indigenous Peoples live in the Americas. In some nation-states Indigenous Peoples are the majority and control the state, whereas in others they are a majority but have been historically deprived of the freedom and resources to govern themselves. Perhaps 75 percent of the peoples in South and Southeast Asia and China are Indigenous.[8]

It has been suggested that most Africans consider themselves Indigenous People who have achieved decolonization and self-determination. Yet many relatively small, nomadic herding and hunter/gatherer societies have been displaced by ethnically unrelated African peoples who have been their neighbours for a millennium or longer. Some authors have suggested that this is the result of state building after colonial governments have departed. "State building almost everywhere in the third world has meant policies aimed at assimilating national and minority peoples, restraining their historical autonomy, and extracting their resources, revenues, and labour for the use of the state."[9] Similarly, in South and Southeast Asia and China, despite the assertion that 75 percent of their population may be Indigenous, their status is disputed by the Nation-States in which they live. In Central and Western Asia many states contain culturally and linguistically related tribal and non-tribal peoples and India defines all members of particular ethnic and linguistic groups as tribal, regardless of where and how they live. By this standard, one-fifth of India's total population is Indigenous.[10]

In Canada, Aboriginal people are typically accepted as Indigenous.

There are three Aboriginal groups defined by the Canadian Constitution Act 1982: "Indians, Inuit, and Metis."[11] The term "Indian" used in the Canadian Constitution is found offensive by many contemporary Indigenous people—a relic of a historic colonial government that still exists today. The term is so pervasive in Canadian legislation and Indigenous lives that Indian has taken on a variety of meanings including people the government recognizes as having Indian status—people who live or were born on a reserve, have an identifiable band, and are recognized under the Indian Act as First Nations—and non-status Indians who are not recognized by the government because their parents or ancestors lost their Indian status.[12]

Indigenous peoples are traditional people, with attachments to land, cultures, and ways of life that have survived since time immemorial. In contemporary terms they are descendants of the original inhabitants of a territory that was conquered or is still at war and is now occupied by an alien and dominant culture. They have a unique way of viewing the world that is embedded in their traditions and language. This worldview includes a custodial and non-materialistic attitude to the land and natural resources.[13] Most significantly, if the cultural group disappears, they cease to exist—their language and therefore, ways of life, become extinct. "All attempts to define the concept recognize the linkages between people, land, and culture, and they are always formulated in the broader context of international efforts to ensure Indigenous Peoples' status and rights."[14] Despite international declarations and covenants that guarantee the fundamental rights of all human beings, nation-states view Indigenous Peoples as non-peoples, not entitled to the same rights as others.

Native Studies scholar Peter Kulchyski argued that "the people who belong to what have been variously described as gatherer/hunter, primitive, paleolithic, nomadic, foraging or band, societies are engaged in a life and death struggle against dominant, late capitalist Western civilization;"[15] this legacy reinforces the thought that native peoples are vanishing and that the conquest of Native lands is justified.[16] Colonialism is alive and well strengthened by the illusion that colonization is no longer practised. Even where the colonizers have withdrawn, political colonization persists.[17] In the context of Canadian society it is difficult to grasp how intense the European effort to destroy Indigenous Nations has been. Some authors, such as Taiaike Alfred, argue that the ongoing national crisis in our communities is a continuing effort of the state's persistent intent to "maintain the colonial oppression of

the First Nations of this land."[18] Eugene Levy suggests colonial wars were to maintain and expand worldwide empires; thus it is reasonable to suggest linkages between historic colonial objectives and neo-colonialism around the globe.[19] I propose there are patterns to relationships. If we deconstruct those patterns, can we identify the roots of the violent relationships between British colonial countries and the resident Indigenous populations? If we consider that the "overwhelming majority of conflicts since the end of World War II have been located in the postcolonial countries that constitute the Third World,"[20] then we must assume there is a relationship between colonialism, Indigenous peoples, and contemporary conflicts in the world. This brief discussion on Indigenous peoples and colonialism proposes a critical interface in the destructive relationship—land.

STRATEGY AND SYSTEMS THINKING: DECONSTRUCTING THE PATTERN OF ENGAGEMENT

This paper is concerned with identifying patterns of British colonialism and its effects on Indigenous populations by showing how colonial structures may learn to become violent. This begins through deconstructing the pattern of engagement by first identifying the primary focus of the colonizer/colonized relationship in Indigenous contexts which I propose is land, and then moving towards an understanding of the international system through Indigenous eyes.

Strategy and Land Acquisition

Building on the work of Carl von Clausewitz,[21] in the book *"The Strategy of non-Violent Defense : A Ghandian Approach,"* Robert Burrowes suggests that strategic theory has three functions: (1) explaining the nature and causes of conflict in the international system and in a particular situation; (2) identifying the appropriate aims for dealing with a particular conflict and guiding the formulation of a strategy to achieve those aims; and, (3) within the context of this strategy, providing a framework for tactical guidance. The author continues to summarize the main elements of strategic theory as described by Clausewitz: "the relationship between politics and war, the principle of polarity and the element of friction, the principle of superiority of defense over the offense, and the concept of the centre of gravity."[22]

Critical in devising strategy is identifying the enemies' "centre of gravity"—their sources of power—and, if possible, to trace them back to a single

element. "By analyzing the dominant characteristics of both belligerents it is possible to detect the centre of gravity; the hub of all power and movement on which everything depends...Just as it is necessary to identify and attack the opponent's centre of gravity" writes Burrowes, "it is also necessary for the defense to concentrate resources in support of its own."[23]

> The defense, by choosing its centre of gravity, also chooses where, what, and how (that is, with what weapons) it should be attacked. Properly used this is an immense advantage. The centre of gravity must be correctly identified by the opponent in order for there to be a direct attack upon it, and it will determine which weapons can be used and which ones are useless.[24]

By considering land as the centre of gravity between Canada and resident Indigenous peoples, it is possible to identify where to attack the opponent, concentrate resources in defense, and choose what and how it should be attacked. Conversely, considering land as the centre of gravity in British colonial/Indigenous contexts, it is possible to identify violent patterns of engagement by determining where the opponents attacked, where they concentrated resources, and what and how they attack. Land has always been the primary focus of the colonizer. Thus, land use, acquisition, and management become the point of interface between Indigenous peoples and the British Crown.

For the colonizer, land was required for economic exploitation and development. For Indigenous peoples land is argued as the basis of their identity. Naomi Adelson suggests that "the politics of the land are mediated through the landscape of the body."[25] In her discussion on the Cree concept of health, she asserts that, "from a Cree perspective, health has as much to do with social relations, land, and cultural identity as it does with individual physiology."[26] Thus, "a sense of health has everything to do with connections to the land and to a rich and complex past."[27]

Systemic Consideration and the British Colonial Model
To understand systems thinking, it is useful to think of the analogy of a web, each part influencing and connected to many others.[28] Altering one part means altering the whole. In order to understand the health of the whole, one must understand the individual components and how they function in relation to one another. It requires the consideration of connections not just among people, but also between people and nature, and the idea that

the health of the whole is maintained by attention to the physical, psychological, and physiological.[29] Systems thinking includes similarities with an Indigenous worldview including an emphasis on the relationship between variables, connection between the four parts that make an individual (physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual), connection beyond the individual (to family, community, nation, country, the world), the dynamic or ever changing nature of systems, considering patterns or cycles in analysis, and most critically for this discussion, considering variables within their environment (land).

Systemic understanding depends as much on how the parts are connected—their collective interaction—as it does in understanding individual parts.[30] When taking a systems approach, you begin by identifying individual parts and then seek to understand the collective interaction of those parts.[31] Fritjof Capra suggested that systems are "an integrated whole whose essential properties arise from the relationships between its parts, the understanding of a phenomenon within the context of a larger whole."[32] Many authors have discussed systems and the importance of considering systems thinking in analyzing conflicts.[33] All these models suggest systemic organization for considering conflict and the complexity inherent in complex conflict systems.

These discussions and others, beginning with Kenneth Waltz's three images of war[34] and moving towards more contemporary examples,[35] reflect an approach to international diplomacy in PACS that is useful in understanding complex international problems requiring analysis of multiple levels and factors allowing us to not only consider individual levels of the global system, but the relationship between levels.

Discussing British colonialism necessitates consideration for the organizational structures of the present world system because the world system in which Indigenous peoples are forced to participate is dominated by the colonial structures of European society. These are the structures that harbour ontological and cognitive violence towards Indigenous peoples. Thus, these structures must be analyzed, deconstructed, and reformulated to create processes that build cultures of peace for Aboriginal peoples.

There is organization to the world system and the British Commonwealth. Decision making flows from the top down and is often coordinated. Information is shared between the various levels and components of the system. This structure is purposely designed for the sharing and coordination

of information. Thus, it becomes a system of learning between levels of the international system.

Strategic Intent, Violence, and the British Colonial System
In contemporary society violence has established a ubiquitous nature. Violence and conflict are generally accepted as synonymous and have been thought of in two ways: *direct conflict* occurring over clearly articulated values between conscious, strategy-planning actors and *structural conflict* occurring between parties over interests embedded in social structure—parties that do not even, in a sense, know what is going on.[36] Another way to view these two types of violence is in terms of Johan Galtung's discussion on positive and negative peace: "Just as a coin has two sides, one side alone being only one aspect of the coin, not the complete coin, peace also has two sides: *absence of personal violence, and absence of structural violence*. We shall refer to them as *negative peace* and *positive peace* respectively."[37]

There are a number of historical examples of direct conflict or personal violence between Indigenious Peoples and the Canadian nation-state most notably: the Riel Rebellion of 1885,[38] the genocide of the Beothuk,[39] and contemporary examples of Oka,[40] and events following the Supreme Court of Canada "Marshall Decision" where Donald Marshall Jr. was acquitted on September 17, 1999 of three charges relating to federal fishing regulations—selling eels without a license, fishing out of season, and using illegal nets.[41] The initial Marshall decision resulted in violence between native and non-native fisherman. Other examples include Ipperwash where protester Dudley George was shot and killed,[42] and the more recent Caledonia crisis[43] to name a few more. When these conflicts are investigated closely, they all contain conscious planning and clearly articulated values. These values reflect a need or desire for land, and although Indigenous groups consciously resisted, Canada maintains coercive power and continues to use that coercive power to further its strategic objectives.

Structural violence is far more difficult to identify due to the fact that the parties may not even know what is going on. For example, Paul Nadasdy discusses co-management of natural resources and land claims in the Southwest Yukon between the state and Yukon First Nations. He concludes that, since the problems are located in the very structure of institutionalized wildlife management and land claim negotiations and the assumptions underlying them, changes in policy are unlikely to be effective. "Solutions

to such problems require radical rethinking and restructuring of Aboriginal-state relations."[44] Similarly, Hugh Shewell argues that institutional power arrangements are the reason for the problem of Indian welfare dependence: "Thus, the problem of Indian welfare dependence was and is purely a construction of the dominant state, defined and measured within its lexicon and dealt with through the discourse of its institutional power arrangements."[45]

In the case of Indigenous peoples in Canada, by analyzing the intellectual battlegrounds of the legal system with particular attention to land access and ownership, one can identify patterns of resistance—response—change that characterize the ongoing conflict between Indigenous Peoples and the Canadian colonial government. Beginning with "Section 91, Subsection 24, of the British North American Act 1867 that gave the government exclusive jurisdiction over Indians and Indian Land,"[46] Indigenous peoples have consistently resisted colonialism and continue to fight for their lands. They have achieved this through nonviolent action.

Resistance, Nonviolent Action, and Change

I contend that Aboriginal people who reside in Canada have consistently resisted colonialism over the decades through nonviolent action. This resistance has been enough to regulate the pressure of colonialism acting as a safety valve that provides periodic release of tension that would otherwise have resulted in direct violence and destructive civil war. The history of failed policies purposely designed to assimilate Indian people[47] have provided the grounds for oppression and violence but also provided the opportunity for learning through active resistance. As June Anonson and her co-authors[48] explain, Indigenous peoples, on average, face poverty and disparity more than any other population group in Canada. However, Canada has never been faced with open civil war between the Indigenous peoples and the colonial second nations of Canada because nonviolent action has been used as a means for achieving psychological, social, and political equality for centuries by indigenous peoples.

Gene Sharp describes nonviolent resistance as a process in which the seemingly powerless can achieve some level of influence. This is based on the assumption that "the power of rulers and of hierarchical systems, no matter how dictatorial, depends directly on the obedience and cooperation of the population."[49] Withdrawing consent, cooperation, and submission allows a challenge to the system to weaken the opponent's sources of power.

According to Sharp, there are 198 methods of nonviolent action classified into three subgroups: *protest and persuasion*, "mainly symbolic acts of peaceful opposition or attempted persuasion;"[50] *noncooperation*, "the deliberate withdrawal of some form or degree of existing cooperation with the opponents or the resisters refuse to initiate certain forms of new cooperation;"[51] and *nonviolent intervention*, including negative or positive interventions which may disrupt, destroy, or established behaviour patterns, policies, relationships, or institutions.[52]

Kulchyski suggests that Native people in Canada have resisted totalization with a good measure of success for a long time—the totalizing force being capitalism that "ultimately attacks all social forms that impede its progress and oppose or do not accord with its order."[53] In response Native resistance has taken the form:

> Of constructing enclaves of culture within the established order, of finding space in the interstices of power, of controlling the pace and nature of links with the dominant social organization and culture, of adapting Western technology to precapitalist social relations, of taking the tools of the State and capital and using them to strengthen rather than destroy primitive culture.[54]

These types of cultural enclaves exist in the form of intellectual battlefields where "word warriors" who listen to their "Indigenous Philosophers" while engaging the intellectual and political practices, resist the hostility of the dominant intellectual culture[55] and at land claim or resource co-management tables where First Nations choose not to participate or work with non-Aboriginal academics[56] and/or to physically protest through blockades or occupation.[57]

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

My intent in this short discussion is to provide enough examples and context so readers may see the connection between oppression, colonialism, and the resulting violence, and to elucidate the ongoing conflict between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian nation-state making a clear connection between acts of resistance (which I equate as a direct result of oppression), response, and the resulting change. In order to be liberated from oppression, resistance must be present at least in equal force to the oppressor. It is the force of resistance that identifies the need for change. If strong resistance is not present, then as in the case of the Beothuks, the resulting violence can lead

to genocide.

Evidence provided for this paper indicates clear historical examples of direct conflict and personal violence between the two actors. However, violence is seldom used in colonial contexts by Indigenous peoples and, I assert, has seldom been coordinated beyond localized communities. Clearly Indigenous peoples and colonial governments are in conflict. However, the methods they use to fight differ greatly. If we consider nonviolent resistance as fighting, then I assert that Indigenous people have always fought and continue to fight colonialism.

To illustrate, Shewell provides a historical account of Indian welfare in Canada from 1873-1965. Broadly categorizing this era into three categories—initial period of subjugation, transition period to citizenship; and, the emergence of Indian welfare bureaucracy—he concludes "To achieve domination, the state needed to define First Nations in terms relative to its superior position and ascribe this definition to them in such a way that both they and the state accepted it as truth about their subordinate position."[58] Although focussed on explaining the institutionalized racism and colonial mentality within the Indian welfare system, it also demonstrates how, through nonviolent resistance, Indigenous peoples learned to organize and fight within the confines of the totalizing Canadian colonial state. Similarly, Robin Brownlie explains how Indian agents through the use of the Indian Act, "gave department control, particularly over Aboriginal resources and political affairs, and it also placed First Nations people under legal disabilities that restricted their economic options."[59] Brownlie's book provides many stories of resistance to the constant changes of the Indian Act and the resulting further subjugation of Indigenous peoples. It seems that whenever Indigenous peoples tried to organize politically, the result was another amendment to the law that governed their lives.

The reality of contemporary society is that we live in a world that values education, economics, and progress. Often times, these values seem to be in direct conflict with traditional views on health, peace, and balance. Thus, every time we step out of our traditional worlds and into modern times, or vice versa, there is a certain amount of disequilibrium. There are times when we are unaware of the effects colonialism played and continues to play in the way we believe in ourselves and in our people. Inherent in this experience is a certain amount of cognitive imperialism that Marie Battiste defined as "the imposition of one worldview on a people who have an alternative

worldview, with the implication that the imposed worldview is superior to the alternative worldview."[60]

Land is the essence of the Indigenous world. It is the foundation of our governance systems and cultural ceremonies, and connects us to the spirit world.[61] It is part of who we are.[62] It is intimately linked to our health[63] and attachment to traditional lands through ceremony and rights of passage is critical in the healthy development of Indigenous identity.[64] Thus, continued access to traditional lands is the only way we can move towards peaceful coexistence. Unfortunately, accessing land and exploiting natural resources is the reason why the second nations of Canada came to this land.[65] As one senior bureaucrat in the Department of Indian Affairs said in 1947, "It is perhaps well that we should have thorough understanding of these before we undertake a program aimed at the legitimate exploitation of the resources to which the Indian claims ownership."[66]

Continued access to lands and natural resources by colonial governments remains the single biggest driver in conflicts throughout the world. Ted Robert Gurr suggests that Indigenous peoples have been most adversely affected by the worldwide impetus to industrialize and exploit underutilized human and natural resources and their reactions have been especially sharp in response to the alienation of the lands, forests, and natural resources on which they are culturally as well as materially dependent.[67] Strategically, land access and ownership is clearly the centre of gravity in the war between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian nation-state. As resource scarcity increases around the world, the value of land and by extension natural resources will increase.

As evidenced by the pattern of resistance—response—change, nonviolent resistance demonstrates the processes by which the oppressive Canadian nation-state has systematically weakened and/or destroyed independent Aboriginal institutions to ensure lack of coordination and strategic planning. This has positioned Aboriginal people in a state of persistent vulnerability. As Sharp explains:

> Oppressive regimes already in existence commonly seek to destroy the independence of social, economic, and political institutions outside the control of the state or party. Weakened or destroyed independent institutions make societal resistance very difficult to conduct. The strength or weakness of such institutions is important in planning strategy for nonviolent

struggle. Social groups or institutions can be organized bases for waging nonviolent struggle.[68]

Charles King suggests that "Even relatively weak organizations can turn the very fact of their organizational structure into an important mobilization tool."[69] The irony of this oppression and violence is that it has increased resiliency among Indigenous peoples in Canada by teaching them how to resist. As suggested, the centre of gravity within the conflict is land. However, land by itself cannot provide the strategic leverage necessary to illicit a national response. Elise Boulding appropriately summarized the present and ever growing challenge between nation-states and colonized Indigenous peoples: "Since mutual respect based on mutual listening and learning is a precondition of peaceable relations between peoples, the failure of the colonizing West to respect the lands and peoples colonized is perhaps the single greatest obstacle to future peaceful cooperation."[70] Alfred echoes this sentiment by suggesting that, "resolution involves dialogue, explanation, and repair of the fabric of the particular relationship—that is, healing."[71] However, this cannot be achieved without first challenging the violence of historical and contemporary colonialism.[72]

The lesson for international peace builders is that solutions must come from within. "External intervention, even when undertaken with the best of intentions—and usually it is not—has the distinct potential to lead to state disintegration or state failure with highly negative consequences for both domestic and international order."[73] Similar to the Indigenous worldview that accepts change as constant[74] and the cyclical nature of Indigenous thinking,[75] violence, war, and resistance have a life cycle independent of other forms of social mobilization.[76] In identifying instances of peaceful resistance and their location in the structures of society, one can begin to predict the following response and facilitate strategic change in instances of structural violence. Alfred suggests that "There is no hope – or sense – in attacking the state with physical force, or in seeking peace by unpeaceful means. The goals that flow from our traditions demand an approach based on undermining the intellectual and moral foundations of colonialism and exposing the internal contradictions of states and societies that promise justice and practice oppression."[77]

CONCLUSION: RESISTANCE, RESPONSE, CHANGE

First Nations peoples of Canada continue to be engaged in a British colonial relationship based on what legal scholar James Youngblood Henderson described as violence towards Indigenous others, cruelty, destruction, and genocide in Europe and the discovered lands.[78] Protracted, structural, multi-layered, and incredibly complex, the relationship has resulted in periodic open conflict and death. Although the national and international narrative of peaceful settlement dominates both historical and contemporary propaganda related to Indigenous relations in the country, the reality is that it continues to be one of violence. This assertion is clearly evidenced in the many studies and statistics that seem ubiquitous when discussing Indigenous lives and the growing body of literature presenting the case for genocide against Indigenous peoples in North America and Canada.[79]

Understanding how this violence towards Indigenous others transformed from one of cooperation, to what Johan Galtung[80] defines as cultural violence is critical to understand. The British legal system, like the others mentioned above imported to Canada with colonial powers, has consistently been used as a tool for the subjugation of Indigenous peoples and is a clear example of how societal structures transform to one of cultural violence. I would suggest it is also a system that binds British colonial countries around the world and that tools of the British colonial model were tested and perfected before being exported to other countries like Canada. Ironically, it has also been the societal structure that often evokes the greatest resistance in the context of colonialism in Canada, Indigenous rights, and equality. The contemporary Canadian legal system based on British common law, has become a flashpoint for the contestation of Indigenous rights and, by extension, the assertion of Indigenous law because it is where issues related to land are contested.

Colonial governments continue to use their positions of power to purposefully refine their colonial tools. Each experience of resistance in the relationship allows experimentation and that experience provides learning. As in the case of the Maori in New Zealand, "The common perception in the United Nations is that the New Zealand government has established Kohanga Reo and Kaupapa Maori as alternative systems of schooling for 'nice natives.' This is not the case. Our gains have come out of intense struggle. The process of struggle has also educated us a lot."[81]

There are patterns to relationships. For the Indigenous Canadian

colonial relationship, that pattern starts with land, is constrained within the complexity of international organization, facilitated by resistance, and continues to evolve as a learning process. Are these patterns any different than the patterns of contemporary exportation of western values and systems to non-western countries?

ENDNOTES

1. Paul Nicolas Cormier, *Kinoo'amaadawaad Megwaa Doodamawaad – They Are Learning With Each Other While They Are Doing: An Indigenous Living Peace Analysis Framework* (Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba, 2017).

2. James Youngblood Henderson, *Indigenous Diplomacy and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Achieving UN Recognition* (Saskatoon, SK : Purich Publishing Ltd, 2008), 28.

3. There are many authors who argue that the colonization of Aboriginal peoples in Canada has never ended. These are just a few examples. Taiaiake Alfred, *Peace, Power, Righteousness* (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 1999); Graham Hingangaroa Smith, "Protecting and Respecting Indigenous Knowledge,*"* in *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision*, ed. Marie Battiste (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2009), 3-8.

4. Peter Kulchyski, *The Red Indians: An Episodic, Informal Collection of Tales From the History of Aboriginal People's Struggles in Canada* (Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2007).

5. John Burrows, *Crown and Aboriginal Occupations of Land: A History and Comparison.* https://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/inquiries /ipperwash/policy_part/research/pdf/History_of_Occupations _Borrows.pdf, 2005, 19.

6. Burrows, "*Crown and Aboriginal*," 22.

7. Marie Battiste, "Introduction: Unfolding the Lessons of Colonization," in *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision,* ed. Marie Battiste (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2009), xvi-xxx, xix.

8. Henderson, "*Indigenous Diplomacy*," 46-47.

9. Ted Robert Gurr, "Minorities, Nationalists, and Islamists,*"* in *Leashing the Dogs of War,* ed. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and

Pamela Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007), 553-582, 135.

10. Henderson, "*Indigenous Diplomacy*," 47.

11. Shin Imai, Katharine Logan, and Gary Stein, *Aboriginal Law Handbook* (Scarborough ON: Carswell – Thomson   Professional Publishing, 1993), 5.

12. Wayne Warry, *Ending Denial: Understanding Aboriginal Issues* (Toronto ON: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 9.

13. Robert J. Burrowes, *The Strategy of Nonviolent Defense: A Gandhian Approach* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1996), 138.

14. Henderson, "*Indigenous Diplomacy*," 46.

15. Peter Kulchyski, (1992). "Totalization and Resistance in Native Canadian Politics," *Cultural Critique* 21, (2005):171-195, 173.

16. Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005).

17. Hingangaroa Smith, "Protecting and Respecting," 215.

18. Alfred, "Peace, Power," 25.

19. Jack S. Levy, "International Sources of Interstate and Intrastate War," in *Leashing the Dogs of War,* ed. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007), 17-38, 18.

20. Mohammad Ayoob, "State Making, State Breaking, and State Failure," in *Leashing the Dogs of War,* ed. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007), 95-114, 95.

21. Carl Van Clausewitz was a military strategist whose work has been a primary source of ideas in military conquest. His famous book *On War* was published in 1832.

22. Burrowes, "*The Strategy of*," 14.

23. Burrowes, "*The Strategy of*," 16.

24. Burrowes, "*The Strategy of*," 17.

25. Naomi Adelson, *Being Alive Well: Health and the Politics of Cree*

Well-Being (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 113.

26. Adelson, "*Being Alive Well*," 3.

27. Adelson, "*Being Alive Well*," 25.

28. Fritjof Capra, *The Web of life* (New York, NY: Anchor Books, 1996), 36-37.

29. Ervin Laszlo, *The Systems View of the World: A Holistic Vision for our Time* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press Inc, 1996).

30. Joseph O'Conner and Ian McDermott, *The Art of Systems Thinking: Essential Skills for Creativity and Problem Solving* (Hammersmith, London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1997).

31. Wendell L. French and Cecil H. Bell Jr., *Organizational Development: Behavioural Science Interventions for Organization Improvement. 5th ed.* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995), 89.

32. Capra, "*The Web of Life*," 27.

33. Louis Kriesberg, *Constructive Conflicts: From Escalation to Resolution* (New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc, 1998); Dugan, 1996 as cited in John Paul Lederach, *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997).

34. Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1959). Waltz's framework classifies the causes of war in terms of three levels: 1. *The individual*: Focusing primarily on human nature and predispositions toward aggression and on individual political leaders and their belief systems, personalities, and psychological processes; 2. *The nation state*: Includes government variables like the structure of the political system and the nature of the policy making process. And, societal factors like the structure of the economic system, the role of public opinion, economic and neo-economic interest groups, ethnicity and nationalism, and political culture and ideology; 3. *The international system*: Includes the anarchic structure of the international system, the number of major powers in the system, the distribution of military power among them, patterns of military alliances and international trade, system wide norms influencing their behaviour, and other factors that constitute

the external environment common to all states.

35. Sean Byrne and Nadan, "The Social Cube Analytical Model and Protracted Ethnopolitical Conflicts," *Critical Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies* ed. Thomas Matyok, Jessica Senehi, and Sean Byrne (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education, 2011), 199-215; Diana Chigas, "Capacities and Limits of NGOs as Conflict Managers," in *Leashing the Dogs of War,* ed. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007), 553-582; Louise Diamond, and John Mcdonald, *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace* (Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press Inc, 1996); Lederach, "*Building Peace.*"

36. Burrowes, "*The Strategy of,*" 67.

37. Johan Galtung, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research*, 6, (1969):167-191, 183.

38. Kulchyski, "*The Red Indians,*" 82-86.

39. James Patrick Howley, *The Beothuks or Red Indians: The Aboriginal Inhabitants of Newfoundland* (Toronto, ON: Coles Publishing Company Limited, 1915).

40. Leanne Simpson and Kiera Ladner, *This is an honour song: Twenty Years since the Blockade. An anthology of writing on the "Oka Crisis,"* ed. Leanne Simpson and Kiera Ladner (Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2010).

41. Supreme Court of Canada (2006). R. Vs. Marshall. https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100028614/1100100028615; Burrows, "Crown and Aboriginal," 51-53.

42. Borrows, "Crown and Aboriginal." This document is research conducted for the Ipperwash Inquiry.

43. CBC News. (2006, April 21). Trains Halted as Standoff Continues in Caldenoia. *CBC News.* http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/trains-halted-as-standoff-continues-in-caledonia-1.607999

44. Paul Nadasdy, *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge, and Aboriginal State Relations in the Southwest Yukon* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2003), 268.

45. Hugh Shewell, *Enough to Keep Them Alive: Indian Welfare in Canada, 1873 – 1965* (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 338.

46. John L. Tobias, "Protection, Civilization, Assimilation: An Outline History of Canada's Indian Policy," in *As Long as the Sun Shines and the Water Flows: A Reader in Canadian Native Studies,* ed. Ian L. Getty and Antoine Lussier (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 1983),119.

47. Wayne Warry, *Ending Denial: Understanding Aboriginal Issues* (Toronto ON: Toronto University Press, 2007), 33-53.

48. June Anonson, Joyce Desjarlais, Jackie Nixon, Lori Whiteman, and Alteta Bird, "Strategies to Support Recruitment and Retention of First Nations Youth in Baccalaureate Nursing Programs in Saskatchewan, Canada," *The Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 19(3)* (2008): 274-283, 274.

49. Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential* (Boston, MA: Porter Sargent Publishers Inc., 2005), 39.

50. Sharp, "*Waging Nonviolent Struggle*," 51.

51. Sharp, "*Waging Nonviolent Struggle*," 54.

52. Sharp, "*Waging Nonviolent Struggle*," 64.

53. Kulchyski, "Totalization and Resistance," 174.

54. Kulchyski, "Totalization and Resistance," 177-178.

55. Dale Turner, *This is Not a Peace Pipe: Towards Critical Indigenous Philosophy* (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2006).

56. Nadasdy, "*Hunter and Bureaucrats.*"

57. Burrows, "*Crown and Aboriginal.*"

58. Shewell, "*Enough to Keep,*" 338.

59. Robin Brownlie, *A Fatherly Eye: Indian Agents, Government Power, and Aboriginal Resistance in Ontario, 1918-1939* (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2003), 150.

60. Marie Battiste, "Maintaining Aboriginal Identity, Language, and Culture in Modern Society," in *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision* ed. Marie Battiste (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2009), 193-208,

192-193.

61. Eugene Richard Atleo, *A Nuu-chah-nulth Worldview: Tswalk* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2004). This book describes the connection between land, ceremony, and Indigenous ways of life.

62. Nadasdy, "*Hunter and Bureaucrats*," 108.

63. Adelson, "*Being Alive Well*," 9.

64. Estelle Simard, "Culturally Restorative Child Welfare Practice – A Special Emphasis on Cultural Attachment Theory," *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, 4, (2) (2009): 44-61.

65. Tobias, "Protection, Civilization,"; Brownlie, "*A Fatherly Eye*," 3; Shewell, "*Enough to Keep*," 8-9.

66. Shewell, "*Enough to Keep*," 210.

67. Ted Robert Gurr, "Minorities, Nationalists," 135.

68. Sharp, "*Waging Nonviolent Struggle*," 477.

69. Charles King, "Power, Social Violence, and Civil Wars," in *Leashing the Dogs of War,* ed. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007), 115-130, 118.

70. Elise Boulding, *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000), 194.

71. Alfred, "*Peace, Power*," 67.

72. Smith, "*Conquest: Sexual Violence.*"

73. Mohammad Ayoob, "State Making, State," 112.

74. Judie Bopp, Michael Bopp, Lee Brown, and Phil Lane, *The Sacred Tree: Reflections on Native American Spirituality. 3rd ed.* (Twin Lakes WI: Lotus Light Publications, 1989)

75. Turner, "This is Not," 101; Sean Wilson, *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2008).

76. King, "Power, Social Violence."

77. Alfred, "*Peace, Power*," 180.

78. Henderson, "*Indigenous Diplomacy*," 15.

79. Andrew Woolford, Jeff Benvenuto, and Alexander Laban Hinton, *Colonial Genocide in Indigenous North America* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014); Ward Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to Present* (San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books, 1997); Smith, "Conquest: Sexual Violence,"; Howley, "The Beothuks."

80. Johan Galtung, "Cultural Violence," *Journal of Peace Research,* 27(3) (1990): 291-305.

81. Hingangaroa Smith, "Protecting and Respecting," 224.