Title

Outsiders in Their Homeland: Discursive Construction of Aboriginal Women and Citizenship

Authors

Fiske, Jo-Anne
Belanger, Yale
Gregory, David

Peer reviewed

Outsiders in Their Homeland: Discursive Construction of Aboriginal Women and Citizenship

JO-ANNE FISKE, YALE D. BELANGER, AND DAVID GREGORY

Confrontations between urban neighborhoods and activist organizations seeking affordable housing and shelter for the homeless are attracting the increased attention of academics and policy makers. Perceived as a problem to be resolved, and constituted as a "syndrome," the social phenomenon "not in my backyard" (NIMBY) is positioned as a response to alleged social and economic threats associated with the siting of undesired facilities within a neighborhood or community. NIMBY resistance emerges in response to the perceived negative social character of nonmarket housing residents and fears that their presence will lead to devaluation of private property and disruption of community harmony and safety. Studies commissioned by governments and public agencies seek to understand the foundations of these positions, provide counterarguments, and overcome community resistance to proposed development. To this end, studies have led to the development of a plethora of guidebooks, videos, and Web sites for community activists, municipal governments, and developers promoting nonmarket housing and other social facilities that established communities resist.[1] Strategies to overcome NIMBYism range from consultation processes to creating equity insurance in order to protect home owners from declining house values.[2] At the same time, scholars have probed the social interactions underlying NIMBY confrontations, conducted critical ethnographies, and interrogated discourses that frame NIMBY political actions.[3] Their work reveals the complexity of NIMBY conflicts; what appear on the surface to be simple ethical or moral dichotomies emerge as contrary, often paradoxical, struggles engaging community members in debates as to who constitute worthy citizens, on whose terms, and whose interests should be protected against perceived threats.

Jo-Anne Fiske is a professor of women's studies and the dean of the School of Graduate Studies at the University of Lethbridge in Alberta, Canada. Yale D. Belanger is an associate professor of Native American studies at the University of Lethbridge. David Gregory is a professor in the faculty of health sciences at the University of Lethbridge.

Studies conducted in the United States indicate socioeconomic differences in the community resistance to nonmarket housing and social service facilities. Randy Martin and David Myers found that the most affluent are most likely to resist developments leading to mixed socioeconomic neighborhoods.[4] They suggest that racial prejudices may make changing views more difficult. Lois Takahashi, however, suggests that it is the perception of threat to home values and social harmony that compels communities to protest the presence of the poor and homeless, and she finds evidence of low-income neighborhoods increasingly resisting developments for the homeless and nonmarket housing. This is particularly so where there is "facility saturation," with several agencies clustered in a neighborhood in order to provide efficient, accessible services.[5]

Through placing the NIMBY encounters within an analysis of macrolevel forces, we seek to advance an understanding of NIMBY interactions and pose new questions regarding the meaning and practice of citizenship. In so doing, we problematize the power of dominant society to define social issues in terms of the "other" and to reproduce, inadvertently, relations of power through a politics of advocacy and good intentions. Specifically, we illuminate how NIMBY encounters are multifaceted interactions in which ideological oppositions are blurred, and constructs of citizenship emerge as variable and fluid as their meanings are readily destabilized within political confrontations. We explore how power relations and the social construct of the "other" are reproduced through discourses and social actions of advocates as they embrace and act upon a "good" politics grounded in ideals of social justice, equity, and respect for cultural and social differences, yet in the process carry the power to define issues as being about Aboriginal peoples and represent Aboriginal peoples with dominant discourses.[6]

We address a case study of NIMBYism in "River City," a Canadian prairie community of 84,000.[7] We focus on discourses of citizenship that arose when a nonprofit association of First Nations women sought a site for a transition home for women seeking temporary accommodation, access to education and training programs, social services, and cultural support. Operated by a staff of First Nations women, the facility provides a number of services for clients seeking a successful transition from nearby reserves and rural communities into an urban community, which would offer them social and economic opportunities not available elsewhere.[8] The female clients are primarily from a regional First Nations culture with limited training for the labor force, and many are caregivers to young children. During their time at the transition home, they enroll in a range of training programs such as life skills and educational upgrading, while their young children participate in early childhood education programs. Upon completion of the transition program, the women may enter further education or training programs or seek employment. The nonprofit organization is responsible to the board of a registered Aboriginal society that oversees the operation and sets its policies and practices.

For twelve years previously, the women had occupied a former school in a well-established middle-class area; however, they had been forced to move when their rented accommodation was placed on the market at a price beyond their reach. After the association had engaged in renting a number of

small units for their residents and staff, the municipal government promised a new facility that would be purchased using provincial funds for social housing. The city was open to placing the transition home in any residential location subject to affordability, suitable transportation, and proximity of services. Following months of seeking an appropriate affordable site, the city made a conditional offer to purchase a church and parsonage, which would then be leased to the association for temporary housing, day care, a Head Start program, and life-skills training. The church appeared to be well suited: in the past it had held day care and early childhood programs and contained a small number of residential units. The city sought support for its decision from the neighboring community by holding three public meetings (two of which were "tea parties," as neighborhood consultations are euphemistically coined, evoking colonial reminiscences; the third was a meeting in city council chambers) and inviting written statements in support of and in opposition to the proposed initiative. Advocates and opponents debated one another in the city paper through letters written to the editor and anonymous cryptic comments in a regular column of public commentary.

Debates generated in this process provided us the opportunity to interrogate the structured communications that produce notions of citizenship within an ongoing colonial place.[9] We explore opposing and ambiguous representations of citizenship in the arguments posed for and against opening the transition home in a lower-income neighborhood bordered by industrial development. In the often-bitter debates between opposing parties, two concepts of citizenship were articulated: one tied to individual property rights and civic voting, the other to social reproduction and collective responsibility. First, we consider official discourses used by the city and leading institutions within it in order to understand how the city constructs itself out of its past. We address ramifications of historically specific discourses for current productions of social identities and interracial relations. Second, we investigate the deployment of these discourses, along with unofficial discourses, by the neighborhood into which the women seek to move. Here we examine the discursive positioning of the neighborhood within the city and its resistance to stigmatizing discourses that stress the presence of social problems and crime. Within this context, NIMBYism takes on specific meanings as individuals seek to identify with those whom they feel are treated as more worthy than themselves, and those whom they perceive to be less worthy, and to devalue their neighborhood. Third, we explore the construction of citizenship within the public forum of NIMBY encounters.

Data on the NIMBY encounters are drawn from a combination of observations of a public meeting held by the city, conversations with city administrators and members of the general public, and letters submitted to the city and the local newspaper.[10] Data for the historical narratives are taken from several sources: Web sites of the city, local museum, and cultural interpretive centers operated by the city, and from discourses utilized in the NIMBY encounter. Critical discourse theory is applied to reveal how dominance and inequality were enacted in the confrontations over the transition home. Critical discourse analysis interrogates who has the power to define given that

"dominant discourses work by setting up the terms of reference and by disallowing or marginalizing alternatives."[11] Critical discourse analysis comprises a series of spiraling critical reflections on strategies of language use. The analyst plumbs texts for meanings located within and between discursive spaces that are generated by literary devices employed for rhetorical purposes. Within this paradigm, the concept of discourse is neither limited to conversation nor to the immediate context of that conversation. Rather, discourses "are made up of shifting networks of associations, bodies of knowledge, expertise, agencies, and problems."[12] Meaning is derived from conversation, social interaction, and knowledge, views, and preconceived notions.

Rather than stopping at describing discursive practices that constitute citizenship within the NIMBY phenomenon, our goal is to explain them in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structure, and within the context that frames them. "Context is defined as the mentally represented structure of those properties of the social situation that are relevant for the production or comprehension of discourse."[13] Context comprises a number of interrelated features: physical location; the social, cultural, and/or political associations attributed to the timing, stated purpose of a situation, and participants; prior and current actions and discourses; and the mental representations attached to it by participants and observers. Within the established political self-conscious praxis of critical discourse analysis we locate ourselves as researchers and activists who "want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality."[14] Our research activities are interwoven with our relationships to the civic administrator who advocates on behalf of the First Nations women, the homeless, and others who occupy marginal positions within the city. Our research aims to contribute to ameliorating structures and barriers that constrain the life choices of those who remain excluded on the basis of gender, poverty, ability, class, and ethnicity. Our analysis proceeds from a theoretical position that interrogates the colonial legacy. The colonial legacy of racism, which privileges whiteness and masculinity, has been understood to create dualities marking insider/outsider and citizen/other.[15] Public debates mark the privileged position of the settler society, while discourses of citizenship reflect a wider set of racialized and gendered relations embedded within a class hierarchy.

Aboriginal women come into this debate on unequal terms. On the one hand, they are oppressed within a racial hierarchy that perceives them as historically less worthy, and, on the other hand, they are constrained by a patriarchal privilege that dominates public arenas and sets standards by which citizenship is constructed and judged. As Aileen Moreton-Robinson has argued with respect to the need to interrogate "whiteness" and the masculine privileges inherent within Australian colonial subjugation, so must discourses of Canadian citizenship be interrogated within the colonial legacy. We need to understand how Aboriginal women are held dually responsible because they are a part of a minority group that historically has been constructed as being "less worthy" of citizenship in consequence of colonial practices and because they are oppressed within the larger cultural and social practices that constitute the normativity of an enduring gendered and racialized hierarchy.[16]

Our position complicates our interpretation, for, as we illustrate below, the participants in NIMBYism are actors who not only enjoy relative privilege vis-à-vis the First Nations women, but also are marginalized by the social structures and economic practices of River City. How they draw upon entrenched ideologies in order to distinguish themselves from those they consider less valued, and threatening in economic terms, reveals the constitutive discourses of their citizenship as much as it does their construction of First Nations women as the devalued (and devaluing) "other."

CITIZENSHIP

Following Aihwa Ong, we conceive of citizenship as a cultural process of subjectification. As Ong expresses it, "becoming a citizen depends on how one is constituted as a subject and who exercises or submits to power relations."[17] We take the position that citizenship is experienced through economic, social, and spatial relations. Segregation and other forms of exclusion and marginalization that deny community membership deny what Henri Lefebvre conceives of as the "right to the city." In his 1996 manifesto he posited two defining rights to the city: the right to appropriate space and the right to participate in the creations of urban space. In brief, the right to the city is the "right to urban life."[18] Joanna Duke adds a third right, "the right to diversity."[19] Full citizenship is not achieved where constraints are placed on individuals and social groups such that these rights are not freely enjoyed. NIMBY encounters highlight the presence or absence of the right to the city and reveal who claims the right for themselves while seeking to block the same right from others.

Citizenship is defined through processes of civic engagement. City governments engage residents through consultative processes. These may include any of the following: holding open meetings, hosting forums to which entry is restricted by invitation, and appealing to citizens to present positions through letters to elected council and/or to civic administrators. In turn, citizens create their own forums for political expression as they form ad hoc citizen groups, organize petitions, write to local newspapers, hold demonstrations, speak to the media, and/or create electronic networks. As Renato Rosaldo asserts, referenda can be "expressions of prejudice"; participatory democracy creates the venue in which claims to citizenship are made and inner prejudices and fears expressed.[20] Vincent Lyon-Callo takes this up in his quest to deconstruct NIMBY practices as grounded in common sense and expressed through available ideological resources: "It is imperative to examine the ideological resources people have available from within their particular social milieu, in order to help them make sense of the conditions of their existence. [Timothy] Gibson writes, 'the kinds of ideological resources we use to make sense of daily events and experiences will go a long way in determining whether we actively work to change or to reproduce existing social relations.'"[21]

The conception of citizenship as a process of cultural subjectification contests well-established concepts of citizenship grounded in liberal

notions of rights-bearing citizenship and alternative concepts grounded in relationality and responsibility. In Canada, the neoliberal notion of rights-bearing citizenship arising from principles of individual property, taxpayers' rights, and governing obligations of duly elected officials is the dominant conception.[22] Rights-bearing citizenship is entwined with perceptions of individual autonomy; such discourses stress the obligation, moral and ethical, of individuals to achieve self-sufficiency through hard work and to sustain self-governance in adherence to law and in accordance with impugned moral codes. Failure to do so, in particular failure to achieve the economic status of property owner, signals failure to enter into full citizenship. Thus, political legalistic narratives distinguish between civic constituents: those whose citizenship is approved as a consequence of achieving economic and social autonomy, and those whose inclusion is rejected as a consequence of perceived social, economic, moral, or intellectual shortcomings, which in racialized contexts are indexed through references of addictions, alcoholism, mental illness, vagrancy, and the like that stand in for Aboriginal peoples, in particular men.[23]

First Nations are disadvantaged by this neoliberal construction of citizenship, which places emphasis on property rights, privatization, individualism, personal independence, and limited government. The lands reserved for them are held by Canada in their collective interest as legislated in the Indian Act and are not available for private ownership.[24] Some occupants gain minimal property rights through certificates of possession; however, these grant neither the right to ownership nor the capacity to be subject to liens held against them in the interests of the individual resident. Economic disadvantages further constrain any pursuit of neoliberal claims to citizenship grounded in property rights as First Nations grapple with a legacy of underemployment, poor access to education, and impoverishment. Insofar as a neoliberal construct embraces political citizenship, that is, an active participation in shaping laws, voting, and public consultation over policy, First Nations have also been confined to the margins. As a minority population they have relatively little, if any, capacity to be heard. Social, economic, and geographic isolation, along with the relatively late awarding of the federal and provincial franchise, create persistent barriers to full participation.[25]

Alternative constructs of citizenship contest the individualism and legalisms of neoliberal narratives and argue for relational citizenship that embraces a collective well-being embedded in strong social relationships through obligation to others, a shared sense of belonging, and commitment to inclusiveness and social justice.[26] Relational citizenship is conceived as a social contract arising from the capacity to see others—in particular vulnerable others, sharing common humanity as evidenced in overlapping aspirations, mutually supportive social actions, and the need to belong. Active citizenship engages individuals in relations through "realizing in action an obligation to aid fellow travelers—in short, of fostering justice between persons."[27] Principles of relational citizenship mirror traditional practices of many First Nations whose societies are grounded in relations of generalized reciprocity, community well-being, and an ethos of care, often expressed in

metaphors of mothering.[28] However, as we will see below, Aboriginal women are constrained in appealing to traditional citizenship and harmonizing discourses because they risk remaining historicized. Despite theoretical positioning of these subjectifications as contrary constructs drawn from opposing ideologies, the construction of citizenship during confrontational encounters is rarely so clear. Political opponents appeal to one another by appropriating and reconstituting each other's subject constructions. In the process, political argumentation slides easily from one construct to another as opponents seek to persuade their supporters and authorities of the justness of their position and the truths of their constructions of others. To exemplify the processes by which cultural processes define citizenship through prevailing ideologies and social processes, we now turn to discourses used by River City to define itself and its citizens.

RIVER CITY

River City is a small city that is in many ways typical of other Canadian prairie cities. Located in agricultural land settled by European farmers and rangers during the nineteenth century, it is situated near First Nations reserves home to the peoples who occupied the region prior to colonization. Today the urban population, like other small prairie cities, is more than 90 percent monolingual English speakers of European descent. The economy is diversified with a mix of commercial services, agriculture, and light industry. The city serves a regional population of 125,000 and is home to the regional offices of the provincial, federal, and county governments; health and education administrations; and tertiary educational institutions. Single, detached homes are the most common form of housing, and neighborhoods reflect economic and social distinctions by the size and style of individual homes. The population is relatively stable with the majority being third-generation families. Currently, River City suffers from low vacancy rates, high rents, and lack of affordable housing.

Citizens of River City turn to two discourses of masculinities rooted in the era of colonial settlement in order to relate popular and official histories: romanticized narratives of frontier adventure and violence and self-referencing tales of commercial and industrial entrepreneurs. The first locates River City's origins in a racialized nineteenth-century frontier of American whiskey traders, drunken Indians, Canadian/British heroes who defended law and order, and prostitution of Native women by their male kin. In these narratives, good overcomes evil as the whiskey trade is eradicated, Natives are sequestered on reserves, and "civilization" takes hold with the emergence of coal mining, railways, and agriculture. First Nations are effaced as nameless and faceless warriors whose last battle in the 1870s is now commemorated by place names and lurid stories, but whose reconciliation and peacemaking are ignored and denied official recognition. The absence of women in the narratives magnifies the masculine stereotypes used to portray past violence and conquest. First Nations homelands are recast as sites of nomadic foraging and vacant lands. Banished to the margins by treaty, which ceded their lands

to Canada, the regional First Nations play into official and popular histories as dysfunctional and violent, victimized by an early whiskey trade and then forgotten.[29] Having flourished for thousands of years prior to colonial settlement and frontier exploitation, their culture is erased from official history to emerge in folklore and pageantry as romanticized figures of the noble warrior, beautiful maiden/princess, and wise elder. A once-dignified people now subjected to minority marginalization, they are represented in the past tense, a mere prologue to the city's history.

The erasure of First Nations from River City mirrors historic reality. Following Métis battles with Canada for land and constitutional rights in 1880s in Manitoba, Canada sought to prevent prairie First Nations from interacting with one another.[30] In 1885 a prairie pass system was established to confine Native leaders to reserves in order to counteract attempts at political activity. Indian agents were granted significant powers that allowed them to force individuals to obtain permission to leave the reserve in order to visit friends or family members located on another reserve.[31] In 1889, Indian agents were given powers as justices of the peace for the purposes of the Vagrancy Act, which they strictly applied to Indians.[32]

Through creation of the pass system, Indian agents were empowered to limit travel to individuals and families to whom they granted passes to leave reserve lands. Never clarified by law because the action was deemed to be unlawful, the practice persisted into the mid-twentieth-century through coercion such as denial of essential supports (rations, for example) and threats of incarceration. Pass law narratives persist in popular civic memory as a legal practice originating in civic law, not in federal powers; this is now conflated with historic vagrancy laws evoked to remove First Nations peoples from public sites in the city and to deny entry to hotels, restaurants, bars, pool halls, and other commercial buildings.[33]

The second discourse also positions the city's birth in the whiskey trade; here the American traders are not outlaws but businessmen whose rugged individualism becomes exemplary for the self-made, risk-taking entrepreneurs of today. Through place naming, commemorative statues and cairns, historical pageants and annual public celebrations, and rhetorical reenactment in civic documents, the city conflates civilization with capitalism indexed through positioning of past entrepreneurs and politicians as "prominent citizens" whose eminence stands against the marking of First Nations history as one of warfare, as in the naming of an "Indian battle" but not as one of social or cultural contribution to peace and prosperity. River City is constituted through neighborhood associations with immigrant populations or the absence thereof. From the early twentieth century, it has gained a reputation for being inhospitable to immigrant populations of color and to Aboriginal people.[34] The central gardens mark retrenchment of Eurocentric *nomos*. From its water park with classical music with its purposeful claim to familial ideology, reclamation through gentrification recolonizes the once-Aboriginal space while the visible presence of security provides a subtext of controlling Indians. Today, ironically, River City officially identifies itself in various promotional literature as one that has defied climate, geography, and

isolation to become "a civilization built on industrious multiracial people . . . recognizing the worth and dignity of the individual."[35]

Currently, nonreferenced histories posted on the Internet feature story lines replete with rhetorical reenactment of racialized masculinity. Cultural and social practices replicate historic ideology. Downtown buildings are adorned with murals of the romanticized warrior chief. Civic identity is established at city hall with a bronze statue of a cowboy and a horse, a brief nod to a First Nations translator at the nineteenth-century treaty, and at the fringes—a former brewery that is now a garden—with a colorful-feathered Indian warrior.

With the exception of a public park located in the city's core (named after an esteemed entrepreneur of the nineteenth century) identified as a temporary respite for the Aboriginal homeless and a permanent refuge for substance abusers, the city's public space offers very little evidence that Aboriginal people make up more than 4 percent of the city's population or of their historic contribution to the region's unique character.[36] Aboriginal presence in the public parks and garden elicits demands that "we take back our parks" and evokes stigmatizing metonyms, such as "Lysol Gardens." Apocryphal stories of indigent, addicted, sexually amoral, and violent Aboriginal men and women circulate in order to justify denial of rental housing, opposition to services, and resistance to public housing. In recent attempts to offset the negative stereotypes, River City sought to mark a Native presence through bronze statues constructed as relics of the past, a gesture representing a further reenactment of an historicized presence that obliterates the present lives and contributions of the Aboriginal culture and society. Historicization reproduces the sense of marginalization wherever and whenever Aboriginal citizens are not represented within the larger body politic.

The absence of an accurate history that reflects Aboriginal women's experiences and contextualizes their current aspirations and collective action replicates more than a century of relations of domination and subordination, which are perpetrated generationally until even today's youth continue to hold these negative stereotypes, often affirmed in gestures of contempt for Aboriginal women. Figured in official histories that carelessly repeat apocryphal stories of desperately addicted individuals who succumbed to the evils of the whiskey trade and fell from the noble stature of the primitive of precolonial times—the founding myths of the negative stereotypes currently in play. Aboriginal people emerge today not as vanquished but as a threat to community stability and citizens' economic welfare. Nostalgic memories of exclusion lasting throughout the 1950s intermingle with laments regarding the future of a city in which individual economic success takes precedence over collective social responsibility and social justice is felt to be threatened. Within this negative climate the city government sought to redress the colonial legacy of racism and exclusion by undertaking new discourses of respect for and collaboration with neighboring First Nations and to foster new opportunities for them within the city through greater social services, increased affordable housing, and integration of First Nations individuals into the body politic. As the ensuing discussion reveals, this stance is not always popular

throughout the city, and particularly so in a neighborhood resentful of social service agencies and the impoverished clientele they serve.

The Neighborhood

River City's downtown core and adjacent neighborhoods illustrate Mary Louise Pratt's notion of a "contact zone," or a social space marked by clashing cultures grappling with one another in contested relations of domination and subordination.[37] Suburbanites avoid public gardens and parks out of perceived physical threats from and disdain for "street people." Downtown business owners fear loss of business through incursion of addicted individuals who will frighten customers away. In daily conversations, one hears claims of proprietorship of the city core and resentment of Natives being in "our parks" or loitering on the streets in front of businesses. Casual statements can be overheard that reject the downtown through allusions to the smell of urine in parks and streets, anecdotes of violence, and the overall resentment of the presence of the poor.[38]

The core's adjacent neighborhoods experience a spillover of these anxieties as representatives of dominant groups proclaim the need to "take back [their] parks" and reassert their power over marginalized residents whose claim to public space is negated by appearance, stigmatized behaviors, and absence of ownership. These anxieties are not mitigated in lower-income neighborhoods marked by high numbers of apartment buildings and private, unregulated rental units in detached houses. This is the case for the Neighborhood into which the transition house was destined to move. It epitomizes the social fractures and vulnerabilities of a lower-income area struggling to achieve economic security and social stability. Here, within a working-class neighborhood, homes have lower capital value than those of other city neighborhoods; in consequence, residents experience themselves as devalued in comparison to residents who live in expensive areas of the city. The presence of industrial sites on the fringes of the Neighborhood visually underscores the felt devaluation and signals the political subordination of a neighborhood unable to protect itself from nonresidential development as do neighborhoods of affluent residents. Spoken of as the "north" of the city and conceived of as being "the other side of the tracks," the area is discursively constructed as a neighborhood in which interventions by social agencies and schools are needed to supplement parental earnings and ameliorate social consequences of inept parenting and dysfunctional households. In local media and city planning, the area is often associated with social problems and crime. Real and perceived social problems devalue property, and, in consequence, the relatively cheaper property becomes an affordable site for establishing public services. In this milieu, residents are not always known as hard workers although city census data record them as having a very high employment rate during times of prosperity; family households may have two or more employed adults working two or more jobs. Many work at low-wage, part-time jobs that offer little security, and rates of transitory residency are much higher than in neighborhoods where residents enjoy employment

stability and higher incomes; the annual turnover of students in the local elementary school, for example, can reach 33 percent during a school year. The Neighborhood residents express feelings of marginalization in relation to residents of more expensive neighborhoods, whom they perceive as enjoying social relations with civic officials as a normal practice. Home owners in the Neighborhood may supplement insecure and inadequate income by renting portions of their homes. Home ownership sets neighbors apart from one another. A home is likely to be the owner's largest investment; therefore, any perceived threat to home values provokes anxiety.

In opposition to stigmatizing discourses, residents frame their identity within historical narratives and neoliberal conceptions of citizenship. They draw on historic tropes to claim a unique past and a special position within the city. They proudly relate to, and relate stories of, a neighborhood that arose from a small village of coal miners in the 1870s to become encapsulated in the city as it was transformed into a trading center with new industries. Ties of belonging are claimed as residents evoke images of forefathers who worked hard and passed down family homes. Resisting stigmatizing discourses circulating from middle-class neighborhoods, they proudly constitute themselves as working-class families. Their constructed identity, however, does not easily resonate throughout River City; the area is less likely to receive positive attention in the local media. Rather it emerges within the context of reported minor crimes, social disturbances, and other incidents that cast negative images. Within a nexus of power and status relations of the city, the Neighborhood lacks the resources and power needed to counter the negativity attributed to it. Further, with a lack of established, wealthy citizens who can influence city politics, the Neighborhood is marginalized relative to wealthier regions.

The class distinctions that residents of the Neighborhood may feel regarding more affluent neighborhoods are not a set of fixed oppositions: rather they claim commonalities with home owners of any social status even as they position themselves in grievance against more wealthy neighborhoods and suburbs that are free from services to the poor. They have not welcomed social agencies, for example, a shelter for the homeless, but resisted them as attractions to the unworthy and unwanted who are seen to be present in unfairly large numbers as compared to more costly neighborhoods. Social agencies, they claim, create a vicious cycle for the Neighborhood; the city takes advantage of lower real-estate prices in order to establish social agencies whose very presence then contributes to further declines even as values rise elsewhere precisely because the wealthier neighborhoods are protected from the incursion of unwanted services.

CONSTRUCTING CITIZENSHIP WITHIN NIMBY ENCOUNTERS

Consultative democracy was embraced by the city council as it sought support for the transition home society. Knowing from past encounters that the Neighborhood opposed social service agencies and understanding what it perceived as an influx of social problems and unworthy tenants, the city council offered extended opportunities for consultation. A greater number

of neighbors were consulted than city policy required, and the period of consultation was extended beyond usual practices. Two tea parties were held rather than the usual one. In a gesture of earnestness to the neighbors of the proposed facility, the council extended invitations beyond the usual boundaries of a controversial facility and extended deadlines for the meetings in response to complaints that the city ought not to hold consultations in summer months. In accordance with prescribed practice, the city received written submissions and held an open forum for public presentations to the city council.

Council chambers could not hold the public; chairs were set in the foyer of the city hall and screens opened to broadcast the proceedings. It was readily evident that protestors from the neighborhood outnumbered advocates and, as the proceedings opened, that no member of the Neighborhood had come to support the women. Physical and symbolic distance between supporters and protestors was established through the seating pattern. The women representing the transition home gathered at the front of the chambers while their few supporters sat together to one side near the front. Protestors filled the rest of the chamber and the foyer.

The way that River City tells and suppresses historic tales provides ideological coherence to current constructions of neighborhood identity and citizenship. Members of the Neighborhood opposing the transition home turned to constructions of citizenship embedded in neoliberal discourses ideologically consistent with popular historical narratives. Although few in the Neighborhood can be said to have achieved the entrepreneurial success that the city celebrates, entrepreneurial masculinity provided a point of reference for constituting citizenship. Positioning themselves as voters, taxpayers, small business owners, and citizens, protestors sought to have the application for rezoning defeated.

Distancing themselves from those who utilize social services in the area, resident home owners sought to locate themselves within a body of taxpayers upon whom the indigent and unsuccessful depend. In this they asserted common cause with resident home owners throughout River City. As the Neighborhood is increasingly marked as bearing the problems of the core city—transience, poverty, street people, and the like—contradictory discourses were deployed to claim that the neighborhood should be protected from the intrusion of outsiders whose needs constitute them as unworthy while protesting that the Neighborhood is unable to offer the protections vulnerable women and children deserve.

The physical absence of Aboriginal women from River City and the narrative erasure of their nation combine to prevent imagining them as neighbors and citizens. The gendered and racialized logic of the origin narratives of today's "gateway to opportunity" preclude alternative visioning of the city; imagining the past privileges masculinity and offers a public discourse in which protestors could locate themselves as meritorious individuals and as an aggrieved collective. Thus, at the Neighborhood gatherings and at city hall, protesters were able to seize control of the discourse and assert themselves as the center of civic polity. In dichotomizing rhetorical maneuvers, they

rejected Aboriginal women as neighbors and denied their right to the city as citizens with equality. They held fast to the notion that Aboriginal women belong on the reserve not in the city. "If these women and children are from a Reserve, perhaps Indian Affairs should be constructing and funding the facility in *their* area," stated one protester.[39] At the public meeting, the Neighborhood speakers positioned themselves as hardworking, voting, home-owning citizens while referring to the woman as "those people" and "them" and complained, "Perhaps the women involved in the program will not be a problem, but their friends will." In racial references that repudiated principles of multiculturalism and diversity, the homeless shelter, food bank, soup kitchen, and other services were conjoined with a large Aboriginal housing project and the concept of a "reserve within the city" populated by "a group of people who normally congregate downtown." In a gesture of semantic reversal, the city council was held accountable for the racism and resentment present in the Neighborhood. The city was alleged by one attendee of the public meeting to have "slapped every citizen in the face" by providing services for "a select group" when the "project should be for all taxpayers" and was, in consequence, fueling "the racism issue."

For home owners, particularly owners of single-family homes, nonmarket housing threatened a once-strong single-family community, now unfairly burdened with multifamily residences. City authorities were positioned as failing to protect the Neighborhood as they did wealthier neighborhoods. In the words of one protester at the meeting, "Tax dollars are tax dollars and ours are every bit as good and valuable as those brought in by the areas not so burdened." From their position as taxpayers and voters, protesters expected their voice to take precedence; at the public meeting at city hall they called upon the city council to do "its duty to [us]." In emotional appeals they begged the council "to listen to us" and remember that at earlier meetings, "the neighborhood gave a resounding no." They called upon the city to "guard and protect" their lifestyles and quality of life and spoke of having the women "dumped" in the Neighborhood. Only neighbors should be heard, one protester alleged, "nonresident letters are redundant"; listening to them was taken as evidence that the "democratic process was being overruled." Another resident of the Neighborhood argued that the matter should never have been brought to the council; neighbors had no desire to see it go ahead, and in doing so the council was capitulating to a "vested interest" group that did not represent the citizens. Implied within their presentations was the implication that should the city council fail them, the mayor and alderman would lose their votes in the future.

In a capitalist society, where home ownership is the primary, and sometimes only, source of secure capital investment for the working class, any perceived threat to housing values is a threat to personal future security. Nonmarket housing is feared to undermine house values, and protestors built upon this fear. The women were not only constituted as outside the realm of voting and taxpaying citizens, but also represented as incompetent in a discourse with a subtext of masculine superiority. Women, male protestors averred, would be unable to manage the building: Who would repair and

maintain it? How would the women, acknowledged as poorly educated and assumed to be poorly skilled, either understand home maintenance or be able to perform it? The women were positioned as a threat to home values on two grounds: their very presence as unemployed women subsisting on the taxpayer and as incompetent women whose rundown residence would mark the community as derelict.

Threaded through public speeches and written statements were implicit racial stereotypes and resentments that have marked cultural processes of subjectification of First Nations peoples from the early colonial period through to the present. Since Canadian Confederation in 1867, First Nations peoples have been wards of the state residing on lands held by the Crown in their interest. In return for ceding large tracts of land and living within regulations unique to them, First Nations people resident on reserved lands enjoyed some tax relief. Thus, it is routine to position First Nations subjects as outside of national citizenship as nontaxpayers. This position was granted legitimacy forty years ago when the federal government sought to terminate special status conferred by colonial law, treaties, and common law. Its logic was summarized in two sentences: "The policy rests upon the fundamental right of Indian people to full and equal participation in the cultural, social, economic and political life of Canada. To argue against this right is to argue *for* discrimination, isolation and separation [italics in original]."[40] The federal government thus echoed common sentiments that any rights conferred upon First Nations people through British law (for example, the Royal Proclamation of 1763) and by treaty were detrimental to their well-being and constituted barriers to assimilation. Protestors who spoke explicitly against the proposed cultural and education goals that the women held dear reiterated this commonly held opinion. They represented Head Start and preschool programs intended to protect cultural knowledge as examples of unwarranted racial privilege that would be paid for at the taxpayers' expense. In another maneuver denying the right to diversity, protesters, assuming the services would exclude non-Aboriginal children, a position not held by the women, alleged the proposed educational programs were "racist" and would block the children from being accepted into society. Paradoxically placed as an unfair burden on the taxpayer due to lack of education, employment, and hard work, the women were then dismissed as an additional burden because they sought these very same advantages. Their schooling and training would require public money, while investments in the house would mean the women were continually dependent on provincial and city funds.

Racialized stereotypes of alcohol and drug abuse marked the threat of the unseen males in this scenario. Knowing that Aboriginal women all too frequently suffer from violence, protestors drew images of violent male predators sweeping into their streets.[41] Fear of street people invading from the unknown of the reserve communities shaped the strongest image of the dangers that the Neighborhood faced. Referring to the clients and staff of the transition home as "all of these people," a woman of the Neighborhood asked at the public meeting, "What is to stop abusive partners from showing up?" A father's fears led him to write to the city council that the transition

home would force him "to relocate [his family] somewhere outside the city limits somewhere where it is SAFE for a young family!!!!!!!!!!!!!" Speaking at the public meeting, another member of the Neighborhood, in a move to constrain the women in their social lives and urban participation, called for the women to be held to a "good-neighborhood" contract that would limit the social activities they could host and hold them accountable if violent men "stalked them in the neighborhood." The council concurred.

Women and their advocates responded to individualized claims of rights and privileges as taxpayers and voters with alternative constructs of citizenship. In a discourse consistent with relational citizenship and in common with principles of the rights to the city, urban participation, and diversity, they appealed to the social responsibilities of the council to uphold principles of human rights, constitutional law, and especially children's rights to cultural membership and education. Staff members of the transition home emphasized the importance of cultural identity in the formation of identity and personal growth.

Advocates attending the public meeting called upon the council "to protect women and children from violence" and reminded the general audience that this is a responsibility "as citizens we all share." Rather than positioning their vulnerability to violence as a reason to constrain the women's social lives and personal freedom of association as the protestors had, advocates called for actions to enhance the women's safety through citizens caring for one another. Framing their understanding of citizenship as founded in shared well-being, they praised locating the transition home in a residential area where the women could participate in a range of social and cultural activities. In a rhetorical move that might be constituted as "writing the city's words back to itself," the community spirit the city proudly proclaims was invoked as a measure of "how well we, as citizens, provide care for those less fortunate than ourselves."

The leaders of the transition society grounded their claims for citizenship in duties of care for one another, their immediate families, and, more broadly, their future generations and culture. As a collective, they assumed responsibility for one another and for children. Culturally appropriate Head Start programs and day care would provide early childhood training that would support children and their parents and provide foundations for children's futures. The children's programs would offer the foundation for the future by building a sense of identity and community.

Calling upon the council to lead in the direction of compassionate inclusivity, advocates positioned the women as valued individuals whose life goals were not dissimilar from anyone else's. The residential units would offer support for the women as they embarked on training and education programs and provide temporary shelter as they sought permanent homes in the city. The women were not destined to remain long-term dependents on public finances as residents of the facility; rather, they were to reside in the house temporarily as they moved toward independent housing. Advocates stressed the integrity of the leaders of the transition society and their commitment to River City as a

place of permanent residence for themselves and their clients. They pointed to the community engagement of the leaders in a range of community activities.

Advocates who had known the women in their former residence also spoke about a sense of community belonging through shared responsibility and mutual respect. They stressed outstanding neighborly relations between residents of the former facility and their neighbors. In their narratives the transition-house residents were characterized as "model citizens" whose children shared play areas with others in neighborhood. The transition house was occupied continuously, and thus the women in it emerged, as protectors of—not threats to—their neighbors' property. Strong relationships were built, as the women became the informal watch over the neighbors during the day when they were out working or for longer terms as the neighbors vacationed elsewhere.

The women's and advocates' construct of relational citizenship failed to persuade their opponents. Unable to control the discourse of the debate, the advocates capitulated to the concept of citizenship posited by the protestors and repositioned the women as subjects with the motivation and capacity to achieve personal autonomy through hard work. The advocates' appeals within a discourse of relational citizenship had some of the same constraints as that of a neoliberal construct of responsibility. With the exception of one letter from a woman's organization, and one speaker for a second woman's organization, advocates failed to address the structural causes of poverty, First Nations displacement, and racialization of social relations. These two speakers reminded the council and audience of the colonial past that led to the loss of their homeland, sequestration on the reserve, poor opportunities for education, and general isolation from urban development and employment opportunities. However, in addressing power relations within the province and city, these speakers also turned to a discourse of individualism: while recognizing structural causation of poverty, their proposed solution lay in individual efforts to achieve independence.

Advocates could not avoid stigmatizing tropes deployed by the protestors. Although, at first, advocates presented the women in terms of contributing citizens, they then defended the women against the charges of the protestors. They spoke of the transition home as one that was heavily regulated, in which zero tolerance for substance abuse prevailed, and in which medications were controlled. The women would be screened for substance dependency and sent to treatment centers elsewhere if needed. Moreover, just as members of the Neighborhood claimed a neoliberal citizenship for themselves, advocates presented the women as hard-working, self-regulating in terms of their personal conduct, and committed to an education that would bring them employment and establish them as taxpayers. Native women who led the transition home negated images of the women as fleeing violence with stories of elders and young moms returning to school.

Protesters, sensing they would lose their struggle against the women who were now being presented in such positive terms, abruptly engaged in a semantic reversal. A member who had previously feared the women now had his "heart going out to them" as he presented the neighborhood as

an inappropriate location of the women to realize their ambitions. Where moments before the women constituted a threat, the Neighborhood now did so. Local industry was presented as dusty and dangerous, streets as too dangerous for the children now living nearby, and the playgrounds and parks as insufficient. The women and children were now constituted as deserving better than what the Neighborhood could offer. Rather than segregating Aboriginal peoples in a poor neighborhood, the city had a duty to integrate them into more stable neighborhoods far from heavy industrial traffic and sewer smells that would endanger the children's health.

In a final gesture of anticipated defeat, the protestors sought accommodation from the council. Should the women have their application granted, the protestors wanted assurance that the city would have the women sign a "good-neighbors" contract. Only then—and only on the terms they set for the women and children—would the Neighborhood accept them.

CONCLUSIONS

In the struggle for the transition home, public forums became arenas for the expression of prejudice and the circulation of fears. Through their actions, the city council and the protestors legitimated relations of dominance and subordination that became explicitly engendered and racialized. In the process, NIMBYism revealed itself to exist within a singular concept of citizenship that is explicitly hierarchical, gendered, and racialized. Relational citizenship was turned back on itself: even as the city authorities embraced the needs of the women, they reinscribed them as less worthy and legitimated the Neighborhood's construction of Aboriginal women as intrusive and unwanted as they sought to hold the women, but no one else, to account through a good-neighbor contract. The Neighborhood protesters sought to protect their accepted residents' "right to the city" even as they struggled to deny the same right to the Aboriginal women and children. Their narrow view of citizenship focused only on rights arising from home ownership and enfranchisement in the city elections.

Neoliberal notions of individualism and privileges of property ownership provided the discursive context for those who sought protection from inequality and abject poverty. Missing from the NIMBY confrontation was a broader expression of belonging to a common society within which members reciprocate duties to one another and share rights to difference. Similarly, a sense of democratic process was taken for granted as an expression of majority opinion. The Neighborhood protestors disputed the city council's decision to bring the matter of the transition home to vote because the majority of public opinion in the Neighborhood rejected the proposal and because they felt that city residents beyond their neighborhood had no right to participate in the process. Neoliberal discourse framed the protestors' construct of equality, which, similar to the framing of citizenship, expunged difference. Democracy not only constituted the power of the majority over the minority, but also constructed equality in strict terms of sameness that eschewed culturally specific education and hence denied the right to diversity.

Whether castigated as unworthy or patronized as vulnerable, Native women and their advocates were unable to take control of public discourse. To placate the protestors, advocates abandoned appeals to broader civic duties of care and integration in order to argue that although the women were not now ready to assume the mantle of hard-working, property-owning, self-sufficient individuals, they would in time. Thus, the envisioned future was one in which claims to cultural uniqueness and collectivity were undermined even as they were embraced. Aboriginal women were unable to constitute themselves on their own terms. They avoided representing themselves in terms of relational citizenship, which is coherent with their traditions of reciprocal rights and collective responsibility, and located themselves on the same terms as their opponents in an acknowledgment of perceptions of progress and assimilation.

Alternative concepts of citizenship arose briefly but were not sustained within the debates. Neoliberal discourse, focused on the individual and grounded in hierarchal relations of power and dominance, resists consideration of citizenship grounded in difference and experienced through complex, multiple cultural relations and identities. The Neighborhood's constructs of an orderly community and its constitution of good neighbors grounded in cultural sameness were granted normativity by the city council. Compelling the women to sign a good-neighbor contract reproduced extant relations of superordination and subordination and reinforced historical notions of gender and racial superiority. An opportunity to reframe civic membership through legitimating difference was lost, and the women remained framed within a deficit model of citizenship that evoked not only their shortcomings but also those of their male kin, whom the Neighborhood feared.

NIMBYism exposes the processes through which Aboriginal identities are stigmatized and their subcommunities are fragmented through relations with the welfare state. Dependency disempowers and demands concession on the most intimate level of self-actualization individually and collectively. Whether seen as a threat to property values or neighborhood cohesion or as too needy to be accommodated, the subordinated carry the burden to prove themselves to their detractors and to undertake self-transformation in the process. Stigmatization is framed by and reconstitutes ideological resources drawn from history. The century-old practice of exclusion through pass laws reemerges in social ethos through exclusion of Aboriginal women from constructs of an effective citizenry who are not merely neighbors through spatial proximity, but who are also respected as contributing citizens. Although much has been written about how to overcome NIMBY practices in practical guides and activist tracts, a more fundamental change is needed. As noted by the Nobel Prize–winning economist, Amartya Sen, "Responsible adults must be in charge of their own well-being; it is for them to decide how to use their capabilities. But the capabilities that a person does actually have (and not merely theoretically enjoys) depend on the nature of social arrangements, which can be crucial for individual freedoms. There the state and the society cannot escape responsibility."[42]

NOTES

1. For an example of strategic advice see Jay White and Bill Ashton, "Meeting Housing Needs and the NIMBY Syndrome," http://www.housing.gov.bc.ca/housing/NEIGHBOUR/check19.html (accessed 27 May 2009). It is difficult to determine how effective such strategies are; whether civic governments have successfully overcome "not in my backyard" (NIMBY) protests or have authoritatively overruled them without accommodating their concerns is not clear in the available literature.

2. Michael Dear, "Understanding and Overcoming the NIMBY Syndrome," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 58, no. 3 (1992), http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/852935_770885140_787374001.pdf (accessed 28 May 2009); William Fischel, "Voting, Risk, Aversion, and the NIMBY Syndrome: A Comment on Robert Nelson's 'Privatizing the Neighborhood,'" *George Mason Law Review* 7 (1999), http://www.law.gmu.edu/gmulawreview/ (accessed 27 May 2009).

3. Joanna Duke, "Mixed Income Housing Policy and Public Housing Residents' Right to the City," *Critical Social Policy* 29, no. 1 (2009): 100–20; Vincent Lyon-Callo, "Making Sense of NIMBY: Poverty, Power and Community Opposition to Homeless Shelters," *City and Society* 13, no. 2 (2001): 183–209; Debra Stein, "The Ethics of NIMBYism," http://www.sfu.ca/dialog/undergrad/readings2008-3/Oct%2010/the_ethics (accessed 27 May 2009); Lois M. Takahashi, "A Decade of Understanding Homelessness in the USA: From Characterizations to Representation," *Progress in Human Geography* 20 no. 3 (1996), http://0-phg.sagepub.com.darius.uleth.ca/cgi/reprint/20/3/291 (accessed 12 June 2009).

4. Randy Martin and David L. Myers, "Public Response to Prison Siting: Perceptions of Impact on Crime and Safety," *Criminal Justice and Behaviour* 32, no. 2 (2005), http://0-cjb.sagepub.com.darius.uleth.ca/cgi/reprint/32/2/143 (accessed 2 August 2009).

5. Takahashi, "A Decade of Understanding."

6. The terms *Aboriginal* and *Native* are used interchangeably throughout this article in keeping with local practices. The women operating the transition home refer to themselves as Native; River City speaks of all the original peoples as Aboriginal. The term *First Nation* is also used in keeping with local usage to refer to those Aboriginal peoples who are the original occupants of the region and whom the Canadian government recognizes as having specific rights under the Indian Act. Terminology is under continuous change as the people struggle for decolonized language that will reflect their self-identity and their political rights. *Indigenous* is a term rarely used in social or political discourses in the area.

7. Following the ethical practices of protecting personal identities, River City is a pseudonym for the location of the study.

8. Nonprofit associations, more generally known as nonprofit corporations in the United States, are dedicated to social welfare, civic improvement, cultural advancement, etc., and refrain from providing personal benefit from income.

9. Structured communication refers to the relations of power and domination that define terms of a public discourse, setting the context for relations between centers of power, within the state, for example, and groups or individuals that engage in public discourse.

10. Three members of the research team attended the public meeting. Each took independent notes on the proceedings, speeches made by the public, and city council's response statements. These field notes were augmented by recording observations

of the social interactions at the meeting, e.g., the seating pattern, interactions between members of the public, and positions taken by members of the public prior to and following the official meeting. Several visits were made to two sites—the former transition home and the site proposed for development—where field notes and photographs were used to interpret the socioeconomic status of the neighborhood and to verify assertions made during the NIMBY encounter regarding the suitability of the proposed site for the transition home. Following the data collection, interpretation proceeded in two steps: individual analysis of data by research team members and a shared review of analysis and the application of critical discourse theory.

11. Cris Shore and Sharon Wright, *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power* (London: Routledge, 1997), 18.

12. Meredith Green and Christopher Sonn, "Problematizing the Discourse of the Dominant: Whiteness and Reconciliation," *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 16, no. 5 (2006), citing L. Blackman and V. Walkerdine, *Mass Hysteria: Critical Psychology and Media Studies* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/113374378/PDFSTART (accessed 6 August 2009).

13. Teun Van Dijk, "Critical Discourse Analysis," in *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 356, http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Critical%20discourse%20analysis.pdf (accessed 12 June 2009).

14. Ibid., 352.

15. For a theoretical analysis of colonial discourses and practices that highlights the embedded privileges of whiteness and patriarchy see Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge: South End Press, 2005). For case studies of colonial legacies inherent in contemporary power relations and social practices see, for Canada, Elizabeth Furniss, *The Burden of History: Colonialism and the Frontier Myth* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1999); and, for Australia, Cathryn McConagy, *Rethinking Indigenous Education, Culturalism, Colonialism, and the Politics of Knowing* (Brisbane, Australia: Post Pressed, 2000).

16. Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *Talkin' Up to White Woman: Indigenous Women and Feminism* (Brisbane, Australia: University of Queensland Press, 2000).

17. Aihwa Ong, "Cultural Citizenship as Subject Making: Immigrants Negotiate Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States," in *Race, Identity and Citizenship: A Reader*, ed. Rodolfo D. Torres, Louis F. Miron, and Jonathan X. Inda (London: Blackwell, 1999), 264.

18. Henri Lefebvre, *Writing on Cities*, trans. and ed., Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1996), 158.

19. Duke, "Mixed Income Housing Policy," 101.

20. Renato Rosaldo, "Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism," in Torres, Miron, and Inda, *Race, Identity and Citizenship*, 265.

21. Vincent Lyon-Callo, "Making Sense of NIMBY: Poverty, Power and Community Opposition to Homeless Shelters," *City and Society* 13, no. 2 (2001): 184, citing Timothy A. Gibson, "'I Don't Want Them around Here': Ideologies of Race and Neighbourhood Decay," *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture and Society* 10, no. 4 (1998): 142.

22. Neoliberal discourses of citizenship that prevail in Canada are not dissimilar to American conceptions; Canada is strongly influenced by American political thinkers and by American domestic practices that define citizens' rights, duties, and constraints.

23. Catherine Kingfisher, "Discursive Constructions of Homelessness in a Small City in the Canadian Prairies," *American Ethnologist* 34, no. 1 (2007): 91–107.

24. The Indian Act is federal legislation; first passed in 1876, it has been revised frequently throughout the years. Canada has authority over the lands reserved for Indians who exercise access to lands and entitlements associated with it by membership in Indian bands for whom the parcels of land are reserved. Complicated terms in the act define who can be recognized as Indian, a process that grants legal status through registration with the Canadian government. Indian bands, now referred to as First Nations, have a limited form of government, loosely structured on principles of municipal governance, that can enforce by-laws and undertake responsibilities held by Canada when authorized to do so either through federal policies or by individual agreements negotiated with the Department of Indian Affairs.

25. In 1960, the Canadian Bill of Rights was introduced, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, and creed, legislation that protected Native interests. Also, the federal franchise and full citizenship rights were extended to Native people, thus permitting them to vote in federal or provincial elections without compromising legal Indian status or making participation "conditional upon complete assimilation into Canadian society." Rick Ponting, *First Nations in Canada: Perspectives on Opportunity, Empowerment and Self-Determination* (Toronto: McGraw Hill Ryerson, 1997), 29. In 1965, Alberta was the last province to permit Indians to vote. Harry B. Hawthorn, ed., *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada*, vol. 1 (Ottawa, ON: Queen's Printer, 1966–67), 260.

26. For a similar position on citizenship see Mark Kingwell, *The World We Want: Virtue, Vice and the Good Citizen* (Toronto: Viking, Penguin Group, 2000), 175.

27. Ibid., 5.

28. Jo-Anne Fiske, "Constitutionalizing the Space to Be Aboriginal Women: The *Indian Act* and the Struggle for First Nations Citizenship," in *Aboriginal Self-government in Canada: Current Trends and Issues*, 3rd ed. (Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing, 2008), 309–31; D. Memee Lavell-Harvard and Jeannette Corbiere Lavell, ed., *Until Our Hearts Are on the Ground: Aboriginal Mothering: Oppression, Resistance and Transformation* (Toronto: Demeter Press, 2006).

29. See, e.g., Hugh A. Dempsey, *Firewater: The Impact of the Whiskey Trade on the Blackfoot Nation* (Calgary, AB: Fifth House Publishers, 2002); Gerald Friesen, *The Canadian Prairies: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984).

30. The outbreak of hostilities among the Métis, a handful of Cree allies, and the federal government in 1885 ended the movement. Chiefs Big Bear and Poundmaker were sentenced to prison for their participation, 28 reserves were identified as disloyal, and more than 50 Indians were convicted of rebellion-related activities, 8 of whom were hanged for their actions. The federal government reacted by impounding Cree horses, guns, and carts; instituting a pass system in the southern prairie region in order to confine Indian leaders to reserves; and passing legislation dictating that hereditary leaders once deceased would not be replaced. Further restrictions included a ban on the Thirst Dance. Many of these changes, designed to limit political activity and destroy the traditional government system, lasted well into the twentieth century and affected all prairie Indian groups. See Blair Stonechild and Bill Waiser, *Loyal till Death: Indians and the North-West Rebellion* (Calgary, AB: Fifth House Publishers, 1997).

31. See, e.g., F. Laurie Barron, "The Indian Pass System in the Canadian West, 1882–93," *Prairie Forum* 13, no. 1 (1998): 25–42; Sarah A. Carter, "Controlling Indian Movement: The Pass System," *NeWest Review* (May 1985): 8–9.

32. John Leslie and Ron Maguire, eds., *The Historical Development of the Indian Act*, 2nd ed. (Ottawa, ON: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 1978).

33. Dominant ideologies that shape narratives of the pass laws stand in sharp contrast to stories shared among First Nations peoples who relate tales of resistance. For many, to escape the reserve without permission became a badge of honor: a gesture that refused personal alienation from their traditional lands and freedoms.

34. Howard H. Palmer, "Strangers and Stereotypes: The Rise of Nativism, 1880–1920," in *The Prairie West: Historical Readings*, ed. R. Douglas Francis and Howard Palmer (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1992), 308–44; Russel L. Barsh, "Aboriginal People in an Urban Housing Market: Lethbridge, Alberta," *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 27, no. 2 (1997): 203–14.

35. See n. 7.

36. In 1976, there were fewer than 150 Aboriginal people living in River City, and by 1991 that number had grown tenfold. In 2001, there were 3,155 Aboriginal people in the city, representing 4.3% of the city's total population of 72,717. We suggest that the current Aboriginal population has grown to roughly 5,000 based on the following factors: (1) new legislation resulting in Aboriginal enumeration, ethnic mobility, and migration; (2) current trends toward high fertility rates; and (3) recent pronouncements by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation that Aboriginal people will comprise 11.3% of the River City population by 2010. Yale D. Belanger, *Assessing Urban Aboriginal Housing Needs in Southern Alberta*. Public Policy Paper #51 (Saskatoon: Saskatchewan Institute on Public Policy, 2007): 3–4.

37. Mary Louise Pratt, "Arts of the Contact Zone," *Profession* 91 (1991): 33–40.

38. Kingfisher, "Discursive Constructions of Homelessness."

39. All the following quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the public meeting held by city council; attendees spoke freely during this meeting, and some submitted their positions in letters to the council, which they read at the gathering.

40. Canada. Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy, http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ai/arp/ls/pubs/cp1969/cp1969-eng.pdf (accessed 20 August 2009).

41. Aboriginal women are 5 times more likely than non-Aboriginal women to be murdered and are the most vulnerable to stranger violence of all Canadian citizens. Sixty percent of murders and 70% of disappearances of Aboriginal women occur in urban areas; with the highest rates of violence found in the western provinces. During the past decade, violence against Aboriginal women has received considerable media attention in response to advocacy campaigns intended to build public awareness of high numbers of missing and murdered women. Criminal justice systems have been called to account for their lower clearance rates of investigated violence and murder and for lower conviction rates of perpetrators, particularly in the province of Alberta. For a summary of relevant statistics see Native Women Association of Canada, *What Their Stories Tell Us: Research Findings from the Sisters in Spirit Initiative,* nwac-hq.org/sisters-spirit-research-report-2010 (accessed 15 May 2010).

42. Nicholas Watt and Patrick Wintour, "Time to Cut Power of Pushy Parents Says Treasury Minister, Liam Byrne," *The Guardian*, 26 June 2009, http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2009/jun/26/liam-byrne-government-public-policy (accessed 26 June 2009).