

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Two Families: Treaties and Government. By Harold Johnson.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6965325z>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 31(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Fehr, Rich

Publication Date

2007-09-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

very small, which means they cannot have specialists, and each officer may be responsible for policing large geographic areas. Another issue is the quality of officers that tribal policing can attract. Luna-Firebaugh notes that training is more isolating for tribal officers because it is seldom local, which means that recruits sometimes must travel great distances. Some potentially good police officers may forego the occupation rather than be separated from loved ones for the months that are required for training. Some tribal police agencies also report that it is difficult to locate individuals who can pass the background investigations, and the reality of politics, favoritism, and nepotism are still alive and well in Indian Country and nefariously affect the hiring, retention, and promotion of police personnel. And, after many tribal agencies attract and train new recruits, they may lose their investments when the officers leave for other departments with higher pay or other benefits. These and other issues plague tribal police officers and their agencies.

The book's major drawbacks are the occasional misspelling ("W. F. M. Army" is presented as "W. F. M. Hall," for example) and possible contradictions in the writing. The lack of frequencies with many percentages means that the book's inconsistencies could not be untangled (for example, percentages that changed between chapters and sections may actually have been based on subsamples). I would also have appreciated a methods chapter or appendix that presented, in one location, all the studies discussed in the book. These drawbacks do not detract from the book's overall value, however.

Tribal Policing is written in a style that is accessible to students yet is useful for seasoned scholars in the policing and Native American studies fields. It could easily be incorporated into a course on Native American policing, mainstream policing, or Native American issues. It fills an important void and makes important contributions to the literature.

Jon'a F. Meyer

Rutgers University–Camden

Two Families: Treaties and Government. By Harold Johnson. Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing, 2007. 144 pages. \$20.00 paper.

Johnson offers a humbling yet altogether powerful lesson for non-Native Canadians on the rights, responsibilities, and necessity of honoring treaty relationships. *Two Families* humbles because Johnson approaches non-Native Canadians not in a position of anger because they have continuously eroded and refused to recognize treaties (namely Treaty No. 6 of 1876, adhesion of 1889), but because he consistently lives up to the book's namesake. To appreciate this sentiment fully, perhaps it is best to understand that Duncan Campbell Scott, the longest-serving minister of Indian affairs and residential school system's primary engineer in the twentieth century, once described treaties as a process that enacts "the cession of the Indian interest in consideration of land grants, educational facilities and so on" (Duncan Campbell Scott, "History of the Indians in Canada—Memoranda, speeches, papers

presented by Duncan Campbell Scott—clippings, 1922–1939,” NAC RG 10, vol. 6812, file 481-1-15). Scott, too, was concerned with family. However, his belief rested on the premise that Euro-Canadians were the paternalistic guardians of indigenous peoples. This brand of patriarchy rests in doctrine and was fulfilled through monarchy and later common law. From Johnson’s perspective, however, Euro-Canadian participants in treaty are Kiciwamanawak (or *cousin* in Cree), and there was no foreign law that superseded the Creator’s law (13, 27).

The *Two Families* account of how relatives are expected to interact with each other offers a foundational tool for understanding the contemporary claims process across Canada. Although the author focuses solely on the 1889 Treaty No. 6 adhesion in central Saskatchewan, he offers a fascinating insight into the epistemological core that seems to be the basis for how most if not all indigenous peoples across Canada approached treaties. Johnson’s offering is released at a most appropriate moment, as Commissioner Sidney Linden, chair of the Ipperwash Inquiry into the death of Dudley George emphasized, “One of the lessons of Ipperwash is the realization that all of us (in Ontario), Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, are treaty people” (*Globe and Mail*, 31 May 2007). Although this admission may be well known to many indigenous peoples and their allies, knowledge of this is sparse in mainstream Canadian society. This knowledge gap offers a fundamental disconnect whenever Native peoples express frustration through protest. For mainstream Canadian society, this disconnect is highlighted by a bureaucratic system that historically sought only the eventual surrender of treaty rights and ultimate assimilation of all indigenous peoples. The disconnect cannot be placed at the feet of the Cree or any other indigenous partner in the treaty process, who almost always pursued treaty rights as a sacred, unending pact. Men like Duncan Campbell Scott and other colonial administrators who saw to it that treaties were “agreements of cession” can be looked to for the roots of such disconnect.

Johnson offers his beliefs in a way that draws both indigenous and governmental parties together and reminds both that the promises made were to be eternally binding. Johnson stands as a threat to the paternalistic mind-set that can only imagine these relationships as hierarchies because he continually brings the discussion back to the responsibilities of both parties. Johnson further destabilizes Western hegemony and colonial hierarchy when he consistently refers to those colonial participants (and we, the non-Native descendants) as Kiciwamanawak. When Johnson speaks in this manner, he enacts a very particular reality that engages the participant in an ever-occurring present. This form of engagement is not a static form of representation nor is it abstract and dualist. (For more information on the enactment of indigenous and Western realities, and the effect both have in interaction with each other, refer to John Law’s *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*, 2004.) This constant manner of speaking reinforces the belief that what is real in an indigenous value system, that is, all of Creation, cannot be surpassed by that which is constructed by humans. For instance, Johnson states, “I cannot convince myself that your artificial entities are real. I cannot respect them the same as I respect you, *Kiciwamanawak*” (65). This draws the reader to engage with the idea of

treaty in a way that transcends the paper they were written on and offers a most appropriate reference to understanding that we are all treaty people.

As Johnson reasserts Cree knowledge of treaty relationships in terms of the sacred responsibilities entered into by family with the Creator, he destabilizes the Canadian belief that the land encountered by Europeans had been *terra nullius*, empty, or with doctrine in mind, a forbidden wilderness in desperate need of European civilization (24). Johnson reframes the notion of expert knowledge of the land when he says, "Under the law of the Creator, students try to simplify things to understand the intricacies of multiple relationships. Under the law of the Creator, a student can spend a lifetime trying to understand three words: 'All my relations'" (18). With this assertion, Johnson asks Kiciwamanawak to reconsider treaties not as a relationship between childlike ward and parental figure, nor even as solely confined to two family members, rather he proposes that treaties be considered with reference to a third partner, the Creator (29). As all territory emanates from this force, all actions on it are subsequently answerable to it.

The territory would not have been relinquished or ceded if the Cree had been fully aware of all the intricacies in British common law; Johnson makes this clear when he looks at colonial and indigenous communication. Johnson points to the differences between orality and written literacy and asserts that the difference between the two determined colonial power relations. The engineering of treaty language in text, both before and, in many cases, after treaty negotiations, creates an intentional knowledge gap that can then be exploited. By giving the ultimate authority to these texts, power is then removed from the Cree participants. The basis of this colonial hierarchy was the opening up of the plains for settlement, which, under Johnson's interpretation of Treaty No. 6, could have been done successfully for both parties (47). By its static nature, the written documents (which differ from the promises that have been passed down as a consistent reminder) subvert events that transpired as recalled by Cree participants through oral history. This process reaffirms and reinvests authority to the ultimate abstract power system in place: colonial government (45). However, the nature of orality insists on maintaining the integrity of cultural institutions as they exist in the territory, or as Johnson contends, "Oral historians know in their deepest core that if they misconstrue, add, or delete, then they, their children, and their children after them will suffer the negative consequences of it" (44). The dominance of written literacy is tricky, as Walter Ong once wrote, as it affords the right amount of time for desire to infiltrate the text, whereas orality maintains an ethic of responsibility that is consistently aware of what the ancestors have passed on and what future generations inherit (Walter Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*, 1982, 40–42).

Johnson reasserts the spirit of the treaties through an effective critique of the Constitution Act, 1982. Section 35 states the rights granted to indigenous peoples by the Crown by placing a caveat with the word *existing* in key areas. By situating rights as already having been lost, and reaffirming the assumed colonial authority to extinguish rights, the potential for further extinguishment is guaranteed, as rights cannot re-exist in this language. Johnson takes

great exception to this and subverts it when he frames the Constitution in another context: “*Kiciwamanawak*, this is backward thinking. Your family cannot determine my family’s rights. Our rights do not come from you. Your rights come from treaty. Our rights come from our connection to creation” (102). Johnson places the political foundation on creation, and by this simply reaffirms the constitutional language that recognizes the supremacy of God’s law (91). The supremacy of God, however, cannot determine hierarchies in the human order, a caveat Johnson is well aware of and uses as a means of further destabilizing hegemony: “Not until you accept that we are equal, that we are relatives, can you justify your place in this territory. Superiority has no legitimacy” (103). With words such as *equal*, Johnson purposefully avoids the colonial definition of *equality*, one that only considers assimilation the ultimate ground for equality. To this end, a number of times the point is made quite clear that indigenous peoples do not acquire “rights” by the government, as this bond is formed between Creator, culture, and family. The colonial assertion that such rights are acquired through the cession of land, language, and culture is a violation of treaties.

The Indian Act’s supposed benefit and the breaking of treaties is the gift of civilization from colonial authorities, who viewed indigenous peoples as lower on the racially based social evolutionary scale. The supposed gift, however, has only become all too effective in diminishing the role of traditional culture and values, the foundation of indigeneity in Canada. Johnson looks to the criminal justice system, the disproportionate number of indigenous youth incarceration, and crime as the real gifts: “Assimilation of my family has not resulted in us becoming you . . . many of my family’s youth no longer have an Aboriginal identity. They do not have our tradition or our ceremonies . . . at the same time, they have no[t] adopted your social structures, your traditions, and your ceremonies” (109). The poignancy of this vacuum is filled with a sense of belonging that often exists outside of the Cree communities and Cree Nation Johnson refers to and instead results in belonging to gangs. Here, criminal behavior becomes a badge of honor against the forces that tore them from the traditional connections (109).

Because Johnson keeps the future generations well in mind, his ultimate vision reasserts a way of being that is indigenous to place, culture, and tradition. The fulfillment of this vision requires that the dominant system cease to enforce its own way of being onto the Cree and, subsequently, all indigenous peoples. Johnson states, “This should be a vision that has at its end freedom from tyranny” (117). Achieving this vision requires a process of imagining life on the territory that is not from hierarchical perspectives where Euro-Canadian civilization is diffused while tradition disappears. Instead, Johnson proposes an imagination that envisions human relationships as familial relationships, where words like *Kiciwamanawak* have more currency than the abstract power relations dictated by doctrine and imperialism. Johnson does not propose that non-Native Canadians revolt but suggests they simply respect the autonomy of traditional governance and cultural systems that have existed in Cree territory since well before Europeans arrived. To achieve this, some self-reflection on the nature of humanity is requested: “You use the failings

of humans as an excuse for superiority. Your elite justify their positions by pointing out the failings of the masses" (120).

The approach taken in *Two Families: Treaties and Government* threatens power relations precisely because of the traditions that form the base of Johnson's treaty knowledge. From Johnson's perspective, treaties were not articles of conquest but were sacred agreements mutually agreed on for the benefit of all participants. It is to this sentiment that Johnson continually returns for the sake of restoring the fundamental principles agreed on by Cree participants. Occasionally, when this continual return finds its way into the Canadian justice system, for example, when the commissioner investigating the death of an unarmed protestor states unequivocally that "we are all treaty people," it is a great benefit for all when a book such as *Two Families: Treaties and Government* is there to say what this means.

Rick Fehr

York University

"Until Our Hearts Are on the Ground": Aboriginal Mothering, Oppression, Resistance and Rebirth. Edited by D. Memee Lavell-Harvard and Jeanette Corbiere Lavell. Toronto: Demeter Press, 2006. 249 pages. \$29.95 paper.

Rarely does the title of an edited collection of writings drawn from personal experience, the social sciences, and literary criticism capture fairly the essence of its full contents. Even more rarely do we find this in a collection gathered internationally. *Until Our Hearts Are on the Ground* is one of these rare exceptions. Organized into four distinct sections, the collection moves seamlessly from self-reflections on personal journeys of becoming an Aboriginal mother, through indigenous conceptions of mothering, to state intrusions into the lives of mothers, to close with critical essays on literary representations of mothering. Authors come from across Canada, the United States, Ghana, and Australia and represent a number of distinct cultural groups in each country.

Lavell-Harvard and Corbiere Lavell have drawn together a selection of texts founded in feminist concepts—patriarchy, gender, oppression, liberation, and resistance—and enriched by framing the political economic context in discourses of colonialism/neocolonialism, repression, and domination. In their introductory chapter they lay out a schema for the reader to understand the experiential grounding of their collection and to appreciate the individual works' pedagogical power in relation to one another as each in its unique manner speaks from a position of marginalization, exploitation, or violation. They frame mothering in holistic terms that stress its spiritual, social, and cultural dimensions. Aboriginal mothering is positioned in opposition to the practices and ideologies of the dominant society: Aboriginal mothering is not only "different from" the dominant society's mothering, but also it is "often fundamentally opposed to the dominant society" (2). Three themes unite the works: an emphasis on community and ceremony; racial and sexist consequences of state domination; and resistance and revitalization.