

Claims to Identity in Determining Resources for Indigenous Social Movements in Canada

Mark van der Maas

Canada has long been praised for its inclusive immigration policies. Being one of the first countries to adopt an official multicultural policy, Canada has been portrayed as an example of a more pluralistic form of nation-state. For members of many indigenous peoples in Canada, however, this image is far from the truth. Movements of indigenous peoples towards self-determination and autonomy from the Canadian government have had a long and frustrating history in Canada. Indigenous resistance to multiple programs of assimilation have been based primarily on claims to distinct cultures and identities that should afford them collective rights, most notably the right to self determination.

As pointed out by Jane Jenson in an article published in 1993 for *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, one of the most important aspects of indigenous peoples' social movements is the names that indigenous groups use to identify themselves. She presents four basic functions served in the claims to identity by indigenous social movements: First, it generates strategic resources; defining boundaries of a group legitimates its claims to resources in that area and creates solidarity for those within said boundaries. Second, in choosing one name over another the prioritization of claims and goals are also established with different claims to identity bringing with them different primary concerns. Third, defining a community also defines its interaction with communities that surround it. This creates relationships of cooperation and opposition

with other communities. And fourth, the definition of a community also defines the interactions with the state and its institutions (Jenson 339).

But the identities that are employed are rarely static. Depending on the level at which these indigenous groups mobilize, claims to identity change. I will consider the four aspects of the self-naming process, and I will examine how identities are expanded and modified depending on their level of mobilization, whether they claim an identity of a particular group (ex. Cree, Iroquois, Inuit), identity at national level (ex. Native Canadian), or at the international or transnational level (e.g. an international community of indigenous peoples). In doing this I hope to create a better understanding of how identities and claims of belonging are determined by the need to access resources associated with those identities and I will situate the identity strategies in relation to citizenship literature.

This analysis will focus on three groups' claims of autonomy in regards to specific interactions with the Canadian government. These will be the Cree and their interactions with Quebec Hydro in the James Bay 1 and 2 projects, the Iroquois and the Oka crisis, and the Inuit and the forming of Nunavut. A small historical context will be given for each scenario.

The Cree and Quebec Hydro

In 1971, the Quebec government created a large plan for a major hydro electric dam in the James Bay basin in Cree territory. This project was planned without consultation with the Cree that lived there even though it would have massive environmental implications for the traditional hunting lands of the Cree. Once separate bands that dealt with

concerns on an individual basis with the federal and provincial governments, the bands organized together and claimed common identity as the Cree nation. Lawyers representing Quebec Hydro claimed there was no such relevant culture and that Cree bands had been assimilated into dominant Canadian culture. Through the consequent legal proceedings the Cree nation was recognized and the project was abandoned (Gagnon & Rocher 17-22).

In 1989 Quebec Hydro tried to start another project in the same area called the Great Whale project, also referred to as James Bay 2. This time the Cree as an already established nation participated in the transnational staging demonstrations in the US to bring attention to their concerns with the Quebec government. This both helped to increase support for the sovereignty of the Cree people and to determine the use of Cree land, and depicted the Cree identity as one that is inseparable from environmentalism. Again, the Cree were able to stop the project and came away with a strong national identity and a greater claim to sovereignty and self-government (Jenson & Papillon 248).

The Iroquois and the Oka Crisis

In March of 1990, the people of the Kanehsatake reserve outside the town of Oka, Quebec set up roadblocks to draw attention to their claims to land which they considered to be of traditional importance. The land in question was a wooded area that was claimed to be connected to an important cemetery for the Kanehsatake people. The town had proposed to expand a golf course into the area that was claimed by the Kanehsatake. The event quickly became a media frenzy as Mohawk warriors from the nearby Akwesasne (reserve) aided in the blockade and transformed the event into an armed standoff. The

standoff continued until late August of that year and the barricades were removed August 29th (George-Kanentiio 120-126). This crisis brought attention and support from various indigenous groups across Canada and from the international community. In fact, delegations of indigenous leaders approached the UN asking them to implement sanctions against the Canadian government similar to those placed on South Africa during Apartheid (Ponting). In the end, the Mohawk nation was successful in stopping the expansion of the golf course and bringing issues of indigenous sovereignty to an international audience. However, the crisis is often criticized for getting out of hand, and many within the Mohawk community deplore the actions of the warriors involved in the standoff as being un-representative of the Mohawk nation (George-Kanentiio 125).

Nunavut

In 1999, the territory of Nunavut was created within Canada. This territory was in part defined in the Nunavut Land Claims Act made in 1993 and the territory now covers the eastern a large part of an area that was once part of the Northwest Territories. The Inuit have chosen a form of public government that is based on traditional notions of self-governance. This is claimed as a strong traditional aspect of Inuit culture and is reflected in the laws and governance of the territory (Lukacheva 31). Claims to self-determination by the Inuit in the territory are based on claims of self-government prior to colonization. The argument claims that since self governance existed before those governmental structures that have been imposed on the territory by the national-state of Canada, self-government should take precedence over any laws or policy enacted by the Canadian government (Lukacheva 39). Under the Nunavut Land Claims Act, the Inuit in the

nearly 350 000 square kilometers were afforded a certain degree of self government on the condition of the “surrender of any claims, rights, title, and interest based on their assertion of an Aboriginal title anywhere in Canada” (Loukacheva 41).

Given these three scenarios I will now examine the claims to identity that were engaged in by the indigenous peoples involved each. I will identify the function that is being preformed in their claims to identity at the level of their indigenous nation, the national level, and the international level.

The first major function in creating an identity is that it generates strategic resources and defines boundaries of a group’s legitimate claims to resources in that area and creates solidarity for those within those boundaries. In response to the encroachment on Cree lands by Quebec Hydro during the first James Bay project, the bands that were previously independent in their dealings with the federal and provincial governments came together claiming a common heritage and culture and traditional lands. This creation of a collective identity allowed the Cree to make claims of collective rights as a people distinct from other people living in Quebec. More importantly, amalgamating all the bands into one identity meant that all of the separate lands controlled by those bands were also amalgamated. Now, instead of each band being able to claim the resources and support that were contained within the boundaries of the bands, the Cree were able to mobilize the resources that were contained in all of the bands’ territories (Jenson & Papillon 250).

In the example of the Cree’s dealings with the Quebec government, we see Benedict Anderson’s idea of a nation as an imagined community at work. The claim of the Cree that they a distinct nation is as legitimate as any other nation’s claim to identity.

They share a particular culture, a language spoken only by their group, and they inhabit a geographically particular space. But an organized and legal claim to sovereignty was not made until the 1970s. This reflects Anderson's assertion that the nation is in part imagined in its limits. A large part of creating an imagined community is defining the space in which it exists and recognizing who belongs in that space (Anderson 7). It was only when the imagined boundaries of the Cree peoples became violated that their consciousness as a nation was stimulated and strengthened the imagined oneness of the Cree people.

If the resources available to a group are defined by the boundaries that are created in the claim of an identity then it would also be the case that as more groups are incorporated into a collective identity then their respective resources could be incorporated as well. During the crisis at Oka in 1990, various First Nations groups from across the country voiced their support for the Mohawk nation. In the words of a Squamish leader in British Columbia, "If the Canadian government is going to walk over the Mohawks, they're going to have to walk over all of us . . . The Mohawks are setting standards for all the other First Nations". (Ponting). This statement shows recognition of commonality among the First Nations groups. This shows a broadening of identity past the mere individual first nation to a more inclusive corporate identity. Recognition of these commonalities lead to large national organizations such as the Assembly of First Nations, the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, and the Native Women's Association of Canada. All of these organizations base their existence in a common identity shared by indigenous peoples in Canada. This is shown clearly in the declaration of the Assembly of First Nations found on their website:

We the Original Peoples of this land know the Creator put us here. The Creator gave us laws that govern all our relationships to live in harmony with nature and mankind. The Laws of the Creator defined our rights and responsibilities. The Creator gave us our spiritual beliefs, our languages, our culture, and a place on Mother Earth which provided us with all our needs. We have maintained our Freedom, our Languages, and our Traditions from time immemorial. We continue to exercise the rights and fulfill the responsibilities and obligations given to us by the Creator for the land upon which we were placed. The Creator has given us the right to govern ourselves and the right to self-determination. The rights and responsibilities given to us by the creator cannot be altered or taken away by any other Nation. (<http://www.afn.ca/article.asp?id=52>).

These national organizations seek to mobilize Indigenous peoples' interest in order to gain support from all indigenous groups in Canada and utilize their resources and strategies and knowledge gained from past dealings with the Canadian government.

This expansion of identity works in the same way in the creation of a transnational identity. The creation of Nunavut in 1999, and the bestowing of (mostly) self-determination on the Inuit in the region points to a new type of citizenship within Canada's borders. Claims of community government by the Inuit have led to confusion over the administration of citizenship rights in Nunavut. The people living in Nunavut must at once follow the principles of self government that is culturally favoured by the Inuit and they must also engage with the governmental structures of Canada which still administers the citizenship rights of the country. This creates a hybrid form of citizenship

(Tedford Gold 352). Hybrid citizenship identifies a type of citizenship in which a person might be under the jurisdiction of two or more polities at one time. This is usually the case for peoples that live across country borders. The term “hybrid” refers to the way in which membership is engaged in. Instead of the expectations of two polities being melded together into one citizenship as it might for a migrant worker, meaning that all of the rights and responsibilities of that person are defined under one term such as a migrant worker on a temporary visa in Canada, the individual is the site of two separate citizenships that must be engaged at different times depending on the context.

While this may seem to be a problematic definition in light commonsensical understandings of identity, it actually allows greater options for the mobilization in the interests of the Inuit in Nunavut. If the resources that a group can use are in part determined by their naming of themselves then we can entertain the possibility of the people of Nunavut being able to essentially name themselves twice. This is an interesting prospect not only for the Inuit but for all indigenous peoples. The possibility of simultaneously belonging to two nations could be extended to any indigenous group that claims self determination yet still resides within the larger bounds of another nation-state. It is important that we do not view this prospect as a *carte blanche* for the acquisition of multiple rights as the membership to a state can restrict as well as enable. It is also the case that one citizenship may take precedence when push comes to shove

The second function performed by a social movement in choosing one name over another is that the prioritization of claims and goals is also set. Different claims to identity bring different primary concerns.

For the Inuit of Nunavut the importance of choosing self-determination over self-government demonstrates this aspect of the naming process. Kymlica describes the position of the Inuit as unique among indigenous groups in North America. They are an indigenous group that constitutes the majority of the population within a distinct area and for this reason have been afforded the opportunity for self-government in the creation of Nunavut (29). However, the Nunavummiut (people of Nunavut) have largely rejected the prospect of self government in favour of self-determination. For not only the Inuit but many indigenous groups in Canada, the idea of self-government is a furthering of the colonial project of assimilating indigenous peoples into a “modern” society. The implication of “self-government” is that it imposes a western European ideal of how a territory should be run and how political action should be done (Tedford Gold 352). Self-determination allows the Nunavummiut to proceed free of preconceptions.

One example of how the Inuit are resistant to western European ideals of government is their conception of health care. In interviews administered by Sara K. Tedford Gold in her 2007 study on the techniques of citizenship of the Inuit. she found that many of the respondents spoke of health as a “southern” term that did not exist conceptually for pre-colonial Inuit. Traditionally there was no ideal of human health for the Inuit. Instead, Inuit conceptions of health involve strong and holistic community living instead of a focus on a particular body (Tedford Gold 358). his conception has led to an increased focus on midwifery and community health programs in order to better represent the culture of the Inuit. A part of claiming any identity is setting it in comparison to other identities. In claiming an Inuit identity, the people of Nunavut have had to define what separates them from the “south”. The focus on community health care

and midwifery in Nunavut over professionalized version of health-care dominant in the rest of Canada shows how choosing an identity also chooses how issues and goals are prioritized.

For the Cree and Mohawk nations it was necessary to gain support from those who were directly connected to the issues at hand. In order to gain support for their direct concerns, it was necessary to expand the framework of the issue as engaged in an expanded identity, that of Indigenous Canadian. Consider the example of the Kanehsatake during the Oka crisis. The issue was initially an problem that they attempted to resolve with the municipal government of Oka as the Kanehsatake. When the roadblock was erected it became framed as an issue of Mohawk control of traditional lands, and neighbouring Mohawk groups added their support, most notably armed warriors of the nearby Akwesasne. Once the issue became a national concern as a result of the now armed barricade, First Nations groups from across the country voiced their support on the premise of self-determination and opposition to government control of indigenous peoples. For the Kanehsatake, the result that the golf course expansion was halted was still achieved. As their identity switched from representing only their small group of the Mohawk nation to representing all indigenous peoples in Canada, we see a redefinition of the goals and priorities as their base of support grew. This move from the particular to the general in what the Oka crisis was “about” demonstrates how priorities and goals must be flexible in order accrue resources from a greater number of sources.

This pattern is also apparent in the international forum. International bodies such as the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues look to work in the interest of all indigenous groups in the world. While there are similar issues that must be faced by

most indigenous groups irrespective of where they are in the world, there is also a great range of issues that are particular to the experiences of each indigenous people. To claim even within one province of Canada such as Ontario that the indigenous peoples share all the same concerns is naïve. Despite the large range of experience of indigenous groups the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues has very few members who participate actively in their sessions. This is a description of the membership of the permanent forum as found on the United Nations website.

Eight of the Members are nominated by governments and eight are nominated directly by indigenous organizations in their regions. The Members nominated by governments are elected by ECOSOC based on the five regional groupings of States normally used at the United Nations (Africa; Asia; Eastern Europe; Latin America and the Caribbean; and Western Europe and Other States).

(<http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/members.html>)

This type of membership leaves some nations with little representation. For all of North America, for example, there is only one representative. Having only one person to represent the many diverse groups that exist in North America points to a possible problem of the expansion of identity to the international level. By participating in an international forum, like UNPFI, in an attempt to gain access to its resources, it is actually possible that particular native groups in Canada lose meaningful representation of their concerns. In claiming an international identity that they must share with all the indigenous groups in their vast geographical region, it could be the case that issues

important to a single group, perhaps the very issues for which they need international support, go unrecognized.

The third function of the naming process as outlined by Jenson is the definition of a community locates it in relation to others. The community is defined as who it is and who it is not and relationships of cooperation or competition with other communities and organizations are also set.

In a multinational country such as Canada, this is an important aspect of the naming process for groups claiming sovereignty. This is especially prominent in the province of Quebec as their claims to sovereignty have large implications for sovereignty movements of indigenous groups. The sentiment is summed up by a quotation from an Akwasne Mohawk: "How can Quebec, with no economic base and no land base, ask to become sovereign? How can Quebec be a nation when they have no constitution? We have had a constitution since before the American revolution." (Ponting). Here we see that the Mohawk nation is claiming a pre-Canada identity. If Quebec is offered the opportunity of sovereignty in actions such as the separation vote in 1994 then the Mohawk nation which has a more legitimate claim to distinct nationhood on the basis of traditional lands and a constitution predating confederation should also be afforded the right of self-determination. Through the process of naming themselves as a distinct nation in the relation to Quebec's sovereignty movement and its recognition by the federal government, the Mohawk nation is able to frame its claim in a way that portrays it as more of a nation than Quebec, so if Quebec is given the opportunity to secede then so should the Mohawk nation.

This aspect of the naming process not only engages a community in opposition to or cooperation with the nations that directly surround it but expands relations to all communities that might be affected within the nation-state in which the community exists. During the early nineties when the possibility of Quebec separation seemed greatest there was some question as to what a separate Quebec would mean for indigenous peoples living there. If Quebec were to be considered its own autonomous nation-state then it may not honour the treaties and agreements that were formed in with the British and French monarchies and maintained by the federal Canadian government (Jenson & Papillon 256). Indigenous groups in Quebec set themselves in opposition to Quebec sovereignty and gained support from various sources elsewhere in the country. Much of this support came through cooperation with those in mutual opposition to the separation of Quebec. During the constitutional negotiations that took place in 1991-2 that were designed to discuss the right of self-determination of Quebec, the Ontario premier insisted that the table at which the negotiations were discussed be expanded to include considerations of aboriginal rights. This inclusion of aboriginal rights helped to bring into question the legitimacy of Quebec's claims to self-determination (Jenson & Papillon 258).

For the indigenous groups in Quebec, it was important to situate their identity in relation the federal responsibility of the Canadian government to ensure the protection of their collective rights and legal agreements. Not only did this aspect of their relational identity set them in opposition to the Quebec separatist government, it also set them in cooperation with other parties within Canada that opposed Quebec separation. The identity of being an indigenous group in Canada gained the indigenous groups in Quebec

the support of the Ontario government and allowed the Ontario government to further its own agenda in impeding the separatist movement, which was also beneficial to the indigenous peoples in the province.

The assertion that claiming a specific identity in part defines the relation of a group to the communities that surround it holds at the international level. During their mobilization against the Great Whale project in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the Cree looked to gather support for their cause by framing the project as an environmental concern. However, since the project was generally understood to be important to the infrastructure of the province of Quebec, they found very little support for their actions against the project at home. Recognizing this, the Cree organized demonstrations in Boston where much of the funding for the Great Whale project would come from. These demonstrations targeted environmentalists that were not compromised by allegiance to Quebec and put international pressure on the Quebec government and financial backers and the project was shut down (Jenson and Papillon 254). Here the identity that was claimed by the Cree was one of environmental oneness. A quotation from a speech by the Deputy Grand Chief of the Cree Nation, Diom Romeo Saganash, demonstrates rhetoric used in this portrayal: “The connection between environmental and human rights has never been a conceptual novelty for indigenous people. Our cosmology places us not as owners or occupants of the lands, we are simply part of the environment” (Jenson and Papillon 254).

By claiming an identity that inextricably ties environmental rights to aboriginal rights, the Cree’s movement against Quebec Hydro was able to create a strong and useful cooperation with environmentalists on the international level. The logic followed that if

the Cree people's understanding of rights is wedded to their environmental rights, then a violation of their aboriginal rights is of concern to environmentalists. What is also interesting about the claims of an identity of oneness with the environment is that the Cree did not make this claim in specific reference to their nation but instead in reference to all indigenous peoples. This allowed the Cree to place themselves in a position of their movement being representative of all indigenous environmental concerns including those in America where their efforts were concentrated.

The final function of the naming process is the definition of community defines its interaction with the state and its institutions. This is important for indigenous groups in Canada because most of their concerns are handled through interactions with the federal government.

For indigenous groups in Canada, relations to the governmental structures have long been a problem in the claiming of nationhood and collective rights. From a very early time in Canada's history, the explicit goal of policy surrounding the indigenous peoples of Canada was one of assimilation into "modern" society and current relations still reflect that goal. In disputes involving autonomy of indigenous peoples, there is often the question of which rights take precedence. During the Oka crisis the claiming of collective rights as a nation separate from Canada was necessary in legitimizing the blockade set up by the Mohawk nation. From this perspective, the political action taken was a response to the unlawful use of Mohawk traditional lands. However, the Canadian government framed the issue as one of legality based on the premise of the Mohawk nation as Canadian citizens and so did not have specific claim to cultural lands; therefore, the government portrayed the protest as illegitimate. In the words of the assistant

commissioner of the RCMP at the time, "This whole thing is about trying to make the laws of the land apply equally to all citizens" (Ponting).

Here we see the importance of the interpretation of the Mohawk people. If they are a distinct nation then the approach to the situation should be one of diplomacy between nations. If, on the other hand, the Mohawks are interpreted as being just another group of citizens in Canada then the issue is one of law enforcement and should be dealt with as such. So in this scenario the definition of a community determines its interaction with the state and its institutions through the application of collective rights.

The RCMP assistant commissioner in his statement premises the actions of the police force and military on the ideal of common citizenship rights. According to this liberal ideology the application of law to those within the nation-state should apply to all so as to avoid inequalities in the treatments of different groups. According to Kymlicka, this argument is flawed as the functions of government in Canada are already based in a cultural perspective. Since the functions of government are already based within a cultural perspective, claims to equal application to all peoples are contradictory because the ways in which those laws are culturally rooted advantages some and disadvantages others (Kymlicka 108). In claiming an identity separate from the dominant culture in Canada, the Mohawks legitimate their claims to collective rights which seek to eliminate the structural inequalities that go unrecognized by common citizenship rights.

The example of the Mohawks demonstrates that claiming of an identity distinct from the dominant culture of a nation-state is crucial in mobilizing (*what*) in the interest of a community. First claiming separation from the dominant culture makes it possible to claim disadvantage within the relations of the state that based on that culture. It is then

possible, in the interest of maintaining equality, to claim collective rights to counteract those disadvantages.

Interactions with the state and its institutions are also capable of connecting distinct and separate groups within a single territory. The primary dealings of each First Nations group with the government are done on the federal level. Education, health care and other governmental services are administered at the provincial level for most citizens and are done at the federal level for those living on reservations. This means that, while all of these individual nations must deal with the federal government on a one on one basis, the laws that determine dealings with the Cree in Quebec are the same as those that determine dealing with the Haida in BC. Since all of the indigenous groups in Canada have a shared stake in the application of these laws, it offers a chance for solidarity among groups that might otherwise be completely distinct in culture, geography and political concerns. According to Rogers Brubaker, incorporation into a common identity necessary for nation building in part happens through participation in the institutions and networks that are bounded within the state (80). So, while this system of requiring indigenous peoples to deal directly with the federal government might discourage cooperation of indigenous on the more local provincial level, it does offer the opportunity to forge a common identity among all indigenous groups in Canada.

Such panaboriginal identities have been successful in many countries in mobilizing for indigenous rights. In countries such as the United States and Bolivia organizations and associations that incorporate all indigenous peoples within the borders of those countries have made great strides in the interest of indigenous peoples (Ramos 226). In Canada, this panaboriginal identity has been engaged surprisingly infrequently in

comparison to other countries with significant indigenous populations. This could in part be explained by the typical strategy of dealing with individual bands by the federal government. This strengthens the reification of differences between indigenous groups and is explained in part by resources mobilization theory. Since resources are provided to individual indigenous nations and not to larger organizations it means that it is more likely that those resources will be devoted to the particular needs of those nations as opposed to larger collective actions (Ramos 226). This lack of engagement in a panaboriginal identity in Canada demonstrates that interactions with the state can also restrict the possible identities that are used by indigenous peoples. In creating only certain avenues for the use and allocation of resources, the federal government also limits the interaction of different aboriginal groups and thereby limits possible realization of common interest and possible creation of solidarity among those groups.

The process of naming also determines the interactions of a community with institutions that exist outside the boundaries of the state. As noted earlier, indigenous groups in several countries have forged a common identity through international organizations created to work in the interests of indigenous groups anywhere in the world. This common identity is an interesting creation as it promotes solidarity among peoples who not only have distinct cultures and geographical locations as they might within one nation-state, as is the case in Canada, but they have also had historically diverse dealings with a great number of colonial or expansionist powers. Perhaps in recognition of the limits that can be placed in definition of groups, the UN has not yet adopted an official definition of what it recognizes as “indigenous”. This is in fact part of

the basis of their human rights documents as it avoids possible unforeseen discrimination (press release for the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues). Self-identification is necessary and recognition is based on a number of possible criteria. By keeping the terms of definition open the UN is able to ensure that any with a legitimate claim to being an indigenous group can be included.

Despite this policy of inclusive strategies for recognizing indigenous peoples, there is still a major aspect of exclusion in the UN's dealings with indigenous peoples. Despite claims of recognizing indigenous peoples as nations and having the right to self-determination, no indigenous nation is recognized as a member of the UN. Instead, the separate organization of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues was created as a result of the UN being unable to adequately address the concerns of indigenous peoples (www.un.org). The creation of a separate group to handle the concerns of indigenous peoples is a double-edged sword for those identified as "indigenous". The council is crucial in ensuring the collective rights of indigenous peoples, but at the same time the name indigenous implies that they are not deserving of the recognition of the nation-states that are granted full member in the UN. This shows that on the international scale as well that in choosing a name in the search for recognition of rights, here "indigenous", a group also determines their interactions with institutions that recognize and enforce those rights.

The ability to acquire and mobilize resources is necessary to both the survival and the structure of a social movement. As suggested by Jenson, an important part of determining the resources that are available to a group is the claim to identity that that group makes. The claim of an identity affects the resources of a group in four ways.

First, it generates strategic resources; defining boundaries of a group's legitimate claims to resources in that area and creates solidarity for those within said boundaries. Second, in choosing one name over another the prioritization of claims and goals are also set with different claims to identity bringing with them different primary concerns. Third, defining a community also defines its interaction with communities that surround it. This creates relationships of cooperation and opposition with other communities. And fourth, the definition of a community also defines the interactions with the state and its institutions (Jenson 339).

Through the examples the Mohawk, Cree and Inuit I have shown that these four aspects of the naming process are relevant to gaining strategic resources in their mobilization for specific concerns. When examining the ways Indigenous groups mobilize, we see an interesting possibility in their claims to identity. This is the possibility of being able to claim many levels of identity in order to acquire resources. In searching for resources and support at the local, national and international levels, we see that the identity of indigenous peoples is expanded or contracted in light of the source of resources that they are engaging with. This is an example of the different claims of citizenship that come as a result of a person's identities being nested in each other. In the same way that an indigenous person interacts with a government as either an indigenous person of the world, an aboriginal Canadian, or a member of a specific indigenous group, so does the non-indigenous Canadian as a covered by basic human rights, Canadian citizenship rights, and provincial identity.

This understanding of a person as the site of multiple identities that can be engaged in selectively in light of the situation they are involved in offers interesting

possibilities in the understanding of the functions of citizenship. This understanding of identity may be of particular interest to those studying transnational identities and dual citizenship.

Works Cited

Anderson, Benedict *Imagined Communities* 2006 Verso, London

Brubaker, Rogers *Nationalism Reframed* 2007 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Cooper, Joshua "Persistent Resistance: UN and the Nonviolent Campaign for the Human Rights of Indigenous Peoples" *Social Alternatives* 22. 3. 2003 17-22

Declaration of First Nations. Assembly of First Nations. December 3 2008

<http://www.afn.ca/article.asp?id=52>

Gagnon, Alain-G and Guy Rocher *Reflections on the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement* 2002 Quebec Amérique inc.

George-Kanentiio, Doug *Iroquois on Fire: a Voice from the Mohawk Nation* 2006

Greenwood Publishing Group inc. Connecticut.

Jenson, Jane "Naming Nations: Making nationalist claims in Canadian public discourse" 30. 3. 337-358

Jenson, Jane and Martin Papillon "Challenging the Citizenship Regime: The James Bay Cree and transnational action" *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 30. 3. 1993 337-358

Kymlicka, Will *Multicultural Citizenship* 2004 Clarendon Press Oxford

Loukacheva, Natalia, *The Arctic Promise: Legal and Political Autonomy of Greenland and Nunavut* 2007 University of Toronto Press. Toronto

Members of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. UNPFII.

December 7 2008. www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/members.html

Ponting, J. Rick “Internationalization: Perspectives on an emerging direction in aboriginal affairs” *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 22. 3. 85-110

Ramos, Howard “What Causes Canadian Aboriginal Protest? Examining resources, opportunities and identity, 1951-2000” *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 31. 2. 2006
211-234

Tedford Gold, Sara K “Techniques of Citizenship: Health and Subjectivity in a New and Predominantly Inuit Territory” *Citizenship Studies* 11. 4 349-365 2007