CANADIAN NATIVES AND
NATIONALISM

A Thesis Submitted to the College of
Graduate Studies and Research
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Masters of Arts
in the Department of Political Studies

University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon

By

Michelle Caza

Fall 1994

© Copyright Michelle Caza, 1994. All rights reserved.
PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of Political Studies

University of Saskatchewan

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 0W0
ABSTRACT

The thesis argues that the Canadian Native Movement since 1969 is better characterized as a nationalist movement rather than a "new social movement." The new social movement theories of Alain Touraine and Alberto Melucci are examined with regard to the characteristics they ascribe to ethno-nationalist movements. Both theories are found wanting in several respects. For example, Touraine specifically excludes ethno-nationalist movements from the parameters of his argument, while Melucci wrongly assumes that ethnic identity is a phenomenon which has gained a greater importance in recent years. In fact, ethnic identity has historically been a central issue to ethno-nationalists. The similarities between Native ethnic identity and other types of ethnic identities, as apparent in nationalist ideology, are examined. The conclusion is that the Native movement is best characterized as a nationalist movement.

However, theories of nationalism do not sufficiently explain the causes of ethno-nationalism. New social movement theories provide some elucidation regarding this. Also, resource mobilization theory as developed by John McCarthy and Mayer Zald provide further factors that explain the emergence of ethno-nationalist movements.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The topic for this thesis is the origins of social movements; the particular social movement in question is the contemporary phase of Canadian Native political activism. Two groups of theories will be used to analyze it: theories of nationalism and new social movement (NSM) theories; a third group of theories, resource mobilization theories, will be considered in the Conclusion. This last group of theories does not consider why social movements originate per se, but rather considers what factors allow social movements to organize themselves into credible social forces. Since the thesis is primarily concerned with explanations regarding why social movements arise, theories of nationalism and NSM will receive greater attention than those of resource mobilization. However, the strengths of all three will be recombined to offset the weaknesses of each. The first task, then, is to examine and critique some of the major contributors to these theories. The second task is to consider what kind of movement Native activism is and the final task is to identify the factors which account for its emergence.

Native activism refers to the resistance of Natives to the intrusions of what Natives refer to as a colonizing power, the Canadian government. This resistance changed in or after 1969, the year of the Trudeau government's *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy, 1969*, the white paper
which proposed to remove the special status of Canadian Indians\(^1\). Because this change is fundamental, the thesis will be seeking the origins for it rather than for the origins of Native activism. An attempt to explain the latter would entail an examination of Native-white relations since the arrival of the Europeans.

Changes occurred in two areas. The first change occurred with the establishment of the National Indian Brotherhood that was the first national organization run for and by Indians. The second was the development of a Nativist ideology. This ideology identifies the source of the oppression; the unsullied and spiritual nature of Natives; and the solution to Native problems. The source of the oppression is represented by "them" in a dichotomized world that consists only of "them" and "us"; the solution consists of establishing a community that excludes "them."

An examination of the origins of social movements necessitates an explication of the development of a sense of "we," for only if there is a solidary group can there be a social movement. The need for an explanation for collective identity thus assumes central importance in the thesis. The kind of group Canadian Natives form would seem to be obvious: they form a distinct ethnic group. However, this distinctness is not quite so obvious. Chapter Two considers some of the problems Native leaders have had constructing an identity. In particular, the difficulties in asserting that similarities among various

\(^1\) The *White Paper* proposed the following changes:
(1)...that the *Indian Act* be repealed and take such legislative steps as may be necessary to enable Indians to control Indian lands and to acquire title to them.
(2)...that [the governments of the provinces] take over the same responsibility for Indians that they have for other citizens in their provinces....
(3) Make substantial funds available for Indian economic development as an interim measure.
(4) Wind up that part of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development which deals with Indian affairs. The residual responsibilities of the Federal Government for programs in the field of Indian affairs would be transferred to other appropriate federal departments. (Government of Canada, *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969), 6).
Native groups with regard to aspects of Native-white relations and to value systems override differences among the same groups with regard to historical and socio-economic conditions are examined. Because of these problems, Native identity is fragile. However, it does exist and it is self-consciously based upon ethnicity. Therefore, the movement is an ethno-nationalist movement.

Of the theorists to be examined in the thesis, only one, Alberto Melucci, an NSM theorist, adequately addresses the development of a sense of solidarity that is found in a collective identity. As will be seen, however, there are weaknesses in his analysis of ethnic identity.

What is being disputed in Chapters Three and Four is the assertion that contemporary ethnic movements in general, and the Canadian Native movement in particular, are new in the sense NSM theorists argue. NSM theorists argue that contemporary movements are new because such movements confront new issues, particularly the importance of identity, and employ new tactics. Chapter Three considers David Long's analysis of the Canadian Native movement from an NSM perspective. However, he fails to analyze it in a manner which is consistent with the NSM paradigm. A number of Long's claims are compared with claims of NSM theorists; Long's use of Touraine's theory, one of the NSM theorists, is also examined. It is concluded that he uses Touraine's theories in error. The chapter ends by demonstrating that an analysis from Touraine's perspective is possible, but only if the collaboration between the Native movement and other Canadian social movements is considered.

Chapter Four considers in greater detail Melucci's theory. A number of his concepts provide an understanding of the construction of identity and why there is a contemporary need on the part of individuals to become part of a collective identity. These concepts are not applicable to the Canadian Native
situation if it is seen as arising from certain processes that have initiated a change in the type of society that characterizes western developed countries. However, two of his concepts—his explication of identity-building processes and his concept of bureaucratic intervention—provide means by which to understand why the formation of a solidary group around a sense of Indianness is poor, as well as understanding the role of the Canadian state in initiating this movement's formation.

Chapter Five analyzes the theory of nationalism offered by Anthony Smith in *National Identity*. As the title hints, he agrees with Melucci that identity is important; however, Smith disagrees that ethnic identity is "new." The centrality of ethnicity in nationalist movements is the object of criticism of numerous theories of nationalism. Such theories argue that ethnic identity is neither natural nor ancient, but rather became "invented" in 19th century Europe. Smith disagrees and argues instead that ethnicity has its basis in ethnic communities that predate the Industrial Revolution. However, he is in agreement with other theorists of nationalism who argue that nationalism as an ideology can only be dated from (approximately) the Industrial Revolution. This chapter identifies the continuities the Canadian Native ideology has with nationalist ideology; ideology, as noted above, forms a framework for the consolidation of an ethnic identity. The conclusion is that this movement is best characterized as a nationalist movement.

Finally, Chapter Six considers what factors are responsible for the changes in the Native movement that occurred in 1969. The explanations of the origins for social movements offered by Smith are examined and discarded because of their extreme generality. Resource mobilization theory, as developed by McCarthy and Zald, is examined to identify some of the changes in resource availability that provided an environment conducive for Native
demands and activities. Finally, Melucci's concepts of identity-building and bureaucratic intervention are utilized in identifying other factors responsible for the emergence of the post-1969 phase of the movement. The identity-building processes provide a link between micro-level and macro-level action, between what individual needs are and how social movements satisfy these needs. These processes also provide an understanding of how individuals interact to form a group. Furthermore, because social movements satisfy certain needs, they can command loyalty and solidarity. The concept of bureaucratic intervention demonstrates the control state and other elites have over individuals. Such intervention may be new to many members of western developed societies, but it is argued that Canadian Natives have been subjected to bureaucratic intervention long before the 1970s, which is approximately when Melucci dates the appearance of the change in societal type.

What the thesis will demonstrate is that nationalist and neo-nationalist theories best account for Canadian Native activism. Nonetheless, they alone are not sufficient to explain the whole phenomenon. Although NSM theory is inadequate, because neither the Native movement nor Native identity are new phenomena, it provides useful insights into the role identity plays in movement formation and maintenance, as well as the role of state and other elites. Finally, RM provides concepts that can be applied to the Native situation and thus can aid in understanding the role of resource availability.

This is primarily a theoretical essay: although I am concerned with the "how" and the "why" of the contemporary Native movement, the reader should not expect to find a history of it. The theories are explained in conjunction with an analysis of aspects of the movement.
CHAPTER TWO
SOME PROBLEMS IN CONSTRUCTING
AN 'INDIAN' IDENTITY

The topic of this chapter concerns the problems associated with and the implications of defining a nation. The specific "nation" in question is the Canadian Native Indian nation. Immediately problems arise because the terms of this phrase are often used ambiguously. Within the context of this thesis (excluding quotations), then, "Indian" will refer exclusively to registered Indians; "Native" includes Indians as well as non-status Indians and Métis.

These labels do not simply reflect problems of semantics. Rather, they reflect different historical experiences that have arguably resulted in different identities. Historical experiences differ among Indian groups as well; hence Indian identities vary. The task for Indian and Native leaders is to forge a new identity. Such identity has been termed "Indianness," a pan-identity or a pan-nationalism. Pan-nationalisms have been defined "as movements to unify in a single cultural and political community several, usually contiguous, states on the basis of shared cultural characteristics or a 'family of cultures'."¹ The term has also been used with reference to "racial minorities of advanced democratic industrial societies."² Pan-nationalisms have always failed in their political

ambitions but Smith suggests they are or may be successful in launching cultural renaissances for these minorities.\(^3\)

There are two reasons why political pan-nationalism fails. The first reason is because there are difficulties in determining what the boundaries of the new state should be. This is not of concern in this thesis because Native groups are not geographically contiguous and for them to reclaim their traditional homeland is an impossibility. The second reason arises from the problem of determining who should belong. It is assumed here that Indianness includes all Natives, but even if it excluded Métis, for example, problems of the sort discussed in this chapter would still arise. These problems are most apparent when Indianness includes Métis.

The assumption that Indianness includes all Natives is derived from the following statements of Adams and Erasmus. Adams notes:

> It is important that Natives develop a sense of unity and a sense of brotherhood....Petty differences and ambitions must be put aside in order to concern ourselves with the masses of Native people. Above all, Indians and Métis must stop trying to be accepted by white society.\(^4\)

George Erasmus extends this further. With reference to a suggestion that a national organization should be formed that would encompass all Natives, he notes: "We are strongest when we are united. We are strongest when we have a single agenda. It is obvious that we need a national agenda. We need to work

\(^3\) Smith, 171—172.

out a better working relationship.\textsuperscript{5} However, petty differences and ambitions are the least of the problems confronting such unity.

One of the sections in Frideres' book, \textit{Native Peoples in Canada: Contemporary Conflicts}, is "Indian: A Legal Concept." Sections 11, 12, and 13 of the Indian Act provide the definition of "Indian." Those who are not "Indian" according to these sections are described as "Métis," "Non-status," or "Inuit." The conclusion Frideres reaches is common:

Those in power have surely been aware that such nominal distinctions have a 'divide and conquer' effect. Natives became easier to control as they begin to fight among themselves....Red Power advocates are not [sic] attempting to point out the divisive effects of legal distinctions and to suggest ways of counteracting their influence. According to these advocates, legal status is irrelevant in the face of discrimination.\textsuperscript{6}

The key word to consider in this quotation is "nominal," for these distinctions are anything but nominal. In fact, the above categories represent and are the result of different historical experiences. The suggestion they are "nominal" and "irrelevant" leads to efforts to conflate the four categories into one called "native." Such efforts have two implications. The first is that the experiences of Indian, Métis, non-status and Inuit groups are made irrelevant because what becomes important is the history and culture of the "Native" category. However, there is neither "Native" history nor culture except in the most general sense. The second is that, if legal status is irrelevant as certain Native groups are arguing, this may provide justification for "those in power" to erode such status.


since it would appear to them that such erosion is the wish of certain Native groups.

The following discussion considers, first, whether legal differences have a "divide-and-conquer" effect, and secondly, whether legal status is irrelevant in the face of discrimination. The conclusion is affirmative in both respects but not because of the legal differences per se. Rather, as has already been noted, it is because these differences have resulted in different historical and other experiences which in turn result in different bases on which to build a collective identity.

Although Indianness is derived "from a shared historical experience of oppression, and exclusion at the hands of the dominant society and from a common hope for the future"7 as well as an awareness that Native "values, beliefs, customs, laws, and practices [constitute] a distinct, spiritually rooted 'way',"8 these generalities should not be understood as overriding specific differences derived from either current conditions or historical experiences. For example, a shared historical experience does not mean all historical experiences are identical. Status (reserve) Indians have had their experiences shaped by the reserve system in a manner which is not experienced by either Métis or non-status or non-reserve Indians: "over a period of time such a system leaves indelible marks on the people who have been subjected to it, and becomes a vital aspect of their reality and self-identity."9 Such an historical experience is the result of original legal differences.

However, such distinctions were not always the result of a policy of "divide and conquer," nor were all distinctions originally "nominal."

In Saskatchewan the legal distinctions set out in the Indian Act reflect historical realities that extend back to the events surrounding the signing of treaties between Indians and the Crown in the 1870s. The only people of aboriginal ancestry who were prohibited from 'taking treaty' were those who had previously declared themselves to be Métis by receiving the halfbreed scrip. The rule applied in all the numbered treaties was, with the above exception, that all persons of mixed blood who lived as Indians had the option to be dealt with as 'full-blooded' Indians. The initial establishment of band lists and enumeration of registered Indians was, therefore, based upon socio-cultural considerations and the choice of peoples of aboriginal ancestry either to be treated or not be treated as Indians....As late as the 1920s halfbreeds who had not accepted scrip were allowed to apply for membership in bands in Saskatchewan and to be registered as Indians.\textsuperscript{10}

Since some Métis were given the option to be included within the terms of treaties, the notion that the federal government initiated a deliberate policy of "divide and conquer" appears to be erroneous, since it is obvious from the above that similarities in lifestyle were a factor in what has since become presumably "nominal." If the federal government has not revised the Indian Act in a manner that is consistent with current conditions, this could be interpreted as neglect to keep abreast of those conditions and not as a "divide and conquer" policy.

However, the mere fact that the government presumes to define who and who is not an Indian is a point of contention. Through its policies of definition, the government engages in bureaucratic intervention of a type of which few other Canadians are the target. Natives dispute, among many other issues, the power of the federal government in this regard.

\textsuperscript{10} Dyck, 38.
The 1985 amendments to the *Indian Act* increased "the powers of band governments in relation to membership matters."\(^{11}\) Although band governments must follow the procedures within the *Act*, they "may adopt their own membership codes."\(^{12}\) It is these codes that determine "who may become and remain a band member" and not the *Act*.\(^{13}\) Furthermore, the "Minister has no power to disallow a membership code or to approve or disapprove it."\(^{14}\) However, the federal government "continues to assert its ultimate right to determine who Indians are" because, although band governments may develop their own codes, they "must stay within the purpose or objective of the delegating Act."\(^{15}\) The "nominal" legal differences continue, particularly with regard to the Métis.

However, historical and other differences find new expression under this amendment for Indians. For example, to become members of the Sarcee (Tsuu T'ina) Band "persons must understand and speak the Tsuu T'ina spoken language [and] be knowledgeable of Tsuu T'ina history, customs, and traditions."\(^{16}\)

A construction of a sense of Indianess is, however, hampered by the legal differences. Most authors suggest this difference is fundamental in preventing Native unity. Fudge, for example, notes that

\[\text{[o]f greater political consequence to the native Indian population is its having been divided by the Canadian Parliament into status and non-status categories. Status Indians, who are beneficiaries of}\]


\(^{12}\) Cassidy and Bish, 62.

\(^{13}\) Cassidy and Bish, 62.

\(^{14}\) Cassidy and Bish, 62.

\(^{15}\) Cassidy and Bish, 58, 69.

\(^{16}\) Cassidy and Bish, 67.
special programs, band funding and other largesse from the federal government, have at times opposed or, more often, failed to support non-status and Métis demands for recognition and funding. Such opposition or lack of support stems in part from a fear that the existing financial pie would not be enlarged.¹⁷

Fudge appears to blame Indians for the lack of Native unity—if Indians oppose Native unity out of fear of financial loss, they are being a bit selfish. This, in turn, tends to reinforce the idea that Native rights can only be enhanced at the expense of Indian rights.

Long agrees with Fudge’s observation that funding and “other largesse” present problems for Native unity. He suggests “[d]ivide-and-rule tactics [have been] used by state representatives to manipulate Natives.”¹⁸ The promise or withholding of monetary aid may be such tactics since they may be used as means of dividing Natives “by provoking conflict within and between bands and tribes over available funds.”¹⁹ Such an example occurred in conjunction with the 1985 Indian Act amendments. One amendment “terminated many of the discriminatory provisions of the Act, particularly those that affected women [and] allowed for the reinstatement of many persons who were denied or had lost status.”²⁰ This posed severe problems for the financially-strapped reserves who could not tolerate an unexpected influx without a corresponding increase in band funds, an increase which was not forthcoming.²¹ To ensure adequate funds for current band members (and those funds are not close to being adequate), band leaders have had to refuse to include reinstated members in “their band membership lists.”²² This exacerbates tensions within bands as well.

¹⁷ Stephen Fudge, ”Too Weak to Win, Too Strong to Lose: Indians and Indian Policy in Canada,” BC Studies 57 (Spring 1983): 138.
¹⁸ Long, 125.
¹⁹ Long, 129.
²⁰ Cassidy and Bish, 61.
²¹ Cassidy and Bish, 63.
²² Frideres, 13.
as preventing the inclusion and enlargement of the Indian population. Potential members could add vitality to Indianess not only by their substantial numbers but by the individual qualities and abilities of each member.23

The removal of special Indian status could lead to the conflating of the legal distinctions into one. This could result in assimilation into Canadian society, something most Natives do not want. In a 1976 statement, David Ahenakew, then Chief of the Federation for Saskatchewan Indians (F.S.I.), noted the possible ramifications of assimilation:

- If government succeeds in reclassifying status Indians as just another category of 'Natives', it will then be only a small step to reclassifying all of us—status Indians, non-status Indians, Métis and Inuit—as simply part of the 'disadvantaged sector' of Canadian society.
- All of us will then be dealt with on the same terms and by the same agencies as all other disadvantaged groups.
- If non-status groups cooperate in the erosion of our rights and status, they will be inviting governments to eventually submerge them, along with us, into the Canadian multicultural mosaic.
- We will be left with welfare programs, beadworks, powwows and very little else.24

The Assembly of First Nations has suffered internal discord on this same matter. The Assembly "eventually was seen by some First Nations with strong nationalistic viewpoints as a vehicle for assimilation, rather than a vehicle for the protection of the cultural differences of the First Nations."25 One particular cultural difference is derived from the signing of treaties, the result of which was the establishment of reserves. As noted earlier, the reserve system "leaves indelible marks" on those subjected to it. Prairie Indians are among those who have been subjected to the reserve system. This has resulted in a specific

23 Cassidy and Bish, 63. In 1988, it had been projected that the eventual total would be 90,000 registrations.
24 Dyck, 41.
sense of identity that differs from, for example, non-reserve and/or non-status Indians. Although the reserve system has had many negative effects, Long points out that it was through it that "Native people were able to protect and begin to rediscover their 'Indianness' together."26 Non-reserve Indians did not have this same opportunity. The desire to resist assimilation into the Assembly stemmed from the same concerns Ahenakew noted above—assimilation in any form is resisted. It is, thus, no surprise that one of the "nationalistic" First Nations that eventually broke from the Assembly was the Prairie Indian group.27

The second implication of conflating the legal distinctions into one category is that it may provide justification for "those in power" to officially erode and eventually eliminate special Indian status and to do so with the apparent support of Native groups, since they are arguing that these differences are irrelevant. This appears to have occurred.

A 1976 federal review concluded,

(1) that the special problems and needs of all 'classes' of 'native' peoples are similar and;
(2) that the Indian Act is arbitrary, anachronistic and harsh in excluding certain 'classes' of indigenous peoples from its provisions.28

Frideres, referring to the article by Dyck from which this quotation is taken, states the latter suggests the differences noted above "can be exaggerated or ignored by the dominant group at will to suit its purpose."29

Dyck does not make this suggestion, noting that the memorandum from which the quotation above is taken

---

26 Long, 124.
27 Opekokew, 36, 37.
28 Dyck, 37.
29 Frideres, 17.
indicates that its recommendations were informed by previous discussions between Federal representatives and the leaders of non-status and Métis peoples. This might conceivably be interpreted as evidence not only that Federal officials are finally listening to 'Native' peoples, but also of the essential correctness of the arguments outlined above [which include the argument regarding nominal difference outlined in this chapter] in favour of ignoring the legal distinctions between registered Indians and other indigenous peoples. Both of these readings have, however, been explicitly and emphatically rejected by...the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians....

Fear of assimilation, as noted above, is the reason for this rejection. However, what is important about this quotation is how the discussions might be interpreted; the federal government may "finally" be listening to Native peoples and attempting to reach an accommodation suitable to all, or it may be cynically pursuing another "divide and conquer" policy, by only regarding the recommendations of those groups which concur with government policy.

Legal differences, thus, appear to have a "divide-and-conquer" effect. However, as the example of the Prairie Indians show, the legal categories have hardened into different senses of identity. It is doubtful these senses would change with the removal of the legal categories. Furthermore, because removal of the categories would change the nature of the special benefits accorded to Indians, such removal is the object of dispute by the Prairie Indians.

The assumption that legal status is irrelevant forms part of the basis for Indianness. If legal status is irrelevant, certain similarities should be sufficient to overcome the differences that have resulted from the legal categories. The similarities have previously been noted. The shared sense of oppression and discrimination is derived from the assumption that legal status is irrelevant in the face of discrimination. This assumption will be considered first and will be

30 Dyck, 37.
followed by a discussion of the shared values, as well as the shared hope for the future, particularly a future that includes self-government.

It is no secret that Native peoples are disadvantaged in Canadian society. Variables generally indicative of social problems and social exclusion for Indians compare unfavourably with those of Canadian society. Both levels of education achieved and life expectancy are lower, housing conditions are substandard, and suicide rates, incidences of violent death and alcohol abuse, unemployment rates, and infant mortality rates are all higher.\textsuperscript{31} Métis are also disadvantaged with respect to the same variables and in comparison with Canadians. Significantly, Frideres provides extensive documentation for Indians but simply summarizes the socio-economic conditions of the Métis: "the Métis, with other native groups, were discriminated against with respect to health care, housing, education, and economic opportunities."\textsuperscript{32} Although it is possible that current documentation was unavailable to him, it is also possible that Frideres is making the assumption that because the symptoms are the same, the disease must be the same and, therefore, so too must the cure be the same. Frideres indeed concludes that "[t]he boundary for Métis identity does not rest on cultural differences between Métis and Whites or status Indians, but on the social and legal exclusion of the Métis from these two groups."\textsuperscript{33} If, however, exclusion is understood to be the cause for Métis problems, self-government could conceivably perpetuate such exclusion, especially if it is not accompanied by sufficient financial aid. This observation applies to other Native groups as well.

It is also argued that there are no discernible differences among Native peoples: because a visual distinction can not often be made, the forms of

\textsuperscript{31} Frideres, 168, 186, 192, 199.
\textsuperscript{32} Frideres, 317.
\textsuperscript{33} Frideres, 319.
discrimination are therefore claimed to be the same.\textsuperscript{34} This, in turn, is a variant of an argument made earlier—if the symptoms are the same, the causes must be the same and identities derivable from historical experiences are thus irrelevant.

There is much that is credible in this. Gellner notes there are entropy-resistant traits which prohibit or reduce the possibilities of integration—the colour barrier is one of the more obvious.\textsuperscript{35} Gellner's hypothetical "blues" are synonymous with Canada's Native peoples: both are concentrated at the lower ends of the socio-economic and occupational scales and because of this, there develops an association between blueness/Indianness and low social position from which is derived prejudice.\textsuperscript{36} Gellner does not consider the possibility that prejudice preceded and thus, originally contributed to the low social position. Regardless of the accomplishments of individual blues/Indians, this prejudice is maintained.\textsuperscript{37} Because of their colour, "smooth assimilation" is blocked.\textsuperscript{38} Gellner notes that this situation presents "grave sociological obstacles, not easily removable by mere good will and legislation."\textsuperscript{39} This makes a mockery of Acton's prescription that "[t]he co-existence of several nations under the same state is a test, as well as the best security of its freedom."\textsuperscript{40} As long as prejudice and stereotypes persist, states will fail this test.

Because the forms of discrimination are the same for all those who appear to be Indian, these provide a basis for the construction of a common ethnic identity. However, it does not provide such a basis for those who do not

\textsuperscript{34} Frideres, 17.
\textsuperscript{36} Gellner, 67; 68.
\textsuperscript{37} Gellner, 69.
\textsuperscript{38} Gellner, 70.
\textsuperscript{39} Gellner, 69.
\textsuperscript{40} Lord Acton, "Nationality," \textit{Home and Foreign Review} (July 1862): 299.

17
appear to be Indian. Since discrimination is a form of oppression, and because its effects are variable, the shared historical experience of oppression again is not identical for all Natives.

Watson asserts that "[e]thnicity is neither...a 'variable' which 'manifests itself' nor...something we are born with whether we like it or not."41 Rather, it is acquired through "interpersonal bargaining" and is constructed in a continual process of interaction and redefinition.42 Most people "experience little tension" during this process, but those who are assigned politically charged labels "must struggle to exhibit and maintain" their ethnicity;43 it becomes a conscious, even self-conscious, struggle rather than a subconscious struggle. The construction of Indianness follows this process.

Indianness is self-consciously coalescing around shared values among Indian groups and the shared hope of self-government. The values which are shared include: a preference for making decisions by consensus; "institutionalized sharing as an important mechanism for community survival; strong negative actions against greed and excessive material acquisitiveness; lack of emotional commitment to personal possessions; a preference for indirection in controlling others as expressed in conversation by giving attention to others without interruption"; and a sense of time as "circular" rather than "linear";44 as well as the previously noted value of spirituality. In addition to common values, a common culture is being made. For example, there is an increasing tendency for Indian leaders to wear Plains Indian ceremonial

42 Watson, 454.
43 Watson, 454.
costumes as well as increasing incidences of inter-tribal powwows. Thus, there is some evidence of a cultural renaissance.

It could be questioned, however, whether these shared values and common cultural attributes extend to the Métis. Frideres notes they "are faced with a crucial need for a core culture on which to focus their identity." Given the disputes between Indians and Natives noted earlier, it can also be questioned whether Métis would acquire the Indian cultural attributes noted above and thus assimilate to the Indian identity. Or perhaps they would develop a Métis "core culture," remain distinct, and further exacerbate current divisions.

Since Indianess is a constructed identity, like any ethnic identity, effort must be given to identifying and acknowledging similarities. These similarities should override the differences, otherwise unity and solidarity will be lacking. It is not certain that historical experiences or value systems are shared significantly by Indians and Métis. Equally, it is not certain that a common hope for the future would be sufficient to provide a unifying force since ideals and ideas of self-government will be predicated upon previous experiences that have differed in substantial ways. Also, it is not clear that the legal differences are completely nominal, as Frideres notes, since they have had an impact in shaping both the different historical experiences that have led to current differences in culture, as well as current socio-economic conditions.

Finally, the interaction between peoples of Native descent and other Canadians and their ancestors has occurred for hundreds of years. Because of this, and because of the permeable nature of ethnic boundaries, it is difficult to determine what is "authentically" Indian. If this is so, it is equally difficult to

---

45 Boldt, 491.
46 Frideres, 318.
determine both what distinguishes Métis from Indians and what makes them similar. The "we" feeling of Indianness rests on unstable ground.

The remaining chapters examine the explanations for why a sense of ethnic identity is important. They also will examine explanations for why resurgences of ethnicity occur.
CHAPTER THREE
NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORISTS:
ALAIN TOURNAINE

David Long uses the theories of certain new social movement (NSM) and resource mobilization (RM) theorists to analyze the contemporary Canadian Native movement. The NSM paradigm explains the "why" of movements.¹ Long uses the contributions of this group to understand the historical antecedents of the contemporary Native movement. RM theories explain the "how" of movements and are used to understand the need for Natives to "cultivate a broad-based conscience constituency."² Discussion of resource mobilization theory, as developed by McCarthy and Zald, will be discussed in Chapter Six.

Long concentrates considerable effort on clarifying the continuities the contemporary Native movement has with pre-1969 activism. According to Long, what is new about the contemporary phase is the development and protection of an ideology that is based upon a shared sense of Indianness and the bureaucratization of movement activities.

Indianness emerged in conjunction with the development of what Long refers to as a Nativist ideology.³ The need for an identity based on ethnicity is considered to be a new feature of contemporary movements by NSM theorists

¹ Long, 132.
² Long, 131, 132.
³ Long, 123.
who do not, however, dispute the fact that ethnic identity has arisen in previous historical times. They argue, rather, that it is new because the meaning of ethnic identity has changed. Those who construct a contemporary ethnic identity are aware of "their capacity to create identities and of power relations involved in their social construction." 4

However, Long does not really argue that the development and protection of a Nativist ideology and the corresponding sense of Indianness is a feature that would mark the Native movement as a new social movement. He presents this development as a new feature of the contemporary Native movement and simply allows the reader to assume that this development must indicate that the movement is a new social movement. I agree that this development is new to the Canadian context. What is being disputed is, first, Long's neglect to adequately develop his argument within the theoretical framework of the NSM paradigm. He assumes, a priori, that the Native movement is a new social movement, and does not entertain the possibility that it may be better analyzed from another paradigm. His failure to adequately develop his argument in a manner which would be consistent with the NSM paradigm is most apparent in his use of one of the concepts of Touraine's theory, a theory that was specifically developed by Touraine to analyze class movements. Long rejects Touraine's "cultural Marxism" and, thus, it is unclear why he should choose to use any of Touraine's concepts. Secondly, it will be argued, in this and in the following chapter, that the ability of the NSM paradigm to analyze ethno-nationalist movements in general and the Native movement in particular, as well as its ability to analyze the corresponding (supposedly new) need for ethnic identity, falters on several accounts.

With regard to the bureaucratization of movements, this is hardly a new feature of social movements per se, although it is a new feature of Native activism. The bureaucratization of movement activities has made appearances in previous movements; thus, this aspect represents a continuity between the Native movement and other, earlier, types of movements. Because this is a continuity rather than a discontinuity, Long's use of the NSM paradigm is misplaced. In fact, the bureaucratization of movement activities would be considered by NSM theorists to be antithetical to both the spirit and the reality of new social movements.

Cohen, for example, notes that new social movements "focus on grassroots politics and create horizontal, directly democratic associations that are loosely federated on national levels." Cohen, 667. Canel, in his review of NSM theories, also notes the importance they place on new organizational forms, forms which tend to have a "minimal organizational bureaucracy." Melucci further notes that traditional organizational forms, particularly the "existing channels of political organization and...the organizational forms of political agencies," are not entirely conducive to satisfying or expressing the needs of contemporary movements. In fact, he argues, social movement organizational forms are increasingly "autonomous from political systems." They consist primarily of networks of small groups and engage in actions which are "spontaneous, anti-authoritarian, and anti-hierarchical." Traditional organizational forms, such as bureaucracy and systems of indirect participation, are "likely to reproduce the

5 Cohen, 667.
mechanisms of control and manipulation against which the struggle is directed in the first place.10

Melucci is referring to the possibility that these organizational forms may become a dominator of those who created them. It is also obvious that a centrally organized social movement organization is more likely to be subject to attempts of "control and manipulation" by those outside the organization. Long notes there have been examples of "social and political manipulation of Native people" such as the "[d]ivide—and—rule tactics" mentioned in the previous chapter as well as "attempts to co-opt Indian leaders and band followers" by "state representatives,"11 though he does not consider the possibility that such tactics have been greatly facilitated in recent years by the very bureaucratization that he assumes to be a condition of strength.

Long makes only passing reference to grass-roots organizing of Natives and suggests this type of organization cooperates with the bureaucratized component of the movement.12 He is primarily concerned with how the bureaucratization of the movement "revolutionized Native/non-Native relations."13 However, Frideres notes, that in the same period with which Long is concerned, "the leadership of major Native organizations began to become further removed from Native grass-roots individuals."14 For example, "[m]ost Native organizations were in large urban areas where few of the people they represented resided. It was difficult to maintain communications and when they

11 Long, 125.
12 Long, 131; see also 129.
13 Long, 130.
did, they began to sound like the bureaucrats Natives had dealt with for so many years.\(^\text{15}\)

A further obstacle to cooperation is the phenomenon of the so-called "red apple."\(^\text{16}\) Watson suggests that such "name-calling" undermines a "leader or potential leader" because "in the opinion of the speaker, such a person is not fit to hold office."\(^\text{17}\) Too much distance from traditional ways and too much incorporation of the "cultural and material resources of non-Natives into [Native] contemporary ideologies and social structures"\(^\text{18}\) can lead to an accusation of being "too white." One example of this is provided by Marule:

> In Indian communities elitism is sometimes promoted by people who go to university and return home believing they have the right, the authority and the wisdom to tell people what they should do or what is best for them. They assume that they should hold a superior economic and social position in the community. Elitism is a European ideology and philosophy. It is completely contrary to our traditional philosophy and ideology, and it is very dangerous to the survival of Indian communities.\(^\text{19}\)

Thus, the cooperation between grass-roots and institutionalized organizations that Long assumes as a given, as well as the strength of Indian organizations, whether grass-roots or bureaucratized, is not as great as he leads one to believe.

Long's efforts at clarifying the continuities contemporary activism has with its predecessor is meant to foster an understanding of the history of Native activism. He notes that there exists an "impression that the activity of the Native

\(^{15}\) Frideres, "Introduction," 4.

\(^{16}\) 'Red-apple' means 'red' or 'Indian' on the 'outside', but 'white' on the 'inside', suggesting that in all aspects except skin colour, the person in question is not Indian. It is meant to be pejorative.

\(^{17}\) Watson, 464.

\(^{18}\) Long, 124.

\(^{19}\) Marie Smallface Marule, "Traditional Indian Government: Of the People, by the People, for the People," in Pathways to Self-Determination: Canadian Indians and the Canadian State, eds. Leroy Little Bear, Menno Boldt and J. Anthony Long (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 41.
Indian social movement activity surfaced in Canada only during the late 1960s."\(^{20}\) Long wishes to correct this impression by "entering into its past and present 'historicity'."\(^{21}\) "Historicity" is one of the concepts developed by Touraine. While there is no doubt that any political struggle can not be understood without understanding its cultural and political antecedents, Touraine's historicity and, indeed, his use of the phrase "social movement" implies something far greater than the history and social movement of a specific group. Both concepts are class concepts and although Long notes in a footnote that he rejects Touraine's "cultural Marxism" this does not justify taking these concepts out of context.\(^{22}\) To do so is analogous to taking the proletariat out of the class struggle.

For Touraine, social movements are the most important of all social struggles.\(^{23}\) His theory and methodology are designed to "separate out [the] different directions in current social struggles in order to bring out in the most diverse areas the new social movement which tomorrow will take over the central role that the workers' movement held in industrial society."\(^{24}\) The central problem of this conflict is "a social problem concerning the whole of society: it is this that separates an action struggle from a pressure group whose objectives are more restricted."\(^{25}\) This social problem is evident in the new class struggle of post-industrial society "between the different kinds of apparatus and user—consumers or more simply the public—defined less by their specific attributes than by their resistance to domination by the apparatus....This is why the

\(^{20}\) Long, 119.
\(^{21}\) Long, 118
\(^{22}\) Long, 133.
\(^{24}\) Touraine, 9.
\(^{25}\) Touraine, 85.
defense against such apparatus is no longer carried out in the name of political rights or workers' rights but in support of a population's right to choose its kind of life and in support of its political potential, which is often called self-management.  

While this demand for self-management appears to be similar to the First Nations' demand for self-government, First Nations' members are defined more by their "specific attributes" than by their relation to the "apparatus." It is from their specific attributes that their marginality is derived. If their "Indianness" were derived from their marginality only, and hence from their relation to the apparatus, then the demand for self-government could be considered a demand for self-management.  

Touraine takes the "social" in "social movement" quite seriously. "The national movement is a response to state domination, just as the workers' movement is a response to class domination." However "national problems do not constitute a testing-ground for class struggles." It is important here to note that Touraine consistently equates social movements with class action. In his discussion on the relation nationalism has with class action, he points out that "[w]hat we are in fact dealing with are not successive stages in history but rather two orders of problems...."—national claims and social claims. He also points out that nationalist movements "bent on uniting" these claims have "always met with failure." However, consistent with his argument that the "different directions in current social struggles" must be "separated out," he concludes that national struggles and social struggles must be combined, "since

---

26 Touraine, 7.  
27 Touraine, 133.  
28 Touraine, 133.  
29 Touraine, 133.  
30 Touraine, 133.
the struggle against a state is also a battle...against an obstacle in the way of economic development."31 Before a social movement can be successful, the older issues of "rights of Man and citizen vis-a-vis the state"32 and economic and other forms of inequality must be resolved.

Touraine does not analyze the nationalist movements of those groups who have suffered from internal colonialism. He refers, however, to "populist movements" that "are founded on the desire of social groups experiencing crisis to avoid splitting up and, by strengthening their collective identity, to succeed in regaining control over their own development."33 Such movements are "modernizing" movements that resist "stoutly against the dispossession of peoples and territories dominated from afar by a distant master."34 The "distance" referred to here could either be geographical distance or, for example, the social distance of Natives from the remainder of Canadian society. He notes the importance of modernizing movements: "for a while we shall have to live with cultural modernization movements linked to a liberal critique before we are able to assist the renaissance of social movements."35

Touraine also notes the tendency of nationalist/populist movements to be "backward-looking" in the sense that such movements revive, for example, traditions or languages that have been lost. Society is in a transition phase from industrialism to post-industrialism; one of the conditions of this phase is that the "new adversary has not yet become clearly delineated...."36 The threat posed by this new adversary is "undefined" because the adversary is as yet unknown;

31 Touraine, 133.
32 Touraine, 17.
33 Touraine, 20.
34 Touraine, 20.
35 Touraine, 18.
36 Touraine, 16.
thus "a community turns back upon its past...in order to salvage a collective existence threatened with disintegration."37

Both Melucci and Smith refer to the "backward-looking" tendency of movements as well. Melucci notes that

social movements, during their formative stage, generally adopt languages, ideologies, expressions and patterns of organization which are inherited from the past, but which are ill-suited to their actual content....This process is a constant feature of cultural orientation: social actors gather together a ragbag of pre-existing cultural elements to express new contents for which an adequate grammar has yet to be developed.38

He suggests this tendency is "linked with other processes of collective transformation."39 Long makes reference to this tendency when he notes the "movement of Canada’s Native Indians drew both strength and direction from traditional ways" but the movement also gave way to "spiritual visions and rituals" when it adopted bureaucratization.40 In terms of both ideology and organization, the Indian movement appears to be "backward-looking," at least as concerns NSM theory. As will be seen later in the thesis, Smith notes that the "backward-looking" tendency has been an endemic characteristic of ethno-nationalist movements; hence it is doubtful that the current rhetoric of the Indian movement that refers to the "pre-existing cultural elements" results specifically from "processes of collective transformation" as NSM theory would suggest.

However, cultural modernization is not the same as a conflict over historicity, as Long implicitly suggests. The social control of historicity is the focus of the class struggle.41 The class struggle occurs between the ruling

37 Touraine, 16.
39 Melucci, Nomads, 136.
40 Long, 124—125.
41 Touraine, 29.
class and the popular class and a social movement "is the collective organized action" through which either of these two classes "battles for the social control of historicity."42 "The ruling class is the group of innovators-dominators which becomes identified with...the work society performs on itself, by inventing its norms, its institutions and practices, guided by the great cultural orientations—pattern of knowledge, type of investment, and cultural model...."43 Historicity is defined as the latter three components. The ruling class utilizes control over historicity "in order to legitimize its domination over the remainder of society, i.e. over the popular class, which is subjected to the ruling class but which also challenges its domination in order to win back historicity for itself."44

Long suggests the conflict is "between state and social movement representatives" and is a "conflict between alternate visions of the state."45 It is in Touraine, however, a class conflict, so the "alternate vision" Touraine is referring to is of society and not the state, as Long suggests. Indeed the same page Long takes his paraphrase from explicitly states this:

the action of social movements is not fundamentally directed towards the state and cannot be identified with political action for the conquest of power. It is a class action, directed against a truly social adversary. There may be convergence or alliance, but never unification, between a social movement and an action for the transformation of state power.46

If Touraine had argued that the "transformation of state power" was in fact the identifying feature of a social movement, Long's suggestion regarding the "alternate vision" would be correct. As noted earlier, the "response to state domination" is the domain of nationalist movements; therefore, an alternate

42 Touraine, 31.
43 Touraine, 31, 29. His emphasis.
44 Touraine, 31.
45 Long, 122.
46 Touraine, 80. His emphasis.
vision of the state belongs to nationalist movements but not to the social movements Touraine is concerned with.

A discontinuity between new social movements and previous social movements, according to Mooers and Sears, is precisely the assertion that the focus of movement attention has ceased to be the state.\textsuperscript{47} They make this observation with particular reference to Melucci, but consider it to be a general failing of new social movement theory.\textsuperscript{48} The discontinuity is obvious in the above quotation taken from Touraine's work. It is just as obvious in Melucci's work: "collective action is shifting more and more from the 'political' form...to a cultural ground" and shows a "scant interest...for the question of the seizure of power."\textsuperscript{49} However, contrary to the criticisms of Mooers and Sears, Melucci notes that action directed towards the state still exists, and is still important.

Melucci perceives social movements as having two levels or components. One is a political component: when social movements "choose public mobilization," they influence and confront "institutions, governments, [and] policies; there are pushes toward the renewal of cultures, languages, habits."\textsuperscript{50} However, he suggests this "is only one part and not always the most important, of contemporary collective action."\textsuperscript{51} In essence, he wishes to correct what he perceives to be the tendency of the resource mobilization approach "to reduce every collective action to the political level"; although the analysis of the political level is both "legitimate" and necessary in understanding contemporary social movements, the exclusion of any other level leads to an

\textsuperscript{48} Mooers and Sears, 64—65.
\textsuperscript{50} Melucci, "Symbolic," 813, 810.
\textsuperscript{51} Melucci, "Symbolic," 813.
incomplete analysis.52 The level Melucci concentrates most of his efforts on is the cultural level, particularly that which "affects the meaning of individual action and the codes which shape behaviours."53 Ethno-nationalist movements contain both political and cultural levels: they confront the political system in their demands for the redistribution of "resources and social opportunities," but also operate at the cultural level in their "renewal of cultures, languages, [and] habits" and in confrontations with "bureaucratic organizations that intervene in the definition and regulation of social behaviour."54

This latter situation is clearly identifiable in the situation of Canadian Natives. As noted in Chapter Two, their ethnicity is legally entrenched. Furthermore, Indians are "regulated by the contents of the Indian Act" and decisions by Indians regarding their political and economic affairs can be overridden by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.55 Historically, too, church organizations with the cooperation and, in many cases, the aid of the state, were able to "intervene in the definition and regulation" of Indian social behaviour through their "civilizing" efforts.56

Long makes reference to the fact that the "primary adversary" of Canadian Natives is the state.57 As Nativist ideology developed it "articulated the brokenness inflicted upon Natives largely as a result of state intervention."58 The brokenness began to be made whole again with the renewal of cultures and languages, although this renewal commenced primarily as a result of, and in reaction to, state intrusions. For example, he suggests "it was as a result of their

54 Melucci, Nomads, 91, 89.
55 Frideres, Native, 9, 368.
56 Frideres, Native, 368.
57 Long, 128; see also Long, 127.
58 Long, 124.
internment on the socially and geographically isolated reserves that Native people were able to protect and begin to rediscover their 'Indianness' together"—this internment was a result of state policies.\footnote{Long, 124.}

To this point, the analysis suggests that the Canadian Indian movement includes the components Melucci posits as comprising new social movements: confrontations directed towards changing state policies and opposition to bureaucratic intervention. Native activism is not, however, a social movement as Touraine understands the term. It could be so considered, although the manner which the research would be undertaken would be different than that which Long attempted. Specifically, the social movement elements would have to be identified in a manner consistent with Touraine's theory and methodology.

Long notes that Canadian Natives have forged links with non-Native groups: "Specific to the mandates of these...coalitions is the establishment of dialogue between people in order to develop a broad-based movement for social change in Canada."\footnote{Long, 131.} Erasmus provides the details of these coalitions:

We have had a working relationship with church organizations since the early 70s....Eventually we started to have a working relationship with the larger labour organizations in this country. More recently, we have been working with women's organizations. We are working with students' organizations and so forth, including the environmental network.

This work has never been fully incorporated into a single strategy and a single alliance. We need to map out a strategy that will take us to the year 2000 and beyond...regardless of what governments do....This is what we must do, if we are to guarantee the kind of recognition and the kind of Canada that we all should have.\footnote{Erasmus, 178.}

The goal of social change would be the characteristic that Touraine would consider indicative of a social movement. If the Native movement were to

\footnote{Long, 124.}
\footnote{Long, 131.}
\footnote{Erasmus, 178.}
confront the following three issues, it would be a social movement in Touraine’s sense.

The first of these issues is the nature of the conflict which the coalitions confronted. To be considered a social movement by Touraine, this conflict would have to be a class conflict; hence the actors would have to be class actors.62 Class conflict emerges "wherever a ruling apparatus is in equal control of demand and supply, and can thus shape social and cultural behaviours."63 The popular class is defined by its relation and resistance to this domination.64

Since this class domination extends into a "rapidly increasing number of social activities,"65 the class nature of the Native movement could conceivably lie in its criticism of the paternalistic nature of the Canadian government as expressed in its policies with regard to Natives. However, to be a social criticism rather than a nationalist criticism, the movement would have to be apprised of its similarity with other groups in the coalitions that have suffered from government encroachment into and control of social activities. At present, First Nations are concerned primarily with their marginality. This is not to diminish in importance the concerns of First Nations, but simply to argue that their struggles are nationalistic. If the dialogue among the coalitions were to consider this similarity, to the extent it exists, then it would be a social movement in Touraine’s sense.

The second issue the coalitions would have to consider is the character of the opponent.66 Touraine would refer to two of the four conditions that constitute a social movement to clarify this. One of these is that the struggle

62 Touraine, 178.
63 Touraine, 7.
64 Touraine, 7.
65 Touraine, 7.
66 Touraine, 178.
"must fight against [a specific] adversary, which may be represented by a social group even if, as often occurs, it is defined in more abstract terms, as capitalism or the state." Since the Native movement is directed primarily towards the state, it meets this condition. However, although the adversary should be specific, another condition states that the conflict with it should not be specific; rather, "it should be a social problem concerning the whole of society." The objective for First Nations is self-government for and by their own people. This is not a social problem concerning the whole society. For it to be a social objective, greater autonomy and "self-management" for all Canadians would have to be demanded. In other words, the social relations in which all Canadians are caught would have to be challenged. The coalitions, in their pursuit of social change, may make such a challenge.

The third issue concerns the cultural stakes of the conflict. Touraine suggests that the actor, in addressing this issue, must put aside ideology and recognize commonalities with the opponent. Social movements occupy the same cultural field, the same historicity—they must since a social movement is engaged in conflict for the control of historicity. Thus, struggles which occur between actors belonging to different fields are not social movements. Such a struggle may be that of a "state militarily engaged in a war against a people." No doubt an argument could be made in favour of analyzing the situation of Canadian Natives vis-a-vis the Canadian state as a situation of war. However, although military intervention has occurred, to suggest the Canadian state is at

---

67 Touraine, 85. His emphasis.
68 Touraine, 85.
69 Touraine, 178.
70 Touraine, 178.
71 Touraine, 33.
72 Touraine, 33.
"war" with Canadian Natives would be stretching the concept of war as Touraine uses it—specifically as a military engagement between adversaries belonging to different social fields.

Long notes that "traditional histories and corresponding world and life views distinguished Indians from most other Canadians."73 The key word is "traditional." Although there has been a resurrection of the traditional ways, Natives are situated in and subject to the influences of an industrial society; their traditional ways can not and have not insulated them from this. Because industrial (and post-industrial) society is so insidious, Canadian Natives are caught in the same social and cultural field as other Canadians. To be a social movement in Touraine's sense would mean that the Native movement would have to recognize this commonality and set aside the part of the ideology that stresses Native distinctness.

None of the preceding is meant to diminish the importance of the Native struggle either to its own participants or to the rest of Canada. However, NSM theory as interpreted and applied by Long seems inadequate for explaining the Canadian Native movement. New social movements are new types of movements, and Native nationalism, while new in the Canadian context, is hardly new to the history of nationalism. Long identifies the bureaucratization of the movement as a new feature. It is, however, not new to social movements and indeed, NSM theorists precisely emphasize antagonism to bureaucratization as a central feature of new social movements. Furthermore, Touraine reserves the term "social movement" as a description for class movements. Touraine arranges social action hierarchically; although he refers to populist movements, this type of movement is situated lower on the hierarchy

73 Long, 123.
than social movements. Finally, although the development of Indianness and of Nativist ideology receives considerable attention in Long’s article, he does not place these developments into a NSM paradigm. The failure to do so means he can not identify whether the meaning of Indianness to Natives is new in the sense meant by NSM theorists; that is, that Natives and other members of contemporary ethno-nationalist movements are aware of their capacity to construct identities. Thus, Long confuses the new directions the Native movement has taken with what new social movement theorists would identify as new features. Simply because the Native movement has evolved in new directions does not, in and of itself, make it a new movement.

Insufficient attention has been given to the analysis of the development of Indianness. Alberto Melucci’s theories with regard to the need for identity will be considered next.

74 Touraine, 10—24; especially, 11.
CHAPTER FOUR

NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORISTS:

ALBERTO MELUCCI

Melucci provides an analysis of individual needs and the relation they have to social movements. Central to his analysis is the importance of the individual need for identity. He argues that this need has assumed greater importance in contemporary society than in previous societies. However, unlike the feminist, the environmental and the peace movements, the emphasis on, and construction of, ethnicity has historically assumed central importance in nationalist movements.

Melucci's analysis also provides numerous analytical concepts that improve immensely on the theories that preceded his. As noted in the Introduction to this thesis, the origins of social movements have consistently been analyzed in absence of what causes the formation of groups. Melucci's identity-building processes analyze group formation and are discussed later in this chapter.

Another of his concepts that is useful is that of bureaucratic intervention. This receives considerable attention in this chapter. The reason for this attention becomes more apparent in the final chapter where this concept is applied to the situation of Canadian Natives.

Finally, Melucci's definition of social movements is precise enough to identify a type of social action that differs from the social action found in interest
groups and political parties. This may not appear to be significant, but one of the
criticisms of the resource mobilization paradigm is that it can not or does not
adequately distinguish social movements from either interest groups or political
parties. This paradigm criticized the theories of collective behaviour for
assuming that social movement participation was fundamentally different from
institutionalized behaviour such as that found in interest groups and political
parties, but in the process of making this criticism, it blurred the distinction
between social movements and interest groups and political parties. As one
author put it, the "baby was thrown out with the bathwater" because resource
mobilization excludes the analysis of political culture.¹ Melucci's definition of
collective behaviour and his analysis in its entirety improves upon both theories
of collective behaviour and resource mobilization. It improves upon the former
by recognizing the rationality of social movement participants, while it improves
upon resource mobilization by recognizing that action has meaning and
rationality over and beyond strategic instrumental rationality.

Melucci's definitions of collective behaviour, social movements, and
ethno-nationalist movements will be considered first. The second topic to
consider will be how Melucci identifies and analyzes complex society as well as
what relevance this analysis holds for the analysis of ethno-nationalist
movements.

Melucci's definition of collective behaviour consists of a range of three
paired characteristics or dimensions. The first dimension ranges from
"solidarity," where actors mutually recognize each other as belonging to the
same social unit, to "aggregation," where action is "purely individualistic" and
"directed exclusively to [the] external environment, rather than to the group

¹ Cohen, 688.
itself." The second dimension ranges from conflict to consensus, where the former is characterized as "an opposition between two or more actors competing for control over resources which they consider valuable." The final set of characteristics ranges from collective behaviour that transgresses the "limits of compatibility of the system of social relationships in which action is embedded" to behaviour that adapts to these limits.

Social movements are situated in one extreme of the space the above dimensions constitute. Thus, a social movement is collective behaviour which involves "solidarity," is engaged in conflict, and which "breaks the limits of compatibility of a system." A "system" can include anything from a business organization to a political system and a social movement can occur in any of these systems.

Melucci's analysis of ethno-nationalist movements makes it clear that he understands them to be social movements as defined above. The same social unit to which members of ethno-nationalist movements belong is the ethnic group. The conflict in which such movements are engaged consists of a dispute over "the distribution of resources and social opportunities." The final characteristic of ethno-nationalist movements involves the right to control a specific geographic territory. This "breaks the limits" for states are loath to forsake territory.

If one were to isolate this definition from the remainder of Melucci's analysis, the argument could be made that Canadian Natives are involved in a

---

social movement struggle. However, Melucci also wants to argue that ethno-nationalist movements are one of the movements which are new and which epitomize the problems and needs of a complex society; unless this is so, he suggests they become "historical by-products" or "[forms] of resistance which [are] archaic, utopian and regressive."\(^8\) According to him, ethno-national movements have brought to light the "two problems central to complex societies": (1) "the need for new rights for all members of the community, particularly the right to be different"; and (2) "the right to autonomy, to control a specific living space (which in this case is also a geographic territory)."\(^9\) These two needs or rights are considered by Melucci to be discontinuous with the demands of previous nationalist movements.

He does, however, recognize the continuities contemporary ethno-nationalist movements have with their predecessors, particularly the aspects of being "rooted in the past"; of being in conflict with the state; of being the object of numerous discriminations and inequalities; and finally, as being the torchbearer for the extension of citizenship and its associated rights.\(^10\) The last point makes it obvious that Melucci understands nationalism in its most benign form.

The concept of complex society will be discussed first. Included in this discussion will be an explication of why Melucci considers the two problems mentioned above to be new.

Complex society is identified by three processes which Melucci argues differentiate it from industrial society. The first process is an increasing control over "inner" nature; the second process is an increasing globalization of the

---

\(^8\) Melucci, *Nomads*, 91, 90.
world's systems; and the third process is "individuation." Each of these will be considered in greater detail in the following discussion.

The first process is that

within this system information has become the core resource. Our access to reality is facilitated and shaped by the conscious production and control of information. 'Forms' or images produced through perception and cognition increasingly organize our relationship to the material and communicative environment in which we live. The transformation of natural resources into commodities has come to depend on the production and control of these cognitive and communicative 'forms'.

The type of information Melucci is most concerned with is that which is used to control the "inner" nature of human beings. The emerging new forms of power based on this new information are those "which control the formation of needs (advertising and marketing), the biological structure of identity (bio-genetics) and the basic motivation of behaviour (neuro-sciences)." Paradoxically, these sources of information are also available to individuals, thus giving them the ability to make more and better choices.

This action on the "inner nature" engaged in by both the new forms of power and individuals is contrasted with the action on the "outer nature" that epitomized industrial society. Such action entailed "modifying and transforming the natural environment." Although "modifying and transforming" continues, "power based upon material production is...no longer central." First, the "formation of needs" becomes prior to the production of materials to satisfy those needs. Secondly, bio-genetics acts directly upon humans themselves by

11 Melucci, Nomads, 185.
12 Melucci, Nomads, 47.
13 Melucci, Nomads, 46.
14 Melucci, Nomads, 185.
manipulating the biological\textsuperscript{15} and genetic\textsuperscript{16} components of human nature; the manipulation of "outer nature" has little to do with this. Finally, the neuro-sciences have taken it upon themselves to define what (and whom) is normal or pathological. People "can be "sick" regardless of their subjective awareness,"\textsuperscript{17} and behaviour becomes normal according to the prevailing opinions within the neuro-sciences.\textsuperscript{18} Again, the manipulation of outer nature has little to do with this area. The provision of services within these three areas is increasingly replacing industries based upon manufacturing and distribution in importance and number; and the core resource, as Melucci understands it, is information, not physical resources.

Mooers and Sears wonder "what people might eat in such societies."\textsuperscript{19} They note that this argument "trivializes the very real privation experienced by many" and fails to "specify the changes" that lead Melucci "to argue that signification has gained relative social weight and material necessity has lost it."\textsuperscript{20} Melucci argues that "[c]omplex societies no longer have an 'economic' basis, they produce by an increasing integration of economic, political and cultural structures" and because they "are informational systems...they cannot survive without assuming a certain autonomous capacity in individual elements, which have to be able to produce and receive information."\textsuperscript{21} However, the necessity for material goods has not disappeared.

\textsuperscript{15} Abortion and other interventions into the reproductive system mean birth increasingly becomes an object of choice and not fate. Melucci, \textit{Nomads}, 111.
\textsuperscript{16} Genetic engineering has the potential to change not only the individual upon which the operation is performed, but succeeding generations since the genetic makeup has been irrevocably changed. Melucci, "Symbolic," 807.
\textsuperscript{17} Melucci, \textit{Nomads}, 141—142.
\textsuperscript{18} Melucci, \textit{Nomads}, 131—134.
\textsuperscript{19} Mooers and Sears, 64.
\textsuperscript{20} Mooers and Sears, 64.
Melucci's argument does appear to trivialize the privation experienced by many people: he suggests social conflicts have moved "from the traditional economic/industrial system to cultural grounds." Such social conflicts would seem to have abandoned the many people who are struggling to satisfy their material needs, and against the economic and other forms of inequality. Although he notes that ethno-national struggles affect "the distribution of resources and social opportunities," these struggles benefit only those who have found solidarity in ethnic identity; those who starve do not always have the benefit of this solidarity. Melucci does consider the role of those who are marginalized because of material privation. Melucci refers to this as marginal in the "strict sense."

With regard to his alleged failure to identify the changes that usher in complex society, Melucci refers to the observation that "science develops the self-reflexive capacity to modify 'internal nature' while the systems of relationships in which individuals act are multiplying." Scientific developments in the areas of neuro-sciences, bio-genetics and the formation of needs, the new sources of information referred to earlier, are responsible for the change from industrial society to complex society, because these developments have led to "an emerging awareness of the capacity to act upon human action itself." The new forms of power grasp hold of these developments to control individuals in areas which have never been controlled before. Because of this change, the social weight assigned to material necessity by participants in contemporary social movements is lessened: participation in contemporary

---

22 Melucci, "An End," 826.
23 Melucci, Nomads, 91.
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social conflicts, in turn, is conditioned by the "differential access" to informational resources.26

The class composition of the conflicts in complex society has changed. According to Melucci, there are three main groups of people who participate in new social movements. These groups are: members of the "new middle class"; "those in a marginal position in the labor market"; and some members of the "old middle class."27

The first group is defined by its members' immediate access to the "new" resource—information—and includes those who work "in the advanced technological sectors...the human service professions and/or the public sector (particularly in education and welfare), and who have achieved a high educational status [as well as enjoying] relative economic security."28 This group is well-integrated into the system and tends to have been involved in numerous forms of social action, such as voluntary associations and self-help groups, as well as traditional political organizations.29 Melucci suggests they are able to construct a collective identity because they have a set of similar resources (e.g., "educational achievement, professional skills, and social abilities")30.

Members of this group become involved in social action because they have immediate experience with the contradictions posed by the new forms of power. Paradoxes seem to be an implicit characteristic of complex society. This group is an example of such a paradox, because they are employed in areas that may coincide with the new forms of power. Although their status and

26 Melucci, Nomads, 47.
27 Melucci, Nomads, 52.
28 Melucci, Nomads, 52.
29 Melucci, Nomads, 53.
30 Melucci, Nomads, 53.
economic security stems from their employment, their propensity to become involved in social action designed to wrest individual control from the new power must lead to somewhat of a bifurcated existence. This may be one reason why contemporary social movement participation tends to be transitory—participants suffer from "burnout" and divided loyalties. Melucci offers two other reasons. The first applies to all three groups and is that "the actors who experience and contest the system's contradictory requirements do not do so all their lives and do not belong to a single social category." With specific regard to the first group the second reason is that participants "can easily shift from a position of conflict to a counter-elite role—[for example,] environmental groups whose members have the required professional skills can easily become consultant firms working on environmental problems." Indeed, according to Melucci, one of the functions of new social movements is to train new elites.

The second group, those marginal to the labour market, includes "students, unemployed or 'peripheral' groups such as youth, retired people [and] middle class housewives." Students and housewives "experience the discrepancy between the surplus of possibilities offered by the system and the actual constraints of their social condition"; they are easily able to participate in social action because they "live in an environment of high density social networks and available resources of leadership." Their propensity to become involved depends upon how immediate the discrepancy becomes and how

31 Melucci, Nomads, 61.
32 Melucci, Nomads, 53.
34 Melucci, Nomads, 52.
35 Melucci, Nomads, 53.
close they are to the "environment of social networks." They do not have direct access to information resources, as does the first group.

Marginalized groups also include retired people and the unemployed who are marginal in "the strict sense." They "respond to crisis conditions only when an existing context for mobilization is available, that is, when there exists a high density of active social networks and organization, and when leadership is available." It is their "degree of exclusion" and the "pace of development of the crisis processes" that are most important when considering how likely they are to participate.

Melucci does not give many details about the third group, the "old middle class." This group includes farmers and crafts people and is "particularly evident in regional and environmental mobilizations." It reacts "to developments that threaten [its] former social position."

The same social movement can include all three groups, but when and how much each becomes involved varies according to the ability of each group to solidify their collective identity. This ability, in turn, is dependent upon the capacity of each group to build and negotiate their collective identity. The first group tends to become "involved in the early phases of mobilization because they can draw upon the identity resources provided by their educational, professional or social status." This first group, because of its immediacy to the new sources of information, are more capable of recognizing the potential of
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these identity resources. Members of this group, for numerous reasons, the most important of which is the capacity to form an identity, provide "the core group of activists and supporters"—the leadership. The second group, on the other hand, tends "to use existing waves of mobilization as a channel for their reaction and are likely to withdraw sooner," because its capacity for identity-building and/or for leadership is less than that of the first group.

Strictly speaking, Natives as a social unit do not belong to any of these classes. However, in Canadian society, they historically have been marginal "in the strict sense." The remainder of the paragraph refers to the situation of Indians. The "crisis condition" that was responded to was the tabling of the 1969 White Paper. The "social networks and organization" as well as available sources of leadership were found in the establishment of the first national Indian organizations, and recently established systems of Indian government. Their "degree of exclusion" from Canadian society was intense, situated as they primarily, at that time, were on rural reserves, for the most part far from the metropolitan centres of Canada. Finally, the "pace of development of the crisis processes" threatened to be rapid, culminating in the removal of special status and all the rights and privileges associated with it.

However, earlier in the chapter it was noted that Melucci argues that new social movement participation is "transitory". If Native participation is transitory, it is more likely because the processes of acculturation forced upon them have resulted in apathy. Unlike members of new social movements, many Natives "belong to a single social category" all their lives because the existing "colour-

44 Melucci, Nomads, 53.
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line" in Canadian society prevents social mobility. An option many of Melucci's first group tends to exercise is a move to a counter-elite role. If Natives were to exercise this option, to the extent that it exists, by, for example, working for Indian Affairs, they are at risk of being labeled "red apples"; this may lessen the appeal of assuming such a role.

Frideres indicates that the leaders of pan-Indian movements "are generally part White, bilingual, and involved in typically White occupations."\(^{48}\) It would thus appear that these leaders would be the Native equivalent to Melucci's first group, in terms of socio-economic status, although it is not certain that they are characterized by the same immediacy to sources of information.

Because bureaucracies increasingly "intervene in the definition and regulation of social behaviour,"\(^{49}\) they replace the more traditional forms of socialization and the means by which succeeding generations were socialized. Inner nature becomes bureaucratized. The new need that arises from this is the need to be different and thus to resist mass conformity. One means by which this need is addressed is through the development or resurrection of ethnic identity. However, while bureaucratic intervention may be new to Melucci's subjects, Canadian Natives have been subject to this kind of intervention far before the arrival of complex society. Some examples have been given previously. Frideres provides more examples of bureaucratic intervention:

- As early as 1830, official programs were developed to force aboriginals to "surrender their nomadic lifestyles."\(^{50}\) Their economy, religion, and identity were intimately connected with this lifestyle.
- "Until 1940, Indian Affairs decided which Natives could and couldn't leave the reserve lands."\(^{51}\) Mobility, thus, was

\(^{48}\) Frideres, Natives, 284.
\(^{49}\) Melucci, Nomads, 89.
\(^{50}\) Frideres, Natives, 367.
\(^{51}\) Frideres, Natives, 368.
bureaucratically controlled.
• "The Minister of DIAND can suspend almost any right set forth in the Indian Act."\(^52\) Since the Act controls almost all aspects of Indian lives, bureaucratic control is almost complete.
• "Civilizing" efforts commenced in conjunction with the policies of 1830 and after. This was a "basic rationale of the Indian Act, which demanded 'civilization' and responsibility from the Indian population while denying them control over the forces affecting their lives."\(^53\)

This denial of control continues to the present. Long indicates that Natives were "entirely excluded from the drafting of the Constitution and the Charter."\(^54\) Further, in spite of the four First Ministers Conferences "to resolve the place of Native Indians in the Constitution...by the fall of 1991 Native people were still being promised that constitutional recognition for Native self-government would be phased in over the next ten years."\(^55\) The continued delay in phasing in self-government is a continued denial of control. When all or most aspects of a people's lives are controlled by a bureaucracy, social behaviour becomes defined according to its dictates. A history of bureaucratic intervention thus exists prior to the arrival of complex society. However, Indianness as a concept used by Natives to refer to themselves did not appear until after 1969. Prior to this, it was a concept used primarily by whites. Therefore, the impetus to develop Indianness must be found in something other than the control over inner nature.

Another of Melucci's observations also does not explain the growth of Indianness. He observes that the "systems of relationships in which individuals act are multiplying." As this occurs, "[t]he need to give unity to rapidly changing and multifaceted social experiences triggers a search for a point of reference for

\(^{52}\) Frideres, Natives, 368.
\(^{53}\) Richard Bartlett, Indian Act of Canada (Saskatoon: Native Law Centre, University of Saskatchewan, 1980), 6, quoted in Frideres, Natives, 35.
\(^{54}\) Long, 121.
\(^{55}\) Long, 121.
individual identity."\textsuperscript{56} Although conditions in complex society "serve to weaken the traditional points of reference (church, party, race, class)"\textsuperscript{57} the search for a point of reference leads to a revival of these traditional sources. Of the traditional sources, Melucci only considers ethnicity. He suggests such a revival "is not necessarily related to open discrimination but is a response to a need for collective identity which transcends the general status of the group and tends to be stronger precisely where an ethnic group's position is relatively strong."\textsuperscript{58} This does not explain the growth in Native identity since it suggests that ethnic identity is directly correlated to strength of status and the status of Natives is low in Canadian society. However, although a shared sense of Indianness has grown in the period since 1969, Native leaders have had difficulty in constructing this identity and preventing it from fragmenting; Melucci's explanation could provide a reason for this.

The concept of identity for Melucci refers to "the reappropriation of the meaning (conditions and goals) of individual and social action."\textsuperscript{59} Meaning has to be reappropriated from bureaucratic intervention in the regulation and definition of social behaviour and from the new sources of power which use information to control inner nature. Melucci suggests social action can only be fully understood if the individual's motivation to participate is understood. But this motivation entails a recognition on the part of individuals that "they share certain orientations in common."\textsuperscript{60} It is this aspect that differentiates Melucci's theory from the collective behaviour and relative deprivation models that were

\textsuperscript{56} Melucci, \textit{Nomads}, 110.
\textsuperscript{57} Melucci, \textit{Nomads}, 109.
\textsuperscript{58} Melucci, \textit{Nomads}, 89.
\textsuperscript{59} Melucci, \textit{Nomads}, 46.
\textsuperscript{60} Melucci, \textit{Nomads}, 30.
developed prior to 1970, and the currently dominant paradigm in North America, the resource mobilization theories.

The former theories hold in common the assertion that participation in collective behaviour is the act of an irrational individual.61 These models obviously focused their attentions on individual pathologies. Resource mobilization theories disputed this approach, and argued instead that individuals act rationally in "the pursuit of interests" when they participate in social action.62 However, an individual who acts rationally, and, more importantly, with strategic-instrumental rationality, would be acting irrationally by participating in collective action when the goods of that action would accrue to him/her regardless of his/her participation. This is the classic "free-rider" problem and is one which has not, and can not, be solved within the parameters of resource mobilization theories. They leave unanswered the question of why there is a group to act collectively.63

Melucci provides a solution to the problem of why individuals "get involved in groups and what makes them solidary."64 The motivation to "get involved" is "rooted in individual psychological traits"; however, this motivation "is constructed and developed through interaction."65 Recruitment networks, based on "existing networks of social relationships," are fundamental in this process.66 These provide the individual with the opportunity to recognize commonalities and, through the processes of interaction, influence, and negotiation, "establish conceptual and motivational frameworks for action."67

61 Cohen, 672.
62 Cohen, 675.
63 Cohen, 677.
64 Cohen, 677.
65 Melucci, Nomads, 31.
67 Melucci, Nomads, 31.
The result is a collective identity. Thus the lack of recruitment networks could provide another explanation for the difficulties in the construction of Indianness. It was noted in Chapter Two that Native bureaucracies were situated in urban settings where most Natives, until recently, did not live. These organizations could have provided a form of recruitment networks, had more Natives had better access to them.

Melucci defines collective identity as "an interactive and shared definition produced by several interacting individuals who are concerned with the orientations of their action as well as the field of opportunities and constraints in which their action takes place."\(^{68}\) It consists of the following dimensions:

(1) formulating cognitive frameworks concerning the goals, means and environment of action;
(2) activating relationships among the actors, who communicate, negotiate, and make decisions; and
(3) making emotional investments, which enable individuals to recognize themselves in each other.\(^{69}\)

The ability to engage in identity-building is contingent upon the "differential access to resources, such as information, access to networks, and professional or communicative skills"; this access, in turn, provides the condition that determines the "propensity of individuals and subgroups to involve themselves in collective action" as well as influencing "the starting point and duration of their involvement, the intensity of their participation and the quality of their expectations."\(^{70}\) For example, it was noted earlier that the new middle class tended to join social movements in the early phases.

The reasons for the growth in ethnic identity were provided previously: the multiplication of social roles and bureaucratic intervention provide the

---
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impetus to seek a stable identity. The first explanation would seem to be inapplicable to Canadian Natives for they are largely prevented by discrimination and lack of skills from participating in either industrial or complex society and thus are somewhat shielded from the multiplication of social roles. The second, on the other hand, appears to predate the emergence of complex society; yet, the development of Indianess did not occur simply because of this intervention. In fact, most Natives "surrendered to a general apathy and dispiritedness: and succumbed to a "culture of poverty" where "withdrawal and [(passive)] rebellion" were the only possible adaptations.71

The processes of identity-building Melucci identifies are not necessarily characteristic of only complex society. These processes are theoretical novelties, identifying as they do problems inherent in collective behaviour and resource mobilization theories regarding why people join movements and how solidarity is produced. However, Melucci argues that the "fundamental" dimensions noted above are empirical realities and are most apparent in the assertion that the personal has become the political. He suggests this differs from "socialist and working-class politics, particularly among militants, [where] there tended to be a split between private life and public life."72 He thus considers the processes of identity-building to be a novel feature of social movements rather than simply a theoretical novelty. Critics of nationalism have, however, argued that national movements have historically insisted on the submergence of the private to the public. This argument will be developed in greater detail in Chapter Five.

71 Frideres, Native, 369, 373.
72 Melucci, Nomads, 205–206.
That Natives only undertook a more sustained effort to produce a coherent ideology and a shared sense of Indianness beginning in or around 1969, at approximately the same time as the change from industrial to complex society began, is purely coincidental and should not be taken to indicate this movement is a new social movement. The continuities with previous attempts to organize political action as well as the prior subjection to bureaucratic intervention mark this movement as something other than a new social movement.

The second process differentiating complex from industrial society is that the "system has become planetary, a completely interdependent World system in which nothing or nobody is external to its boundaries. In this respect it differs from the capitalist system, which only laid the foundations for planetarization." Interdependence has several facets. The first facet is that for the first time in human history, global destruction is possible: "war and peace acquire a planetary dimension and break the limits of relations among the states which have maintained in modern history a monopoly over them." This is an extreme example of "the capacity to act upon human action itself" as well as the power information holds in contemporary societies, for the knowledge necessary to create weapons of mass destruction would only disappear in the event of a planetary catastrophe.

The second facet of interdependence is that of political and economic interdependence. Melucci asserts that "the state has dissolved [and] has been replaced, from above, by a tightly interdependent system of transnational

---
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relationships, as well as subdivided, from below, into a multiplicity of partial governments...."77 Nationalist movements contribute to this dissolution of the state whenever they demand complete independence from it. As noted previously, though, Natives are not making this demand. Also, neither is this observation nor the dual nature of this process new. The past 150 years or so have been witness to the efforts to create viable transnational organizations as well as the fragmenting tendencies of nationalist movements.

Mooers and Sears raise two objections to Melucci's articulation of this process. The first is that the nation-state has not dissolved to the extent suggested above, and, indeed, retains much of its economic power. With regard to trade blocs, an example of economic transnationalism, they note that "U.S. and other central banks...used the control of interest rates and money supply to limit the impact of the October 1987 stock market crash."78 The commitment to free trade and the resulting free flow of monies appears to be "rhetorical."79

Their second objection regards Melucci's assertion that the capitalist system "only laid the foundations for planetarization." Mooers and Sears note there is "a long tradition of Marxist work on globalization" beginning with the description Marx and Engels gave of the rise of capitalism: ""It produced world history for the first time, insofar as it made all civilized nations and every individual member of them dependent for the satisfaction of their wants on the whole world, thus destroying the former natural exclusiveness of separate nations."80 The first facet, the possibility of nuclear destruction, has little to do with this phenomenon, but it is obvious that to distinguish a system on the basis

77 Melucci, Nomads, 171.
78 Mooers and Sears, 62.
79 Mooers and Sears, 62.
80 Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels, The German Ideology (Moscow: Progress, 1976), 81, quoted in Mooers and Sears, 62.
of when the foundation was laid and when it was completed is trivial. Indeed, it
would seem more valid to argue that the completion of the foundation indicates
the existence of a more sophisticated and complicated society that differs from
capitalist society only in the degree of complication.\textsuperscript{81}

However, Melucci is referring to some phenomenon greater than the
simple establishment of transnational organizations of the economic type
Mooers and Sears focus their criticisms on. The recent lobbying of international
bodies and non-Canadian governments by Natives in the pursuit of their
demands is an example of a case where a state can no longer pursue its social
policies in a vacuum. Ponting notes "there is a growing interest in the
international community in Canadian governments' handling of aboriginal
affairs...[a]s recent resolutions [and actions] of the European Parliament and the
United Nations have demonstrated."\textsuperscript{82} For example, the European Parliament
sent a delegation to visit Canada in January, 1992 for the purposes of
investigating the Oka crisis.\textsuperscript{83} Also, The U.N. has passed numerous resolutions
concerning indigenous peoples and, in 1989, the Working Group on Indigenous
Peoples was to prepare a study "on the potential utility of treaties, agreements,
and other constructive arrangements between indigenous peoples and
States...[with] particular regard to universal human rights standards."\textsuperscript{84} Ponting
notes also that "]w[e should expect...that aboriginal leaders' appeals to the
world to engage in an economic boycott of Canada will become the focus of a
much more concerted campaign as the stakes are raised in aboriginal

\textsuperscript{81} Mooers and Sears, 64.
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\textsuperscript{84} Centre for Human Rights, \textit{Human Rights: The Rights of Indigenous Peoples—Fact Sheet #9} (Geneva:
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affairs.\textsuperscript{85} If such boycotts would have the effect of changing Canadian policy vis-a-vis its Native peoples, then its sovereignty has been reduced in the manner in which Melucci argues above. Also, while the economic and other powers of certain states remain sovereign, weaker powers may be witnessing the erosion of their sovereignty in a manner not encountered previously. If this has not been encountered previously within the world system, it may indeed be a differentiating process between industrial and complex society. Native exercise of the means this process makes available to them would mark this aspect of their movement as being a new movement.

The third and final process differentiating complex society from its predecessor "is individualization, the fact that the main actors within the system are no longer groups defined by class consciousness, religious affiliation or ethnicity, but—potentially at least—individuals who strive to individuate themselves by participating in, and giving meaning to, various forms of social action."\textsuperscript{86} There are two components to this process. The first concerns how the main actors are defined. As seen earlier, they are defined by their relation to informational resources. That they are not defined by ethnicity would seem to preclude ethno-nationalist groups from being new social movement actors. Melucci equivocates about this for he asserts that the revival of ethnicity provides a point of reference for individual identity, yet he notes that "the unity and continuity of individual experience cannot be found in a fixed identification with a definite model, group, or culture."\textsuperscript{87} Alternatively, he asserts that identity-building is a process and as such presumably changes as individuals continue to interact. He does not specify, though, whether ethnicity is fixed or variable.

\textsuperscript{85} Ponting, 102.
\textsuperscript{86} Melucci, Nomads, 185.
\textsuperscript{87} Melucci, Nomads, 110.
However, this appears to be a moot consideration, for he does specify that the main actors are not defined by their ethnicity.

The second component elaborates the connection between individual motivation and social action. Melucci notes that "[p]articipation in collective action is seen to have no value for the individual unless it provides a direct response to personal needs." There appears to be no room for altruism in Melucci's theory; there also does not appear to be room for radicalism and the attendant willingness to suffer personal injury or death. He suggests the "use of violence and terrorism" has its roots "in the malfunctions of the political system, against which it [tends] to be directed" but this does not explain why participants, who participate primarily "to satisfy personal needs" should engage in actions which pose personal dangers.

However, the value in collective action is not to be found only in its measurable results. In Chapter Three it was noted that Melucci perceives social movements to have both a political and cultural level. Measurable results belong to the political level. If this was the only level to exist, Melucci would be faced with the "free rider" problem, because participation, as noted above, occurs only when the participant perceives some direct response.

Movements, however, "live in another dimension: in the everyday network of social relations, in the capacity and will to reappropriate space and time, and in the attempt to practise alternative life-styles." This dimension provides the "direct response to personal needs" and, indeed, the ability to mobilize for action at the political level. The direct response in question is
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found in the everyday network of social relations. It is within these networks that the identity-building processes take place, and it is in the construction of identity that individuals satisfy their need for a reference point for identity. The construction of identity not only satisfies an individual need, it provides the social movement with a ready source of committed and loyal members who are loyal and committed because they have made emotional investments in each other. Without such commitment, the movement would lack solidarity and without solidarity, the movement's ability to produce results at the political level would be seriously impaired. The frailty of Indianness could, thus, be considered to be one of the reasons for why the Native movement remains unsuccessful in its pursuit of political goals such as self-government.

The reappropriation of space is the second need ethno-nationalist movements are presumed to expose. However, the desire to have a "space" within which to develop and/or protect members of a certain nation has been expressed in any nationalist movement that asserts the need to have an independent nation-state.

NSM theory, as developed by Melucci, is useful in explaining the changes in Native activism that occurred after 1969 because it focuses on the role of social interaction and recruitment networks in forming shared or collective ethnic identities, thus offering an explanation for the development of these identities rather than simply taking them as a given. Although social interaction and the number of recruitment networks was greater after 1969 than before, Indianness still is weak. By focusing on these means by which identity is formed, Melucci provides a means by which the weakness of the Native identity can be understood. Melucci also draws attention to the role of globalization and international actors in encouraging and supporting ethnic movements.
However, there are a number of inadequacies in his theory with respect to the Native movement. The first is that Canadian Natives are not members of any of the three classes Melucci identifies as activists and supporters of new social movements. Secondly, Natives have been subjected to types of bureaucratic intervention prior to the emergence of complex society. Thirdly, membership in the Native movement is not transitory as Melucci claims is true of new social movements. Fourthly, Melucci specifically excludes ethnicity as one of the defining attributes of individuals who participate in social movements. And, finally, nationalist movements, of which the Canadian Native movement is one example, are not new. Chapter Five considers whether theories of nationalism and neo-nationalism do not offer the best account of the Native movement.
CHAPTER FIVE
NATIONALISM AND NEO-NATIONALISM

Chapter Five examines once again the question raised in Chapter Two, of what a nation consists, but does so within the theoretical framework developed by Smith to analyze nationalism. In particular, Nativist ideology will be examined to demonstrate its continuity with other nationalist ideologies. Smith defines nationalism as "an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity on behalf of a population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential 'nation'." ¹

The development of Indianness was discussed in Chapter Two and Melucci’s identity-building processes in the previous chapter. Smith provides five more processes that are similar to those identified by Melucci but which refer specifically to nationalist movements. It is through these processes that an ideology, or a "cognitive framework concerning the goals, means and environment of action," to use Melucci’s phrase, is developed. Each of these processes is considered in conjunction with examples of Nativist ideology. These processes include:

1. a movement from passive subordination of the community to its active political assertion
2. a movement to place the community in its homeland, a secure and recognized compact territory
3. a movement to endow the territorial community with economic

¹ Smith, 73. His emphasis.
unity
(4) a movement to place the people at the centre of concern and to celebrate the masses by re-educating them in national values, memories and myths
(5) a movement to turn ethnic members into legal 'citizens' by conferring civil, social and political rights on them.2

The first process directly involves the process of identity-building. Such a movement activates "relationships among the actors, who communicate, negotiate, and make decisions" as well as "making emotional investments, which enable individuals to recognize themselves in each other." As Melucci points out, identity is the basis of any collective action.3 Smith concurs with the importance assigned to this. The need for a core identity around which to coalesce was the topic of Chapter Two. Part of this movement also involves the ideological development of the nation "with its own individuality, history and destiny."4

Nationalist identity, as with any other collective identity, needs to be constructed. Nationalist identity, however, has often been assumed on the part of nationalists to be both pre-political and natural. These assumptions make their way into nationalist ideology. Smith notes that there is an ideological "return to 'nature' and to its 'poetic spaces'," as well as the assertion that the "chosen people" are being "reborn after [their] long sleep of decay and/or exile."5 Such ideology, thus, is backward-looking. Both aspects are found in Nativist ideology.

For example, Ponting notes that in the discussion between Natives, members of the federal government, and delegates of the European Parliament

---

2 Smith, 64.
3 Melucci, Nomads, 46.
4 Smith, 74.
5 Smith, 65, 66.
in 1991, "[s]pirituality and Indians' links with nature were an ubiquitous theme." He quotes Milton Born-With-A-Tooth: "Nature is our constitution. Nature is everything. It tells us who we are and how to think. Water is fundamental to growth....Nature is in us, just as we are part of Nature....I end by giving respect to this land that we are on."7

That Natives are "chosen" people is evident in the following: "The original instructions that we were given as a people and the role we play was to take care of the earth."8 Thus the connection to nature is intrinsic to the sense of identity. Finally, Long suggests 1969 was important for Natives for many reasons, not least of which was the "fulfillment of a long-misunderstood Indian prophecy":

Long ago it was said that when grandmother meets mother, Native people will take their place. Our people didn't understand what this meant until the astronauts brought back pieces of the moon to the earth. This was important, for our people have always called the moon Grandmother and the earth Mother. In 1969, Grandmother met Mother. Natives who had kept their spirituality alive then said, "We must now build our sweat lodges. Our people must now gather together."9

Nativist ideology thus presents itself as both natural and pre-political. It might be objected at this point that distinct Indian groups did exist prior to the arrival of Europeans. This is not in dispute; however, group consciousness is not nationalist consciousness.

6 Panting, 95. His emphasis.
7 Panting, 95.
9 Long, 120.
There is argument among theorists of nationalism whether nationalism created the nation\textsuperscript{10} or nations preceded nationalism. The latter is the assertion of nationalists: hence the metaphor of being reborn. The former assumes nationalist leaders to be manipulative in that they must choose attributes that will appeal to a particular group of people, regardless of the truth content of these attributes.

Smith steps between these two extremes and argues instead that ethnic communities preceded both nations and nationalism and it is the attributes of these ancient communities that are selected for inclusion in a nationalist ideology. In some cases, the history of these communities may be "deficient" and thus "invented" in some places.\textsuperscript{11} In other cases, the "role of 'invention' and 'construction'" may be lessened.\textsuperscript{12} But in both cases, "the uses of ethno-history [are] always selective: it [is] as important to forget certain things as to remember others."\textsuperscript{13} Those "things" that are forgotten may, however, have been more than adequately remembered by the historians of the dominant society.

Regardless of the prior existence of ethnic communities, their consciousness was not nationalistic in orientation. Nationalism as an ideology and its attendant consciousness does not make an appearance until the advent of industrialism. The nation and the identity that is intrinsic to the nation, as identified in this ideology, similarly does not appear on the historical scene until nationalist ideology identifies it as being reborn.


\textsuperscript{11} Smith, 126. 

\textsuperscript{12} Smith, 101. 

\textsuperscript{13} Smith, 126—127.
Indianness as being constructed has been considered in Chapter Two. However, the themes of "nature" and "rebirth" noted here suggest the development of the Nativist ideology is a development consistent with other nationalisms.

The second process is apparent in both land claims and self-government demands. "Nationalism is about land, both in terms of possession and (literal) rebuilding, and of belonging where forefathers lived and where history demarcates a 'homeland'."14 Literal rebuilding is expressed by Senator George Watts:

Our culture, our names, our dances, everything about our life is based on resources. Whether we are talking about the food we eat, the houses we build on our own, without government handouts, resources are at the source of our being. Why then should we not want to gain back control of our resources?...You cannot solve anything by just giving Indians money, or looking after the Indians. There is only one way to look after the Indians, the Aboriginal people on this continent, and that is to let them look after themselves. The only way we are going to be able to do that is to have a proper land base. Allow us to have the right to our languages, and our cultures, to our lives.15

A land base provides more than a means of livelihood. It also provides the means by which dignity can again be conferred on Natives. Thus the oneness with nature noted above makes another appearance. This quotation also is an example of the third process: "to endow the territorial community with economic unity."16 If control over land such as is consistent with Native demands is ever granted by the federal government, this could possibly provide economic unity. Such demands include "aboriginal hunting and fishing rights, the recognition of aboriginal title to lands and waters within traditional territories, and the
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jurisdiction required to control and protect the traditional homeland from third party incursion."  

However, the goal of economic unity seems unlikely for Canadian Natives. For example, the percentage of reserves with "good or excellent mineral potential" does not exceed 20 per cent. The one resource in abundance is "deer, caribou, etc.," but this abundance only exists in five provinces. Numerous authors have indicated that economic self-sufficiency could be obtained through the form of "rent" paid by Canada for use of the land that encompasses Canada; this would hardly be supported by the Canadian electorate. Frideres suggests that Natives "will have to expand their economic development activities." Yet the average population of bands is only about 500 and only 13 have populations greater than 1000; given such small populations as well as the low percentage of available resources and given that these populations include children and others incapable of working, band-based economies appear to be an optimistic ideal.

Although nationalism is "about land," it is not always necessary for that land to be a nation-state. Smith suggests this is a new feature of what he calls the "third wave of nationalism" which has swept over industrial societies since the late 1950s. Movements in this third wave are demanding autonomy rather than separation. Autonomy is demanded in cultural, social and economic areas. Although there are outright assertions by Canadian Natives of political

19 Gibbins and Ponting, 243.
20 Frideres, Natives, 386.
22 Smith, 135.
independence, Jhappan suggests these are primarily "symbolic political gestures designed to publicize Indian claims for self-determination. They must be viewed as expressions of Indian discontent with the sluggishness of the political process, rather than as serious attempts to secede from Canada."23 Cassidy and Bish's book *Indian Government in Theory and Practice* holds as its central theme the assumption that self-government is fully compatible with Canada's federal system.24 Richard Simeon argues the same.25 Native leaders such as Erasmus and Cardinal also understand the Native future to be within Canadian federalism, albeit a radically different federalism if self-government were to be fully recognized.26

Smith's fourth process involves "a movement to place the people at the centre of concern and to celebrate the masses by re-educating them in national values, memories and myths."27 Indeed, there is an emphasis among Natives for increased control over education. As Peters argues,

>We must understand the legends and stories that we have about the creation of this land and why we call this land Turtle Island—our songs, our dances, our ceremonies—all of those oral things that tell us how we were put here and why we were put here and what we must continue to do in order to remain here.28

The final process identified by Smith is "to turn ethnic members into legal 'citizens' by conferring civil, social and political rights on them."29 With regard to Natives, this is manifested in a two-pronged process. The first has been
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23 Radha Jhappan, "Indian Symbolic Politics: The Double-Edged Sword of Publicity," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* XXII, no. 3 (1990), 32; in reference to the Haida "declaration of independence" 24 Cassidy and Bish, *passim*.
26 Erasmus, 176; Long, 124.
27 Smith, 65.
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29 Smith, 65.
mentioned previously and is the attempt to end political exclusion and social and other marginality within Canadian society. The second is explicit in models of self-government. For example, Indian leaders argue that an Indian right to define citizenship is an inherent right of self-government; the ability to formulate membership codes under the *Indian Act* revisions of 1985 is "essentially a significant portion" of this right.\(^{30}\) Those opposed to this view obviously include the federal government, but others, such as Gibbins and Ponting, also suggest that such a right would pose immense difficulties regarding the continuation of Natives as Canadian citizens. These difficulties stem from the assumption that the relation of Natives to Canada would be through Native government and not through Natives as individuals.\(^{31}\) The primary allegiance would thus be to Native communities and governments.\(^{32}\) This is reflected in other nationalist doctrines which assert that the "nation is the source of all political and social power, and loyalty to the nation overrides all other allegiances."\(^{33}\)

However, Gibbins and Ponting argue that "[t]here is no reason to assume, for example, that aboriginal Canadians will be any less interested than other Canadians in acid rain, the health of the national economy, and arms control."\(^{34}\) Such interests may not be able to be fully articulated through a relationship between Native governments and the Canadian government. Also, if citizenship was to be defined at the Native level, questions regarding the citizenship rights and obligations of Natives to Canada would arise. Cassidy and Bish, on the other hand, argue that the federal system provides a framework in which "[p]eople can be citizens in more than one government at a time. There is

\(^{30}\) Cassidy and Bish, 56.
\(^{31}\) Gibbins and Ponting, 208.
\(^{32}\) Cassidy and Bish, 57.
\(^{33}\) Smith, 74.
\(^{34}\) Gibbins and Ponting, 207.
no reason why Indian people should not continue to enjoy the full rights of Canadian citizenship....[because] different governments do different things for people."35 However, the federal system does not share jurisdiction in the area of citizenship. The movement to turn ethnic members into legal citizens may prove to be an impossibility.

Smith's analysis of nationalist movements offers a useful framework for identifying the Native movement as a nationalist movement. As has been seen, however, the movement does not, and likely can not, meet all five facets of traditional nationalist movements. It might, thus, be more appropriate to consider it as a neo-nationalist movement.

One aspect of neo-nationalism has already been referred to: the focus on autonomy rather than separatism. Three other features identified as aspects of neo-nationalist movements are:

(2) movements of ethnic autonomy recognize the possibility, perhaps desirability, of dual identities, a cultural-national and a political-national identity;....
(3) movements of ethnic autonomy in industrial societies take place in well-established states enjoying a generally higher standard of living than that of most developing states;....
(4) movements for ethnic autonomy in industrial societies are directed...as much against neglect by the 'nation-state' as against its bureaucratic interference.36

The second feature concerns the preceding discussion of dual citizenship. Erasmus asserts that the "visions of the indigenous peoples are based on...two sovereignties, two sources of responsibility."37 However, there is internal discord among Natives regarding this issue.

35 Cassidy and Bish, 57—58.
36 Smith, 138—139.
37 Erasmus, 176.
Federal systems are based upon divided sovereignties; dual identities certainly pose little hindrance to these. In most respects, the Native movement is an autonomist movement. However, the assertion that the right to determine citizenship is an inherent right of self-government would mark it as a separatist movement that could only be accommodated within some kind of confederal arrangement. This would "break the limits" of Canadian federalism.

The claim to the right to make citizenship codes also leads to questioning the assertion of Jhappan that Native claims of political independence are merely symbolic. The Haida, to whom she was referring, not only declared themselves independent but also issued their own passports.38 Such issuance assumes the right to make citizens.

Finally, Ponting notes that at the January 1991 conference, there were "disavowals of Canadian identity."39 As an example, he provides a statement by Huron Chief Max Gros-Louis: "We do not use the vote because we are not Canadian and are not Quebecers, and will never be!"40 Erasmus, at the same conference, provided a more conciliatory view: "Canada must come to realize that we are not a threat and do not wish to dismantle Canada. Rather, Native sovereignty strengthens Canadian sovereignty."41 These two opposing visions of the place Natives wish to be in Canadian federalism are, no doubt, another reason for the frailty of Indianness.

Smith's third characteristic of neo-nationalism also is true of Canadian Natives. Canada is both an industrial society and a "well-established state" with standards of living that exceed those of developing areas. The desire of Natives,

38 Jhappan, 32.
39 Ponting, 94.
40 Ponting, 94.
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evident in Senator Watts' quotation earlier in this chapter, to control their resources stems largely from the desire to share in Canada's standard of living.

The fourth feature of neo-nationalism is that it is directed towards modern nation-states by minorities within the state, rather than by colonized people directed towards an imperial power as was typical of nineteenth century and third world nationalism. It is also "directed as much against neglect by the 'nation-state' as against its bureaucratic interference."42 Such neglect and interference occurred prior to the 1960s when most neo-nationalisms arose. Smith notes that, in fact, neo-nationalisms are really not that new but that they "merely experienced an upsurge of support in the 1960s"43 such that their demands were received with more sympathy.

Smith argues that there are three continuities between neo-nationalisms and earlier nationalisms. Each of these continuities applies to Native nationalism; each also provides a refutation to Melucci's contention that ethno-nationalism is a new social movement. The discussion will combine the first and second continuities. While at one time these may have been considered to be two distinct issues, there is evidence that this is changing.

The first continuity between nationalism and neo-nationalism is that all nationalist movements are "of 'subject peoples' against dominant...and 'alien' states and their ruling élites...They are directed against the status quo, the existing distribution of power within the polyethnic state, its systematic exclusion or relegation of certain ethnic categories and its denial of their collective culture and rights."44 Natives are colonized people and hence subject peoples; their demands for self-government upset the status quo as well as challenge the

42 Smith, 139.
43 Smith, 141.
44 Smith, 140.
distribution of power. If self-government were to be fully implemented, both provincial and federal levels of government would find themselves with less power. Natives have suffered systematic exclusion, not only through the reserve system but because of discrimination. Finally, there is continued denial of collective rights. However, the argument in support of collective rights raises concern over the potential conflict between collective and individual rights, an issue that will be considered in connection with the second continuity Smith identifies.

The second continuity is connected to the issue of collective rights, for nationalism has always been "bent on creating a new kind of individual in a new kind of society, the culturally distinct ethnic nation." Nationalists have been criticized both because of their insistence on collective rights and because of the idea that the individual can only be created through the nation. Critics suggest nationalists eliminate the difference between the public and the private and thus foster a totalizing politics. In terms of ideology, it is asserted that "[h]uman beings must identify with a nation if they want to be free and realize themselves."46

Acton, for example, noted that the nation

overrules the rights and wishes of the inhabitants, absorbing their divergent interests in a fictitious unity; sacrifices their several inclinations and duties to the higher claim of nationality, and crushes all natural rights and all established liberties for the purpose of vindicating itself. Whenever a single definite object is made the supreme end of the State...the State becomes for the time inevitably absolute.47

45 Smith, 140.
46 Smith, 74.
47 Acton, 288.
Plamenatz notes, however, that nationalism respects both individuality and individual diversity. He notes that

[a] human being becomes an individual, a rational and a moral person capable of thinking and acting for himself, in the process of acquiring the language and the culture of his people. He becomes a person distinct from others, in his own eyes and in theirs, by developing potentialities which can only be developed in assimilating a culture and learning to belong to a community. Diversity is desirable as much within the nation as between nations if the life of the individual is to be enriched.48

There are two objections. First, what if an individual does not want to assimilate to the Native culture? Secondly, what if the individual's diversity is not to the nation's liking? What if, for example, a Native wished to marry a non-Native and thus enrich his/her life? According to the Sarcee Band membership code, membership would be lost.49 However, prospective members are aware of this aspect of the membership code. Furthermore, the membership process presumably would be initiated by an individual who may be willing to forfeit certain rights to validate a reference point for individual identity and satisfy the need for identity.

With regard to the first objection, Thomas v Norris may provide an example of the issues involved. In 1992 this case was heard by the British Columbia Supreme Court. Thomas "objected to being initiated into the Coast Salish Big House tradition known as the Spirit Dance."50 This initiation was involuntary.51 Although Thomas was a "member of the Coast Salish people, he

49 Cassidy and Bish, 57. However, an Indian who is already a Status Indian cannot lose that status, although it is unclear whether membership in a band could be stripped if an individual were to violate band codes.
51 Eisenberg, 3.
knew little about the religion, he was not interested in learning about the culture and he lived off the reserve." His objections were upheld by the Court.

This has been interpreted as a case where individual rights "trumped" collective rights. However, Eisenberg points out that the issues of both group and individual identity, not group and individual rights, were central to the decision: "the Court found that the Spirit Dance, and more specifically the involuntary aspect of it, was not a central feature of the Salish way of life"; the relation Thomas had to the band was also of concern. It is because his sense of identity was not contingent upon his ethnicity and also because the Dance was not a central feature of the Coast Salish collective identity, that his case was successful. Eisenberg argues that the Court considered the central issue to be one of identity and not whether the assault Thomas suffered was an infringement of his individual rights.

Eisenberg notes that individual identity and group identity "are threatened by different kinds of circumstances." Individual identity may be threatened by not allowing individuals "the opportunity to voice their opinions, to choose their beliefs and generally to be the authors of their own lives...as long as their choices do not cause harm to others." Furthermore, "[i]ndividual rights legitimately limit community interests when they protect interests that are crucial to the individual's identity from conflicting claims which are, on balance, less crucial to the identity of the community." Group identity depends upon and fosters the well-being of its members. This is essentially what Plamenatz
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argues above. Cardinal argues the same: "Few Indians can discover a sense of purpose and direction from the White society. They must find a sense of identity within themselves as human beings and as Indians before they can begin to work creatively with others."59

Eisenberg argues that the Court applied a "difference perspective" to Thomas v Norris and that it did not consider the conflict as being between individual and collective rights but as a conflict over identity, specifically over what components were crucial to the maintenance both of Thomas' individual identity and of the Coast Salish collective identity. This perspective rejects the "supposition that people [as individuals and as members of a specific group] ought to be treated the same way despite the characteristics, which are crucial to a healthy identity, by which they differ."60 This is a new perspective. What Eisenberg calls the dominant perspective interprets jurisprudence "in terms of a competition between individual and collective rights";61 and thus does not recognize that individual identity can be dependent upon group identity. Therefore, both senses of identity need to be protected. The new perspective is in keeping with Melucci's arguments, but because nationalist movements have been making these kinds of demands, as Smith points out, prior to the advent of complex society they are not new social movements.

Smith's third continuity is that, in all nationalisms, intellectuals play an important role.62 This may not have been so apparent in 1969, but it is readily apparent in the 1980s and since. Frideres notes that the genesis of present nationalism "lies in the emergence of Native intellectuals graduating from White

60 Eisenberg, 10.
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schools. These individuals were equipped to assemble Native history and promote the historical legacy they discovered. "63 It could then be asked how one would characterize the movement from 1969 to the 1980s. It would still be characterized as nationalistic: Melucci's identity-building processes as well as the processes identified by Smith are time consuming. Further, as demonstrated in this thesis, there were many nationalistic elements prior to the 1980s.

The inability to date the appearance of a movement has just been made apparent. Earlier, it was noted that Smith observes that "several of the 'recent' movements for ethnic autonomy in the West are really not at all recent; they merely experienced an upsurge of support in the 1960s." As discussed in Chapter Three, Long emphasizes the continuities contemporary Native activism has with pre-1969 activism. He dates the contemporary phase from 1969 for two reasons. The White Paper provided an issue that affected all Indians, "helped to crystallize the 'problem' facing Native people in this country, [and] also served as a catalyst for large-scale organization of Native interests."64 The forerunner to the Assembly of First Nations, the National Indian Brotherhood, was "the first national-level Indian organization run by and for Indians."65 This does not provide an explanation for why it emerged when it did however. Chapter Five considers this question. What can be concluded, however, from the examination of nationalism and neo-nationalism is that the Canadian Native movement more closely resembles a nationalist or neo-nationalist movement than a NSM.

63 Frideres, Natives, 269.
64 Long, 120.
65 Long, 120.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

Earlier it was noted that the emergence of contemporary Native activism was unrelated to the processes Melucci identifies as leading to a change in societal types. What has been in dispute since is whether ethno-nationalist movements are "new." However, the continuities in ideology and the similarity between Smith's processes and the issues Natives have confronted suggests the Native movement is a nationalist movement and, thus, not new.

However, Smith's explanation for the rise of nationalism is found wanting in several respects. He suggests the economic revolution and the social and cultural revolutions that marked the emergence of industrialism were also responsible for the rise of nationalism.¹ This is tantamount to asserting that nationalism arose because of the industrial state, and while this is a valid assertion, it provides only the broadest of frameworks within which to place a specific nationalist movement. Other theories of nationalism are similarly broad, relying as they do on some form of generational conflict or modernization theory.² At the same time, the role of intellectuals is overemphasized in theories of nationalism: nationalist movements become understood as the articulation of disenchanted and unsatisfied individuals seeking a solution to a personal

¹ Smith, 60.
² See for examples, Kedourie, Chapter 6; and Minogue, 84—85.
identity crisis. This differs from Melucci’s identity-building process because the underlying assumption is one of the individual irrationality of the intellectuals rather than the consequence of rational interaction. Smith improves upon this by confining (initially) this crisis to intellectuals but concluding that “the nationalist solution was adopted not only by many intellectuals in search of their roots but also many others for whom a similar quest for roots...became equally paramount and for whom a similar solution, the nation, was equally necessary and attractive.”

Although the Native movement is best conceived as a nationalist movement, the explanation for its emergence since 1969 is not to be found in theories of nationalism. Had not the industrial state arisen in North America, Native nationalism would also not have arisen. It probably would not have arisen had Natives been treated fairly and with respect or had they not been the subject of bureaucratic intervention and discrimination. These factors combined to provide them with a set of grievances, but as McCarthy and Zald argue, there is “always enough discontent in any society to supply the grass-roots support for a movement.” These grievances have to be organized and the movement must have "at its disposal the power and resources of some elite group." In some cases, these grievances may be invented.

Nativist ideology has “invented” the idea of Indianness. It also has structured Native grievances within an ideological framework. The actions and policies of the Canadian state have been presented by Nativist ideology in the
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most unfavourable light possible. What was paternalism has become transformed in this ideology to racism. As Smith notes, "we are dealing with perceptions of neglected or suppressed identity, and in each case it is the centralized state itself that is held to blame. One has to admit that in this matter the state can do no right; benign neglect is as much cause for grievance as crass intervention." Again, this is not to diminish the grievances and difficulties Natives have had to face in Canadian society.

These grievances did not find expression in national organizing prior to 1969; nor were they expressed, except occasionally, in terms of nationalist ideology prior to 1980. What factors are responsible for these changes?

Long suggests the resource mobilization paradigm of McCarthy and Zald can be used to examine "how resources are mobilized by movement supporters and/or opponents." He concentrates his analysis on the resource he calls "strategic militancy." McCarthy and Zald, however, argue that the traditional theories of collective behaviour and relative deprivation analyzed the strategies of "bargaining, persuasion, or violence" that social movement leaders used "to influence authorities to change." Their analysis, on the other hand, concentrates upon the strategic tasks of "mobilizing supporters, neutralizing and/or transforming mass and elite publics into sympathizers, and achieving change in targets." Long again incorrectly applies a theoretical framework in focusing on strategic militancy or violence that McCarthy and Zald dismiss.

It was noted earlier that the resource mobilization paradigm cannot, within its parameters, explain militant behaviour. To recap briefly, such
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behaviour requires a level of commitment and a sense of solidarity that an actor acting with strategic-instrumental rationality does not have. It is equally difficult to explain civil disobedience with this paradigm. The manner in which social movements meet an individual's need for an "anchor" that is found in collective identity, as identified by Melucci in Chapter Four, does provide a means to explain the ability of social movements to command loyalty from its members. A means also is provided by which the willingness to suffer personal privation can be understood.

What the RM paradigm can explain is the need for social movement organizations with few financial resources "to induce the media to give free attention."

One of eight incidences of Native "strategic militancy" Long refers to was the invitation to South African Ambassador Glenn Babb by the Peigus Indian band of Manitoba to visit their reserve. This was widely reported by the media—most importantly it was free "advertising." Jhappan also notes that instances of illegal hunting and trapping have been bids for media attention. In most cases, the media was warned ahead of time, so it could be present for the arrest.

This paradigm also can explain why those not directly affected by the movement's goals would support it. This "conscience constituency" has greater "discretionary resources" in terms of both time and money; it also tends to include well educated individuals—"the higher the education the more likely the giving of time." Long concludes that it is important for Natives "to cultivate a

12 McCarthy and Zald, 31.
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broad-based conscience constituency."  

What he does not consider is that violence is unlikely to appeal to members of this group.

McCarthy and Zald also examine the role of intellectuals in social movements. Although their data are derived from American surveys, Wohlfeld and Nevitt examine the effect "post-material values" have on the amount of sympathy for Native demands in Canada. Their analysis will be considered shortly; the point here is that American surveys could be considered valid for identifying similar trends in Canada. The trend McCarthy and Zald identify is that more members of contemporary (American) society are university-educated and more of them are educated in the humanities and social sciences. This tends to produce both increased sympathy for the goals of social movements as well as an increased propensity to participate in social movements. This is not, however, a new feature of complex society as Melucci argues. McCarthy and Zald note that Schumpeter had identified this trend in 1947 when he "thought that capitalist societies are marked by 'the vigorous expansion of the educational apparatus and particularly the facilities of higher education'." They conclude that the "growth of the intellectual stratum must be seen as the result of the transformation of higher education and the professionalization processes in modern society"; both processes had been developing prior to the 1970s which is when Melucci suggests complex society began to emerge.

These processes did not affect Natives themselves until the late 1970s and after. However, the presence of large numbers of "change-oriented"
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intellectuals both in government and in Canadian society provided a conducive environment within which Native demands would be heard. This is the conclusion Wohlfeld and Nevitt reach.

Wohlfeld and Nevitt observe that those who hold post-material values are more sympathetic to Native demands. Post-materialists "value aesthetic and intellectual needs. Because post-materialists have 'risen above' mere economic goals as it were, they give priority to autonomy and participation and to the need of belonging." Post-materialists were raised in conditions of relative economic security; they are, thus, also those most likely to attend university.

Apart from the more conducive environment, there were other factors that facilitated the new directions Native activism took after 1969. If the experiences of the Fort Hope band in Northern Ontario is typical of Natives in other parts of Canada, one factor may be found here. It is that bureaucratic intervention as a process was completed by the early 1970s.

Thirty years ago, the Fort Hope band made its living by trapping, as it had since the signing of the James Bay Treaty, Treaty #9, in 1905. Such a lifestyle was nomadic in the winter; in the summer the members would camp by the Hudson Bay trading posts. Bureaucratic intervention had made its appearance prior to the 1960s, for the children had been attending residential schools in southern Ontario; this was a source of pain for both parents and children since this meant prolonged separation. The Indians complained to the Indian agents and, as a result, schools were built by the trading posts.
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Band members still adhered to their nomadic lifestyles, "[b]ut once the buildings were completed, Indian Affairs warned the people to send their children to school or face the consequences, including the threat that family-allowance payments would be stopped."26 It was not this threat that caused the Indians to cease tending their traplines, but the warning they must send their children to school. Most band members chose to stay with their children, not wishing to continue the prolonged separation experienced in the period of the residential schools.27 The unintended result was a "sedentary life-style," no source of income, and no housing.28 Welfare payments increased such that by 1969 "more than 52 per cent of people's disposable income" came from them.29 In less than a decade, the band had gone from being largely self-sufficient to becoming enmeshed in a culture of poverty.

A general theory that the economic revolution provided the conditions for nationalism does not really apply here. The market economy had served the Fort Hope band quite well, since they were able to provide themselves with disposable income from the sale of their furs. Although Indian Affairs provided some goods and services, many of their needs would have been satisfied by the subsistence lifestyle they lived. Certainly, the income received from the government was barely worth mentioning: first, "there was the small, four-dollar annuity guaranteed by Treaty #9; second, starting in 1927, band members seventy years of age and older30 began to receive an old-age pension up to a maximum of $240 per year; and third, starting in 1946, parents of school-age
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children began to receive a monthly family allowance up to a maximum of eight dollars per child.”31

Bureaucratic intervention, on the other hand, can be cited as a specific factor that contributed to the emergence of Native nationalism. With settled communities came a need for a type of government that Indians had not required previously: for example, committees were organized to deal with such issues as who should get the scarce housing first.32 The establishment of regularly scheduled air service “brought the band into closer contact with the outside world.”33 Visits by federal and provincial officials increased, as did the number and variety of programs the band had to address as a result of becoming a settled community.34

Long notes that Native leaders emerged in the 1970s. Although these were not "issue entrepreneurs" in the sense McCarthy and Zald mean—"middle class leaders who possess the requisite skills for overcoming potential obstacles for social movement 'success'"—Long suggests such success "does not depend on where the leaders who 'learn the ropes' come from, as long as leaders emerge who have learned them."35 The experiences noted above would provide Indian leaders with opportunities to "learn the ropes." That bureaucratic intervention proceeded over decades would suggest that these leaders also were appearing over a period of time. Native activism, as has been noted several times previously, did not suddenly appear in 1969. The concept of bureaucratic intervention and the uneven manner in which it proceeded provides
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for an understanding of both the fragmented nature of pre-1969 activism and the relatively more unified activism of post-1969.

Another vehicle for the development of Native leadership was the Indian and Eskimo Association of Canada. Although this was an organization of whites concerned with Native problems, by the late 1960s and early 1970s, it was being used as a forum by such leaders as Adams, Cardinal, and Opekokew for discussion of Native problems by Natives. Natives thus had at their disposal the power and resources of this elite group.

Although the 1969 White Paper provided a catalyst for the Native movement, the experiences of American Blacks and Indians can not be underestimated. As Cardinal noted in 1969:

We can and we have watched black riots in the United States and we can and have pondered their lessons. Our people have seen the methods used by other groups in similar situations, and we have measured their successes—and failures. We are learning from others about the forces that can be assembled in a democratic society to protect oppressed minorities. These things, too, are our classrooms now and our textbooks. And we are learning our lessons well.36

Other groups in similar situations included American Indians who had suffered disorganization under the Eisenhower administration. There is evidence that "indicates that Liberal policy-makers may have been guilty of imitating" the policies of this administration when they formulated the White Paper.37 It could be argued that Canadian Natives coalesced so quickly in opposition to the White Paper because they were aware of the consequences, having witnessed it in the American Indian experiences.

37 Driben and Trudeau, 23.
In conclusion, I would argue that Native activism is best characterized as a nationalist movement. Theories of nationalism and neo-nationalism offer the best account of the nature of the Native Canadian movement. Chapter Five identified the following similarities between Nativist ideology and other nationalist ideologies: the "rebirth" of the nationalist group; the group's connections with nature and spirituality; and the importance of land both in providing an economic base and in conferring dignity on its people.

Chapter Five also noted some of the differences between neo-nationalist, or contemporary nationalist, movements and nationalist, or historical nationalist, movements. One difference between these two movements is that neo-nationalist movements consist of minorities who direct their attention to a state which has tended to be neglectful of them, at best, and, at worst, has attempted to "civilize" them. Another difference is that neo-nationalist movements occur in the wealthy industrial countries. The desire to partake of that wealth is evident in the emphasis of Nativist ideology on land, as well as in the willingness to accept an autonomist status.

Perhaps the greatest difference is that neo-nationalist movements recognize the limits of the states in which they "move" and are willing to work within those boundaries. This is particularly so with regard to the tendency Smith identifies of neo-nationalist movements to accept a political-legal status of autonomy within an already established state as well as to recognize the desirability of dual identities.
Although there are these differences, the similarity between neo-nationalist ideology and nationalist ideology provides one continuity between the contemporary phase of nationalism and its historical phase. This similarity is most evident in the nationalist assertion of the need for collective rights as well as of the idea that the individual can only be created through the nation. Such assertions find their counterparts in Nativist ideology as well.

Smith identifies two other continuities between the contemporary and historical phases. The first is that movements from both phases are movements of "subject" peoples against a dominant society. The second concerns the important role played by intellectuals in both phases.

Chapter Five indicated that both the Native movement and Nativist ideology have the characteristics of nationalist and neo-nationalist movements and/or ideologies. The continuities and differences between nationalist movements and neo-nationalist movements are also apparent in the Native Canadian example. Theories of nationalism and neo-nationalism are deficient, however, in not being able to explain why the Native Canadian movement emerged when it did and why it has met and continues to meet so many obstacles in its development. Smith develops a general theoretical framework within which to understand the phenomenon of nationalism; specific nationalisms can be identified by this framework as, indeed, belonging to the phenomenon of nationalism. However, certain aspects of nationalist movements can only be understood by identifying factors specific to an individual movement. One such aspect concerns the question of why the Native Canadian movement emerged when it did.

Resource mobilization theory was utilized in the thesis to correct this deficiency. RM theory is useful in explaining the "when" of the emergence of the Native Canadian movement, by identifying the importance of such resources as
conscience communities and elite support, as well as the importance of intentional publicity and, more importantly, the importance of obtaining free publicity. RM theory also identifies where social movement leadership comes from. It comes from a middle class. However, Native leadership, in the early years of the movement, did not come from a middle class.

How Native leadership was developed is best understood by using Melucci's concept of bureaucratic intervention. The experiences of the Fort Hope Band demonstrates the manner in which bureaucratic intervention proceeded and identifies how the Band moved from a nomadic to a sedentary lifestyle, with a requisite need for new forms of government. The experiences of the Fort Hope Band are assumed to be typical of what happened as Canada's economic development proceeded. By the 1970s, this economic development had been extended to all parts of Canada; thus geographically isolated Native groups came into closer contact with the dominant society and felt the effects of this more immediate contact. Contact between Natives and whites varied and gradually became more immediate by the 1970s. The gradual nature of this contact and of the bureaucratic intervention that depends upon the degree of contact provides an understanding for how Native leadership was developed.

The "new social movement" theory of Melucci suggested that contemporary nationalist movements are new to the extent that nationalist identity assumes a new and central importance. However, the similarities between Native ideology and identity and other nationalist ideologies and identities as identified in Chapter Five suggest otherwise. Also, Melucci considers nationalist movements to be social movements as he defines the latter. One of the identifying characteristic of social movements is that social movements "break the limits" of the state. However, as indicated above, neo-nationalist movements recognize such limits and are willing to accept autonomy
with state limits. Although it was noted in Chapter Five that the claim to the ability to define citizenship could possibly find satisfaction only in a confederal structure, it is also possible to satisfy this claim within the federal structure. The differences in opinion among Natives regarding the place Natives hold, or should hold, in Canada suggest that either scenario is a possibility. However, other than for this one issue, the Native movement is an autonomist movement, and thus not a social movement as Melucci defines it.

NSM theory, however, draws attention to the importance of the international context. It also stresses the importance of such factors as social interaction and recruitment networks in the development of movements, and the impact of bureaucratization on such development. It is the newness and still relative weakness of these interactions which both explain the newness of the Native movement and, at the same time, the continuing obstacles to its full development.

Thus, the best account for the emergence of the Canadian Native movement is offered by building upon the general framework developed by Smith by adding to it selected elements from RM and NSM theories. These selected elements identify specific factors of the Native Canadian movement that differentiates it from other nationalist movements. Smith's general framework identifies the numerous similarities between the specific movement and the general phenomenon of nationalism.
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