

Indigenous self-government in the Northwest Territories in Canada: Political Negotiations between Native communities, government, and multinational diamond mining companies

Linda Armano

Abstract

For many decades, the Northwest Territories were simply regarded by the Canadian government as barren land. Only with the discovery of mineral deposits that could be mined for gold and, after 1990, for the extraction of diamonds, did the government and the multinational mining corporations create agreements with the Indigenous communities for the use of these lands. This research aims to understand the negotiation process that the Dene and Tłı̨chǫ Indigenous communities have established with the government and the mining industries. Through a review of the regulations of the Indian reserves in the Northwest Territories, this study analyses specific agreements, called Impact and Benefit Agreements, between the mining corporations and the Native groups.

Keywords: Northwest Territories, diamond mines, Dene, Tłı̨chǫ, Treaties 8 and 11, Impact and Benefit Agreements

Anthropologists are often involved as experts in policy negotiations between Indigenous groups and governments (Miller and Menezes 2015). Although many social scholars operate as witnesses in legal issues in support of Native communities (Coulthard 2014), other authors warn against approaches that may not be fully respectful towards Indigenous peoples, albeit unintentionally, given the original colonial nature of anthropology (Bennett et al. 2014). The researchers who have addressed this topic have focussed primarily on the relationship between power and knowledge (Cooper et al. 2021) and ultimately consider academic production also as being an imperialistic tool (Escobar and Restrepo 2010; Ideland 2018).

A structured consideration of anthropology of law envisioned as a sub-discipline of anthropology initially appeared in the second half of the nineteenth century (Moore 1973). One of the most commonly recurring themes in current debates among anthropologists who specialise in this branch of study concerns the question of how to identify the conceptual boundaries of what “law” is (Pirie 2019). The use of empirical material of an ethnographic nature is fundamental both when attempting to provide increasingly precise definitions of the concept of “law” and to

structure cross-cultural comparisons (Nader and Todd 1978). In this regard, Simon Roberts (2005) affirms the importance of distinguishing social norms from written norms, arguing that the concept of law is intrinsically linked to a centralised government. However, other studies suggest that highly structured legal forms are also typical of communities not based on state power (Fikowski and Moffit 2018). The burgeoning human rights studies and international and transnational law studies lend further support to this argument. For example, Fernanda Pirie (2019) poses the following question: “If law is not firmly tied to centralised government, then how are we to recognise and distinguish it?” (p. 4). Introducing the concept of “legalism”, she explains how written rules and law codes can structure social behaviours and classify worldviews just as much as rules transmitted orally. She further argues that the concept of legalism does not aim to define what law is, and claims that the label of “law” is too heterogeneous to provide a precise definition of what is or is not a law. Using the concept of legalism, however, Pirie states that it is possible to avoid the common association between law and a state or centralised government. The scholar highlights the fact that legal norms do not always belong to an organised legal system, therefore the concept of legalism will not always be useful in distinguishing written laws from oral rules which share innumerable common traits. The anthropologist also notes that many researchers make the mistake of considering constitutional norms as universal laws applicable to any socio-cultural context.

In accordance with Fernanda Pirie’s suggestions, this paper furthers the work of those few previous studies (i.e., Hall 2013, 2015; Fikowski and Moffit 2018) that have addressed the delicate issue of land use negotiation between Indigenous communities in the Northwest Territories, multinational mining corporations and the Canadian government. To boost scientific debate on an issue only marginally addressed in the existing literature, this article aims to highlight the political difficulties still experienced by Native groups in this Canadian region. Commencing with research in the archives of the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Center in Yellowknife, and from a careful analysis of the existing literature on this topic, this paper intends to focus on the political negotiation related to land use between the Indigenous communities of the Dene of Yellowknife and the Tłı ʘq̓ (or Dogrib) of Behchokò and the mining companies and the federal government.

The contents of this article are part of a broader investigation related to a Marie Curie Global Fellowship (H2020-MSCA-IF-2018) hosted at the Department of Management of the Ca’ Foscari University of Venice and at the Faculty of Management of the University of British Columbia. Specifically, this research is part of the “DiaEthic” project (n. 837190; <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/837190>) entitled *Map value transformations in a global interconnection. How sensory experiences and cultural interpretations shape concepts of “ethical diamond” and “mining work ethics”*, funded by the European Union.

The ethnographic research commenced in September 2019 and ended in September 2021. The general objective of the Marie Curie “DiaEthic” project was to collect the different interpretations that the various subjects involved in the diamond supply chain, (i.e., people belonging to different socio-cultural and economic-political contexts such as managers of multinational companies, miners, geologists, trustees of public and private departments, Indigenous people, jewellers and consumers) ascribed to the concept of ethics in relation to the mining practices of the multinational corporations operating in the Northwest Territories. As often happens, however, the present research proved to be more complex than had initially been hypothesised. Firstly, many people involved in the production process were reluctant to provide their interpretation of the concept of ethics in relation to the actions of the mining companies present in the Canadian region (Armano 2022b). Moreover, several delicate political issues related to the use of land between Indigenous communities, mining corporations and government (Whiteman and Mamen 2002; Paci and Villebrun 2005; Duhaime and Comtois 2003) became apparent. By reviewing the regulations of First Nations Indian reserves in the Northwest Territories, this article then analyses the so-called Impact and Benefit Agreements (IBAs) through which the British Crown delegates the regulation of natural resources in the region to multinational mining corporations (Cascadden et al. 2021).

The importance of the Northwest Territories for the Canadian government became apparent in the first half of the twentieth century following the discovery of oil and gas deposits as well as abundant deposits of gold and diamonds. Historically, this region has been home to Indigenous communities including the Dene and Tłı̨cho, groups belonging to the Dene Nation. This latter is a political organisation founded on October 3, 1969, following the Trudeau government’s presentation to parliament of a White Paper in which the federal government proposed the transfer of control of Indigenous populations to the various Canadian territorial bodies (Coulthard 2014). In response, Indigenous groups in the Northwest Territories organised in the Dene Nation to defend their rights to the territory in which they had resided for centuries (Hall 2013). The Dene Nation was established based on Treaties 8 and 11 which, as we will see below, regulate the relationship between Aboriginal title and the exploitation of the natural resources present in their territory (Fumoleau 2004). The term Aboriginal title is used to refer to a sub-category of the so-called Aboriginal Rights which in turn include regulations relating to hunting, fishing, and the construction of traps that the Indigenous people are required to follow. Aboriginal title enables Native communities to appeal to the measures aimed at the protection of the territory from environmental damages caused by industrial activities (O’Faircheallaigh 2010). Aboriginal title can be applied when an Indigenous Canadian community demonstrates that they occupied a specific area of land at the

time at which the Crown asserted sovereignty over such land¹. In addition to proof of pre-sovereignty occupation, an element of continuity in the occupation of the territory by the Indigenous community claiming Aboriginal title must exist. The latter is, therefore, regulated by constitutional rules that derive from British political jurisdiction (Coulthard 2010).

Like other Indigenous communities of the region, both the Dene and Tłı ʈı speak Athapaskan, a language shared, despite some variations in linguistic traits, by populations scattered throughout Alaska and the southwestern United States including the Apache and Navajo (Hearne 1795; Armano 2022a). Today, some groups living in the Northwest Territories, especially those settled in Yellowknife, are simply known as Dene which, in the native language, means “people”. The Dene call their land “Denendeh”, namely “Land of the People”. This territory in the western part of the Northwest Territories extends as far as the treeline, beyond which lies the northern tundra, and comprises an area of about 1,000,000 square kilometres (Andrews 2004). The Dene Nation includes several Indigenous groups living in Denendeh: the Yellowknife-Dene, the Tłı ʈı, the Dettah (meaning “burnt point”) and the Ndlı (meaning “end of the island”), the Denesoline (Chipewyan), the Deh Gah Got’ine (Slavey), the K’ashot’ine (Hareskin) and the Dinjii Zhuh (Gwich’in) (Helm and Gillespie 1981; Armano 2022a).

Starting from the seventeenth century, Canadian colonial history was punctuated by a series of political treaties that stipulated, not without friction, regulations on the management of the territories inhabited and managed by Indigenous communities, and they continue to do so to this day (Coulthard 2014). As some studies highlight (Trigger 1987; Ray 2016), however, it is wrong to assume that forms of political negotiation began only after colonisation. On the contrary, the continuous relations between the various Native communities resulting from the exchange of objects useful for traditional activities (flint), or of basic necessities (such as corn in exchange for meat or skins) or ornamental objects including pearl or shell necklaces (Smith 2008) meant that certain territorial divisions affiliated to each group were sanctioned and reaffirmed, albeit not in a clear and intractable manner (Dickason 2009; Dickason, Newbigging 2015). The object exchanged in such circumstances could ensure positive relationships between groups or establish alliances based on particular needs (Helm and Gillespie 1981). In these cases, the object exchanged established political agreements that had to be periodically renewed by conducting ceremonies (Paci and Villebrun 2005). However, from the end of the 1500s, English, French and Dutch colonists took advantage of the pre-established trading trajectories of the Native populations and thus encountered the Indigenous communities, laying the foundations for subsequent deterritorialisation (Borrows, 2010). At the beginning of the 1600s, the British Crown began to ratify a series of

¹ Delgamuukw v. British Columbia, [1997] 3 S.C.R. 1010 at para. 143.

treaties with the Indigenous Canadian populations which were formally recognised by the Crown as agreements to encourage peaceful relations in that they specified a series of obligations and benefits for both sides according to the territories (Armano 2022a). In the early historical phase, these agreements were accepted by all the Native Canadian communities who saw them as constructive relationships from an economic and political point of view². For example, this interpretation of the interrelationships between Indigenous peoples and settlers is represented by the Two Row Wampum which today symbolises the process of building relationships between Canadian Indigenous communities and colonisers of European origin but can be traced back to the agreements between the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) who lived on Turtle Island and Dutch traders that began in 1613 (Long et al. 2019). On that occasion, the Haudenosaunee rejected the patriarchal relationship that the Dutch traders wished to impose, instead proposing relationships of brotherhood that came to be represented by two parallel, coloured lines running the length of the Two Row Wampum belt to symbolise two journeys made in boats travelling side by side along the same river (Hill and Coleman 2019). Even today, the Natives recount that the Native boat in the Two Row Wampum belt signifies a birch canoe³, while the Dutch boat represents a ship. Indigenous people lend further symbolic meaning to the Two Row Wampum. The two coloured rows might also be interpreted as the relationship between the two counterparts, which should never interfere in the internal affairs of the opposing group (Paci and Villebrun 2005).

The treaty concluded between the Haudenosaunee and the Dutch traders formed the structural basis for subsequent treaties (Battiste et al. 2000). In 2013, the 400th anniversary of the Two Row Wampum was commemorated in Canada⁴. Speaking at a public conference as part of the commemorative events, elders belonging to the Haudenosaunee community explained the profound meaning they attributed to the Two Row Wampum belt. They described how even today it symbolises an extraordinarily important cosmological principle, one that regulates a universal relationship in which every component, natural and human, must maintain a harmony between the forces involved, opposing any form of domination (Borows 2002). Indigenous Canadians include in the concept of “relationship” not only the direct relationships between people but also the relationships between nations and between people and the natural environment in which they live (Wilson 2003). This last consideration is common to all Canadian Indigenous communities that have no cultural conception of private ownership of the land, but rather a sense of belonging to it. They consider themselves responsible for managing and preserving the land for

² NWT Archives, Hudson’s Bay Company

³ The birch canoe takes on a symbolic significance for many Native Canadian communities as it is a metaphor for human existence flowing down the river of life.

⁴ <https://www.onondaganation.org/news/2012/2013-calendar-features-two-row-wampum/>

future generations. Indeed, despite hybrid forms of economy they still derive part of their livelihood from the land today (Armano 2022a).

The Two Row Wampum is still used by many Indigenous communities, also called First Nations⁵, as a symbolic means of introducing discourses on decolonisation and negotiating land management with the government and mining corporations (Battiste 2008).

Knowledge negotiation as a method for a legal anthropology investigation

Conducting ethnographic research among the Indigenous peoples of the Northwest Territories means establishing a relational process of knowledge negotiation with them (Hall 2013, 2015; Lee-Hammond 2017; Armano 2022a). Margaret Kovach (2010) points out that Indigenous knowledge comprises a specific way of sharing knowledge through storytelling (Thomas 2005; Bishop 1999; Absolon & Willett 2004). She calls this process the “conversational method” (Kovacha 2010: 40) and describes it as follows:

“The conversational method is a means of gathering knowledge found within Indigenous research. The conversational method is of significance to Indigenous methodologies because it is a method of gathering knowledge based on oral story telling tradition congruent with an Indigenous paradigm. It involves a dialogic participation that holds a deep purpose of sharing story as a means to assist others. It is relational at its core”. (Kovach 2010: 40)

Indigenous interlocutors often speak explicitly of a “protocol” by which they mean a series of rules that researchers must follow to establish a relationship with them and enable them to share their knowledge with scholars, especially as regards the Indigenous elders (Kovach 2021). Shawn Wilson (2001) states that this approach is based on an Indigenous epistemology in which the relationship becomes the fulcrum for establishing any type of conversation. From an anthropological point of view, Kovach underlines: “Protocols are a means to ensure that activities are carried out in a manner that reflects community teachings and are done in a good way” (Kovach 2010: 41).

Other scholars have conceptualised the relationships between researchers and Native groups. For example, Bessarab and Ng’andu (2010) introduced the concept of

⁵ “First Nations” is a term used to describe the Aboriginal peoples of Canada who are neither Métis nor Inuit. This term entered into common usage in the 1970s and 1980s replacing the term “Indian” although, unlike the latter, the term “First Nations” has no legal definition. While “First Nations” refers to the original populations of Canada, “First Nation” refers to a specific band or tribal group sharing the same territory.

“yarning” referred to the Noongar population in southwestern Australia. As the two authors point out, there are different forms of yarning (social yarning, collaborative yarning, therapeutic yarning, research yarning, etc.). Specifically, research yarning concerns a particular area of interest in which the relationship is developed to achieve a certain purpose. Furthermore, reflecting on storytelling as a dialogic method that builds relationships, the Maori researcher Russell Bishop introduces the notion of “collaborative history” (Bishop 1999: 6) through which the scholar is positioned in the role of participant. Bishop explains that when stakeholders engage in a collaborative process, the relationship builds and deepens as stories are shared.

The conversational method is certainly not the only methodology that allows you to relate to members of Indigenous communities in the Northwest Territories and initiate a conversation. Barrett and Stauffer (2009) introduce, for example, the concept of “narrative inquiry” in which the history of a community is considered as a particular form of knowledge that involves the construction of Native knowledge. Nevertheless, Margaret Kovach (2010) states that the conversational method is that most frequently chosen by social scholars who intend to start an investigation of Canadian Indigenous communities. However, she warns that far from having a rigid structure, this method must be adapted each time according to the specific ethnographic requirements. Nevertheless, Kovach identifies some constants within this approach which can be summarised as follows: the conversational method is connected to a specific Indigenous epistemology; it is relational and purposeful; it involves compliance with a precise protocol modelled on the Native epistemology as well as informality and flexibility when new relationships are created. It is also reflective and self-reflective (p. 43).

In addition to Kovach’s considerations, it seems useful to state that the current “Indigenous protocol” to which researchers must comply is the result of the lengthy and ongoing political history of territorial negotiation between the Indigenous Canadian populations of the north, the federal government and multinational mining corporations.

Western anthropological research has only recently started to use the so-called Indigenous methodologies (Absolon, Willett 2004; Kovach 2005). Hence, this paragraph aims to reflect critically not only on what incorporating Indigenous knowledge related to the cultural meaning attributed to the land means for academic studies of anthropology of law but also how such Native knowledge is transferred orally from generation to generation may become a real research methodology within this branch of study. To this end, I will consider some of the insights gained during my ethnographic and archival research in the Northwest Territories during which time

I was also able to extend my knowledge through informal conversations⁶, with elders belonging to the Dene and Tłı̨ chų communities. If, as has been claimed, the “conversational method” aligns with the Indigenous worldview and is useful for creating personal relationships through orality, the transmission of knowledge is the essential means of establishing any relationship between researchers and Indigenous people during ethnographic research. Specifically, the term “knowledge” here refers to knowledge linked to an Indigenous concept of “land” that is based on the practice of traditional activities that incorporate both subsistence and ceremonial activities (Armano 2022a). The intervention of Richard Nerysoo (an Indigenous politician from the Gwich’in community and member of the Legislative Assembly of Northwest Territories from 1979 to 1995) as reported by Berger (1977) following the latter’s field research captures the relationship between Canadian Indigenous communities and their land: “To the Indian people, our land really is our life. Without our land we cannot or we could no longer exist as people” (Richard Nerysoo, Fort McPherson, 1976 - from Berger 1977:94).

During the informal conversations I had with some Dene and Tłı̨ chų elders in Yellowknife, I was able to understand that the territory in which they live is not simply conceived as a neutral space or one to be exploited for resources but is rather seen as a dense network in which symbolic meanings, traditional activities, stories, historical events, and geographical features are interwoven. They thus speak of a cultural landscape in which physical characteristics are used as mnemonic devices to introduce oral narratives which, in turn, give cultural meaning to the landscape (Armano 2022a).

The mnemonic link between territory, the specific name of a place and certain oral narratives has been well documented in numerous studies (Andrews et al. 1998; Feld and Basso 1996; Hirsch and O’Hanlon 1995). Many elders still recount how, in former times, vast territories were intimately known to all band members. In the past especially, such knowledge was extremely important to the mobile populations of the Northwest Territories. By creating toponyms and telling stories linked to specific parts of the territory, an ethno-geography was established where the physical world merged with the oral tradition in a semiotic continuum (Ligi 2003). However, many Indigenous people still talk today about the importance of accompanying the children of their communities along sacred paths within their territories. During these journeys, the elders tell stories to the young people who are encouraged to reinterpret them based on their own experiences. Furthermore, these journeys constitute valid opportunities to teach place names to the younger generation and to teach them respect for certain sacred places. Thus, moving around the territory becomes a vehicle

⁶ My conversations with Indigenous people in the Northwest Territories were not recorded. In fact, the interlocutors expressed their willingness to have informal conversations with me without using any device to collect data through interviews.

for learning and transmitting Indigenous culture (Armano 2022a). This ancient form of ethno-pedagogy in the Indigenous communities of the Northwest Territories directed towards children, and young people in general, and developed through knowledge of the territory (Andrews 2004) risked disappearing totally due to the establishment of residential schools (Wilk et al 2017).

One of the best-known traditional Indigenous narratives tells of a time long ago when humans and animals could exchange form. In this story, Indigenous history is divided into two main periods called respectively “Old World”, i.e., when men and animals lived in a state of absolute harmony, and “New World”, that is, when human beings and animals began to take their current physical form (Paci and Villebrun 2005). In the New World people and animals continued to abide by rules of mutual respect with which the Indigenous communities of the region still comply today, especially at certain times such as during hunting trips (Wilson 2003). In the Old World all the communities that currently inhabit the Northwest Territories lived in harmony until two Dene and Tłı̨chǫ children began to fight over an owl. This quarrel caused bitter fighting between the various communities of the region until, the story goes, streams of blood formed in the hills (Helm and Gillespie 1981). Eventually, a Tłı̨chǫ elder ordered the various groups to stop fighting and thereafter the communities settled in different parts of the territory within the region. The Gwich’ community followed a dog, which became the group’s ancestral animal. The Inuit joined a very athletic young man who wandered as far as the Arctic coast. Hence, the Indigenous populations of the Northwest Territories say that the Inuit are very agile. On the other hand, the Denes decided to follow some children who ran towards Great Bear Lake. The Denes are therefore generally considered to be very energetic. By contrast, one elder remained in the place where the fighting had taken place and gathered the Tłı̨chǫ around him; the latter are recognised as being particularly wise (Armano 2022a).

Although the teaching of stories is still handed down, many of the younger people reject such guidance and currently seem more attracted by the job opportunities in the mining industries present in the region (Coulthard 2010). To counteract this phenomenon, many elders urge young people to transcribe these traditional stories so they may be preserved (Thomas 2005; Kovach 2010; Meyer 2001). Over the last decade, there has been an increase in this important process of transcription of oral narratives thanks to the work of international scholars and, above all, by Indigenous researchers. Indeed, many Indigenous communities have collected these materials in archives within the local communities as well as in online archives (Armano 2019; Wilson 2001).

Deterritorialisation and attempts at reterritorialisation. Political negotiation, through treaties 8 and 11, between Indigenous communities and the mining industry in the Northwest Territories

In 1991, Professor Ralph Johnson of the University of Washington published an important article entitled *Fragile Gains: Two Centuries of Canadian and United States Policy Toward Indians* in which he compared the history of federal politics of the United States with that of Canada. In his article, Johnson stated that by comparison with the policy of regulating Indian communities in the United States, Canadian legislation referring to Indigenous peoples has remained almost unchanged since the beginning of the nineteenth century (Johnson, 1991: 666). In fact, until the 1990s, in Canada, by contrast with the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States, there was no official regulation relating to the possibility for Indigenous communities to govern themselves. At the beginning of the 1990s, the only law related to Indigenous people was the Indian Act which controlled the distribution of bands and regulated the Indian reserves (Nichols 1989). Notwithstanding this initial legislative backwardness regarding the Native communities and despite countless clashes between the First Nations and the federal government, Canada has reached slightly better compromises between the two parties than the United States (Young 1984). Although Canada's population of 34.3 million people places it 35th in the world ranking by the number of inhabitants, with its ten provinces (Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia) and three territories legally belonging to the First Nations (Nunavut, Yukon and Northwest Territories), it is only second to Russia as regards the extent of its territory. Eighty per cent of the population lives either along the border with the United States or in major cities such as Montreal (Quebec), Toronto (Ontario) and Vancouver (British Columbia). The current distribution of the population is related to the location of the inhabitants back in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries when settlements were placed along waterways and close to natural resources, mining villages were built (for the extraction of coal and gold) or settlements grew up along the railway tracks (Armano 2019a).

Today Indigenous communities maintain agreements stipulated with the British Crown, passing through the federal government, through particular treaties (11 in total). These were created to manage the exploitation of natural resources present in the Indigenous territories in exchange for (often inefficient) economic and political support (Bouchard et al. 2021). However, the different interpretation given to the treaties by the Indigenous people on one side and the state on the other has now been recognised even by the federal government (albeit in a purely informal sense) (Hall 2015). This difference certainly originates in the different worldviews of the two parties involved, above all as related to the concepts of land and property

(Armano 2022a). Indigenous communities still conceive the land as a polysemous web of spiritual, economic, and political elements that are directly experienced by the Natives by making long journeys within a specific area of the territory (Ligi 2003). On the other hand, the British Crown and the federal government have always conceived the land as a resource for exploitation. Based on this conception, from the institution of the very first treaties, the settlers established rigid borders that failed to coincide with the previous Indigenous territorial divisions. In many cases, these practices of colonial deterritorialisation of the Native territories have undermined the traditional cultural, economic and social ties of the Indigenous communities with their land. However, over the last forty years, many communities have placed their total trust in the elders who are seen as representing a sort of oral archive (Andrews 2004) that can retrace the corpus of stories that enable a reconstruction of the traditional territorial divisions, as well as the Native belief systems linked to the landscape (Armano 2022a). While the structure of the treaties signed between the Canadian government and the various Indigenous communities can be considered similar, the contents of these documents differ according to the territory which is, in each case, exploited differently as regards its resources (Coulthard 2014).

Historical sources trace the origin of the activation of the treaties to the Charter for Rupert's Land. From 1670 to 1870, the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) had exclusive fur trading dominance in the northernmost areas of the American continent (Barclay 2015). Rupert's Land, named in honour of Prince Rupert (admiral, colonial governor of German origin and first governor of the HBC), included a large part of present-day Canada (Manitoba, Saskatchewan, southern Alberta, southern Nunavut, northern Ontario and Quebec) and the northern United States (Morton 1968). Three years after the establishment of the Canadian Confederation (1867), the Government of Canada purchased Rupert's Land from the HBC for \$1.5 million, thus representing Canada's largest real estate transaction (Barclay 2015; Barman 2014). This purchase determined the geographical transformation of Canada (Armano 2022a). Rupert's Land was subsequently divided between Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and the Northwest Territories (Hyde 2011).

Around the period of Canada's unification in 1867, the Canadian Constitution enshrined a political division between the provinces and the federal government (Getty, 1994: 973). From a legislative point of view, Burrage points out, provincial governments have no jurisdiction over Indigenous affairs, as only parliament has the power to pass laws on the management of Indigenous lands and traditional activities, which are specifically included in section 91(24) of the Constitution. She also underlines that, from 1876 onwards, the Canadian federal government tried to administer the Native communities through a series of laws, the main one being the Indian Act.

On the other hand, Section 35(1) of the Canadian Constitution regulates the protection of the rights of Indigenous communities which include both groups

belonging to the First Nations as well as the Inuit and Métis (Hyde 2011). Since the 1980s, initiatives involving Native communities and the federal government to promote the self-government of the former have also increased, although no official and widespread agreement throughout the nation has ever been reached (Armano 2019a). While the various political forces now state that the recognition of Indigenous self-government has been achieved and included in the Constitution, the First Nations still struggle to assert their rights to the land, to celebrate ceremonies and to preserve and pass on their traditional languages and activities (Coulthard 2010). In his book *First Nations Sacred Sites in Canada's Courts*, Michael Lee Ross explains that although Aboriginal title has been formally included in the Canadian Constitution since 1982, none of the rights included in it have had legal effect.

Even though many treaties were signed shortly after the Canadian Confederation was formed (such as Treaties 1, 2 and 3 relating to the territories of present-day Manitoba and Ontario) (Elliott 1988), their relative negotiation processes must be considered as ongoing, and their interpretation is continuously re-examined by the Native communities to establish new relationships with the government (Burnard 1992). It is therefore possible to state that the Treaties are still used, especially by Indigenous bands, as living documents continuously co-constructed with the government and adapted according to the historical and political needs that the Natives face (Coulthard 2014). When the Constitution Act was passed in 1982 – added to the earlier British North America Act of 1867 – the Treaties were incorporated into the Canadian constitution. The Constitution Act can therefore be considered a container that gathers the innumerable political battles of the Indigenous communities into the Canadian constitution, the battles through which the Native peoples have tried over the centuries and in various ways to negotiate their land rights with the government and fought against colonial deterritorialisation (Bouchard et al. 2021; Armano 2022a). Another extremely important historical fact that sanctioned the stipulation of treaties in Canada was the Royal Proclamation (1763) through which the concept of “Aboriginal title” was established by means of which the Native communities could claim their rights to occupy the lands in which they carried out traditional activities (Barclay 2015). At least in theory, therefore, through the “Indigenous law”, the federal government was required to enter into agreements with the Indigenous bands before starting any economic activity in the Native territories (Absolon and Willett 2004). Nonetheless, after 1870, the federal government began an ambitious plan to extinguish Aboriginal title so that infrastructure such as the Canadian Pacific Railway could be built (Barclay 2015).

In the late nineteenth century, as gold prospectors and settlers advanced up central Alberta (still in the area of Treaty 6), via Edmonton (in the area of Treaty 7) to Pelly River near the Klondike mine in present-day Yukon, the government also needed to regulate territories extending from northern Alberta, north-eastern British Columbia, north-western Saskatchewan as well as the area south of Hay River and

Great Slave Lake in the Northwest Territories (Armano 2022a). Specifically, Treaty 8 includes the southern area of Great Slave Lake, Lutsel K'e, Fort Resolution, Pine Point and Hay River⁷. However, it does not include Providence, Rae-Edzo, Yellowknife, and the mining area of Great Slave Lake (Spilsbury 1981). When the Treaty was negotiated at the end of the nineteenth century between the government and the Indigenous communities, the latter were part of two large linguistic groups: the Cree and the Athapaskan, which included, among others, also the Chipewyans, the Beavers, the Slaveys, the Dogribs and the Yellowknives. The Cree-speaking communities lived in the territories of what is now northern Alberta while the Beavers occupied present-day British Columbia along the Peace River (which at the time of the signing of the treaties was part of present-day Alberta) (Helm 2000). On the other hand, the Slaveys, Dogribs and Yellowknives lived in the northernmost territories. Treaty 8 negotiations are therefore estimated to have included 2700 Indians and 1700 Métis (people born of relations between Indigenous people and settlers) (Barclay 2015). The borders relating to Treaty 8 were drawn up in 1900. Treaty 8 was drafted for the first time in 1891. In 1898, it was simplified and in 1899 it was drawn up in its definitive version. The latter was approved by a private Commission and signed by commissioners David Laird, James McKenna and James Ross on June 21, 1899 at Lesser Slave Lake (Armano 2022a).

The third paragraph of the treaty enables us to clarify the main purposes of Treaty 8, namely, issues related to the immigration of new residents of European origin, the extension of the fur trade, mining, and timber harvesting⁸. Through this treaty, the government established that Indigenous communities would cede their lands to the British Crown, as well as their rights to manage these territories⁹.

The commissioners who signed Treaty 8 and who also decided the boundaries within which it was to be established, did not initially inform the Native communities of the new territorialisation (Spilsbury 1981). Furthermore, the boundaries (which currently remain those set in 1900) were determined simply on the basis of notes taken by members of the commission during their travels through northern Canadian territory during the summers preceding the first drafting of the Treaty (Weigel 2019). A letter sent to the Department of Indian Affairs in Ottawa, dated April 25, 1898 and written by the Dene, Slaveys and Tłı̨chǫ settled within the borders of the Treaty 8 territories, makes no reference to the question of the new borders but affirms their intention to maintain their traditional activities (economic and ceremonial) on their lands (Forget 1898). It can therefore be assumed that Clifford Sifton, the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs at the time, was aware a year before the final draft of Treaty 8 of the resistance he would encounter by continuing with the

⁷ *Northwest Territories Act*, c.62, RSC 1906.

⁸ <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100028813/1581293624572>

⁹ Cfr. A reproduction from the NWT Archives – Treaty 8.

issue of this document (Spilsbury 1981). Only on September 22, 1899, in a Commission headed by Superintendent Sifton, was the “Report of Commissioners for Treaty No. 8” drawn up, stating that the Natives were concerned about their rights to hunt and fish in the territories under the control of Treaty 8 (Armano 2022a). In response to these concerns, the Superintendent wrote to Indigenous band representatives to assure that the government would guarantee such rights¹⁰.

More recently, in 1994, Wendy Aasen, a researcher at the University of Northern British Columbia, wrote an important report entitled *The Spirit and Intent of Treaty 8 in the Northwest Territories*¹¹. The report was commissioned as a communication on the contents to be discussed by the “Constitutional Development Steering Committee” (CDSC) set up by the government of the Northwest Territories for the creation of the Nunavut region. Aasen’s report is fundamental as it includes the court testimony of Father Rene Fumoleau during the “Paulette Case” in which discussion took place on the different interpretations given to Treaties 8 and 11 by, on one hand, the government and, on the other hand, the Indigenous communities (Aasen, 1994). Specifically, Francois Paulette, Chief of Fort Smith, along with sixteen other community chiefs in the Northwest Territories (including the Dene and Tłı̨chǫ), filed their complaint with the Land Titles Office in Yellowknife on September 6, 1973 (Armano 2022a). Aasen reanalysed the interviews of Judge William G. Morrow who presided over the court in the “Paulette Case”, as well as the recorded testimonies of some members of the Dene community. Her report highlighted that although the latter had carefully read the texts of Treaty 8, they had failed to understand, from a conceptual and therefore cultural point of view, the meaning of the term “surrender” and the idea of “cession of their land title or rights” (Aasen 1994: 17-18). As some Dene people testified during the hearing, the members of the Native community who signed Treaty 8 in 1899/1900 believed that it sanctioned a peaceful collaboration that would allow them to continue subsistence activities and ceremonial practices in their territory (Coulthard 2014).

They therefore concluded that, given the priority of this issue, in 1898 the problem related to the territorialisation dictated by Treaty 8 was secondary to the concern of the Indigenous people for the continuation of their right to practice traditional activities on their land (Coulthard 2010). Commenting on Aasen’s report, in his book *Legacy: Indian Treaty Relationship* (1991), Richard Price, professor emeritus at the University of Alberta in the Faculty of Indigenous Studies, explains the Canadian government’s motives when entering into Treaties 8 and 11. Specifically, the author emphasises the need for the state to acquire the legal title over the western and northern territories to initiate agricultural projects, to build railways as well as for mining and the construction of various types of infrastructure. Any

¹⁰ A reproduction from the NWT Archives, Dené National / Assembly of First Nations Office (NWT).

¹¹ <https://data2.archives.ca/rcap/pdf/rcap-628.pdf>

response by the government to the economic and political needs of the various Indigenous groups was marginal.

In the concluding chapter of his book, entitled *Why Have a Treaty?*, Price specifies the reasons why the western territories of Canada were included in the Treaties. In particular, he affirms the importance, for the government, of allowing future non-indigenous residents to inhabit those lands and above all to protect those settlers who had entered the region for trading purposes. Furthermore, the government aimed to compensate Indigenous communities in exchange for the exclusive right to their lands.

The approval of Treaty 11 went considerably less smoothly than the signing of Treaty 8. Since 1880, the Mackenzie Valley was known to have important oil fields (Sabin 1995). Towards the end of the nineteenth century, however, exploratory drilling in the north-western areas of Canada increased, reaching its peak shortly before the great oil strikes at Norman Wells in the Northwest Territories in the summer of 1920 (Finch et al. 1993). However, the Mackenzie Valley received only belated attention from the federal government when it became aware of the economic potential of the far north of the region, especially after some members of the Geological Survey of Canada who were traversing the area and mapping the region, hypothesised the possible presence of minerals (especially gold) (Armano 2022a).

Although the results of these explorations were promising, at the end of the nineteenth century the government representatives were disinclined to include this part of the Northwest Territories in Treaty 8 or to create another one ad hoc because of the area's harsh climate, geographical isolation, and the high costs for transporting goods envisaged for the survival of the workers required to start any mining activity¹². Thus, the federal government preferred to consider this area profitable only for the fur trade (Hall et al. 2011). The area was accorded some minimal attention in 1903 when the North-West Mounted Police established an outpost at Fort McPherson (Fumoleau 1975; Morrison 1985). Initially, this outpost was merely an extension of the sovereignty of the Canadian government which, for the first time, directly encountered the Indigenous communities residing in the Mackenzie Valley (Armano 2022a).

Due to the hostile climate, the police forces in Fort McPherson were forced to seek help from the Indigenous communities with whom they often also negotiated food and other subsistence goods (Helm 2000). This attitude therefore encouraged the Natives to collaborate more frequently with the police, helping them with transport by sledge and welcoming them into their camps. On the other hand, the police force played a strategic role as mediator between the government and the First Nations (Hearne 1795).

¹² A reproduction from the NWT Archives, Ref. Mining.

In 1907, H.A. Conroy, a Treaty 8 inspector, was sent to the northern Mackenzie Valley. The purpose of his expedition was to visit Indigenous bands and report to the federal government on their way of life to suggest the measures necessary for managing the communities residing in the northernmost areas of Canada (Fumoleau 1975). In his report, we read that the Native communities of the Mackenzie Valley lived in desperate hygienic conditions with the consequent spread of contagious diseases unspecified by the author. For these reasons, Conroy reasoned, these bands needed immediate help from the federal government through a possible extension of Treaty 8 to include the Mackenzie Valley (Weigel 2019). Despite insistence by Conroy and some missionaries, the government rejected the proposal, discarding such a possibility on the basis of lack of funds to meet the expenses required in an extreme environment such as the Northwest Territories¹³.

Further solicitations for the extension of Treaty 8 to encompass the Mackenzie Valley also came from Bishop Breynat of the Roman Catholic Oblate Order who justified his request by stating there was an urgent need to draw up a treaty before the start of mining in the far north of the Northwest Territories, an area which already seemed promising in the early 1900s (Armano 2022a). This proposal was also rejected by the Department of Indian Affairs due to the high costs of the services to be allocated in the northern areas and above all because, at that time, the government was concentrating on extending the cultivation of cereals in other areas of Canada further south or in the central part of the country (Coates and Morrison 1985). In 1910, the Hudson's Bay Company also wrote a letter to the Department of Indian Affairs asking them to consider the possibility of a treaty in the Mackenzie River valley since the collateral costs of the fur trade, borne exclusively by traders, exceeded the funds budgeted by the government; this proposal was again rejected (Ray 1984).

Only in 1912 did the Indigenous bands ask to have a treaty with the government though this was certainly not for the aforementioned reasons advanced by the inspectors and the missionaries. Rather, the Indigenous people felt the need for formal guarantees given the imminent start of mining activities in the area in which they lived (Armano 2022a).

Only after new exploration recognised the great potential for oil exploitation in the northern Northwest Territories did the government add the Mackenzie Valley to its agenda (Finch et al. 1993). In that period, relations between the government and the Indigenous people also intensified as the latter anticipated serious threats to the continuation of their subsistence and ceremonial activities with the advance of the settlers for the exploitation of mineral and oil resources (Armano 2022a). In 1913, in response to Indigenous requests, the federal government sent Thomas Fawcett, chief inspector of the Department of Indian Affairs, to the Mackenzie Valley to examine

¹³ <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100028912/1564415459067>

the Native summer settlements along the Mackenzie River (Morrison 1974). The purpose of this investigation was to protect both the Indigenous inhabitants and, above all, the non-Indigenous people living in the district, from subsequent incursions by the new settlers (Morrison 1985).

The initial process to establish Treaty 11 began on January 16, 1921, when a public notice was promulgated informing the Indigenous communities and Métis living in the Mackenzie Valley of the arrival of yet another government superintendent to extend Treaty 8 in the northernmost parts of Canada as well (Morrison 1974; Hall 2015).

For the signing of the Treaty relating to the Mackenzie Valley, Conroy was sent to Fort Providence in June 1921 (Price 1991; Armano 2022a). Conroy's testimony describing the difficulties he encountered during negotiations with the Natives of the valley can be seen in numerous documents now held in the inventory of the Indian Affairs Record Group¹⁴. Although the extension of Treaty 8 into the Mackenzie Valley was initially hypothesised, it was decided to create a different treaty formulated specifically for the more northern territories (Weigel 2019). Thus, Treaty 11 was signed between Conroy and the Indigenous communities of the Tłı̨chǫ, Gwich'in and Sahtu, incorporating more than 950,000 km² of the current Northwest Territories, Yukon and Nunavut (Aasen 1994).

Impact and Benefit Agreements (IBAs). Privatisation of colonial policy through the advance of the mining industry

Canada has a long history of mining (Paci and Villebrun 2005). Even before the arrival of Europeans, many Indigenous populations, especially those living in the northern regions, smelted copper to make tools and weapons (Notzke 1994).

While there is a large body of literature attesting the considerable participation by members of the Native communities both during the explorations (Coumans 2002; Dreyer 2002) and during the advance of the mining activities by the settlers in the north-western regions and along the Canadian shore of the Pacific (Marshall 1996; Cruikshank 1992), other authors highlight the contemporary attempt at resistance against large-scale extractive exploitation (Marshall 1996).

Although for decades copper especially was used for the production of Canadian pennies (Paci and Villebrun 2005), today's mining is principally for the export of gold, diamonds, iron, uranium and zinc while copper and nickel are now marginal (Sandlos and Keeling 2012). In inland territories, extractive activities have inevitably caused serious impacts on Native populations, on the environment and, consequently, on their Native systems of meaning (Hall 2013). Nonetheless, the

¹⁴ <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100028912/1564415459067>

harms or benefits to Indigenous peoples greatly depend on the type of material extracted, the management of the extractive enterprise, regulatory regimes, local socio-economic conditions and the responses of Indigenous communities (Coulthard 2010, 2014).

In recent years, there has been a growing number of studies on the developments of mining and its impacts on Indigenous communities both in Canada and in other parts of the world (Canada: Hobart 1982, 1989; Gibson and Klinck 2005; Paci and Villebrun 2005; Gibson 2005; Schlosser 2013; Hall 2013. Other contexts: O'Faircheallaigh 1991; Banks 1997; Bury 2002; Doohan 2006; Ali and Grewal 2007). Furthermore, many studies have shown that the development of large-scale activities (mining, oil, etc.) has generally produced only minimal benefits for Indigenous peoples worldwide (Appel 2012; Schlosser 2013). Furthermore, O'Faircheallaigh (1991) observed that, despite local cultural and geographical particularities, Indigenous communities in various parts of the world experience quite similar negative and positive effects deriving from the inclusion of large-scale extractive industries. Whiteman and Mamen (2002) further argue that the impacts of mining activities on Indigenous communities can be roughly grouped into five main categories which include: impacts resulting from environmental damage, socio-cultural impacts, health impacts, human rights abuses, and impacts related to gender. Among the most studied impacts deriving from the extractive industry are those linked to the greater economic prosperity arising from the absorption of Indigenous labour in the mines with the consequent destruction of traditional family, social and economic systems (Freudenberg 1984; Goldenberg, 2010). Moreover, the increase in income has been linked to an increase in gambling, alcohol and drug use (Caron et al. 2020).

Despite the abundant literature on the negative impacts of the mining industry in the Northwest Territories (Hall 2013, 2015; Coulthard 2010, 2014), as well as in other parts of Canada and the world (Whiteman and Mamen 2002; Cousins and Nieuwenhuysen 2020), there are also numerous studies highlighting the positive consequences deriving from the involvement of local populations in mining activities (Caron et al. 2019). Economic prosperity, the increase in employment rates, the increase in incomes and, in general, the improved standard of living are the topics most cited in these studies (Caron et al. 2020).

As far as the Northwest Territories are concerned, recent analyses have shown that incomes and employment rates have seen a significant increase over the last twenty years in the areas closest to the mines (GNWT Department of Finance, 2006). It was also estimated that a few years after production started at the extraction sites, about 31% of the workers in the two main diamond mines of the Northwest Territories (Ekati and Diavik) were Indigenous (IWGMI, 2005). In addition, Indigenous communities have confirmed increased job opportunities thanks also to

the education of future mine workers at vocational schools in Yellowknife (Dogrib Treaty 11 Council and Dogrib Community Services Board, 2005; IWGMI, 2005).

A closer analysis of the issue of mining exploitation between the end of the nineties and the early 2000s related mainly to open diamond mines in the middle of Lac de Gras and about 300 kilometres from Yellowknife, cannot fail to highlight the rapid increase in services both in the capital of the Northwest Territories and, albeit to a lesser extent, in the neighbouring areas (Hall 2013). It must be said that until the 1960s, both the Dene and the Tłı̨ chò (as well as other communities in the region) were nomadic groups that moved according to the seasons as they followed the herds of caribou (Helm 2000). Until then, therefore, the various bands lived in tents and small huts (Helm and Gillespie 1981). The area just outside Yellowknife also had some storage buildings and a field hospital. Electricity was brought to Yellowknife and Behchokò in the 1950s, while the road linking the two locations was built during the 1960s (Armano 2022a).

As a result of hydrogeological instability, inadequate water disposal systems and the increase in pollution of the waterways near Behchokò due to the release of mercury and arsenic by the multinational corporations that operated in the gold mines from the 1960s to the 1980s (Hall 2015), the Tłı̨ chò community divided into two groups: one group continues to reside in Behchokò while the other settled in Rae (about 150 km from Yellowknife) (Armano 2022a). This shift began in 1966 when, following a population increase, the federal government decided to build a school in Edzo (a small village near Rae), which was opened in 1972 (Davison 2007). Over the last three decades (with a substantial increase especially since the early 2000s) the Dene and Tłı̨ chò have initiated new forms of political negotiation with the federal government for land claims and attempts at self-government. Indigenous bands also negotiated the first mining royalties in 2005, as well as mineral exploration rights and the subsequent opening of mines in an area of 39,000 km² between Great Slave Lake and Great Bear Lakes in the Northwest Territories. In addition to these agreements, the two communities signed Impact and Benefit Agreements (IBAs) in 1999 (Sandlos and Keeling 2012).

Impact and Benefit Agreements: Examples of privatisation of political negotiation practices between Indigenous peoples and the diamond industry

Specific policies are applied in Canada to tackle the governmental and corporate challenges related to the exploitation of natural resources; these policies define the strategies required to meet the economic and socio-cultural needs of the First Nations (Bradshaw et al. 2018). From the early 2000s, however, the diamond industry in the Northwest Territories began to treat Native communities as stakeholders with the creation of IBAs. The aim was to bolster global support for an ethical and sustainable

image through a business project (Armano 2022b). This process, which minimises the Indigenous rights on the land and annuls their possibilities to challenge the extractive business in the region, establishes an agreement between the industry and the Native groups with the latter granting their territory and their support to multinationals in exchange for work (Schlosser 2013). From a regulatory standpoint, IBAs are described as formal contracts between Aboriginal bands and private industries which establish obligations on both signatory parties through a business relationship (Armano 2022a).

Although the contents of IBAs are based on secret agreements signed between multinational corporations and Native groups, it is known that the provisions always differ from one context to another and according to the type of relationship established between the mining industry and the Indigenous communities (Sandlos and Keeling 2012). Nonetheless, IBAs maintain a general structure that is based on some specific prerogatives concerning the provisions for employment contracts to ensure that the Indigenous peoples of the region have accessibility to employment, equity participation in the mining industry and preferential social categories for hiring and methods of layoffs and dismissals (Armano 2022b; Hall 2013). IBAs also include economic development plans involving support to increase relationships between Indigenous companies associated with mining (such as diamond polishing and cutting companies) and multinational diamond companies. There are also plans to develop residents' welfare that are implemented through a range of projects ranging from the building of infrastructure to the creation of educational opportunities and curricula in schools (Bradshaw et al. 2018). Other programmes that fall into this category include Native language preservation efforts and Indigenous diet-compliant meal plans in the workplace. IBAs also include regulation of the environment through the establishment of environmental monitoring commissions, as well as financial and commercial provisions which provide for legal measures and logistical planning to be applied to long-term obligations towards the residents of the region (Sandlos and Keeling 2012 Schlosser 2013).

In 1998, production started at the Ekati diamond mine (Armano 2022b). An epic tale has been created around the discovery of the mineral deposits here by Canadian geologist Charles Fipke (Krajick 2001). The next mine to be opened after Ekati was the Diavik mine which opened in 2002 and was followed by the Snap Lake Diamond mine in 2006; the latter, however, closed in 2015 (Armano 2022a). Many small side enterprises for polishing and cutting diamonds were created concurrently with the opening of the diamond mines and these were mainly entrusted to Chinese and Armenian workers, as well as Indigenous groups. Since the early 2000s, economic indicators have shown a staggering increase in GDP in the Northwest Territories as well as the increase, to record levels, in the incomes of citizens directly employed in the mines and in the retail and wholesale trade for the sale of diamonds (Ellis Consulting Services, 1999-2002).

Until about fifty years ago, Aboriginal communities had no say in the decision-making processes related to mining activities on their ancestral lands (Prno, Slocombe 2012). In recent years, however, numerous attempts (albeit often informal) have emerged to consider the point of view of Indigenous communities on extractive issues (Goldenberg 2010). In this context, the enactment of IBAs between the late 1980s and early 1990s constituted an innovative component regarding the governance of natural resources in the northern regions of Canada (Keeping, 1999). IBAs have since become formal practices for regulating relations between Indigenous communities and multinational mining corporations (Goldenberg 2010; Gibson, O’Faircheallaigh, 2010). However, some scholars point out that the mining companies negotiate clauses through IBAs that prohibit public criticism to safeguard the brand of the so-called “ethical” diamonds¹⁵ certified by the government of the Northwest Territories (Hall 2013; Schlosser 2013; Keeping 1997). The confidentiality agreement of these regulations was signed also by the Native communities of Dene and Tłı̨chǫ. However, some research shows that sometimes the impact and benefit agreements included in IBAs remain undisclosed even to the signatory Native communities (Sandlos and Keeling 2012). Consequently, the analysis of IBAs in the existing academic literature can only be approximate. Caine and Krogman (2010) state that the works hitherto published on this subject, while failing to delve deeper regulatory measures contained in IBAs, hold that the political negotiation between mining multinationals and Indigenous peoples for the continuation of diamond mining activities focuses on maintaining socio-political consensus on the importance of keeping the diamond industry in the Northwest Territories.

Notably, IBAs differ from other agreements and regulations related to the governance of natural resources in the Canadian region such as treaties, Crown land regulations and previous forms of gold mining licenses due to their unusual bilateral and private nature (Sandlos and Keeling 2012). Indeed, their contents are known only to certain managers of the mining companies and to the political representatives of the Indigenous communities (such as the chiefs), with no participation by the federal government (Keeling 2012). The federal government was only involved in the first IBAs signed in conjunction with the opening of the Ekati mine. In this case, the federal government provided formal political control to build the initial relationship between the multinationals and the Native communities involved in the diamond industry (Prno and Slocombe, 2012). Not only is it impossible to access these

¹⁵ The ethical certification of Canadian diamonds is part of the GNWT Diamond Certification Program through which the GNWT guarantees that all diamonds mined in the NWT are also cut and polished within the region. The uniqueness of the diamond ethical certification scheme issued by the GNWT is also proven by laser engraving of logos and alphanumeric codes on the stones which allow the consumer to identify the traceability of the diamond by viewing its history, supply chain and the exact location where the stone was mined in the NWT by entering these codes in a special database, (See Armano 2022b; Armano and Joy 2021)

documents but there are also gaps in the existing literature related to any analysis of the marginal role played by the State in the early IBAs (Caine and Krogman 2010). Only Prno and Slocombe (2012) have probed the implications of this absence, arguing however that, in recent years, Indigenous communities are negotiating with greater force through IBAs on the governance of extractive resources in the Northwest Territories vis-à-vis multinational corporations and demanding larger stakes in the diamond industry. Other works that reach the same conclusions as these two authors also argue that the almost total absence of the State from the governance of resources in the Northwest Territories is perceived positively by the Native communities, given that the State is perceived by the Indigenous people as being an obstacle to the direct management of their territory and in Aboriginal political self-determination practices (Dickason and Newbigging 2015). By contrast, other authors consider IBAs as supraregulatory agreements and claim that their role furthers or masks the previous colonial policy (Galbraith et al. 2007). Yet, despite this consideration, the relationship between IBAs and the colonisation process is another theme that is only marginally addressed by scholars (Keeling 2012). The studies on this subject mainly focus on the role assumed by IBAs in the promotion of privatisation processes of the natural resources present in northern Canada that are granted by the State whose interests focus on ensuring the continuation of mining exploitation and the creation of pipelines in the north of the country (Caine and Krogman 2010). Other authors add that the main goal of privatising natural resources in the Northwest Territories is to remove bureaucratic obstacles so as to accumulate as much capital as possible in the region (Dickason and Newbigging 2015).

Based on such considerations, it could be argued that IBAs have permitted the political power of the British Crown to be privatised through the exploitation of mineral resources in northern Canada (Hall 2013). As far as other political bodies are concerned, the English monarchy maintains its decision-making power although it can delegate the procedural aspects thereof to the Canadian government, as often happens (Sandlos and Keeling 2012). Third parties in the Northwest Territories (such as specific environmental and social impact assessment departments) may, for example, evaluate and determine actual or potential infringement of Aboriginal title related to a mining development project. However, they have no legal obligations as these are assumed by the Crown (Keeling 2012). Fidler and Hitch (2009) do point out that, in the case of the diamond industry in the Northwest Territories, the federal government operates as if the duties of the British monarchy were facilitated by IBAs as these mean that the requirement of consulting the Native communities is the prerogative of the mining multinationals. In fact, some research shows that violations of Indigenous rights are particularly thorny issues for the federal state (Hall 2015). In recent years, therefore, the government has promoted a tax incentive that enables it to delegate relations with the Native populations to the mining corporations and, in general, to the private sector (Hall 2103).

Over the last decade, a growing number of papers have highlighted the increase in Indigenous entrepreneurship, as well as the consequent economic well-being deriving from the new business practices of Indigenous communities (Fidler and Hitch 2007; Caron et al. 2019; 2020). From treaties to privatisation of land and natural resources to various forms of joint ventures between Native entrepreneurial companies and diamond multinationals, it has become increasingly common for Aboriginal communities to advance efforts at self-government by establishing business relationships with extractive companies through various forms of investment (Coulthard 2014). Political and economic negotiations develop through IBAs linked, for example, to the difficulty of finding work and the lower income of the Indigenous population compared to other residents of the region (Fidler and Hitch 2009). Given the lack of financing for infrastructure in Canada's far north, multinational corporations have thus taken over the traditional role of the State in providing services for Native groups. Therefore, while on the one hand, the government continues to subsidise the continuation of diamond activity in the Northwest Territories, multinational corporations have become the main political and economic point of reference for Indigenous communities (Hall 2013). Furthermore, in the last fifteen years, the mining companies have actively contributed to the construction of roads from Yellowknife to extreme areas of the north and to the restructuring of the airport, as well as to the increase in projects to monitor the health and economic conditions of the Indigenous communities. At the same time, Natives exploit the requests set out in IBAs to redeem rights that they had not previously been able to obtain from the federal government (Brock 2010).

The relentless advance of multinational mining companies and the application of IBAs reinforces the idea that the problems of employment opportunities and low incomes among Indigenous workers in the Northwest Territories may be resolved exclusively through the privatisation of relations between Aboriginal communities and the mining industry. Given the threefold increase over the last twenty years in the number of courses in Yellowknife's vocational schools that relate to the training of miners or other specialised figures in the mining industry, some scholars affirm that, also through education, mining companies can strongly influence the educational and professional choices of Indigenous peoples through the educational offer (Fidler and Hitch 2009).

In conclusion, the privatisation of the governance of natural resources in the far north of Canada and the relations between the central power and the Native communities regulated in IBAs appears to support the "healthy suspicion" suggested by Caine and Krogman (2010). In fact, these authors argue that while IBAs have improved the economic conditions of the Indigenous people by securing higher salaries than in the past thanks to work opportunities in the mines, on the other hand, their main function is to gain broad public consent to implementing long-term mining projects while also silencing potential criticism against mining development.

Furthermore, according to the authors, IBAs can neutralise Indigenous political claims for territorial control and free the British Crown from the responsibility of consulting the Native populations.

References

Aasen W (1994) *The Spirit and Intent of Treaty 8 in the Northwest Territories: As Long as the Sun Shines, the River Flows, and the Grass Grows*, Yellowknife, Treaty 8 Tribal Council.

Absolon A and Willet C (2004) *Aboriginal research: Berry picking and hunting in the 21st century*, *First Peoples Child & Family Review* 1(10): 5-17.

Ali S H and Grewal A (2007) *The ecology and economy of indigenous resistance: Divergent perspectives on mining in New Caledonia*, *The Contemporary Pacific* 18(2): 361 – 392.

Andrews T (2004) *The land is like a book: Cultural landscape management in the Northwest Territories, Canada*. In Krupnik I Mason R Horton T (eds.), *Northern Ethnographic Landscapes: Perspectives from Circumpolar Nations*, Washington, D.C.: Arctic Studies Center, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution: 3011-322.

Andrews T D Zoe J B Herter John B (1998) *On Yam Qzhah's Trail: Dogrib Sacred Sites and the Anthropology of Travel*, in Oakes J Riewe R Kinew K and Maloney E (eds.), *Sacred Lands: Aboriginal World Views, Claims, and Conflict*, Edmonton: Canadian Circumpolar Institute, Alberta, University of Alberta: 305-20.

Appel H (2012) *Offshore work: Oil, modularity, and the how of capitalism in Equatorial Guinea*, *American Ethnologist* 39 (4): 692-709.

Armano L (2019a) *Maschera bianca, pelle rossa. Negoziazione culturale e politica del diritto di autogoverno indigeno in Canada*, *Dialoghi Mediterranei* 40.

Armano L (2019b) *Indigenous Digital Technologies. The Taicho and Yelloknives Dene's Website and Cultural Online Archives*, *Rivista Italiana di Antropologia Applicata*, 5(2): 7-27.

Armano L and Joy A (2021) *Encoding Values and Practices in Ethical Jewellery Purchasing: A Case History of Italian Ethical Luxury Consumption*, in Gardetti M A and Coste-Manière I (eds.), *Sustainable Luxury and Jewellery*, Singapore: Springer: 1-20.

Armano L (2022a) *Conceptions of Territories. Indigenous Land Management and Multinational Property in the Northwest Territories of Canada*, Roma, Tab Edizioni.

Armano L (2022b) *Quanto etica è l'eticità? Interpretazioni culturali lungo la filiera del diamante canadese*, [How ethical is ethicality? Cultural Interpretations along the Canadian diamond supply chain] *Anuac*: 111-139.

Banks G A (1997) *Mountain of desire: Mining company and indigenous community at the Porgera gold mine, Papua New Guinea*, PhD thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.

Barclay K (2015) *From Rupert's Land to Canada West: Hudson's Bay Company Families and Representations of Indigeneity in Small-Town Ontario, 1840–1980*, *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, 26 (1): 67-97.

Barman J (2014) *French Canadians, Furs and Indigenous Women in the Making of the Pacific Northwest, Vancouver*, University of British Columbia Press.

Battiste M Henderson J Sákéj Y (2000) *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge*, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Purich Publishers.

Battiste M (2008) *Research ethics for protecting indigenous knowledge and heritage: institutional and researcher responsibilities*, in Denzin N K Lincoln Y S and Smith L T *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*, SAGE Publications, Inc.: 497-510.

Bennett T Dibley B and Harrison R (2014) *Introduction: Anthropology, Collecting and Colonial Governmentalities*, *History and Anthropology* 25(2): 137-149.

Berger T R (1977) *Northern Frontier, Northern Homeland: The Report of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry*, 2, Ottawa, Supply and Services Canada.

Bessarab D and Ng'andu B (2010) *Yarning About Yarning as a Legitimate Method in Indigenous Research*, *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, 3(1): 37-50.

Bishop R (1999) *Collaborative storytelling: Meeting Indigenous people's desires for self-determination*, paper presented at the World Indigenous People's conference, Albuquerque, New Mexico, June 15-22.

Borrows J (2002) *Recovering Canada: The resurgence of Indigenous law*, Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Borrows J (2010) *Book Notes: Canada's Indigenous Constitution*, by John Borrows, *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, 48 (3-4): 715-717.

Bouchard K Perry A West-Johnson S Rodon T Vanchu-Orosco M (2021) *Measuring What Counts to Advance Indigenous Self-Determination: A Case Study of the Nisga'a Lisims Government's Quality of Life Framework and Survey*, *International Journal of Community Wellbeing*, 4(3):415-441.

Bradshaw B Fidler C Wright A (2018) *Impact and benefit agreements and northern resource governance. What we know and what we still need to figure out*, London, Routledge.

Brock D (2010) *Finding Dahshaa: Self-Government, Social Suffering, and Aboriginal Policy in Canada*, *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 43(3): 769-770.

Burnard T (1992) *Family Continuity and Female Independence in Jamaica, 1665-1734*, *Continuity and Change*, 7 (2):181-98.

Burrage K (2006) *A Multifaced Approach to Recognizing Canadian First Nations Governments: What Courts May Decide*, King Scholar Program Michigan State University College of Law.

Bury J (2002) *The political ecology of transnational gold mining corporations and the transformation of livelihoods in Cajamarca, Peru*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Colorado.

Caron J. Asselin H Beaudoin J M (2019) *Attitudes and behaviors of mining sector employers towards the Indigenous workforce*, *Resources policy*, 61: 108-117.

Caron J Asselin H Beaudoin J M (2020) *Indigenous employees' perceptions of the strategies used by mining employers to promote their recruitment, integration and retention*, *Resources policy*, 68: 1-11.

Cascadden M Gunton T Rutherford M (2021) *Best practices for Impact Benefit Agreements*, Resources Policy 70, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2020.101921>

Coates K Morrison W R (1986) *Treaty Research Report: Treaty No. 11*, Treaties and Historical Research Center, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Cooper R Pollock N J Affleck Z Bain L Hansen N L Robertson K Chatwood S (2021) *Patient healthcare experiences in the Northwest Territories, Canada: an analysis of news media articles*, Intern. Journal of Circumpolar Health 80(1): 1-7.

Coulthard G (2010) *Place Against Empire: Understanding Indigenous Anti-Colonialism*, A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture and Action, 4 (2): 79-83.

Coulthard G (2014) *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Coumans C (2002) *Mining, water, survival and the Diavik diamond mine*, in Evans G Goodman J and Lansbery N (eds.) *Moving mountains: Communities confront mining & globalization*, London, Zed Books: 91-108.

Cousins D and Nieuwenhuysen J (2020) *Aboriginals and the Mining Industry. Case studies of the Australian experience*, London, Routledge.

Caine K J Krogman N (2010) *Powerful or Just Plain PowerFull? A Power Analysis of Impact and Benefit Agreements in Canada's North*, Organization & Environment, 23(1): 76-98.

Davison C M (2007) *Engagement and the northern school setting: a critical ethnography among the Tlicho First Nation of Behchoko*, NWT, doctoral thesis, Calgary, University of Calgary.

Dickason O P (2009) *Canada's First Nations: A History of Founding Peoples from Earliest Times*, Oxford: University Press.

Dickason O P Newbigging W (2015) *A Concise History of Canada's First Nations*, Oxford: University Press.

Doohan K E (2006) *"Making things come good": Aborigines and miners at Argyle*, Ph.D. thesis, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia.

Dreyer D (2002) *Economic development for Kaska Dena communities: Improving impact and benefits agreements in order to increase benefits from mining projects*, MA thesis, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George.

Duhaime G Comtois R (2003) *Abandoned mining exploration equipment in Nunavik: Methods to identify and locate potential sites*. In R.O. Rasmussen, N. E. Koroleva (eds), *Social and environmental impacts in the North: Methods in the evaluation of socio-economic and environmental consequences of mining and energy production in the Arctic and Sub-Arctic*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers: 353 – 367.

Elliott S (1988) *Irish Migrants in the Canadas: A New Approach*, Kingston and Montréal, McGill-Queen's University Press.

Escobar A Restrepo E (2010) *Anthropologies hégémoniques et colonialité*, Cahiers des Amériques Latines, 62.

Fadden R (1999) *Wampum Belts of the Iroquois*, Akwesasne, Tehanetorens.

Feld S Basso K H (1996) *Senses of Place*, Santa Fe, School of American Research Press.

Fikowski H and Moffit P (2018) "A culture of violence and silence in remote Canada: Impact on service delivery to address intimate partner violence". In Exner-Pirot H Norbye B and Butler L (eds.) *Northern and Indigenous Health and Health Care*, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, University of Saskatchewan. Available from: openpress.usask.ca/northernhealthcare

Fidler C Hitch M (2007) *Impact and Benefit Agreements: A Contentious Issue for Environmental and Aboriginal Justice*, *Environments Journal*, 35(2): 45-69.

Fidler C Hitch M (2009) *Used and Abused: Negotiated Agreements*, paper presented at the "Rethinking Extractive Industry: Regulation, Dispossession and Emerging Claims" conference, York University, Toronto.

Finch D Jaremko G McKenzie-Brown P (1993) *The Great Oil Age Hardcover*, Edmonton, Brush Education.

Forget A E (1898) *Letter to the Secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs*, Ottawa, 25 Apl, 1898, in Indian Affairs: RG 10, Volume 3848, File 75, 236-1.

Freudenberg W R (1984) *Boomtown's youth: The differential impacts of rapid community growth on adolescents and adults*, *American Sociological Review* 49(5): 697 – 705.

Fumoleau R (1975) *As long as this Land Shall Last: A History of Treaty 8 and Treaty 10*, Toronto, McClelland and Stewart.

Fumoleau R (2004) *As Long As This Land Shall Last: A History of Treaty 8 and Treaty 11, 1870-1939*, Calgary, University of Calgary press.

Galbraith L Bradshaw B Rutherford M (2007) *Towards a New Supraregulatory Approach to Environmental Assessment in Northern Canada*, *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 25(1): 27–41.

Getty I (1994) *An Overview of Economic Development History on Canadian Native Reserves*, in *The Native North American Almanac: A Reference Work on Native North Americans in the United States and Canada*, Duane Champagne ed.: 969-983.

Gibson G Klinck J (2005) *Canada's Resilient North: The impact of mining on Aboriginal communities, Pimatisiwin*, *A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health* 3(1): 116–139.

Gibson G. O'Faircheallaigh C (2010) *IBA Community Toolkit: Negotiation and Implementation of Impact and Benefit Agreements*, Toronto, Walter, and Duncan Gordon Foundation.

Goldenberg S M (2010) *And they call this progress? Consequences for young people of living and working in resource-extraction communities*, *Critical Public Health* 20(2):157 – 168.

Hall R (2013) *Diamond Mining in Canada's Northwest Territories: A Colonial Continuity*. *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography* 45(2): 376-393.

Hall R (2015) *Divide and Conquer: Privatizing Indigenous Land Ownership as Capital accumulation*. *Studies in Political Economy* 96: 23-45.

Hall T D Kardulias N P Chase-Dunn C (2011) *World-Systems Analysis and Archaeology: Continuing the Dialogue*, *Journal of Archaeological Research* 19(3): 233- 279.

Hearne S (1795) *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort in Hudson's Bay, to the Northern Ocean. Undertaken by order of the Hudson's Bay Company, for the Discovery of Copper Mines, a North West Passage, & in the Years 1769, 1770, 1771, & 1772*, London: A. Strahan and T. Cadell.

Helm J (2000) *The People of Denendeh: Ethnohistory of the Indians of Canada's Northwest Territories*, Iowa City, University of Iowa Press.

Helm J and Gillespie B (1981) *Dogrib Oral Tradition as History: War and Peace in the 1820s*, *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 37(1): 20-34.

Hill R W and Coleman D (2019) *The Two Row Wampum-Covenant Chain Tradition as a Guide for Indigenous-University Research Partnerships*, *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies* 19(5): 339–359.

Hirsch E O'Hanlon M (1995) *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hobart C W (1982) *Inuit employment at the Nanisivik mine on Baffin Island*, *Études/Inuit/Studies* 6(1): 53 – 74.

Hyde A F (2011) *Empires, Nations and Families: A History of the North American West, 1800–1860*, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press.

Ideland M (2018) *Science, Coloniality, and "the Great Rationality Divide"*, *Science & Education* 27(7): 783- 803.

Keeping J M (1999) *Local benefits from mineral development: The law applicable in the Northwest Territories*, Calgary, Canadian Institute of Resources Law.

Kovach M (2005) *Emerging from the margins: Indigenous methodologies*, in Brown L and Strega S (Eds.), *Research as resistance, critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches*, Toronto, Canadian Scholars' Press: 19-36.

Kovach M (2010) *Conversational Method in Indigenous Research*, *First Peoples Child & Family Review* 5(1): 40-48.

Kovach M (2021) *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Krajick K (2001) *Barren Lands: An Epic Search for Diamonds in the North American Arctic* Bloomington, Iuniverse Inc.

Johnson R (1991) *Fragile Gains: Two Centuries of Canadian and United States Policy Toward Indians*, *Washington Law Review* 66: 643-718.

Lee-Hammond L (2017) *Belonging in nature: spirituality, indigenous cultures and biophilia* in Waller T Ärlemalm-Hagsér E and Sandseter E B, *The SAGE Handbook of outdoor play and learning*, SAGE Publications Ltd: 319-332.

Lee Ross M (2005) *First Nations Sacred Sites in Canada's Courts*, Vancouver, UBC Press.

Ligi G (2003) *La casa Saami. Antropologia dello spazio domestico in Lapponia*, Padova, Il Segnalibro.

Long R Heffernan C Cardinal-Grant M Lynn A Sparling L Piche D Nokohoo M Janvier D (2019) *Two Row Wampum, Human Rights, and the Elimination of Tuberculosis from High-Incidence Indigenous Communities*, *Health Hum Rights*, 21(1):253-265.

Marshall D P (1996) *Rickard Revisited: Native 'Participation' in the Gold Discoveries of British Columbia*, *Native Studies Review* 11 (1): 91-108.

Meyer M A (2001) *Our own liberation: Reflections on Hawaiian epistemology*, *The Contemporary Pacific* 13(1): 124-148.

Miller B G and Menezes G (2015) *Anthropological Experts and the Legal System: Brazil and Canada*, *American Indian Quarterly* 39 (4): 391-430.

Moore S F (1973) *Law and Social Change: The Semi-Autonomous Social Field as an Appropriate Subject of Study*, *Law & Society Review*, 7 (4): 719-746.

Morrison W R (1974) *Native Peoples on the Northern Frontier*, in Dempsey H. *Men in Scarlet*, Calgary, McClelland and Stewart West.

Morrison W R (1985) *Showing the Flag: The Mounted Police and Canadian Sovereignty in the North, 1894-1925*, Vancouver, University of British Columbia.

Morton W L (1968) *The West and the Confederation*, Historical Booklets, Ottawa.

- Nader L and Todd H. F. (1978) *The Disputing Process: Law in Ten Societies*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Nichols R L (1989) *The United States, Canada and the Indians: 1865–1876*, *The Social Science Journal* 26(3): 249-263.
- Notzke C (1994) *Aboriginal Peoples and Natural Resources in Canada*, North York, Captus University Press.
- O’Faircheallaigh (2010) *Aborigines, mining companies and the state in contemporary Australia: A new political economy or ‘business as usual’?*, *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 41 (1): 1-22
- Paci C Villebrun N (2005) *Mining Denendeh: A Dene Nation perspective on community health impacts of mining*, *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health*, 3(1): 71- 86.
- Pirie F (2019) *Legalism: a turn to history in the anthropology of law*, *Droit et anthropologie* 15(1): 1-21.
- Price R T (1991) *Legacy: Indian Treaty Relationship*, Winnipeg, Plains Pub.
- Prno J Slocombe S D (2012) *Exploring the Origins of ‘Social License to Operate’ in the Mining Sector: Perspectives from Governance and Sustainability Theories*, *Resources Policy*, 37(3): 346–57.
- Ray A (1984) *Periodic Shortages, Native Welfare, and the Hudson’s Bay Company, 1670-1930*, in Ktech S., *The Subarctic Fur Trade: Native Economic and Social Adaptations*, Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press.
- Roberts S (2005) *After Government? On Representing Law without the State*, *The Modern Law Review*, 68(1): 1–24.
- Sabin P (1995) *Voices from the Hydrocarbon Frontier: Canada’s Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry (1974-1977)*, *Environmental History Review* 19(1): 17-48.
- Sandlos J and Keeling A (2012) *Claiming the New North: Development and Colonialism at the Pine Point Mine, Northwest Territories, Canada*, *Environment and History* 18(1): 5-34.

Schlosser K (2013) *Regimes of Ethical Value? Landscape, Race and Representation in the Canadian Diamond Industry*, *Antipode* 45 (1): 161-179.

Smith D (2008) *Convergence: Fort Peck Assiniboines and Sioux Arrive in the Fort Peck Region, 1800–1871*. In *The History of the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Montana, 1800-2000*, in D. Reed Miller, J. R. McGeshick, D. Smith, J. Shanley, Fort Peck, MA: Montana Historical Society: 41–64.

Spilsbury R (1981) *Cobourg: Early Days and Modern Times*, Cobourg, ON, Cobourg Book Committee.

Thomas R (2005) *Honouring the oral traditions of my ancestors through storytelling*, in Brown, Strega (eds), *Research as Resistance – Critical, Indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches*, Toronto, Canadian Scholars Press: 237-254.

Trigger B G (1987) *The Children of Aataentsic: A History of the Huron People to 1660*, Kingston: McGill-Queen's Press.

Weigel, M.J. (2019), "...Whether they took treaty or not, they were subject to the laws of the Dominion": Report of The Commissioner for Treaty No. 11 H. A. Conroy, *Constellations*, 10, 2.

Whiteman G Mamen K (2002) *Meaningful consultation and participation in the mining sector? A review of the consultation and participation of indigenous peoples within the international mining sector*, Ottawa, North-South Institute.

Wilk P Maltby A and Cooke M (2017) *Residential schools and the effects on Indigenous health and well-being in Canada—a scoping review*, *Public Health Review* 38(8). doi.org/10.1186/s40985-017-0055-6

Wilson S (2001) *What is Indigenous research methodology?*, *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 25(2): 175-179.

Wilson K (2003) *Therapeutic landscapes and First Nations peoples: an exploration of culture, health and place*, *Health and Place* 9 (2): pp. 83-93.

Young T K (1984) *Indian health services in Canada: A sociohistorical perspective*, *Social Science & Medicine*, 18(3): 257-264.

