

(DIS)ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTH:
RESISTANCE AND RULE IN THE NORTHERN BOREAL INITIATIVE

By

Steven Scott Richter

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Through the Department of Sociology and Anthropology
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
The Degree of Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2004

© 2004 Steven Scott Richter



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

ISBN: 0-494-04952-9

Our file *Notre référence*

ISBN: 0-494-04952-9

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

ABSTRACT

In 2001 the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources released the Northern Boreal Initiative, outlining their plans to develop commercial forestry operations in the far northern regions of the province where many First Nations communities are located. The NBI emphasized an approach to land management known as 'community-based land use planning' or CBLUP, which stressed the importance of community led economic development. Drawing on concepts of appropriation, translation and alignment developed within the governmentality literature, I propose that such locally or regionally specific development projects can be viewed as sites where resistance and rule interact resulting in novel configurations and organizations of governing and governed. The thesis also explores links between the Northern Boreal Initiative and international development discourse to illustrate how policies and plans for development employ the community discourse in order to attempt to govern the participation of indigenous communities in development projects.

PREVIEW

DEDICATION

To My Fiancée, Samantha Joan Lord, whose constant support and love carried me through the most difficult times.

PREVIEW

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I owe a great deal of gratitude to my family, Edgar, Sandra and Karin Richter. Without their love, support, and belief in my ability to overcome any obstacle, I would have not been able to even conceive of undertaking such a task.

I would like to thank my thesis committee, Dr. Alan Sears, Dr. Tanya Basok and Dr. Jeff Noonan, for contributing their advice, time, patience, understanding, and guidance throughout the whole process.

I would also like to acknowledge the support of those friends closest to me, above all Christopher Mayoros who has been like a brother. Without these people as my fan club, I would have burned out long ago.

Much appreciation goes to friends and fellow students, graduate and undergraduate, with whom I engaged in lively debates about many of the ideas expressed throughout this document.

Thank you as well to Russell Nahdee and all those at the Turtle Island Aboriginal Education Center with whom I had the pleasure of working and learning during the summer of 2002.

I would like to thank all the professors I had the pleasure of learning from in Anthropology and Sociology for their contribution to my journey through postsecondary education. I would especially like to thank Dr. Max Hedley [thanks for coming to the defense], Dr. Glynis George, and Dr. Lynne Phillips. A very special thank-you goes to graduate secretary, Andria Turner, for her constant devotion to serving students, including myself.

PREVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ANALYSIS OF GOVERNMENT DISCOURSE: PROBLEMATIZING DEVELOPMENT	25
III. MNR INFLUENCE ON THE WHITEFEATHER FOREST INITIATIVE	58
IV. DIAGRAMS OF POWER: ANALYZING VISUALIZATIONS OF FIELDS TO BE GOVERNED	66
V. THE WHITEFEATHER FOREST INITIATIVE	94
VI. LINKING THE NBI WITH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT DISCOURSE	116
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION	126
REFERENCES CITED	135
VITA AUCTORIS	138

CHAPTER I Introduction

The purpose of this research project is to explore relationships between indigenous peoples and governing institutions. Drawing on concepts of appropriation, translation and alignment developed within the governmentality literature, this thesis makes the argument that locally or regionally specific development projects can be viewed as sites where resistance and rule interact resulting in novel configurations and organizations of governing and governed. Similar to Perreault, I hope,

...to examine the cultural politics of development—that is, the manner in which the practices, discourses, and social relations of rural development become sites of contestation in which indigenous peoples' organizations challenge official understandings of citizenship, ethnic identity, and national belonging (Perreault 2003: 586).

The above quote seems to summarize quite succinctly the research goals and ideas I wish to express and support throughout this thesis regarding the relationship between indigenous groups and development institutions. My thesis will focus on development in the Canadian context through an analysis of text illustrating interactions of indigenous peoples' organizations and the Ontario government. Some comparisons will be made between this relationship and relationships between indigenous groups in other countries and international development institutions. The analysis is focused on sub-national and international levels through a detailed analysis of texts associated with development initiatives designed specifically for remote regions where there exists a greater concentration of indigenous people, in North and Central America. The focus is placed on the sub-national and international levels as it is becoming more and more common at the national level for governments to withdraw from relationships with indigenous groups by downloading responsibilities for related services, social and economic, to regional governments, and promoting community level governance programmes in which local

actors are encouraged to build relationships beyond the state with experts on ‘community’ in order to obtain the skills required for responsible self government—skills that are often related to greater participation in the market (Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins 2004: 289). At the international level, development institutions, such as the World Bank, are increasingly promoting similar programmes for ‘developing’ nations, making such regional or community level programming a prerequisite for funding development projects (Bobrow Strain 2004: 889).

The Northern Boreal Initiative (hereafter NBI) land use planning policy is the Ministry of Natural Resources’ (hereafter MNR) response to the resource development interests of First Nations communities located North of the 51st parallel in Ontario. The *Whitefeather Forest and Adjacent Areas Community-based Land Use Strategy: Terms of Reference* (Pikangikum First Nation and Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources 2003) provides a fairly detailed example of the demands a First Nation community will place on the government but also illustrates how, through a closer analysis, one can discern between First Nations and government influence. The texts associated with the NBI will be further discussed in the context of development at the international level to compare and contrast the representations of the role of indigenous people in development by government agencies in Canada with those of global institutions—in this case the World Bank—in order to illustrate overall that, “...the practice and discourse of development cannot be separated from questions of political participation, governance, and citizenship” (Perreault 2003: 600).

The relationship between Aboriginal people and the government in Ontario has often revolved around two main policy areas, social policy and economic/resource policy;

however, this thesis is focused on the conflict and complexity regarding the economy and resource development as the province attempts to cater to a variety of competing interests including aboriginal communities, resource industries and environmental groups, as equal stakeholders, or interest groups (Malloy 2001:138-9). Since the 1970s the relationship between increasingly more vocal indigenous populations and the provincial government regarding land-use issues intensified as negative effects on First Nations communities often far outweighed promised benefits of economic development (Angus 1991: pp. 51-56; Churchill 1999: pp 190-231; Malloy 2001: 131; Wilson 2002: 398; York 1997: in passim.). In 1999, Ontario's Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) announced its new land use policy entitled *Ontario's Living Legacy* which eventually gave rise to the Ontario Forest Accord and finally the NBI (Ontario. Ministry of Natural Resources. 1999b: 2).

O'Malley (1996: 311) suggests that an analysis of the relationship between indigenous populations and government regarding economic development would benefit from research into the province's current natural resources policy focusing on how resistance may play a constitutive role in neo-liberal rule. This thesis will address that as well as investigate the discursive similarities between the recent provincial resource management policies of Ontario and a World Bank (2002) land administration project (PRODEP) in Nicaragua illustrate both the constitutive role of resistance in indigenous peoples' struggles for more control over lands and resources and some of the similarities between development in North American and Latin American contexts. This research will contribute to understanding how neo-liberal political rationalities are invested in

governing in diverse sites and contexts, and how in each of these contexts resistance plays an important, and possibly transformational role.

Ontario's Living Legacy:

The main responsibilities of the Ministry of Natural Resources (hereafter MNR) consist of forest resource management, land conservation, water conservation and outdoor recreation promotion (Bell and Pascoe 1988:145; Ontario. Ministry of Natural Resources. 1999b: i). Thus the MNR is responsible for the regulation of the socio-economic relationships between the population and their environment within the province. In 1997 the Minister of Natural Resources announced that the ministry would engage in a new planning strategy for those areas on which the majority of recreational and resource demands were made that would include a broad public consultation process (Ontario. Ministry of Natural Resources. 1998: 5). The consultations proceeded in three regions—Boreal East, Boreal West and Great Lakes-St. Lawrence—led by three Round Tables consisting of government appointed members with diverse interests in Ontario's Crown lands (1998: pp.5-7). The members of the Round Tables were to keep the consultations focused on four Ontario Government Objectives stated below,

- Completing Ontario's system of provincial parks and other protected areas.
- Recognizing the land use planning needs of the resource-based tourism industry.
- Providing the forest, mining, and other resource industries with greater land and resource use certainty.
- Enhancing angling, hunting and other Crown land recreation opportunities (1998: 6).

After public consultation proceedings concluded, the Round Table members published *Lands for Life: Consolidated Recommendations of the Boreal West, Boreal East and Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Round Tables* (1998) consisting of 242 recommendations to which the Ontario Government responded with an initial report on

those recommendations it would approve and followed up with the publication of *Ontario's Living Legacy: Land Use Strategy* (1999b). Of these 242 recommendations, 23 related directly to how land management strategies may affect Aboriginal people (1998). The Living Legacy land use strategy reasserted the emphasis on the four goals mentioned above, and made only brief mention of consultation with First Nations organizations or communities, stating that issues relating to Aboriginal peoples were "...beyond the scope of the *Strategy*," and thus included in the initial response report (Ontario. Ministry of Natural Resources. 1999b: 4)¹. While two of the round-tables included Aboriginal representatives, they eventually withdrew from the discussions because according to those heading up the round tables (Ontario. Ministry of Natural Resources. 1998: 7),

First Nations and treaty organizations believe that they should be dealing with Ontario on a "government to government" basis. This belief was not consistent with their participating in the Round Tables as one of many stakeholders.

The participation of aboriginal peoples in these discussions was thus partially determined by their acceptance of the status of "stakeholder", and therefore the denial of the desired "government to government" negotiating relationship. Aboriginal representatives may not have continued their participation in the public consultation process; however, it should be noted that the Great-Lakes-St.-Lawrence Round Table was both the only group to reach complete consensus on all recommendations and the only group to never have included any aboriginal representation whatsoever (1998: 9). This raises questions as to how either the initial presence or eventual withdrawal of Aboriginal representatives from the other two groups may have affected the outcomes of these discussions, warranting further consideration of the mutually constitutive roles of

¹ The *Government Response to the Consolidated Recommendations of the Boreal West, Boreal East and Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Round Tables* was found at the *Ontario Living Legacy* website <http://www.ontarioslivinglegacy.com/govresponse.pdf>. It will be one of the key documents in this analysis supplementing the land use strategy.

resistance and rule in the forming of policy. This theme of resistance will be given further consideration following a more thorough discussion of the development of Ontario's Living Legacy.

The MNR (1999b: 19) has developed two categories of land use—Land Use Designations (hereafter LUD) and Enhanced Management Areas (hereafter EMA). There are four LUD categories—provincial parks, conservation reserves, forest reserves and general use areas (1999b: 19). Forest reserve and general use LUDs, according to the MNR, will not be regulated—allowing for a broad range of resource use—and together make up the largest portion of the Living Legacy land management area at approximately 70 percent (1999b:20). The *Land Use Strategy* (1999b: 19) outlines seven EMA (enhanced management areas) categories as well—natural heritage, recreation, remote access, fish and wildlife, Great Lakes coastal areas, resource based tourism, and intensive forestry. There are no figures for the intensive forestry EMA included in the *Land Use Strategy*; however, it is noted that the forestry practices to be carried out within these areas may help to alleviate the loss of commercial access to forest resources in newly protected areas (1999b: 28). Furthermore, all of the EMA designations, including protected areas such as parks and conservation reserves, allow for some commercial resource development (1999b: pp. 25-8). In order to achieve the goals outlined in the *Land Use Strategy*, the MNR developed the *Ontario Forest Accord*—31 commitments agreed upon by members of the Ontario Forest Accord Advisory Board (hereafter OFAAB)—a government appointed committee formed to implement the accord, consisting of representatives from the MNR, the forestry industry and the Partnership for Public Lands. In addition to the Ontario Forest Accord, the MNR established the Living

Legacy Trust—30 million dollars devoted to funding the implementation of the Living Legacy projects, controlled by a board of directors appointed by the MNR, the World Wildlife Fund and Tembec Incorporated (Living Legacy Trust 2000: 1). The OFAAB (2001: 5) states that the MNR is implementing a separate land use planning process for the development of forest resources “north of 51” which includes members of Northern Ontario First Nations communities, the forest industry and the Partnership for Public Lands. The MNR’s (2001: 4) *Northern Boreal Initiative: A Land Use Planning Approach* identifies land use planning as an important step towards “orderly development” of those regions north of the 51st parallel. According to the MNR,

Approved strategic land use direction is in place for the area of Ontario described in *Ontario’s Living Legacy Land Use Strategy, 1999*, but not for areas to the north. Recommendations for land and resource allocation north of the OLL area are considered through MNR’s approved procedure under the EA Act and provincial policy direction. Broad scale land use planning for the north has been approached in the past, however, successfully integrating community level needs unique to the north with the provincial level needs has remained elusive (2001: 3).

What has not remained elusive, however, is the persistence of government and businesses in their further encroachment on aboriginal lands to seek out new opportunities for economic development, especially in the resource industry (Angus 1991: 52). The NBI represents yet another push in this very direction at both the (Ontario. Ministry of Natural Resources. 1999a: 4; Ontario. Ministry of Natural Resources. 2001: i). In attempting to integrate the “unique” needs of northern communities with provincial level needs MNR states that,

The overall direction of policy for aboriginal groups at times includes elements of self-determination, but often through practical measures that are designed to foster Canadian nationhood in relation to a changing domestic economy overshadowed by international commerce. Most recently the case for this argument can be seen in the attempt to fashion a political agreement between industry, business, aboriginal leaders, and provincial governments (Nahdee 1999: 51).

The inclusion of self government or self determination in the discourse by government in this process of integration is deeply influenced by a neo-liberal agenda indicated by the emphasis on economic independence through partnerships between aboriginal communities and corporate interests (Slowey 2001: 265). Analysis of this process of integration requires attention to the various tactics and techniques employed by government and how they are influenced by resistance. The governmentality literature provides useful analytical tools for the analysis of government programmes and while there has been some work concerning policies aimed at self-determination of indigenous peoples in Australia, indigenous peoples in Canada have not received the same attention (O'Malley 1996; O'Malley 1998)².

Liberalism, Studies in Governmentality and Indigenous Peoples:

Foucault himself suggested that liberalism should be seen neither as a historical period nor as a substantive doctrine of how to govern. Rather, liberalism denotes a certain ethos of governing, one which seeks to avoid the twin dangers of governing too much, and thereby distorting or destroying the natural laws of those zones upon which good government depends—families, markets, society, personal autonomy and responsibility—and governing too little, and thus failing to establish the conditions of civility, order, productivity and national well being which make limited government possible (Rose 1999: 70).

The above characterization of liberalism provides a starting point for looking at the ways in which thought on governing economic development and thought on the governing of indigenous peoples have intersected at federal and provincial levels in policies and programmes aimed at ending special status for aboriginal peoples giving provincial governments more control over the land and resources with little or no consultation with First Nations organizations (Nahdee 1999: pp. 76-78). On one hand,

² It has come to my attention that there are courses offered at Carleton University regarding aboriginal peoples and governmentality. The following two links are for the course descriptions of the two classes offered: <http://www.carleton.ca/cu0203uc/courses/SOAN/3007.html>, <http://www.carleton.ca/cu0203uc/courses/SOAN/4200.html>. Thus, there is the possibility that published work within governmentality regarding Canadian Aboriginal people is forthcoming.

past policies aimed at ending aboriginal status have been seen by the Federal government as a step towards self determination for aboriginal peoples and as mentioned above, a step away from governing too much, while on the other hand, transferring responsibility for various services to the provincial governments in the past has provided reassurance that the problem of governing too little could also be avoided,

The elimination of special status was still desirable, but no force would be necessary if a scaled down version of self government was agreeable to aboriginal groups. As a general agreement, the recognition of protecting aboriginal and treaty rights was not to be included. An informal process occurred within the provinces, which, at this point had acquired more responsibility for the finances designated for aboriginal people. The policy created to define aboriginal rights was to be contained through a policy by policy approach, in order to gain political leverage. Contrary to the federal government's intentions, the entire exercise increased the political leverage for aboriginal people and presented a clear direction to argue for aboriginal rights (Nahdee 1999: 96).

In order to obtain approval for, or to at least reduce opposition to, the termination of the status of aboriginal people as distinct groups, the government required a way of thinking and speaking about such issues which, within a governmentality framework, could be considered indicative of a neo-liberal political rationality. According to Mitchell Dean (1994:187) a political rationality is, "...the relatively systematic, explicit, discursive, problematisation and codification of the art or practice of government, as a way of rendering the objects of government in a language that makes them governable." The ways that governments construct aboriginal demands for self-government or self-determination become invested in policies and programmes. Dean's definition aids in exploring how thought becomes invested, through discourse, into various policies and programmes with intended goals to be achieved in the conduct of the governed, though it leaves little room for understanding the constitutive role for aboriginal resistance in liberal programmes for governing. Alternatively, Nikolas Rose (1999: 28) defines political rationalities as, "discursive fields characterized by a shared vocabulary within

which disputes can be organized....” Rose’s (1999: 28) discussion of political rationalities allows for a more mutually constitutive role for both governed and governing as he states that,

Within this zone of intelligible contestation, different political forces infuse the various elements with distinct meanings, link them within distinct thematics, and derive different conclusions as to what should be done, by whom and how.

With regards to the policies described above, a shared vocabulary regarding aboriginal self-determination is used by both aboriginal groups and government, but either group will derive problems and solutions from the vocabulary in specific ways and the results may, in some cases, change the nature of the relationship between governing and governed. The Northern Boreal Initiative is an example of neo-liberal political rationality, but more in the sense discussed by Rose, as both First Nations and the MNR will have a role in the community-based planning process. Policies or programmes directed toward self-government were formed in a specific manner in order to reduce resistance by aboriginal groups to the government’s objective of eliminating special status for First Nations and avoid the need for forceful actions in the process of governing, and thus maintains the liberal ideal of governing through freedom. Governing through freedom is defined, according to O’Malley, as a liberal form of governing,

...in ways that appear to delimit freedoms in minimal fashion. Accordingly, liberalism is attracted to technologies of rule which distance the processes of regulation from the forms or images of coercion (O’Malley 1996: 313).

Maintaining this apparent separation of forms of coercion and processes of regulation has been achieved through a method of ruling Rose (1999: 49-50) has referred to as ‘*government at a distance*,’ where distance is maintained spatially between a wide variety of experts and authorities in diverse sites and is linked through various techniques of calculation to those at the center, as well as a constitutionally through non-political

forms of authority of experts in diverse fields in order to obtain specific results in shaping the behaviour of people. According to Miller and Rose, government at a distance involves a process known as translation where through the use of shared vocabularies,

...loose and flexible associations may be established between agents across time and space—Departments of State, pressure groups, academics, managers, teachers, employees, parents—whilst each remains, to a greater or lesser extent, constitutionally distinct and formally independent (Miller and Rose 1990: 10).

These associations are important for the operation of government at a distance as they help to maintain that appearance of minimally delimited freedom; however, translation is often a source of instability as results are rarely seen as successful in terms of the goals of government (Miller and Rose 1990: 10-11; Rose 1999: 51). Translation, while a possibly effective way of bringing the behaviour of diverse groups into alignment, is also the very point where resistance meets government at a distance such that the possibility exists that programmes of government will be misinterpreted or carried out in a less than satisfactory manner, or will create problems in other areas and thus require further programming to fix these errors and failures of government (Rose and Miller 1992: pp. 190-191). Resistance here refers to the way in which indigenous forms of social organization and governance have, “asserted themselves not through overt opposition, but rather by rendering white practices of rule unworkable in many contexts” (O’Malley 1998: 161)³. In attempting to bring diverse groups into alignment, governments may take these possible points of resistance into consideration when creating and implementing programmes and policies. According to O’Malley,

Among the many forms of such ‘government at a distance’, one of the most attractive to advanced liberalism is the appropriation of ‘indigenous’ governances—the forms of

³ O’Malley (1998: 161) indicates that in Australia, government-designed programmes purporting self determination for indigenous groups have often failed, “...because of the robust nature of Aboriginal forms of governance” and that “...resistance did not so much appear in hostile conflict as in more subtle processes which sustained indigenous governance.”

government that arise in and are endemic to the everyday lives of subjects. Such forms are more likely to appear (to rulers and ruled) as the expression of individuals or groups rather than impositions from without. (O'Malley 1996: 313).

Appropriating 'indigenous' governances should not be seen in terms of government merely choosing those aspects it sees fit to meet its ends for in each case there is a complex process of negotiation that may result in policies and practices that leave the governed with more power than originally intended or at least open up spaces where more resistance may be possible (O'Malley 1996: pp. 313-14). O'Malley (1998: 158-9) refers to this process variably as appropriation, alignment, or incorporation, of indigenous governance, but remains consistent in the assertion that no matter what the process is named, it involves translation. According to Nikolas Rose,

It is through translation processes of *various sorts* [emphasis added] that linkages are assembled between political agencies, public bodies, economic, legal, medical, social and technical authorities, and the aspirations, judgments and ambitions of formally autonomous entities, be these firms, factories, pressure groups, families or individuals (1999: 48).

While the above quote indicates how programmes for governing are taken up by the governed, O'Malley (1998: 162-163) inverts this concept in order to describe a process where governments, in attempting to govern at a distance, translate appropriated governances or elements thereof such that those aspects that seem incongruous with the aims of liberal rule are downplayed and those aspects that are more compatible, or more familiar to the programmers are given more significance. To some degree, it may be more beneficial to consider that the whole process of governing involves translation in both directions.

One of the key methods for the appropriation or incorporation of indigenous governance is to employ a discourse of 'community', such as in developing a project for community development. This emphasis on community, "locates rule in the everyday,

voluntary interactions or commonalities of interest of private individuals,” and simultaneously, “...permits the apparent retreat of formal, exogenous or imposed government, as rule is carried out by the community itself” (O'Malley 1998: 158). Because a formal distance exists between liberal rule and the traditional indigenous governances, government programmes aimed at self determination for indigenous people provide a fairly lucid context in which to explore the possibility that processes of appropriation or alignment are at work (1996: 314). While the Northern Boreal Initiative is not formally recognized by the MNR as a self-determination policy it is an extension of a province wide land management programme that has been altered specifically for implementation within First Nation communities above the 51st parallel and as its subtitle indicates, employs the language of community mentioned above (2001: i).

The project is, however, aimed at giving more control of the planning process to the community and as the communities associated with NBI are First Nations, it may be seen to some degree as a policy of self-determination. Furthermore, developing a policy specifically geared towards First Nations communities in Northern Ontario shows how the provincial government has, to some degree, been affected by previous resistance by indigenous people to policies that are implemented without any First Nation input and thus to include these opportunities for greater community participation into the MNR policies indicates the incorporation of resistance, either in the form of overt opposition by First Nations to exclusion, or as the failure of earlier government programmes likely caused by the robustness of indigenous governance. Either way, resistance becomes an important factor in designing policies such that indigenous people are included.

Research Problem:

My research entails a discursive analysis of how Ontario's Living Legacy land use planning policy is modified for application in the far north under the guise of the Northern Boreal Initiative (NBI). Drawing upon Miller and Rose (1990: 5), discourse in this case implies, "a technology of thought, requiring attention to the particular technical devices of writing, listing, numbering and computing that render a realm into discourse as a knowable, calculable and administrable object." That realm is the management of Crown lands in Ontario, and the relationship a population has to these lands, especially in the far northern regions where, according to the MNR and Lands for Life round tables (1998: 5), "there are vast areas of Crown land, but few people, few roads and relatively little resource or recreational use." As an extension of the OLL policies into the far northern regions, the Northern Boreal Initiative represents the provincial government's push for a greater role for private business in the *orderly development* of the north where a large proportion of the population is Aboriginal. There is no clear definition of what the MNR means by 'orderly' and thus this term is problematic as it seems to imply that the North, the 'vast areas' of Crown land are currently in a state of *disorder*. Thus, the government is faced with the task of aligning neo-liberal political rationality with the concerns and interests of First Nation's communities in order to foster 'orderly development'.

On one hand, alignment may appear easily achieved, given that First Nations have been calling for more autonomy in decisions over economic development within their own communities, "...asserting a *moral* and *legal* claim to the exercise of a greater degree of effective control over their daily lives. (Spiegel 1988: 105). This raises

questions as to the degree and nature of appropriations of indigenous governance and thus, the relations of power between governing and governed. To what degree does the alignment reflect the original aims of the governing, or the governed?

The possibility emerges for new arrangements in which, even when the programme is successful in its major goals, liberalism may incorporate alien and contradictory practices and assumptions. In such contexts, at least where the problems are recognized, subterranean work is likely to be carried out to neutralize, eliminate or transform these resistant elements. Such work is subterranean in the sense that to be successfully effected, it must not violate the authenticity of the indigenous governance in the eyes of the programmers and the programmed (O'Malley 1996: 313).

Thus, an analysis of the alignment of neo-liberal political rationality and indigenous governance in each case entails exploration of resistance and rule, as well as attention to the evaluation of a policy by both governing and governed. This in turn poses a second line of questioning concerning the degree to which policy makers are constrained, and in effect governed, by the evaluations of authenticity and the possible resultant resistance to a policy by members of a community from which the indigenous forms of governances are appropriated. As programmers and programmed, or governing and governed, rarely see eye to eye in their evaluations of policy, the alignment will require 'subterranean work' alluded to by O'Malley (1996: 313). I am interested in exploring the appropriation of indigenous governances—a technique for 'governing at a distance'—as a technique deployed in the MNR's land use planning required to align a neo-liberal political rationality with the interests of First Nations in Ontario regarding economic development, land use and control of natural resources. Some of the key issues involved include the possibilities for transforming neo-liberal rule, the way discourse used by the MNR reflects or illustrates appropriation, and the discourses or aspects thereof, that are adopted in the appropriation and alignment of indigenous governance. In addressing these issues, it is hoped that linkages can be made at a broader level by

drawing out similarities within both the discursive and practical fields of international development and how this has possibly transformed the often neo-liberal nature of the international aid industry (Malena 1995: 8). Fisher (1997: 446) notes that among anti-neo-liberal critics of development there is the recognition of the industry's aptitude for adopting and transforming resistance to the hegemonic development discourse.

There are connections between development in the north and the south and O'Malley's notion of the appropriation of indigenous governances—as both a technique of neo-liberal governmentality and a possible space for transforming neo-liberal forms of rule⁴.

The aim of this research is to identify these connections and make them more concrete through analysis of the discourse used in both northern and southern contexts with a focus on the role of indigenous peoples in land use and the allocation and extraction of natural resources. The neo-liberal tendency towards governing at a distance takes place at all levels, as this is part of its strategy, and development organizations are equally as likely to engage in such practices as a so called “neo-liberal” government at any other level—state, regional or local—as all of these become both targets and techniques of the neo-liberal political rationality. According to Rose,

Organizations such as the World Bank have sought to specify 'good governance' in terms of strategies that purport to disperse power relations amongst a whole complex of public service, judicial system and independent auditors of public finances, coupled with respect for the law, human rights, pluralism and a free press. They urge political regimes seeking aid and loans to correspond to this normative image of governance, by privatizing state corporations, encouraging competition, markets and private enterprise, downsizing the political apparatus, splitting up functions and allotting as many as possible to non-state organizations, ensuring budgetary discipline and so forth (Rose 1999: 16).

⁴ The reference to development in the North and the South is made not only to differentiate between the NBI and the World Bank development schemes and the intended location of their implementation, but also to draw attention to the fact that development, often carried out in remote locales distant from the origin of inception of such schemes, is very much an exercise in governing at a distance.

What is most important here is not whether they do it or why they do it, but by what means—techniques, technologies, discursive practices—and how these means shape and are shaped by both governing and governed in the process. In both the NBI and the World Bank contexts, community-led development projects are discussed as solutions to the problems faced by indigenous peoples. The analysis of these projects using analytical tools and concepts developed in the governmentality literature is the focus of this thesis.

Research Methods:

The analysis will consist of detailed descriptions of the various documents produced by the MNR, Pikangikum First Nation, and the World Bank⁵. To some degree, one may consider the approach to be an ethnographic analysis of carefully or strategically selected portions of institutional texts rather than carefully or strategically extracted selections of dialogues with human subjects. Chapters focusing on the discourse contain noticeably lengthy examples drawn from the texts allowing the documents to speak for themselves. Chapter four diverges from this pattern, focusing on the ways in which relationships between governing and governed are represented through visualization of fields to be governed and diagrammatic representations of authority and obedience.

Chapters two and three focus on the analysis of the MNR and its role in the governing of the relationship between territory and population. In examining the textual portions of the key NBI documents published by the MNR, emphasis is placed on the language used in describing the role of Aboriginal people in the development of the

⁵ Many of the policy documents for this project thus far have been obtained through Government of Ontario Internet sites. For this reason, it could be important to include in the research a deeper consideration of inscription devices, modes of representation and possibilities of resistance (Rose and Miller 1992). On the other hand, the shape this project has taken has not allowed such a discussion to be carried out in a manner that would do any justice to the topic. It could be a future research possibility from a media studies framework.

regions north of the 51st parallel (the area of undertaking discussed in the NBI)⁶. The NBI itself consists of two key documents, the concept document published in July of 2001 and then the actual NBI itself, published in October of 2002 (Ontario. Ministry of Natural Resources. 2001; Ontario. Ministry of Natural Resources. 2002). In addition to these two documents, there are postings on the Internet at the Environmental Bill of Rights Registry site (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/envision/env_reg/er/registry.htm) regarding the NBI and public information about its development and decisions regarding its implementation. The Northern Boreal Initiative concept document also refers continuously to the *1999 Ontario Forest Accord and Building Aboriginal Economies Strategy* as foundations for NBI (Ontario. Ministry of Natural Resources. 2001: i). While some reference will be made to them, the focus will be on the NBI documents. The texts that make up the Whitefeather Forest Initiative developed by Pikangikum First Nation and the MNR are also given some attention in this section of the project in terms of analyzing the possible influence MNR has had on the design of the program.

Within Chapter four, the analysis is initially focused primarily on the diagrams found in NBI documents while the latter portion looks at those documents found in the *Whitefeather Forest Initiative Terms of Reference* (Pikangikum First Nation and Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources 2003). This both allows for a clear comparison of the two organizations and how they visualize fields to be governed and relations of authority as well as maintaining the flow of this research project as the discussion shifts towards the analysis of resistance and indigenous forms of governance in chapter five.

⁶ A list of these documents will be attached to the proposal and listed under “Appendix A: Ontario’s Living Legacy Publications.”