Globalization and Development in the Fourth World: Indigenous Experiences in Canada and New Zealand Compared

Globalization and Development Stream

GABRIELLE A. SLOWEY
Department of Political Science, York University
S671 Ross, 4700 Keele St. Toronto, ON M3J 1P3
416-736-2100 (ph)/416-736-5685 (fax)
gaslowey@yorku.ca

Paper Prepared for the
4th International Critical Management Studies Conference

4-6 July 2005
Judge Institute of Management,
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

FIRST DRAFT

Development theories proposed in the 1960's and 1970's were a product of a particular time and place, tied to an historical moment. At the time, theories of indigenous development, under-development and dependency reflected the reality of an era dominated by state interventionism and Aboriginal dispossession. The last three decades, however, have seen major changes occur in the relationship between the state and indigenous peoples in both Canada (with First Nations peoples) and New Zealand (with Maori peoples). Government policy on the administration of indigenous people, the settlement of land claims and the negotiation of self-government has ushered in a new era in indigenous development. In light of these changes, are we now witnessing the decolonization of development? This paper argues that, in an era of globalization indigenous development carries with it normative and neoliberal goals of economic, political and cultural self-reliance and ultimately the continuity of colonialism. That is, even though indigenous development (although the concept of development generally refers to economic development, in the context of this paper it will also include elements of political change or "self-determination") under neoliberalism is put forward as a way to counter underdevelopment and dependency resultant from colonial policies of an interventionist state, when presented in terms of development however it does not represent decolonization but rather neo-colonialism or re-colonization. The reason being that capitalism and Western ethnocentrism continue to form the basis for the current development project. Reflecting upon field research conducted among indigenous groups in Canada and New Zealand, this paper begins by looking at notions of development in the Fourth World. It then considers specific treaty settlements and development strategies emerging in the post-claims era in both Canada and New Zealand. In the end, it concludes that we must review and regenerate theories of development and root them in a practical understanding of the challenges confronting indigenous people today.

Development Dynamics in Theory

The concept of development, like its kindred notions of growth and modernization, is tied to a period of social change. Theories of development that emerged in the 1960's and 1970's sought to explain the political and economic problems of poorer nations and devise strategies aimed at alleviating poverty and elevating standards of living.[1] At that time, development and progress were portrayed as unilinear, with cultures passing through phases of development associated with processes of modernization and capitalism. Theories of development and modernization, along with their critiques of dependency and underdevelopment, highlighted uneven relations primarily between the global north (or "First" World includes those so-called developed, capitalist, industrial countries like Canada and the United States) and the global south (or "Third" World countries; today often used to roughly describe the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The term Third World includes as well capitalist (e.g., Venezuela) and communist (e.g., North Korea) countries as very rich (e.g.,

Saudi Arabia) and very poor (e.g., Mali) countries).[2] Soon thereafter indigenous activists and academics, inspired by this framework of analysis, drew upon these categories to explain uneven relations existing between the First World and "Fourth" Worlds, or the experience of indigenous nations within European-derived states.[3] For instance, Canadian political scientist and political economist Mel Watkins proffered a seminal volume of works that drew upon theories of development and notions of dependency to articulate challenges confronting the Dene community of the Northwest Territories of Canada in the context of looming oil and gas development.[4] This work was significant because it expanded the application of development theories and demonstrated that Dene dependency and underdevelopment was based on state interventionism and First Nations dispossession.[5] Today, what is interesting is the extent to which literature exploring the relationship between indigenous peoples and development continues to flourish and how the concept of development (and concepts associated therein) is being used by indigenous peoples. Notions of development have resurfaced to describe contemporary goals of development or self-determination.

Another term from with a past, the Fourth World first came into use in 1974 with the publication of Michael Posluns and Shuswap Chief George Manuel's: *The fourth world: an Indian reality* which was used to refer to nations (cultural entities, ethnic groups) of indigenous peoples living within or across state boundaries (nation states). The concept of the Fourth World was used by these authors to explain and describe the oppressive condition confronted by Canada's indigenous peoples. It is another concept tied to a particular historical moment that has also been revitalized. Most recently appearing in Anthony J. Hall's critical work, *The American Empire and the Fourth World*, Hall writes that Manuel's notion of the Fourth World is valuable today because it contained a vision for a "very different future from the monocultural organization of the world's resources as an American empire of private property under a regime of transnational corporate rule." As such, Hall posits that the Fourth World provides an important blueprint for decolonization. He suggests that the "Fourth World envisages a pluralistic global village without tyranny of a universal and homogeneous state." Hence in Hall's opinion the Fourth World describes not only indigenous-state but also societal-globalization struggles.

In theory, the Fourth World is emblematic of the indigenous struggle not only against colonialism but also for recognition and emancipation which is most significant today as the world moves towards monocultural models of globalization. In reality indigenous development is best understood as a phenomenon influenced by globalization and its promise that societies around the world will be taken in new, interwoven and positive directions.[6] Neoliberalism, like development, invokes rhetoric of progress and growth to legitimate systems of power and domination. It suggests that increased market freedoms and decreased government intervention will improve the lives and fortunes of individuals. Interestingly, instead of seeing neoliberalism as a force of domination and disempowerment, many indigenous peoples see only the potential for liberation and empowerment. Why? Where once the state stood as

an impediment to indigenous development, today it stands in support, having devolved many of the responsibilities for program design and delivery into the hands of indigenous communities. Where once the state was viewed as an obstacle to development, now it is considered an important assistant, promoting partnerships and joint ventures.[7] Where change is most remarkable however is in the attitude of many indigenous people who no longer view development as anathema to their cultural survival.

A change in perspective correlates to a change in objectives and opportunities. Achieving political independence and economic self-sufficiency are critical goals of indigenous development and important for decolonization. Though one could make the argument that no individual or state is "self-sufficient" (relying on imports/exports, trade – or labour for wages) indigenous nations strive to develop and achieve some level of self-reliance, thereby ending their historic dependence on government. Positive development therefore is tied to notions of decolonization and positive identity which can be linked to better health, education and economic prospects.[8] Although the desire to end dependency and poverty and achieve a better quality of life or self-determination is a primary factor driving indigenous development, many indigenous groups appear increasingly convinced that outstanding social, political and economic issues are best resolved through direct access to the free market as opposed to state interventionism. To that end, some indigenous nations have appropriated neoliberal discourse for their own purposes. Ideas of choice and empowerment are attractive. Embracing the rhetoric of neoliberalism may therefore represent a pragmatic approach to development but indigenous groups also recognize the value of being involved in globalization process rather than being victims once again. Hence, some indigenous groups embrace development as a building block to more equitable power-sharing, or, at the very least, as a way to ensure they exert influence in the development process.

If neoliberalism is about opening up the marketplace and removing potential impediments or barriers to the marketplace, then state and indigenous support for a neoliberal approach to indigenous development should not be surprising because neoliberalism provides a policy environment that privileges the marketplace and disproportionately benefits the wealthy who are better able to take advantage of opportunities because of their financial status. Hence those indigenous groups that settle outstanding treaty-related grievances with nation-states are in a privileged position to base their self-determination on market participation, assuming they receive financial compensation. The settlement of claims and accompanying financial settlement most often provides the basis for an indigenous group to capture market opportunities and to participate in the broader social relations of production, from which they had been largely excluded in the postwar era.

Linking the concepts of development and indigeneity and exploring the inter-relationships between them is important given the context of globalized neoliberalism. Indigenous development (or self-determination), "with its focus on tribal responsibility for health, education, welfare, economic progress and greater autonomy" fits quite comfortably with the free market philosophy of a minimal

state, non-government provision of services, economic self-sufficiency and privatisation.[9] The fact remains, however, that not all indigenous communities fit into the neoliberal paradigm as well as others. Neoliberalism affects not only the way in which indigenous development is organized, but also how it tends to unequal relations of power. With some indigenous groups choosing to embrace neoliberal determined development, the issue of development leads also to increased polarization. Already a new group of indigenous peoples is emerging, one that competes more vigorously in the marketplace than others. Issues of development and self-determination, like globalization, increasingly raise issues of unequal relations. The result is that market driven self-determination may lead to the separation of indigenous nations, both within state borders and globally, into "have" and "have not" groups as globalization causes stratification potentially within and certainly among indigenous groups as economic development strategies and political successes are accentuated.

In terms of pursuing development, the debate about strategy is usually reduced to discussions of assimilation or traditionalism because globalization, like development, "demands the elimination of those societies based not on mobility but on complex attachments to the local ecology of particular places."[10] Development has always required that tradition and culture be overcome to ensure unobstructed path to development and assimilation into dominant/Western-European cultures. Consequently, indigenous nations that choose to embrace capitalist-oriented development are accused of having sold their tribal spirit for business. However, Durie suggests this is a shallow criticism.[11] This polarity tends to reinforce the view of indigenous peoples as passive victims of policy and activity instead of agents of change with decision-making abilities. Although there exist many challenges associated with development, in a neoliberal context the most significant challenge is, as Cassidy and Bish explain, having the ability to use governments effectively "to accomplish the social, economic, cultural and political goals they have set for themselves" (Cassidy and Bish, 1989: xix). Although it appears that within the context of neoliberalism that space in which indigenous peoples can determine their own path for development exists, it is important to observe the extent to which many do not seek to alter the status quo. While indigenous goals may include cultural preservation and increased autonomy, the pursuit of these goals and economic prosperity are most easily achieved through existing parameters. Given the uneasy relationship between goals and outcomes, it is important to consider the extent to the type of development that is actually occurring, as indigenous peoples pass from their contemporary status as dependent wards of the state to that of independent economic actors and the extent to which related strategies for development are both innovative and indigenous-oriented. It is also important to contemplate ways in which development is occurring and the associated implications for power relations. This paper now turns to review and analyze progress made to date in indigenous development among indigenous groups in northern Canada and in New Zealand, and to discuss the future nature, value and challenges associated with decolonizing development.

Canada and New Zealand were selected as the basis for a comparative study for the reason that both states embraced neoliberal paths in policy making and both countries enjoy a treaty relationship with indigenous peoples. To elaborate, neoliberalism in New Zealand was first introduced in 1984 under the Fourth Labour government, led by David Lange, in a series of reforms that dramatically transformed the country. It was during this period that the Labour government began to recognize Maori claims for the resolution of long-standing grievances and Maori development emerged as the core of state Maori policy. As Mason Durie explains, in 1984 this shift in policy direction formed part of a "wider manifesto of the Fourth Labour government to reduce the size of the state and devolve functions and accountabilities to the private sector as well as to communities." [12] Revisiting the Treaty of Waitangi, the government worked consciously to restructure its relationship with the Maori people. In Canada a similar enthusiasm for neoliberalism led to a dramatic change in policy direction during the same period. Canada was also engaged in a process of revisiting its relationship with First Nations peoples (or Indians) through the negotiation of new treaties as well as through the settlement of outstanding claims arising from the unfulfilment of historic treaties. It is those communities that have already passed through the treaty relationships that are of interest in the context of this study and the way they choose to structure their development.

Dynamics of Development in Practice I: The Canadian Case[13]

In Canada my research has concentrated on the Mikisew Cree First Nation (MCFN) community of Fort Chipewyan, Alberta.[14] More recently, I have travelled to other communities in the circumpolar north including Ouje-Bougamou in the James Bay region as well as a host of communities in the Yukon and Northwest Territories in search of patterns of First Nations development across northern Canada. These communities were selected because they had recently settled outstanding claims with the federal government and were in the process of setting up new structures and enterprises. For the Mikisew Cree, they signed a Treaty Land Entitlement in 1986 which awarded them $26,000,000 and nine parcels of land. The Mikisew Cree are not a large community, comprised of approximately one thousand members, but their community is located immediately north of the lucrative oil sands deposits in Fort Mcmurray, a multi-billion resource extraction site that forms an integral part of the oil and gas industry driving the Alberta economy. Upon settling their claim, the Mikisew Cree began to focus on governance and accessing opportunities derived from oil sands development.

What are the changes in governance? First and foremost was the development of a band philosophy which sought to promote economic development in conjunction with self-preservation and that reflected the values of individual responsibility and market solutions to social program delivery. Second, changes in governance are apparent in increased band autonomy over the design of social policy meaning more flexibility and less government scrutiny. Together, these changes have manifested themselves in new modes of

governance that are guided by its first mission statement dubbed the Vision 2000, a statement that was arrived at after consultation with members. It reads:

> By the year 2000, our people will be independent, proud professionals, working co-operatively in a clean environment in such a way that we preserve our Treaty Rights, cultural and spiritual values, to enhance our self-esteem so that competent people of the Mikisew Cree First Nation will be conducting all Mikisew Cree First Nation business in all fields in Fort Chipewyan and on lands of the Mikisew Cree First Nation by having no people of the Mikisew Cree First Nation on welfare.
>
> The people of the Mikisew Cree First Nation see our future as being self-sufficient. Working together while practicing good planning, [cultural and educational] resulting in the development of the lands of the Mikisew Cree First Nation and keeping our Indian rights [sic].[15]

Although dated, the Vision 2000 mission statement is a unique feature of Mikisew Cree governance that reflects a market-oriented approach to socio-economic development. It also demonstrates an ability on the part of MCFN members and leaders to think in neoliberal terms. Designed to guide MCFN actions and chart a course for the future, the vision statement also reflects MCFN members understanding of the importance of local ownership and authority, education, training, career development, healthy lifestyles and community participation, all of which mirror their underlying social values, "parallel [with] those of any other community."[16] Hence, the Vision 2000 is a statement about what this community perceives to be important and how it defines success.

The political nature of First Nations development also reveals itself in the struggle for control of resources which is not only influenced by geography but also by First Nations goals and strategies. As the Assembly of First Nations has argued, "(e)specially important is the right to natural resources and the ability to initiate economic development that generates wealth and keeps it in native hands."[17] In other words, if First Nations have any hope of ending their dependency on the state, they need to develop a capacity for autonomous growth and to achieve this end, they similarly need the political authority, jurisdictional control and relevant authority to exercise their independence. Unfortunately, the transfer of control and authority over resources is not forthcoming. In reality, First Nations self-determination is being constructed in such a way as to allow the state to pursue its own political and economic agenda and perpetuate a neoliberal regime of power.

While not equal partners in resource development, resource corporations have a significant impact on the path of First Nations development in Canada. For the Mikisew Cree, the most significant change that occurred post-TLE was the separation of band politics from band business and from band administration. The purpose of this change was to protect business from politics, the separation of economic development from political administration being a critical element for political success.[18] The result was the transformation of daily administrative

affairs of the band and the creation of a host of new positions including the Office of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Financial Officer (CFO), Economic Development Officer (EDO), Director of Social Services (DSS), Administrative Manager and Director of Education (DOE). Direct accountability to the community and commitment to realizing the terms of the mission statement were the new focus of the Mikisew band government.

The separation of band governance from band enterprise was largely attributable to market imperatives. More specifically, MCFN made important institutional and structural changes at the behest of a local resource corporation. MCFN was advised to separate its political institutions from its economic institutions by Syncrude which felt that the historic fusion of band elected leaders and Aboriginal businesses led to difficulty in working effectively with the band and its companies. According to Syncrude officials, a significant obstacle encountered by Syncrude in working with MCFN was the mix of politics and business in the communities. As one oil official explained,

> one of the struggles that we had with the developing companies in the Aboriginal communities is that we had a hard time getting the band elected leaders to separate themselves from running the business. And every time the band council changed over, they would fire all the management in the company and then you would have to restart again so we wanted to change that. We wanted to make sure that these companies were set up in a way that they could be managed irrespective of who the Chief was.[19]

Syncrude wanted to ensure that MCFN companies were set up in a way that they could be managed, notwithstanding the politics inherent in band administration. In exchange, Syncrude promised that Aboriginal-owned businesses would receive a significant portion of supply and service opportunities. It was clear that the corporate sector wanted to see a particular model of governance within the MCFN community.

Political restructuring however is only one component of self-determination. As former AFN chief Mercredi once argued, "If we gain [political] power for the community but we don't get the economy, we have power that cannot exercise itself."[20] Accordingly, to function independently and to reduce their dependence on government First Nations must similarly reduce their levels of economic dependence on government. Resource development remains the main economic engine of the Canadian north, not to mention the spin off industries. Although most First Nations in the region are all too familiar with the boom and bust cycle attached to the resource development and exploration, with land claims settled, many are exploring new entrepreneurial opportunities tied to resource extraction activity. The Chief of the Mikisew Cree First Nation concedes that new avenues for economic development are necessary since "the sad reality of it all is everything has been affected with no hope of recovering or healing."[21] There is a sense that it is impossible to live a traditional lifestyle, as they did years ago "because there has been too much development and globalization."[22] To that end, MCFN has developed its own group of businesses

that include Fort Petroleum, a bulk fuel distribution business that retails a wide range of fuel and petroleum products to the residents; Air Mikisew, an airline with service extending between Fort Chipewyan, Fort McMurray and Edmonton; and Mistee Sepee Development Corporation, a construction company.[23] MCFN businesses operate primarily in the northeastern corner of Alberta, in Fort Chipewyan, Fort McMurray and Edmonton, in various sectors of the economy. An important function of these businesses is to train and employ MCFN members, thereby developing human capital in addition to delivering important services to the community and MCFN members.

First Nations economic development is primarily targeted at generating economic growth. It includes strategies designed to reduce inequality (including poverty and unemployment) and ensure people prosper, benefit and participate. It reflects the adaptive nature and flexibility inherent in the culture. To that end, First Nations are actively engaged in the practical business of trying to solve concrete problems. High rates of unemployment, poor housing stocks, above-average suicide and incarceration rates and below average health and socio-economic status are just some of the many problems currently confronting northern First Nations. Changing tactics and changing social values reflect changing material circumstances. As Joe Linklater, Chief of the Vuntut Gwitchin explains, when confronted by members of the community who question his vision of development, driven by his desire to achieve a healthy community, he asks the question, "what would our community look like today if we had never been touched?"[24] That is, if First Nations had been left undisturbed, would they have followed the designated stages of economic growth and modernization? Or, would they have remained on the land, living as they did many years ago? He suggests that the answer is moot given the realities of capitalist penetration and cultural change.

With land claims dollars in the bank and powers of governance in their hands, First Nations are engaging with resource development as a way to achieve important development objectives. Economic objectives of self-determination are most often tied to improved material change, not only the accumulation of wealth but also the provision of basic needs like housing, health and education. Reduction of poverty, unemployment and inequality are also important areas of development In the post-claims era, development strategies tend towards the creation of new economic opportunities.

Band development strategies differ between First Nations communities. Some bands choose to take advantage of resource development occurring on or near their land. Band development strategies like that used by the Mikisew Cree for instance are premised on the creation of its own companies that primarily exist to service the local oil sands companies. With its own capital and initial assistance from oil sands producers, the Mikisew Cree First Nation has created a host of financially successful companies that service neighbouring resource development projects. These companies in turn invariably employ band members in an effort to provide employment opportunities and alleviate welfare dependence. However, the Mikisew Cree recognize that dependence upon a finite resource is also risky and to that end have sough to diversify their economic

portfolio by expanding their economic enterprises beyond the local oil sands community.

Other communities, like the Ouje-Bougamou First Nation of James Bay in Quebec, are also working to create an environment conducive to entrepreneurial activity. This includes providing a loan to an individual band member with a sound business proposal. If approved, it is the individual who then opens up a business and repays the loan with proceeds from the business. In this scenario, the development strategy is targeted at improving the socio-economic prospects of the individual while also improving the overall health of the community. What is interesting about these two examples is the fact that they are entrepreneurial in nature. The bands promote business development and employment opportunities as part of a strategy to improve socio-economic status. Even though these bands may suffer negative criticisms for their actions by other, more "traditional" groups, the fact remains that both groups recognize the importance of First Nations participation in the market economy and neither would concede that they have abandoned their culture in exchange for jobs and wages. Just the opposite. Self-sufficiency is promoted as an integral component of First Nations culture as it exists today and as such forms an important part of development strategy.

Economically, by setting up band-owned businesses or by assisting band members develop business ventures, many First Nations are now engaged in market-based solutions to economic problems. Building human capital and community capacity, the First Nations are able to expand their basis for development. This corresponded with a much stronger emphasis on the development of sustainable markets and businesses.[25] But sustainable economic development requires many things, including access to capital, gaining exposure to wider markets, ensuring the development of labour force skills and creating business-friendly communities and stable investment environments.

Dynamics of Development in Practice II: New Zealand[26]

In New Zealand my research centred upon two iwi (tribes), the Tainui and Ngai Tahu. These communities were chosen as they were amongst two of the tribes that had settled claims with the New Zealand government. Each iwi received a financial package valued at approximately $170,000,000. The Tainui were the first iwi to settle their claim in May, 1995. In the early days following the Tainui focused on achieving tribal, social and economic well-being. However, initially not everyone was happy with the direction the Tainui were going. It was not a conflict over vision but over strategy. To explain, the Tainui engaged in high risk ventures that quickly saw revenue disappear, generating $42,000,000 in debt. Having lost a substantial sum of money, the Tainui have undergone a number of growing pains. They encountered a difficult period as the result of making some poor investment and organizational choices but are now in the process of turning their organization around with a new approach to management. While the Tainui initially undertook to construct their own political structures and institutions they soon recognized the inability of their structures to function effectively. Hence, as has been the case with other iwi in New Zealand, they turned to the very successful Ngai Tahu as a model for governance.[27]

Politically, the Ngai Tahu are, according to the 2004 Census, the largest iwi in the South Island of New Zealand with 41,600 people identified as having Ngai Tahu genealogy and 35,000 of that total as registered members. Although they settled their claim after the Tainui, in 1998 the Ngai Tahu have been more economically successful because, according to Durie, they did what was necessary. He explains that , what the "Ngai Tahu did (was) what quite a lot of tribes did initially. They had money from the settlement and of course to get the right structure they had to move away from a tribal structure and adopt the model of a company which was never the sum total of the tribal operations but was starting from scratch."[28] To elaborate, to achieve a settlement, the Nga Tahu altered their tribal structure to facilitate the treaty process. As Ngai Tahu leader Mark Solomon explains,

> one of the downsides of the treaty process was that you have to come under some sort of corporate structure that is approved by the government. We took a slightly different tact and we negotiated a statutory recognized structure which we wrote up ourselves. Now, it does follow a lot of the corporate guidelines, especially around accountability.[29]

This shift in government structure did not occur without significant discussion, however, amongst the members of the iwi. In fact, it was the culmination of a four year debate in which Maori elders expressed concern over the adoption of Pakeha (non-Maori/European) structures. There was a fear that the new structure of governance would not reflect Maori values. However, as Solomon explains that he convinced members of the different communities to take on these structures by looking at them as tools of accountability which he suggested was a Maori value. Consequently, the Ngai Tahu do have Pakeha corporate structures, incorporated societies and charitable companies.

Institutionally, the structure is a statutory body. As Solomon argues, "we *had* to adopt them."[30] So when they first started out in 1998 the Ngai Tahu allowed the business structure, the Ngai Tahu Holding Corporation, to be involved in any business they liked. The idea was to "just get out there and make us money so that we can spend it on the social side."[31] This was consistent with the Ngai Tahu Vision 2025 which seeks to create long term economic wealth for Ngai Tahu members but also addresses issues of culture and identity, education, tribal communication and participation, social development and protection of the natural environment.[32] After about four years, however, concern began to emerge that the corporations were getting involved in too many different areas. Following more debate, the Ngai Tahu settled on four strategic pillars of development that delineated the four areas which Ngai Tahu would be involved. Those areas are fishing, property, tourism and equities.

Economically, the Ngai Tahu is currently the seventh largest fishing company in New Zealand. They are definitely the largest Maori group in New Zealand involved in the fishing industry, having invested $100,000,000 worth of assets in the fishing industry. In terms of property, the Ngai Tahu is the largest land owner, next to the Crown, in the South Island. Because of these investments, the Ngai Tahu have been able to transform a settlement of $170,000,000 into

$441,000,000 within a period of six years. They have, more recently, expanded into the tourism industry. Owning 80% interest in "Shot Over Jet", an international icon, it is one of the highly recognized tourism companies in New Zealand.[33] They are also involved a $180,000,000 project with Skyline tours of Queenstown to build a gondola over the main divide of the southern alps from Queenstown to Norford Sound. Finally, to minimize risk, the Ngai Tahu have invested 30% of their assets offshore. In terms of equities, the Ngai Tahu are also major shareholders in the Riemand Group, an investment group in which they began with an initial investment of $7,000,000 that now has a current market value of close to $42,000,000.

The Ngai Tahu clearly are focused on the positive potential of globalization because it opens up the marketplace and new trade networks. To elaborate, the Ngai Tahu have been approached by other indigenous groups in the South Pacific uninterested in working with state governments. Instead, indigenous groups in Japan and Indonesia seek to establish trade networks that will open up new opportunities for industries like fishing and agriculture. The Ngai Tahu see the establishment of indigenous trade links and indigenous-allied joint ventures as an important part of the future.

Durie suggests that it is necessary to develop in order to advance. To that end, Durie writes that Maori development refers to Maori economic, social and cultural advancement in modern times.[34] As demonstrated by the Ngai Tahu, the settlement of claims ensures access to capital, a critical component of indigenous development. And in terms of achieving success, money is an important tool. At very least, makes it easier since it is easier for wealthy indigenous community to construct self-determination upon more vigorous market participation. For their part however the Ngai Tahu view success in terms of how they better prepare their people to move forward. While their status is almost equal to that of Pakeha, in terms of owning own homes, being educated and employed, the Ngai Tahu want to be better.

Although substantive differences exist between the political structures Canada and New Zealand as well as the constitutional protections assigned to indigenous peoples and resource opportunties, similarities between the indigenous path to development in Canada and New Zealand are striking. That these development paths emerged post-settlement in a neoliberal fashion is perhaps not, however, as surprising as one may first think. Durie suggests that "what happened (was) a lot of people began to think. There were lots of breaches of treaty. All were looking back at past, not the future. That was the main driver. It was an anti-colonial thing."[35] What it was not was an anti-globalization or anti-neoliberalism thing. In their haste to break away from tight control of the state and poor socio-economic status, many indigenous communities turned towards forces of globalization in search for emancipation, either not recognizing that they were turning towards new forms of colonialism and domination or unable to identify any real alternative to achieve their goals.

Despite the fact that modernization and industrialization have been presented as inevitable and even inescapable, most indigenous peoples embrace self-determination as part of a strategy to retain and secure traditional ways of living

(i.e. off the land) while also trying to gain access to global markets. Indeed, retention of cultural norms, values and activities challenge the assumption that indigenous peoples, like the industrial nations once did, have to abandon traditional modes of living to move onto the next stage. Instead, the adaptability and inherent flexibility of culture is uncovered as critical to preservation of indigenous identity. Yet, self-determination as a contemporary project essentially redraws the very configurations and sets of relations that indigenous groups seek to escape.

What is also striking is that despite its prevalence, there exists no struggle to counterpose globalization or challenge the dominant narratives of globalization. As Durie explains, the Maori remain ambivalent on that. "Even if you don't like it you still cling to it as the main focus of attention."[36] That is, there is no strong opposition or resistance to market model primarily because they do not see globalization as a significant threat. They barely acknowledge it as a minimal influence. That is just how pervasive it is. The overwhelming focus of indigenous groups in Canada and New Zealand is on gaining control over their own lives and resources, restoring a quality of life which is independent and dignified and free from oppression and poverty. Hence the most critical factor remains redefining the indigenous relationship with the national governments from a paternalistic and largely adversarial association to a more open, flexible partnership based on equality and trust. But the paradox is that indigenous groups are in essence combining economic dependence with self-government. To clarify, although they seek to disengage themselves from the stranglehold of the state, to achieve some degree of political autonomy and independence, indigenous groups are clearly turning to the capitalist paradigm of development and in the process they are succumbing to greater economic dependence as the forces of the marketplace are clearly dominant and penetrate them greatly. Even though they may undertake diversification as a strategy to ensure the sustainability of their businesses over the long term, it is obvious that they are not immune to the ebbs and flows of the marketplace and are, instead, heavily invested in and dependent upon the success of their business ventures. Consequently, this means that self-determination reflects the extent to which some indigenous people believe equality can best be achieved through the incorporation into the dominant political and economic regime. The hazard of course is that the ongoing shift occurring in indigenous-state relations essentially expose indigenous peoples to the neoliberal processes and social power relations implicated in their production.

By virtue of engaging in self-government negotiations and land claims settlements there is, instead of decolonization, apparent capitulation in that First Nations governments are normalized within the existing relations of the state. Decolonization requires a reordering of political power and jurisdictional control and authority which is not really achieved under the limited parameters of self-government or through economic development. Instead, self-government undermines and displaces traditional forms of governance because it is based upon non-indigenous concepts (ex. economic growth) and institutions. As colonial governance falls to the community, the resolution of treaties serves not only indigenous interests but also, primarily, those of the wider community.

Conclusion

Today, it is important that we reconsider the meaning of indigenous development. Although not every indigenous group or community benefits from neoliberalism, a growing pattern suggests that those communities that negotiate settlements of grievances with the nation-state are better able to access the opportunities that are available. Drawing largely on their treaties, First Nations and Maori peoples are using claims and settlements as a way to generate financial security and deliver social benefits back to their people. Indigenous processes and experiences of development are surprisingly similar to the processes found in relationships and situations other than those involving indigenous peoples and the nation-state.[37] In this way, indigenous peoples today, like their ancestors, are the product of political processes and ideological stimuli. The Maori and First Nations peoples have much in common in terms of their political demands and activities, commonalities which "derive at least in part from similarities in their respective national political contexts."[38]

Globalization presents indigenous peoples with many challenges. It seeks out lands and resources upon which indigenous people rely. It threatens their diverse and sustainable ways of life. Yet, despite having been the historic victims of development, experiences in Canada and New Zealand demonstrate how indigenous groups are constructing new models of development. At the same time, they must also do everything they can to be competitive. What is striking is the extent to which national indigenous struggles are increasingly global and the extent to which they cause a rethinking of what it means to be indigenous in the twenty-first century. There exists an increasing dialogue as much about the relationship between land, territory and identity as about the relationship between globalization and development.

If one looks around the world today, there are clear examples of globalized development as a success story. For indigenous peoples, one need only consider examples found in a growing number of communities across Canada and New Zealand. And there are examples of failures. Think of the number of indigenous groups without treaties or constitutional protection in Central or South America. Far from being a panacea development does not end issues of power or inequality. In fact while arguably it solves some issues, it also raises many more so in the end the inherently uneven character of development leads to contradictory consequences such as freedom from one oppression in exchange for another. Indeed many of problems currently facing indigenous peoples (or poised to challenge them) stem from this basic but enduring conundrum of development.

Ultimately, for decolonization to occur it requires a different path of development than that which corresponds to non-indigenous imperatives. As long as colonial authorities and economic activities continue to control indigenous development, decolonization will not ensue. Therefore, decolonization must take into account different needs of different peoples and different cultures. As long as globalization works to erode culture by creating a global consciousness, by

making the world smaller and more interconnected, it will also chip away at the future of the Fourth World.

---

[1] Early theorists of development include (but are certainly not limited to) Fernando H Cardoso, "The Consumption of Dependency Theory," *Latin American Research Review,* v22,3 (1977); Andre Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil*. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1967); Walter Rostow, "The Stages of Economic Growth." In *Development and Society: The Dynamics of Economic Change*, David E. Novack and Robert Lekachman, eds. (N.Y.: St. Martin's Press, 1964).

[2] For a theory review of development I refer the reader to Robert B. Anderson, "Chapter 3: Theory Review and Development", *Economic Development among the Aboriginal Peoples in Canada: The hope for the future* (Toronto: Captus Press, 1999), 27-56.

[3] The term Fourth World first came into wide use in 1974 with the publication of Shuswap Chief George Manuel's and Michael Posluns book *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality* (Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1974). In this book the authors argue thought of the Fourth World as the "indigenous peoples descended from a country's aboriginal population and who today are completely or partly deprived of the right to their own territories and its riches." (40) Noel Dyck's 1985 publication, *Indigenous Peoples and the Nation- State* continued to support the conception of the Fourth World as aboriginal populations who are "politically weak, economically marginal and culturally stigmatized by members of the national societies that have overtaken them and their lands." (1)

[4] Watkins, "From Underdevelopment to Development," 91. Watkins writes that "large-scale resource projects are said by their proponents to create 'development.' In fact, for native people what has resulted is properly characterized as 'underdevelopment.'" Mel Watkins, ed. *Dene Nation:The Colony Within* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977).
Mel Watkins, ed.

[5] See Watkins, *Dene Nation: The Colony Within*,1977.

[6] John Ralston Saul, "How globalism fell short", *Globe and Mail* (21 May, 2005), F9.

[7] But "partnerships" do not reduce inequality. Instead, they perpetuate the ability of the state to maintain traditional systems of power thereby making domestic resources continuously available and making economic development unlikely since any surplus/revenue generated appropriated by elites/state. See Dennis Conway and Nikolas Heynen, "Classical dependency theories: from ECLA to Andre Gunder Frank", *The Companion to Development Studies,* Vandana Desai and Robert B. Potter, eds. (London: Oxford University Press, 2002), 97. This suggests not only that First Nations remain politically subordinate but also that there continues a steady flow of primary resources.

[8] Mason Durie, *Te Mana, Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Maori Self-Determination* (Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press, 1998), 59.

[9] Durie, *Te Mana, Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Maori Self-Determination:* 11.

[10] Subcommandante Marcos cited in Anthony J. Hall, *The American Empire and the Fourth World* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003), 146.

[11] Mason Durie. Personal Interview with author. 8 November, 2004. Palmerston North, NZ. Page. 3 of 6.

[12] Mason Durie, *Launching Maori Futures* (Wellington, NZ: Huia Publishers, 2003), 1.

[13] The concept of "Aboriginal peoples" is enshrined in the constitution, 1982. All together, Aboriginal peoples represent approximately 3% of the total population, spread across ten provinces and throughout three territories. Canada is a federal country in which responsibility for the administration and development of Aboriginal peoples (including Indian, Inuit and Metis) falls within the scope of federal jurisdiction.

[14] This community was the focus of my doctoral dissertation. Gabrielle Slowey, The Political Economy of Self-Determination: The Case of the Mikisew Cree First Nation. PhD Diss. University of Alberta, 2003.

[15] Ron Selin, *Into the New Millenium*, *Our Story: The Mikisew Cree FirstNation*. (Edmonton: Western Communications Ltd. 1999), 9.

[16] deCardinale, Fort Chipewyan: A Community Profile and Attitude and Perceptions, 1995-1996. Fort Chipewyan: Mikisew Cree First Nation, 1996), j-1.

[17] Phil Fontaine, "Indian Act is racist: Fontaine", *Globe and Mail* (3 June, 2004), A 11.

[18] Ibid., 29.

[19] Syncrude Representative, *Interview with author no. 21* (Fort McMurray, AB: 8 May, 2000), 6.

[20] Ovide Mercredi, "A Conversation with National Chief Ovide Mercredi, *Mawioni Journal* (Winter, 1994), 7.

[21] Archie Waquan, "Presentation by Mikisew Cree First Nation to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal People" (Fort Chipewyan, AB: June 18, 1992), 17.

[22] MCFN Member, "Interview with author no. 27" (Edmonton, AB: 27 May, 2000), 5.

[23] Air Mikisew operates two flights daily between Fort Chipewyan and Fort McMurray, flying some 15,000 passengers yearly. The airline also carries 3,000 Syncrude employees between Fort Chipewyan, Fort McMurray and Edmonton annually, provides air service for major tourist operations as well as emergency medical evacuation services. In addition, Air Mikisew has ongoing negotiations with Suncor and Shell Canada to provide future charter and corporate shuttle services. With its growing success, MCFN has been able to provide its members with a return on their investment. More specifically, MCFN now defrays some of the costs of transport for its members. This includes two-discounted seats and reduced rates on freight for MCFN passengers on each flight, awarded on a first come, first serve basis. The point of the reduction is to ensure that MCFN members who invest as a band in the business venture also benefit from the airline initiative.

MSD is owned by MCFN and employs 30 people year-round and trains an additional 10 people each year. In 1995 it successfully entered the booming but competitive building industry in Fort McMurray. It soon secured millions of dollars in construction contracts, providing much-needed employment for members living there.

[24] Joe Linklater, *Interview with author* (Toronto, Ontario: 11 February, 2005).

[25] Mark Macdonald, "Relearning our ABC's? The New Governance of Aboriginal Economic Development in Canada," in Leslie A. Pal (ed.), *How Ottawa Spends 2000-2001* (Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2000), 171.

[26] New Zealand is a unitary state in which the indigenous peoples or Maori represent thirteen percent of the total population with approximately forty-three iwi (tribes) spread throughout the country. Settled primarily by Europeans (or "Pakeha"), the central government was granted jurisdiction over Maori development in 1852 despite the existence of the Treaty of Waitangi which was signed between the Crown and the Maori in 1840.

[27] Today the Tainui have bounced back with $220,000,000 in assets and $40,000,000 in the bank.

[28] Mason Durie. *Personal Interview with author*. (Palmerston North, NZ: 8 November, 2004), 3 of 6.

[29] Mark Solomon. *Personal Interview with author (*Christchurch, NZ: 18 November, 2004), 1 of 11. For more detail on the Ngai Tahu structure see: http://www.ngaitahu.iwi.nz/Office/Te%20Runanga%20o%20Ngai%20Tahu/Structure

[30] Ibid, p. 2 of 11.

[31] Ibid, p. 2 of 11.

[32] For more on the Ngai Tahu Vision 2025 see http://www.ngaitahu.iwi.nz/Development

[33] For more information on Shotover Jet go to www.shotoverjet.co.nz.

[34] Mason Durie, *Launching Maori Futures* (Wellington, NZ: Huia Publishers, 2003), 1.

[35] Durie, *Personal Interview with author*: p. 4 of 6.

[36] Ibid, p. 4.

[37] Dyck, 1985: 24.

[38] Dyck, 1985: 2.