

Practicing Sustainable Self-Determination: Indigenous Approaches to Cultural Restoration and Revitalization

JEFF CORNTASSEL
Associate Professor
University of Victoria

CHERYL BRYCE
Songhees
Lekwungen Ancestral Land

TODAY THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 370 MILLION indigenous people living in over 70 states throughout the world, constituting five percent of the global population. Eighty percent of all biodiversity on the planet thrives in the twenty-two percent of global territories home to indigenous peoples.¹ Increasingly, researchers recognize that the same forces that threaten biodiversity also threaten indigenous peoples' longstanding relationships with their homelands and the health and well-being of native communities. Ongoing environmental destruction jeopardizes the sustainable relationships indigenous nations have practiced for thousands of years, including land-based and water-based cultural practices such as gathering medicines, hunting, fishing, and farming. As the late geographer Bernard Nietschmann observed:

Where there are nation peoples [place-based communities whose relationships with their homelands (both land and water) govern their roles and responsibilities] with an intact, self-governed homeland, there are still biologically rich environments [...]. The converse is equally

JEFF CORNTASSEL is Associate Professor in the Indigenous Governance Program at the University of Victoria. He is the author of *Forced Federalism: Contemporary Challenges to Indigenous Nationhood* (University of Oklahoma Press, 2008). CHERYL BRYCE is Songhees of the Lekwungen ancestral land. Her family roles include managing indigenous ecosystems and foods including kwetlal.

Copyright © 2012 by the *Brown Journal of World Affairs*

striking: State environments—where the non-nation peoples live—are almost always areas of destructive deforestation, desertification, massive freshwater depletion and pollution, and large-scale reduction of genetic and biological diversity.²

As a result of colonial encroachment onto their homelands, being indigenous today means engaging in a struggle to reclaim and regenerate one's relational, place-based existence by challenging the ongoing, destructive forces of colonization.³ According to Mohawk scholar Taiaiake Alfred, "colonialism is best conceptualized as an irresistible outcome of a multigenerational and multifaceted process of forced dispossession and attempted acculturation—a disconnection from land, culture, and community—that has resulted in political chaos and social discord within First Nations communities and the collective dependency of First Nations upon the state."⁴ These forces of disconnection further distance indigenous peoples from their spiritual, cultural, and physical relationships with the natural world and serve to destroy the confidence and well-being of indigenous peoples.

When addressing contemporary colonialism and cultural harm, it is important to understand that the indigenous rights discourse has limits and can only take struggles for land reclamation and justice so far. Indigenous mobilization around rights-based strategies premised on state recognition of indigenous self-determination—which entails unconditional freedom to live one's relational, place-based existence, and practice healthy relationships—has serious shortcomings in terms of redressing cultural harms and loss. According to Dene political theorist Glen Coulthard, "the politics of recognition [for indigenous peoples] in its contemporary form promises to reproduce the very configurations of colonial power that Indigenous peoples' demands for recognition have historically sought to transcend."⁵ It follows that indigenous self-determination is something that is asserted and acted upon, not negotiated or offered freely by the state.

152

Indigenous self-determination is something that is asserted and acted upon, not negotiated or offered freely by the state.

Based on Coulthard's description of the politics of recognition, it is clear that the rights discourse has certain limitations in relation to indigenous struggles for self-determination. Rights are state constructions that do not necessarily reflect inherent indigenous responsibilities to their homelands. Rather, rights are conditional in that the state can withdraw them at any time or selectively enforce them. Additionally, the rights discourse compartmentalizes indigenous self-determination by separating questions of governance

and community well-being from homelands and relationships to the natural world. Consequently, a right to indigenous self-determination is often reduced to self-governance, when this is only one of several layers of indigenous self-determining authority. Finally, by embedding themselves within the state-centric rights discourse, indigenous peoples risk mimicking state functions rather than honoring their own sustainable, spiritual relationships with their homelands. In this context, indigenous self-determination can be rearticulated as part of a sustainable, community-based process rather than solely as narrowly constructed political or legal entitlements.

As the above discussion indicates, when approaches to indigenous cultural revitalization and self-determination are discussed solely in terms of strategies, rights, and theories, they overlook the everyday practices of resurgence and decolonization. Indigenous resurgence is about reconnecting with homelands, cultural practices, and communities, and is centered on reclaiming, restoring, and regenerating homeland relationships. Another dimension centers upon decolonization, which transforms indigenous struggles for freedom from performance to everyday local practice.⁶ This entails moving away from the performativity of a rights discourse geared toward state affirmation and approval toward a daily existence conditioned by place-based cultural practices. What, then, does a process of sustainable self-determination look like in practice as indigenous peoples move from rights to practicing their everyday responsibilities? This article examines indigenous communities in Lekwungen (Songhees First Nation in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada) as they work to overcome cultural loss by reclaiming their homelands and distinct cultural practices.⁷ First, however, concepts of culture and sustainability are further developed in terms of their applicability to international law.

153

CULTURAL HARM AND COMMUNITY RESURGENCE

Indigenous peoples in urban areas often find ways to maintain their links to families, communities, and homelands by going “home” for ceremonies and/or practicing their ceremonial life in the cities. According to a comprehensive 2010 survey of urban indigenous peoples, 61 percent of those responding felt either a very (30 percent) or fairly (31 percent) close connection to their “home community” (defined as the place where their parents and grandparents were raised).⁸ Whether on their homelands or maintaining homeland connections through regular visits and other land-based/water-based cultural practices, indigenous peoples defy the standard reservation/off-reservation dichotomies.

One example of community resurgence in action is the “Water Walkers” movement in Wikiwemikong Unceded First Nation in Ontario, Canada. The movement began in the winter of 2002 in response to mounting threats of environmental pollution to community lakes and traditional waters. According to one of the leaders of this movement, Josephine Mandamin, they asked themselves, “What can we do to bring out, to tell people of our responsibilities as women, as keepers of life and the water, to respect our bodies as Nishnaabe-kwewag, as women?”⁹ They decided as a group to undertake a spiritual walk around the entire perimeter of Lake Superior with buckets of water to raise awareness of

Given that their future survival depends on it, indigenous communities adamantly assert an inherent right to subsistence living.

the need to protect water. According to Josephine, “This journey with the pail of water that we carry is our way of Walking the Talk [...] Our great grandchildren and the next generation will be able to say, yes,

our grandmothers and grandfathers kept this water for us!”¹⁰ When examining indigenous community resurgence, questions of sustainability and subsistence become key starting points for assessing cultural harm, and, ultimately, for the restoration of cultural practices. In a comprehensive United Nations study examining indigenous peoples and their natural resource rights, Special Rapporteur Erica-Irene Daes found that “few if any limitations on indigenous resource rights are appropriate, because the indigenous ownership of the resources is associated with the most important and fundamental of human rights: the rights to life, food, shelter, the right to self-determination, and the right to exist as a people.”¹¹

154

Given that their future survival depends on it, indigenous communities adamantly assert an inherent right to subsistence living. For indigenous peoples, subsistence living involves everyday cultural, spiritual, and social interactions grounded in reciprocal relationships that sustain communities for generations. Cree activist Ted Moses discusses how self-determination and a right to subsistence are interrelated in this regard: “We may not be denied our own means of subsistence [...] We may not be denied the wherewithal for life itself—food, shelter, clothing, land, water and the freedom to pursue a way of life. There are no exceptions to this rule.”¹²

How does the most comprehensive indigenous rights instrument in effect today—the 2007 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples—protect indigenous rights to subsistence and sustainable self-determination within Canada? While it initially voted against adoption of the Declaration (along with Australia, New Zealand, and the United States), Canada has since reversed

course due to political pressure from First Nations and formally endorsed the Declaration in 2010.¹³ When providing the details of its endorsement, the Canadian government emphasized that the Declaration is a “non-legally binding document that does not reflect customary international law nor change Canadian laws.”¹⁴ Notwithstanding this interpretation, some international legal scholars contend that the Declaration has political and legal force because it is grounded in universally upheld principles of self-determination. When describing the potential of the Declaration to rectify injustices to indigenous peoples, S. James Anaya states:

By particularizing the rights of indigenous peoples, the Declaration seeks to accomplish what should have been accomplished without it: the application of universal human rights principles in a way that appreciates not just the humanity of indigenous individuals but that also values the bonds of community they form.¹⁵

Drafted by indigenous activists, scholars, and state delegates over the past three decades, the Declaration is comprised of 46 articles that mirror several international customary norms already in place.¹⁶ The main articles of interest here are those which outline the rights of indigenous peoples to restorative justice, including redress for any action which has the aim or effect of depriving them of their ability to live as indigenous peoples, such as their means of subsistence (Article 20); access to health and traditional medicines (Article 24); or the right to maintain and strengthen their distinctive spiritual relationship with their traditionally owned or otherwise-used and occupied lands, territories, waters, coastal seas, and other resources (Article 25).¹⁷

Despite the potential for existing international legal institutions and standards to hold signatories accountable, as of this writing no global forum has yet held Canada accountable for its denial of indigenous cultural practices and everyday subsistence. In this regard, Article 46, Part 1 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is revealing: “Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, people, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act contrary to the Charter of the United Nations or construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States.” While indigenous peoples do not tend to seek secession from the state, the restoration of their cultural practices is often portrayed as a threat to the territorial integrity of the countries in which they reside, and thus, a threat to state sovereignty. The politics of recognition highlight the shortcomings of pursuing rights-based strategies for indigenous

peoples desiring decolonization and restoration of their relationships to the natural world.

As of this writing, only two countries have implemented the Declaration within their domestic policies and laws: the Philippines, which signed the Declaration's provisions into law with the 1997 Indigenous Peoples Rights Act, and Bolivia, which adopted the Declaration as Law No. 3760 in 2007 and incorporated it into the new constitution in February of 2009.¹⁸ Questions over how to implement the Declaration remain, which expose limitations in the rights discourse for indigenous peoples. Currently, indigenous peoples around the world are testing the enforcement of the Declaration's provisions, such as the Nay'dini'aa Na' (Chickaloon Village) Traditional Council in Alaska regarding inherent water rights.¹⁹ Given the devastating impacts of cultural loss for indigenous peoples, there is an urgency to restore and regenerate cultural practices and reconnect to indigenous homelands now for the future sustainability and survival of indigenous communities.

How, then, do subsistence and sustainability fit into a discussion of cultural practice and continuity in indigenous communities? For indigenous peoples, sustainability is upheld by honoring longstanding, reciprocal relationships with the natural world, as well as by transmitting knowledge and everyday cultural practices to future generations. An indigenous conceptualization of sustainability runs much deeper than the 2011 *Human Development Report* (HDR) definition of "sustainable human development" as "the expansion of the substantive freedoms of people today while making reasonable efforts to avoid seriously

compromising those of future generations."²⁰ The HDR's emphasis on personal freedom and equity does not correlate well with the collective spiritual or cultural aspects of indigenous peoples' relationships to

156
Subsistence and sustainability are being redefined by indigenous peoples to express their complex relationships with their homelands.

their homelands and the transmission of this traditional knowledge to future generations. An indigenous notion of sustainability involves upholding one's responsibilities to the land and natural world and giving back more than one takes, rather than simply residing on the land. It follows that indigenous *sustainable self-determination* is both an individual and community-driven process where "evolving indigenous livelihoods, food security, community governance, relationships to homelands and the natural world, and ceremonial life can be practiced today locally and regionally, thus enabling the transmission of these traditions and practices to future generations."²¹

Whether living in rural or urban areas, indigenous peoples are finding new pathways to resurgence and cultural continuity in order to strengthen their nations amidst ongoing colonialism and legacies of cultural harm. Rights have limits when addressing issues of cultural harm, and new indigenous movements, such as the Water Walkers, are emerging to protect indigenous lands, cultures, and communities. Terms such as *subsistence* and *sustainability* are being redefined by indigenous peoples to express their complex relationships with their homelands. Resurgence ultimately entails community reclamation, restoration, and regeneration of local cultural practices, and the Lekwungen people have begun a movement to fight for their unique way of life.

KWETLAL AND COMMUNITY RESURGENCE

How do indigenous communities respond to the loss of their homelands and cultural practices? What recourse do indigenous peoples have when their traditional plants have been overrun by invasive species (plant, animal, or human)? One example of everyday practices of resurgence in action comes from British Columbia, Canada. The Lekwungen ancestral homelands are also known as Victoria (Metulia) and Greater Victoria in British Columbia, Canada. Diverse ecosystems, such as the Garry Oak Ecosystem (GOE), which is known for the *kwetlal* (*camas*, a starchy bulb that has been a staple food and trade item for indigenous peoples in the region for generations), have thrived on Lekwungen territories for centuries. The GOE remains vital to the kwetlal food and trade system, and Lekwungen communities were known worldwide as the place to trade for kwetlal. Bryce explains:

Captain Vancouver described upon his arrival in May of 1792 a landscape almost as enchantingly beautiful as the most elegantly finished pleasure grounds in Europe diversified with an abundance of flowers [...] this enchanting landscape was only there by virtue of a lot of hard work by her female ancestors who owned and managed the camas fields through seasonal burning, weeding and harvesting on a sustainable scale. The only reason they [the company] settled here was that we had done such a good job of keeping the soil rich.²²

Additionally, the University of Victoria is located in the one area where kwetlal was celebrated, harvested, pit cooked, and traded with people up and down the coast.

Lekwungen women have been the backbone of the kwetlal food system by managing it for centuries and, through their connections to kwetlal and

management of their traditional homelands, have sustained their communities. This important role was passed down from mothers to daughters. Cheryl Bryce and her family have been managing their traditional Lekwungen territories for several generations, and Bryce continues to harvest kwetlal on parklands and private property despite threats to her and her family's well-being from settlers attempting to deny her access to Lekwungen homelands.²³ The struggles of Bryce and her family highlight how these foods systems have been greatly impacted by settler colonial encroachment that continues today.

In 1844, James Douglas decided to settle the new Hudson Bay Fort in Metulia (downtown Victoria) because of the beautiful kwetlal food system, and Fort Victoria became the first "box store," so to speak, in the Lekwungen ancestral homelands. Initially, the Lekwungen people maintained relations with the alien settler economy as a secondary form of trade. However, Fort Victoria was developed in the center of the Lekwungen ancestral lands and its impacts were directly aimed at destroying the combined strength of the culture, people, and land. As a result, this trading system deteriorated over time, and led to the decline of the kwetlal food systems. Today, the kwetlal food system comprises less than five percent of its original yield over 150 years ago.

158

Given that 95 percent of the ancestors' land base for this food system is not available today, the current state of the indigenous food system is evidence of colonial development, pollution, and cultural suppression and oppression, which has led to cultural loss and the destruction of roles and responsibilities within the Lekwungen community. For example, the Lekwungen people have seven major families each with food resources, roles, and an area of land. However, as a result of colonial encroachment, gender roles relating to traditional land management and harvesting have been disrupted and fishing and planting areas governed by particular families have been encroached upon by settler populations. Additionally, local environmental conservation efforts have focused on the revitalization of the GOE, rather than on addressing the reality of indigenous food systems and community sustainability in the region.

Today, the work continues among the women with inherent family rights to the kwetlal food system. It will take generations of Lekwungen peoples acting in solidarity to reinstate cultural food systems such as kwetlal. Cultural revitalization starts with protecting the land, reinstating traditional roles, and practicing everyday acts of resurgence. Harvesting, pit cooking, and trading continue today despite the colonial disruption. However, Lekwungen homelands, roles, and nationhood remain threatened as they have been since the first contact with settlers. After all, Lekwungen homelands remain at the center of

ongoing colonial expansion. Cheryl Bryce is a Lekwungen woman visibly reinstating her role among both Lekwungen and settlers. It was around 1999 when Bryce realized she needed to educate and develop a working network toward reinstating kwetlal food systems. As a child, Bryce remembers going to parks in Lekwungen ancestral lands early in the morning with her grandmother Edna George née Norris and, upon encountering settlers, being told that they did not have the right to harvest in “Victoria parks.” Within Victoria and throughout Canada, acts of community resurgence are criminalized when it comes to regenerating one’s cultural practices on original indigenous homelands, which are often considered private properties or public parklands. As an adult Bryce continues to encounter this type of ignorance coupled with threats of physical force. These experiences and her concern with the decline of the food system led Bryce to raise awareness and build networks of like-minded indigenous and settler peoples.

Bryce took the struggle for cultural restoration beyond her family and invited indigenous peoples and settlers to partake in public events such as kwetlal pit cooks and invasive plant species removal and to engage in creative awareness-building campaigns. The goals of the “Community Tool Shed” founded by Bryce focus on education and the reinstatement of indigenous food systems such as kwetlal. There is a strong educational component to this work, because Bryce has developed maps of Victoria with traditional place names and has also spoken to several school groups and residents about the history of the region, as well as their obligations to the kwetlal food systems in Lekwungen territories.²⁴ In order to protect the remaining five percent of kwetlal yields and reinstate kwetlal food systems, it will take generations working at removing invasive plant species (such as Scotch Broom), pollution concerns, and colonial development. As Bryce states:

The Douglas Treaties were supposed to allow traditional harvesting of resources in their territory but in practice that has never happened or been acknowledged. Look at the Indian Act [...] “when they passed laws that it was illegal to leave the reserve without a pass, told what you can grow on the reserve, harvest off reserve and what you can purchase it was one more aspect of cultural genocide.” It was illegal to gather traditional foods outside of reserve lands and yet the practice of gathering the foods, processing and eating them [...] were what kept us alive both from the perspective of diet and culture.²⁵

Bryce’s efforts to revitalize kwetlal food systems, as well as to regenerate community roles and responsibilities, are critical to the future survival and resurgence of

Lekwungen peoples. As the Lekwungen example points out, communities must assert sustainable self-determination rather than negotiate for it. Ultimately, a community's cultural continuity is premised on direct actions to protect these sacred relationships.

CONCLUSION


When discussing questions of indigenous community sustainability, the previous research and an in-depth look at community resurgence on Lekwungen homelands make it clear that the revitalization of land-based and water-based cultural practices is premised on enacting indigenous community responsibilities, which “entails sparking a spiritual revolution rather than seeking state-based solutions that are disconnected from indigenous community relationships.”²⁶ Processes of reclamation, restoration, and regeneration take on a renewed urgency given the high stakes of dispossession and disconnection from indigenous territories.

The pursuit of self-determination should be reconceived as a responsibility-based movement centered on a sustainable self-determination process, not as a narrowly constructed, state-driven rights discourse. Overall, one sees that grassroots efforts like those referenced above do not rely heavily on rights as much as they do on community responsibilities to protect traditional homelands and food systems. By resisting colonial authority and demarcating their homelands via place-naming and traditional management practices, these everyday acts of resurgence have promoted the regeneration of sustainable food systems in communities and are transmitting these teachings and values to future generations.

We also have to remember that change happens in small increments—*one warrior at a time*. As Cheryl Bryce's actions in Lekwungen demonstrate, “Measurable change on levels beyond the individual will emanate from the start made by physical and psychological transformations in people generated through direct, guided experiences in small, personal groups and, one-on-one mentoring.”²⁷ In her role as a mentor, Bryce brings indigenous children to pull invasive species and learn more about native plants. Passing on this experiential knowledge to younger generations is crucial to the survival of indigenous communities. Additionally, the Community Tool Shed is a place where both indigenous and non-indigenous people can come together under a common goal of protecting the land from invasive species so that native plants will flourish once again. All of these grassroots efforts begin to create awareness of these local struggles and the urgency to protect indigenous homelands.

There is also an educational component to this struggle. Bryce creates

teachable moments in order to convey the history and contemporary struggles of the indigenous peoples in the region. For example, she makes bouquets out of cut-outs of kwetlal (camas) flowers, along with cedar and other native plants, and brings them to Parliament in order to remind people of the local battles being waged over the land. Bryce uses symbolism to urge people to practice healthier relationships so that the land itself can also heal.

By understanding the overlapping and simultaneous processes of reclamation, restoration, and regeneration, one begins to better understand how to implement meaningful and substantive community decolonization practices. Future generations will map their own pathways to community regeneration, ideally on their own terms. By moving from performance to everyday cultural practices, indigenous peoples will be recognized by future generations for how they defended and protected their homelands. 

NOTES

1. United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2011* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 54.

2. Bernard Nietschmann, "The Fourth World: Nations Versus States," in *Reordering the World: Geopolitical Perspectives on the 21st Century*, ed. George J. Demko and William B. Wood (Philadelphia: Westview Press, 1995), 239.

3. The United Nations has not adopted an official definition of indigenous peoples, but working definitions, such as the one developed by the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations in 1986, offer some generally accepted guidelines for self-identifying Indigenous peoples and nations:

- Self-identification as indigenous peoples at the individual level and accepted by the community as their member;
- Historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies;
- Strong link to territories and surrounding natural resources;
- Distinct social, economic, or political systems;
- Distinct language, culture, and beliefs;
- Form non-dominant groups of society; and,
- Resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities.

For more on the complexities of defining 370 million indigenous peoples around the world, see: Jeff Cortassel, "Who is Indigenous? 'Peoplehood' and Ethnonationalist Approaches to Rearticulating Indigenous Identity," *Nationalism & Ethnic Politics* 9, no. 1 (2003): 75–100.

4. Taiaiake Alfred, "Colonialism and State Dependency," *Journal of Aboriginal Health* 5 (2009): 52.

5. Glen S. Coulthard, "Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'Politics of Recognition' in Canada," *Contemporary Political Theory* 3 (2007): 1–29.

6. Kahikina de Silva, "Pathways to Decolonization" class session, Indigenous Governance Program course *IGOV 595: Reclaiming Cēlánen: Land, Water, Governance* (University of Victoria: July 19, 2011). This quote is used with Kahikina's written permission.

7. For the purposes of this article, cultural practices comprise the everyday activities of indigenous peoples in relation to their homelands. Additionally, it is understood that indigenous peoples who live outside their territories continue to practice their cultures, though they express their deep relationships and connections to place in different ways on a daily basis. For example, while over 50 percent of indigenous peoples in Canada live in urban areas, there is a multidirectional flow between urban and rural communities.

8. Environics Institute, *Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study: Main Report* (Toronto: Environics Institute, 2010), 32–33, <http://uaps.ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/UAPS-Main-Report.pdf>.

9. Renée Elizabeth Mzinegiizhigo-kwe Bédard, “Keepers of the Water: Nishnaabe-kwegaw Speaking for the Water,” in *Lighting the Eighth Fire*, Leanne Simpson, ed. (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2008), 103.

10. *Ibid.*, 104.

11. Erica-Irene A. Daes, *Final Report on Indigenous Peoples’ Permanent Sovereignty Over Natural Resources*, July 13, 2004, UN Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/2004/30.

12. Ted Moses, “The Right of Self-Determination and its Significance to the Survival of Indigenous Peoples,” in *Operationalizing the Right of Indigenous Peoples to Self-Determination*, ed. Pekka Aikio and Martin Scheinin (Tuku/Abo: Institute for Human Rights, Abo Akademi University, 2000), 161.

13. Australia, New Zealand, and the United States have also reversed their 2007 positions on the Declaration and formally endorsed UNDRIP.

14. S. James Anaya, “The Right of Indigenous Peoples to Self-Determination in the Post Declaration Era,” in *Indian and Northern Affairs Canada*, “Canada’s Statement of Support on the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples,” November 12, 2010.

15. *Ibid.*

16. The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process, which is a new inter-state mechanism of the Human Rights Council, may also be an important mechanism for mainstreaming the provisions of the Declaration into existing human rights law and establishing human rights obligations for states under review. See: Luis Rodriguez-Pinero, “‘Where Appropriate:’ Monitoring/Implementing of Indigenous Peoples’ Rights Under the Declaration,” in *Making the Declaration Work: The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, ed. Claire Charters and Rodolfo Stavenhagen (Copenhagen: International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs, 2009), 321–22.

17. Other relevant articles in UNDRIP include Article 8, 11, 21, 28, 29, 31, 32, and 40.

18. *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Positive Initiatives and Serious Concerns* (Geneva, Second session, August 10–14, 2009), http://www.ubcic.bc.ca/News_Releases/UB-CICNews08120901.htm#ixzz1kQR2ZSv5.

19. Letter to Catarina de Albuquerque, Nay’dini’aa Na’ (Chickaloon Village) Traditional Council (February 22, 2011), <http://www.treatycouncil.org/PDF/Independent%20Expert%20Communication%20CVTC%20Alaska.pdf>.

20. The Brundtland Commission definition is the most frequently cited: “meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” World Commission on Environment and Development, *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, A/RES/42/187*; posted by UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), December 11, 1987, <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/42/ares42-187.htm>; United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2011* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 18.

21. *Ibid.*, 119.

22. Briony Penn, “Restoring Camas and Culture to Lekwungen and Victoria: An interview with Lekwungen Cheryl Bryce,” *Focus Magazine*, June 2006, <http://www.firstnations.de/media/06-1-1-camas.pdf>.

23. *Ibid.*

24. For example, see: Cheryl Bryce and Brenda Sam, “Lekwungen People: The Traditional Territory of the Songhees and Esquimalt People” (pamphlet), 1997, <http://bcheritage.ca/salish/ph2/map/lekwungen.htm>.

25. *Ibid.*

26. Jeff Corntassel, “Toward Sustainable Self-Determination,” 124.

27. Alfred, “Colonialism and State Dependency,” 56.

Copyright of Brown Journal of World Affairs is the property of Brown University and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.