Introduction

As I am writing this on the beautiful Stoney Nakoda territory in Banff, Alberta, the sun is hitting the majestic mountains around me. If you listen carefully, you can hear the ancient ones' songs echoing off the mountains, reminders of the ceremonies of here, steeped in the ancient teachings of existence and reality. Reaching deep into this existence, I acknowledge the ancestors of this place, the original songs of this place, the dances, the traditional names of here, the language of here, the teachings of here, all creating the energy field of this place translated to mean Sacred Buffalo Guardian Mountain.

This book sets out to examine the significance of the Indigenous presence in today's modern economy and within the emerging economy here in Canada and beyond. This book is a contribution to a new world of thinking—where economics, productivity, development, progress, and prosperity are aligned with human values from an Indigenous perspective.

In authoring this book, it is important to locate my sphere of influence as an Indigenous person being deeply impacted through the establishment of Canada and through the development of the mainstream economy of today. I am most influenced by being a Hesquiaht woman. I am of Nuu chah nulth descent from the west coast of Vancouver Island—a name that describes the location and identity meaning "all along the mountains" and serves to center me in this world. They call me W'aa?katuush, which refers to Big Sister, a name that means I come from a line of the oldest women. I am from the house of Mam'aayutch, a Chiefs' house, that means "on the edge." My roots stretch from Ahousaht, Ehattesaht, and as far as the Makah

people in Washington State. I am the first generation out of residential school system. I am the fifth generation since the existence of the Indian Act. I come from over 10,000 years of the potlatch tradition of giving and demonstration of wealth, connection, and relationship. My parents went to residential school, my grandparents went to residential school. Being the first generation out of residential school, I am deeply connected to focusing on building a collective reality that centers Indigenous Peoples in social and cultural well-being and economic empowerment today.

It is time. It is time to increase the presence, visibility, and role of the emerging modern Indigenous economy. It is time to bring to light and realize the increasing role and responsibility of Indigenous Peoples both within Canada and globally. This is the highest intention of Indigenomics.

As the founder of the Indigenomics Institute, my work specifically brings focus and attention to the economic empowerment of Indigenous Nations to design our own future as Indigenous Peoples. The Indigenomics Institute focuses on modern, constructive, generative economic design to fully realize the growing potential of the emerging Indigenous economy today and into the future.

This book is centered within the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which is an international human rights instrument adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. UNDRIP emerged from over 20 years of negotiations by Indigenous Peoples worldwide. The Declaration establishes the minimum standard for the treatment of Indigenous Peoples. The rights outlined within the Declaration establishes the minimum standards for the continued survival, dignity, and well-being of the Indigenous Peoples of the world. The articles serve to affirm the distinction of Indigenous rights from human rights and describes Indigenous Peoples having the right to self-determination and, by virtue of this right, to freely determine political status and pursue economic, social, and cultural development. The Declaration is an international call for a new model of development; one that advances Indigenous self-determination and the right to an economy. Indigenomics connects to the UNDRIP framework that calls for the self-determination of our continued reality and rights as Indigenous Peoples globally both now and into the future.

Indigenomics serves as a tool to facilitate increased understanding of an Indigenous worldview of economy and works to facilitate the creation of space for a collective response based on economic inclusion within the emerging modern Indigenous economy using Canada as a context.

Indigenomics directs our attention to the power center of the evolving Indigenous economic reality today that ties the future of Canada to the economic success of Indigenous Peoples. It brings into focus the historical context of Indigenous economic distortion, the emerging power shift, and the rise of Indigenous economic empowerment. As a platform for modern Indigenous economic design, Indigenomics brings to the forefront an Indigenous economic development model that moves away from a narrative of "happened to us" toward a new "designed by us" approach. It acknowledges the unfolding story shaping Canada through the law courts that is testing the very foundation of the Crown relationship with Indigenous Peoples and the historical formation of Canada itself. It brings focus to the media narrative regarding Indigenous Peoples that feeds the collective national and global consciousness. It highlights the thinking behind the archaic response to now and the invitation to a new evolved response based on recognition. Indigenomics facilitates a new narrative: Indigenous Peoples are economic powerhouses.

Indigenomics is a platform to facilitate leadership of the economic convergence upon the emerging economy of now. It describes the unfolding power play is expressed within the legal system and the establishment of the new emerging economic space of Indigenous Peoples. This is the global power shift—the convergence of human values and the economic system. It's time to take our place at the economic table.

Indigenomics is a platform to design economic empowerment, inclusion, and economic reconciliation. Economic reconciliation is the space between the lived realities of Indigenous Peoples, the need to build understanding of the importance of the Indigenous relationship, and the requirement for progressive actions for economic inclusion. It is through economic reconciliation that Indigenous Peoples are creating a seat at the modern economic table.

This book sets out to address the uncomfortable space. This uncomfortable space is the emergence of Indigenous recognition in the

story of Canada's formation, the evolution of rights and title, and the new requirement for making space for Indigenous Peoples at the economic table. This is the foundation of economic reconciliation.

The well-known concept of the *seventh generation* is founded in Iroquois philosophy that outlines the need to ensure that the decisions we make today result in a sustainable world seven generations into the future. Indigenomics is the seventh-generation economy. It is the economy behind the economy. This is the relational economy. This is economic future pacing.

Indigenomic's future paces and facilitates the insertion of the dual concepts that there is an alternative Indigenous reality at play within our experience of the modern economy as well as within the development of the Indigenous economy. To future pace is to insert, imagine, and design the future reality of Indigenous economy. Future pacing establishes the scenarios or the pathways of possibility. Indigenomics is both the light on the pathway and the focus on the leadership and tools for modern Indigenous economic design.

This book is set against the backdrop of the Canadian media narrative; it points to the language structures of the evolving Indigenous economic relationship in this country as told within the influence of media. This book draws heavily on the current media narrative to respond to the pervading myths of this country in regard to Indigenous Peoples who are too often perceived as a burden on the fiscal system of this country. This book retains a Canadian focus and at times draws on parallel international Indigenous experience and insight.

In authoring this book, I interchange the terms Indigenous, First Nation, and Aboriginal. I use "Indigenous" most frequently as it is politically neutral, inclusive, and most current and consistent with government language usage. Some quote sources utilize the terms "First Nation" or "Aboriginal." The term "Indigenous" as used here is intended to be inclusive of Métis peoples and Inuit as distinct cultural groups.

Indigenomics works to escape the boundaries of methodology and instead follows the pathway of an Indigenous worldview as expressed through economy and the lived realities of Indigenous Peoples today. Indigenomics is not pedagogy, it is not epistemology, scientific theory, or philosophy. Indigenomics is grounded in Indigenous worldview, focusing on the values and belief systems that have

allowed a foundation for Indigenous success through the continuation as people for thousands of years. At the heart of Indigenomics is the creation of space for Indigenous economic modernity. It outlines the foundation of a distinct Indigenous worldview that is embedded in both physical and spiritual relativity.

Moving away from the standard format of academic-focused referencing of previous external work or thought, this book instead draws from living examples of current leadership in relation to the growth of the Indigenous economy. This book calls upon the leadership and the insight of key business leadership, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, who are bringing awareness to the growing Indigenous economy here in Canada. I interviewed the following six key business leaders, all exceptional in their field. Each leader is a living example of Indigenous business thought leadership, and each is actively participating in the increased visibility and growth of the Indigenous economy today.

Bill Gallagher, author of *Resource Rulers* and *Resource Reckoning*, is a lawyer and strategist in the area of Indigenous, government, and corporate relations and is a leading authority on the rise of native empowerment in the Canadian resources sector. *Resource Rulers* tracks the rise of native empowerment and the remarkable legal winning streak in the Canadian resource sector. Gallagher's work is instrumental in building understanding of the growth Indigenous legal and economic empowerment.

Don Richardson is a partner in Shared Value Solutions. Don brings over 25 years of experience as a skilled facilitator supporting project implementation, impact assessments, and building agreements between energy, infrastructure, and resource management project proponents; community/nongovernmental organizations; government agencies; and rural/Indigenous communities. Richardson works to foster constructive engagement to create *shared value* between communities and infrastructure proponents. He currently manages stakeholder and government relations on several large-scale environmental and infrastructure development projects.

Dara Kelly is an assistant professor at the Beedie School of Business at Simon Fraser University, teaching in the Executive Master of Business Administration program in Indigenous Business and Leadership. In 2017, she received her PhD in commerce from the

University of Auckland Business School in Aotearoa, New Zealand. Kelly's doctoral thesis, "Feed the People and You Will Never Go Hungry: Illuminating Coast Salish Economy of Affection," focuses on Indigenous knowledge systems as a way to inform approaches for economic development grounded in Indigenous notions of freedom, wealth, and interconnectedness. Kelly is from the Leq'á:mel First Nation of the Coast Salish people and is an advisor to the Indigenomics Institute.

JP Gladu, past president and CEO of the Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business, is Anishinaabe from Thunder Bay and is a member of Bingwi Neyaashi Anishinaabek Nation located on the eastern shores of Lake Nipigon, Ontario. Gladu completed a forestry technician diploma in 1993, obtained an undergraduate degree in forestry from Northern Arizona University in 2000, and holds an Executive MBA from Queen's University. Gladu has over two decades of experience in the natural resource sector. His career path includes work with Indigenous communities and organizations, environmental nongovernment organizations, industry, and governments from across Canada and internationally. At the Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business, Gladu led the mandate of working to grow and improve opportunities for Aboriginal businesses across Canada.

Shannin Metatawabin, the CEO of the National Aboriginal Capital Corporations Association, is Cree/Inninow from Fort Albany First Nation of the Mushkegowuk Nation. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in political science from Carleton University and an Aboriginal Economic Development certificate from the University of Waterloo. Metatawabin has over 15 years of industry and economic development experience, primarily focused on Aboriginal development. He is an entrepreneur, commercial lender, business and community developer, and management consultant with proficiency in remedial management, optimization, and business planning.

Clint Davis, an Inuk from Labrador, is the Partner and Managing Director of Acasta Capital Indigenous, an Indigenous-owned subsidiary company of Acasta Capital that works with Indigenous governments and economic development corporations to achieve growth and value creation by assisting in the maximization of their inherent competitive advantage. Prior to the creation of this company, Davis

served as the Vice President of Indigenous Banking at TD. Davis is the Chair of the Board of Directors for the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies, which is the economic arm of Nunatsiavut Government, a self-governing entity that represents the political, social, and economic interests of the Inuit of Labrador. Under Davis's leadership, the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies has grown to owning and partnering in fourteen operating companies with general revenue of over $35 million annually. Clint is an advisor to the Indigenomics Institute.

Each of these leaders brings a key voice and insight into the developing Indigenous economy, and all are actively contributing to its development, visibility, and growth in their own way.

The Indigenomics Manifestation

Indigenomics is a new word. It is intended to serve as a tool to insert into national and global consciousness the importance of building understanding of the Indigenous economic and legal relationship and its role within the modern economy today. Indigenomics welcomes you to an Indigenous worldview. It is a place to wonder, a means to converge on the ancient and the modern and on the potential of an Indigenous economy today. Indigenomics is bringing focus to the pathway forward. It is about building on the previous work of the ones who came before us. It is a light on the pathway that establishes what it can mean to have a "right to an economy" as confirmed within the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Indigenomics is about honoring the powerful thinking of Indigenous wisdom and facilitating that into economic outcomes today.

Indigenomics calls into visibility the relevance of an Indigenous worldview in today's modern economy. It is the conscious claim to and the creation of space for the advancement of today's emerging Indigenous economy. Indigenomics is a statement of claim of Indigenous space in modern existence. It is a callout or invitation into an Indigenous worldview and its application into the concept and experience of "development" and "progress."

Indigenomics is the economy behind the economy—the values that spin the relationship between nature and human kind—the life force of intention. Indigenomics is the seventh-generation economy.

It is the spiritual reality behind the modern economy. It is the spiritual dimension that connects our humanity and worldview as Indigenous Peoples across time.

Indigenomics is about honoring the powerful thinking of Indigenous wisdom of economy, relationships, and human values. Indigenomics works to bring to the forefront human values and to increase Indigenous visibility and insight into modern Indigenous economic presence. It is bringing into visibility the practice of economic inclusion, and the building of a modern response to now, a response built from the too common rhetoric "We were never taught this in school!" Indigenomics converges upon today's modern economic context—the evolving, shifting, growing influence of Indigenous Peoples across time and inviting the leadership in shaping the new narrative—we are a powerful people.

Indigenomics invites dialogue and thought-provoking insight into the possibility of the Indigenous economic relationship both in Canada and beyond. The time is now. The opportunity is here to influence and participate in the emerging reality and contrast of the new economy.

Indigenomics is Indigenous intelligence in motion. It is the practice of bringing an Indigenous perspective into economic and social development. It works to connect community economic development practices and principles for building an inclusive local economy. Indigenomics is the slow realization of the application of Indigenous values into local economy. It is an inception into economic theory that allows for another worldview.

Indigenomics is an Indigenous approach to the global economic and financial crisis. It questions the reality of current economic thinking while examining the pathway of humanity to bring into focus where we have collectively come from and where we are going. It examines the characteristics of accountability, reciprocity, and responsibility as expressed as fundamental to the Indigenous economy.

Indigenomics is the modern expression of Indigenous existence. It is how we pay attention and create a collective response to the emerging Indigenous economy today. Indigenomics is the return to human values within our economic relationships. It is the economy of consciousness.

Indigenomics is an expression and acknowledgment of the historical and current devaluing of an Indigenous way of life and world-

view. It is a way to frame the creation of value and the destruction of value from both an Indigenous and mainstream worldview. It is an expression of modern indigeneity and the evolution of our economic well-being. Indigenomics is a response to hundreds of years of colonization. It is a response to the economic degradation, distortion, and regression experienced across time by Indigenous Peoples globally through the process of decolonization.

It is the social field for economic reconciliation. It is an invitation to build a modern response to the Indigenous relationship. Indigenomics is about influence. It is a platform for the deconstruction of the experience of systemic Indigenous economic exclusion. It is an explanation of a belief of the relevance of an Indigenous worldview to the modern economy. It is a collaborative framework that calls the economic system toward Indigenous values. It is a social media platform to share Indigenous business success, excellence, and struggles.

It is a way to frame the understanding of who has been left out of the economy and who is included in the emerging economy. It is about connecting the current economy with the growing number of Indigenous businesses and entrepreneurs and recognizing the growing value of Indigenous economies through strategic focused actions and collective design. Indigenomics is a platform to facilitate the Indigenous relationship of this country to collectively re-imagine the future we want and redesign the systems to get us there.

Indigenomics is a process of claiming our Indigenous place at the economic table. Indigenomics speaks to the uncomfortable space from which the truths of the experience of Indigenous Peoples are built. It shapes the pathway forward and works to establish the requirement for inclusion, for visibility, and the collective actions for facilitating the emergence of today's Indigenous economy.

An Indigenous worldview allows us the ability to express what is most important to us as Indigenous Peoples. Indigenomics examines how we see the world in such a way that we can act to ensure the continuance of who we are as Indigenous Peoples across time.

It is time to pay attention to this evolving, emerging Indigenous economy and the quality of the Indigenous economic relationship. This emergence is happening now, and it is happening globally. This is the global power shift. It is time.

Why Indigenomics? Because the Indigenous economy is growing. Because new thinking is required today to evolve the Indigenous relationship. Because new language will get us there. Because an Indigenous worldview is required in our future, and not just the past. Because there are increasing land and resource pressures. Because Indigenous continuity to our ways of life are threatened. Because there is a convergence upon the current limitations of the state of the global economic system.

Why Indigenomics? Because we still have Canadians saying "Why don't you just get over it?" Because we are still confronting the Aboriginal Question today. Because Canada is in a treaty relationship and because we have over 150 years of broken treaties and still need a pathway for treaty implementation. Because the "right to an economy" has yet to be defined. Because 76% of Indigenous children live in poverty in some areas of Canada today. Because there are still Nations without running water in this country or access to the internet.

Why Indigenomics? Because Indigenomics is about the strength of the Indigenous relationship that is at the heart of shaping the future of our country. Because this country is in a legal and an economic relationship with Indigenous Peoples. Because the global economy is slowing. These are the truths of our time. Because it is time to build from the truth—we are a powerful people.

1

Through the Lens of Worldview

Culture is the backbone of the existence of our people. Our culture is a way of life.

—Elder Tom Crane Bear, Blackfoot Nation

A worldview is described as a philosophy or a way of life as expressed through individuals and groups such as family, communities, or societies. It is a collective set of beliefs and values that make up a way of life, a way of seeing the world, and a specific way of experiencing reality. A worldview is passed on through our children, grandchildren, and across generations and works to ensure continuity through time. Indigenous Peoples hold a distinct worldview with distinct differences from a mainstream or Western worldview. The intent of this chapter is to highlight these distinctions for the purpose of framing economics from within an Indigenous worldview.

Humanity's worldview is the channel through which we interpret reality as we see it and experience it. Our worldview directly influences every aspect of our lives from what and how we think to how we act, our emotional responses, and how we form, maintain, and uphold our beliefs, values, and goals. Our worldview encompasses our assumptions about the world and how we see it, how we see ourselves and others, and how we experience reality. Our worldview includes what influences us, what motivates us, how we see the world in a particular way, what we experience as "good," what we identify as "right," and also what we see and define as "truth." Every single human being has a worldview, and each has a story about how we perceive reality. Worldview defines our cultural and personal beliefs, our assumptions,

attitudes, values, and ideas that form the maps or model of our lived reality, perception, and experience of our humanity.

A worldview is the centralized system that serves to structure the perception of reality from which stems the human values system. The highly esteemed educator and author Leroy Little Bear writes extensively on Indigenous worldview. Little Bear describes values as "an abstract, generalized principle of behaviour to which the members of a group feel a strong, emotionally toned positive commitment and which provides a standard for judging specific acts and goals."[1] Values can provide the organizing principles for the integration of individual, family, and community or societies' collective goals.

An Indigenous worldview is centered within the relationship to the land. As Little Bear states in *Aboriginal Paradigms*, "Worldview is important because it is the filter system behind the beliefs, behavior, and actions of our people. It is the implied infrastructure people use for their beliefs, behavior, and relationships."[2]

An Indigenous worldview is what allows us as Indigenous Peoples to be able to express what we value most and how we experience reality through the physical and spiritual domains. An Indigenous worldview focuses on the experience of holism—an embedded understanding of the concept of the connection of the "whole" that has supported the continuity of Indigenous existence, culture, success, and survival across time. It is this continuity of thousands of years that reaffirms and upholds our modern existence, resilience, and relevance.

An Indigenous worldview helps to frame the questions: What are the teachings that have sustained us for thousands of years? How do we see the world in such a way that we can ensure the continuance of who we are as people, but that we can also look at what new thinking is required today? How do we interact with our environment today? How do we want to interact with our environment in the future? What decisions will we make today that will impact the seventh generation? The answers to these questions form insight into an Indigenous worldview and, through answering, begin to demonstrate distinct differences from a Western or mainstream worldview.

The Indigenous economy is a source for our well-being, a platform for our worldview. It acts as the center of the interconnection between

social, spiritual, and our livelihood or economy. Indigenomics works to center Indigenous ways of knowing and an Indigenous worldview to support modern economic development.

A worldview, both consciously and unconsciously, serves to construct a conceptual framework that provides a way to systematically organize the beliefs and values about who we are, about the world we live in, and about our experience and perception of ourselves and of others. This process of organization shapes the very basis of our reality and lived experience. These maps or models help to explain how we view the world and gives explanation or meaning as to why we act or believe the ways that we do. Language is an invisible line to our past and is a primary tool of this transmission of worldview. A worldview brings rationality and organization and helps to form both meaning and structure in our lives.

The inherent characteristics of an Indigenous worldview can be observed and expressed both within the culture and through the relationship to land. As demonstrated in the words of Frantz Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth*, "For a colonized people, the most essential value, the most concrete, is first and foremost the land: the land which will bring bread and, above all, dignity."[3] Bigger than the sum of its parts, the interconnection between worldview, land, values, and beliefs forms the basis of the concept and structure of Indigenous reality.

Over 150 years into the reality of what we call Canada today, the essential Indigenous relationship remains to the land. The Indigenous worldview prevails across the crisis of colonialism and exists as an alternative to a world in an economic crisis stemming from its own worldview and as a parallel reality to the global marketplace of today. As described by Little Bear, "The relationship to and use of the land manifests itself through a complex inter-relational network with all of creation—one that sees humans as simply part of creation, not above it and has balance and harmony as the goal."[4]

The work of Dara Kelly, a leading Indigenous academic who is of Coast Salish descent, is centered on understanding the underlying fundamental values that are embedded in our traditional Indigenous knowledge systems and how these can inform our world today. In my interview with her, she describes an Indigenous worldview:

> There are different levels of philosophies. There are values and philosophies that are embedded into our own interpretations across our tribes and nations. There are philosophies that operate in terms of protocol that are common across our tribes, and then there are values and philosophies that are at the highest level which are unchangeable. These are the things that are universal within a Coast Salish Indigenous worldview.[5]

As further articulated by Oren Lyons, the spiritual leader from the Haudenosaunee of the Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy, who sums up an Indigenous worldview as being in sharp contrast with the modern economic paradigm in *Changing the Narrative* as follows: "You've been trying to instruct the Indians to be capitalists ever since you got here. But we don't value what you value."[6] A simple statement demonstrating a clear divergence in worldviews: "We don't value what you value."

Building from these pointed words of Lyons, it is important to identify some of the key distinctions between an Indigenous and mainstream Western or European worldview. Each has a distinct approach that centers reality and shapes experience. These differences can be seen in the expression of knowledge systems of science, law, religion/spirituality, commerce, and economy and how these knowledge systems are transmitted across time. The following demonstrates a comparison of broad features of these distinctions between a Western/mainstream worldview and an Indigenous worldview.

Each of these distinctions, while only providing the briefest of insight, identifies an expression of differences in worldview that has played out across time. As the world-renowned environmentalist and activist David Suzuki articulates:

> The way we see the world shapes the way we treat it. If a mountain is a deity, not a pile of ore; if a river is one of the veins of the land, not potential irrigation water; if the forest is a sacred grove, not timber; if other species are biological kin, not resources; or if the planet is our mother, not an opportunity—then we will treat each other with greater respect. Thus, the challenge is to look at the world from a different perspective.[7]

Indigenous Worldview	Western/Mainstream Worldview
Disctinction 1: Spirituality	
Four central operating domains: physical, spiritual, mental, and emotional	Science based
Spiritually oriented experience of reality	Is based on "skeptical thinking" or critiquing
Based on belief in the natural world as a knowledge system	Requires proof as a basis of belief
Economy must be spiritually based and about connection	Truth is formed through empirical evidence and methodology
Relationship is everything	Truth must establish proof and be replicable
Cosmos-centered approach shapes an expansive perspective	
Spirituality informs experience of reality	
Disctinction 2: Spirit	
One's spirit and the function of business must be directly connected	Devoid of spirit
Spirit is everywhere—everything has spirit	Evidence is found in tangible numbers and metrics
It is all spiritual	Spirit is not measurable; therefore, irrelevant to economy
Economy is spiritual: a way of being in relationship or having right relationships	
Disctinction 3: Nature of Reality	
Truth is multidimensional	Only one truth based on science of empirical evidence
There can be more than one reality—only limited by our internal state to understand multiple realities or dimensions	Can be seen in legal system
Reality is a unified force	Singular or compartmentalized knowledge systems

Indigenous Worldview	Western/Mainstream Worldview
Disctinction 4: Connectivity	
Community operates within a state of relatedness of connectedness	Compartmentalized society
"All my relations" is expansive connectivity of the whole	Disconnected, silos, isolation
Is inclusive, expansive, universal	Based on hierarchy and order
Connected to the cosmos	
Systems reinforce connectedness, and identity stems from connectedness	
Disctinction 5: Concept of Responsibility/Liability/Risk	
Land is sacred, and the inherent role of stewardship is directly connected to identity	The land and resources should be available for "development" and extraction
Risk is managed through responsibility	Value is not created until it reaches the "marketplace"
Liability is found in carelessness and lack of connectivity or relationship	Risk/liability is to be managed
Responsibility is passed across generations and directly connected to governance and personal self-management	Risk/liability can be paid for/bought
Responsibility is between worlds: physical and spiritual realities. The spiritual domain must be taken into account in decision-making	Risk is externalized to others (governance regulations or legal system)
Risk takes the form of "taking caring"—care for our ancestors/offsprings' needs, and they will care for our needs	Responsibility is to the "owners" or "shareholders"
The marketplace is the cosmos; risk can be found in lack of care of relationships	
Seen within concepts of justice and law	

Indigenous Worldview	Western/Mainstream Worldview
Disctinction 6: Concept of Time	
Time is cyclical	Time has linear structure
Non-linear	Framework of time reinforces industrial structure of productivity
Can be multidimensional	Growth and time are connected
Generational	Time is connected to quarterly/annual profit-based performance (time is money)
Decision-making related to natural cycles	
Future paced	
Disctinction 7: Concept of Wealth	
Wealth is based on accumulation and distribution that supports good of community	Amassing wealth is for individual gain
Wealth is connected to the quality of relationships	Wealth represents status. Wealth is disconnected from community
Wealth can be symbolic and will not always take "monetary" form	Wealth needs to be structured, measured and is intended to multiply
Status is earned by the ability to "give"	Wealth accumulation is a measure of success
Wealth is framed in the system of distribution and relationship	Competitive in nature
Generosity forms basis for success	
Wealth is connected to family (having many grandchildren is an expression of wealth)	
Collaborative in nature	

Indigenous Worldview	Western/Mainstream Worldview
Disctinction 8: Concept of Ownership	
Ownership can be collective	Individual, rights based
Rights extends across generations and is connected to stewardship	Fee simple
Rights means responsibility not ownership	Linear
Ownership is not singular; everyone has a vested interest	Contract based
Connected to all living things	Polorized concept of ownership
	Based on "authority"
	Responsibility is externalized within law
Disctinction 9: Knowledge and Power	
Knowledge is based on traditional teachings	Scientific process, replicated
Knowledge is formed and shaped from Traditional ecological knowledge systems (TEK)	Ego based
Connected to environment: environment is source of knowledge	Critical
Generational: to be transmitted across time and is a responsibility	Short-term
Distribution of power available in the cosmos, universal thinking	Humans hold distribution of power in the universe. Distribution of power concentrated on the wealthy and decision makers
Decision-making must be universal	Power originates in authority
Power originates from alignment between physical and spiritual realm	Knowledge is based in science of knowing
Knowledge is reflected in our environment and allow us to continue over time	

Indigenous Worldview	Western/Mainstream Worldview
Disctinction 10: Economy	
Spiritually based	Gold rush extraction-based mentality: get it out of ground as fast as you can
Relationship focused	Short-term thinking
Abundance stems from nature and connectivity	Growth focused
Prosperity is demonstrated in distribution	Short-term measurements
Gift giving is a demonstration of wealth and long-term value	Wealth is collected
Economy is ceremonially based	Mechanized
Is circular in nature: wealth returns and is demonstrated as an action and not a collection of wealth	Performance based
Ceremony focused	Comparative in nature
"Resources" and responsibility are intertwined	Competition is a necessity
"Resources" are our relatives	
Economy is a way to express the spiritual truths of reality	
Cooperation is essential	
Disctinction 11: Cause and Effect	
Connectivity: what you do to environment you do to yourself	To cause to grow or to diminish
Separation is a symptom	Seen as separate from the environment
Spiritually rooted	Cumulative effects are to be measured and risk mitigated

This concept of "The way we see the world shapes the way we treat it" centers an Indigenous worldview in a direct collision with the Western or mainstream worldview. At times bumping into each other, at times a full collision, the long history of power struggles shaped through a dominating Western worldview tells a story of Indigenous relations and the power structures in the development of this country. The ongoing power struggle as it plays out in the court system calls into question the validity of one worldview over another through the constant stream of Indigenous-based legal challenges within this country. It is here the emerging power shift can be observed, led by Indigenous Peoples and operating from within an Indigenous worldview. The origins of this power struggle can be found in the early language of the formation of this country.

The Indian Problem

In the early development of Canada, Duncan Campbell Scott, deputy superintendent of the Department of Indian Affairs in 1913 exclaimed:

> I want to get rid of the Indian problem. I do not think as a matter of fact, that the country ought to continuously protect a class of people who are able to stand alone. Our objective is to continue until there is not an Indian that has not been absorbed into the body politic, and there is no Indian question, and no Indian Department.[8]

These words demonstrate a clear power struggle embedded within differing worldviews that would shape the development of Canada from infancy to well beyond its first century. Through the lens of assumption viewed through another worldview, the Indians were viewed as a problem to be solved. The Indians were viewed as a problem to be solved. It is this thinking that has shaped the systemic dis-invitation of Indigenous Peoples to the economic table of this country. It is this thinking that has shaped policy, law, budgets, and regulations since the formation of this country. Indigenomics is future pacing the language construct of Indigenous economic inclusion. It is time for new thinking.

The underlying construct of the "Indian Problem" in Canada across time can be seen in questions such as "Why can't they just be

like us?" or "Why don't they just get over it?" These questions are manifestations of expectation and assumptions embedded within the particular dominating worldview across time. It is this thinking that has formed and shaped the structures of this country and the very basis for a collision of distinct worldviews, and the cause of both the economic displacement and the socio-economic gap experienced by Indigenous Peoples in Canada.

Indigenous Economic Displacement and Marginalization

There is a direct causal relationship between historical economic displacement and the marginalization of Indigenous Peoples today. Economic displacement is the systemic removal of Indigenous Peoples from cultural ways and relationships to lands and resources. This can be demonstrated in the widening socio-economic gaps experienced by Indigenous Peoples and communities. This deficit narrative continuously reinforces a perception that Indigenous Peoples are falling behind. Marginalization is the over-representation of one worldview. It is from the margins that the root cause of the commonly told negative statistics of today's Indigenous Peoples' experience of colonization, poverty, and social challenges can be found. Marginalization is the systemic absence from the economic table stemming from the systemic disruption of an Indigenous worldview, sense of responsibility, and inherited rights. Indigenous Peoples are viewed through the lens of negative social statistics—such as the highest levels of suicide, education, jail, and poverty or ill health—and often viewed from these limitations. These negative statistics, often described as the "socio-economic gap," can also be described as the over-representation of one worldview. The experience of poverty in Indigenous reality is a testament of the economic displacement from lands. Furthermore, measuring the socio-economic gap also facilitates a false narrative of the fiscal burden of Indigenous Peoples.

A 2018 Auditor General report, *Socio-economic Gaps on First Nations Reserves*, by Indigenous Services Canada, succinctly focuses on the state of the marginalization of Indigenous Peoples. The report identifies the government's inability in improving the lives of Indigenous Peoples in Canada as an "incomprehensible failure" through

failing to track the country's progress in closing socio-economic gaps between on-reserve First Nations and the rest of Canada. The report highlights inadequate collection of data about the well-being of First Nations living on reserve.[9]

After the report was tabled, Auditor General Michael Ferguson said, "There are too many discussions about the need to close the socio-economic gaps between Indigenous Peoples and other Canadians in this country and yet we don't see those gaps closing."[10] This is an old story still being lived out—the socio-economic gap, a story still reflecting the Indian as a problem to be solved. The social/economic gap is the effect—the cause is rooted firmly in worldview and the structures of economic displacement. It's time for a new story—of economic empowerment, inclusion, and of Indigenous Peoples taking our seats at the economic table of this country. "Closing the socio-economic gap" of Indigenous Peoples is a story that serves the invisibility of the economic distortion of the Indigenous economic and legal relationship across time. It is time for modern, constructive, generative, Indigenous economic design.

Indigenous Worldview and Responsibility

Across time, across socio-economic gaps, across margins, across high rates of poverty, across systemic economic exclusion and yet firmly embedded in an Indigenous worldview is a deeply engrained sense of responsibility. Within an Indigenous worldview, the sense of identity and responsibility are deeply intertwined. The formation of expectations and assumptions stemming from differing worldviews is the starting point for conflict. Conflict has its origin in worldview, stemming from difference in values, beliefs, assumptions, and expectations. Responsibility is the inherent life force of an Indigenous worldview.

It is this divergence in worldviews around responsibility that has played out in the unfoldment of Indigenous legal and economic conflict as further demonstrated in the following chapters. It is this distinction from the dominant worldview that has systematically allowed Indigenous Peoples to be uninvited to the economic table of this country from its establishment. It is this collision of worldviews that sets the stage for beginning to understand Indigenous conflict.

It is from this divergence that the emerging rise of Indigenous economic empowerment can begin to be seen. It is by design that Indigenous Peoples have begun to establish space at the economic table of this country.

The following examples serve to further demonstrate this distinction in worldviews as a way to draw comparisons between Western mainstream and Indigenous worldview's expression of responsibility and risk.

Clayoquot Sound: The Understanding of Liability

The first example draws from direct experience and demonstrates the culturally embedded sense of Indigenous "responsibility." I worked on a local Clayoquot Sound Climate Change Adaption project near Tofino on Vancouver Island, B.C., a number of years back. Our team worked with our Elders and scientists to learn about how the local First Nations peoples experienced climate change in our own territories over time. As a project team, we looked at how certain factors were culturally remembered, such as storm intensity, salmon levels, and water sources, and compared that to how it is done now through scientific measurements and how these have changed over time. The project identified localized decision-making tools and adaptive responses to the changing climate situation to develop adaptive strategies. In the big picture, *we* needed to confirm factors such as access to clean water was ensured over time, that water sources were protected. The project worked to incorporate an Indigenous worldview into resource management and localized decision-making. As an Indigenous-led project, we posited, "We are responsible for this place. We must make decisions for future generations."

Later, I joined a climate change task force for a local municipality that was a similar project but in a different area. Here, the first order of business was to hire a risk management lawyer. The lawyer presented an analysis report that outlined the mitigation of "risk" by identifying who was not responsible, who didn't have to pay, where liability occurred, and how to minimize it. This was the opposite of localized responsible decision-making. That was culture shock for me of comparing a mainstream concept of risk and responsibility and Indigenous concepts of managing both risk and responsibility over time.

Mount Polley Mining Disaster: The Desecration of Responsibility

A second example contrasting responsibility and risk from an Indigenous worldview is the 2014 Mount Polley mine in central B.C., the biggest environmental disaster in the province's history. When the tailing pond broke, 24 million cubic meters of mine waste and water flowed into the nearby water systems. The stories in the media demonstrated the playbook for lack of responsibility that still continues today. With the appropriate amount of finger-pointing, the government did not want to take responsibility, the engineers did not want to take responsibility, nor the company itself. An independent panel of experts concluded the cause was an inadequately designed dam that didn't account for drainage and erosion failures beneath the pond. One of the panel's geotechnical engineers described the location and design of the pond as having a loaded gun and pulling the trigger.

In response to this disaster and the ensuing lack of action, the local Indigenous people took responsibility. The First Nation brought their leadership voice to the disaster, as a *Global News* headline stated, "Neskonlith Indian Band Issues Eviction Notice to Imperial Metals." This disaster triggered a return to Indigenous responsibility. The Nation collectively voiced, "We are responsible for this area." The response was to facilitate a reclaiming and return to Indigenous responsibility and decision-making. They voiced, "As the caretakers of our land and waters, we have an obligation to protect our land for our future generations. Neskonlith Indian Band cannot permit any mining development especially in these Sacred Headwaters that will contaminate the water or destroy our salmon habitat."[11]

The article highlights the collective failure to properly protect Secwepemc land and waters. This example demonstrates the stark contrast in approach stemming from differing worldviews. The local Indigenous people posited "We are responsible" versus the response to the disaster that was based on the narrative of "Who is to blame, who doesn't have to pay, and who is not responsible" approach. These differences in worldview play out very different pathways and form very different perceptions of risk as well as conflict. This divergence in worldview around risk and responsibility plays out in the media narrative, shaping perception, opinion, and awareness.

"We have seen the desecration of responsibility in our lifetime," expressed an Elder from the local Nation. This statement indicates the Indigenous experience of the long-term systemic removal of inherent responsibility stemming from within an Indigenous worldview. Indigenous concepts and lived realities of "responsibility" have been systematically removed through the establishment of Canada's policies and regulations. It is the sense of responsibility and managing of risk that is at the very center of Indigenous existence and reality. The effects of marginalization are experienced through the continuous removal of Indigenous responsibility expressed through the stewardship of place. Indigenous Peoples have experienced the desecration of responsibility across lifetimes. Indigenomics is a return to Indigenous responsibility. The return to the Indigenous role of responsibility and stewardship is Indigenomics in motion.

Idle No More: The Igniting of a Collective Response

A third example of the contrast between an Indigenous and mainstream worldview and the concept of responsibility is the Idle No More movement of 2015 in Canada. The movement, which gained unprecedented national and global attention on Indigenous rights, was formed from the basis of a collective Indigenous worldview of taking responsibility that was led by a core of Indigenous women.

The movement was initially ignited based on the protection of water bodies in response to the Conservative government's introduction of Bill C-45, which derogated responsibility of entire water systems across Canada, 164 water bodies in total. This caused an unprecedented Indigenous uprising of gigantic proportions; a response so swift, so strong, and grounded in Indigenous values and responsibility that it was unmeasurable. The government was unable to form a quick enough response to the Indigenous movement steeped in inherent Indigenous responsibility. This is the perfect showcase demonstrating the collision with Indigenous worldview.

The movement mobilized Indigenous leadership for the protection of a healthy water supply for all, not just Indigenous Peoples. It was ignited as a movement of Indigenous voices saying "We are responsible" but expanded into an expression of injustice, marginalization, and socio-economic gaps in Indigenous communities. It was a grassroots movement of epic proportions for Indigenous sovereignty,

Indigenous rights, and respect for the numbered treaties that shaped Canada itself. The goals of the movement included addressing environmental degradation and socio-economic inequality. This movement, while complex in nature, was essentially a pushback against the government demoting responsibility of protection of water systems and a shift toward a return to Indigenous responsibility.

The continued degradation of Indigenous responsibility is experienced through the parallel process of imposed externalized government authority as well as systems of land regulation and policies for resource management. As articulated by Eriel Deranger, a member of the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation in Alberta, "Our people and our Mother Earth can no longer afford to be economic hostages in the race to industrialize our homelands. It's time for our people to rise up and take back our role as caretakers and stewards of the land. We are economic hostages in our own homeland."[12]

No Dakota Access Pipeline (#NODAPL): Risk Is Spiritual

A fourth example demonstrating the relationship between responsibility, Indigenous worldview, and conflict stemming from differing expectations is the No Dakota Access Pipeline (NODAPL) movement in North Dakota in the winter of 2017 in the US. The concept *Mni Wiconi* in the Lakota language means "water is life" and was the foundation of the entire movement. The Dakota Access Pipeline by Keystone XL proposed to drill beneath the Missouri River upstream from the reservation, endangering the drinking water supply. The pipeline would move half a million barrels of oil a day beneath the Missouri River, the main source of drinking water for the Standing Rock Sioux people. The Lakota people accused the government of approving the pipeline construction without consulting them, a requirement under US law.

The Lakota people believe that the pipeline correlates with a terrible Black Snake that was prophesied to enter the Lakota homeland and cause destruction. The Lakota believe that the Black Snake of the prophecies will cause unbalance and desecrate the water and render it impossible for the Lakota to use that water in their ceremonies.

The response was to set up several spiritual camps that became the largest mobilization of Indigenous Peoples in US history, rallying

Carpenter, Zoë and Tracie Williams. "Since Standing Rock, 56 Bills Have Been Introduced in 30 States to Restrict Protests," February 16, 2018; thenation.com/article/photos-since-standing-rock-56-bills-have-been-introduced-in-30-states-to-restrict-protests/

around the concept of responsibility as expressed in the concept of "water is life." This was taking a stand for Indigenous responsibility for the water which was swiftly met with extreme state-led violence. More than 200 Native American tribes pledged their support to protect the water system, in the single largest coming together of Indigenous Peoples in the history of the United States. The Lakota people argued that the project would contaminate drinking water and damage sacred burial sites.

While met with extreme state-led violence, the movement itself posited through peaceful demonstration of ceremony and dance that the pipeline would endanger the drinking water for the current and future generations. The movement was so large and so violent it caught international attention, and it brought into focus Indigenous rights and the growing sense of Indigenous responsibility for the care of water globally.

Doctrine of Discovery: Naming the Economic Distortion

This final example has had hundreds of years of impact on Indigenous sense of inherent responsibility. The Doctrine of Discovery was the singular tool in the systematic removal of Indigenous responsibility and a pillar to the colonization across the Americas.

The original Papal Bull was issued in 1452. Pope Nicholas directed King Alfonso of Spain to "capture, vanquish, and subdue the Saracens, the pagans, and other enemies of Christ and to put them into perpetual slavery and to take all their possessions and property."[13] This laid the foundation of the Doctrine of Discovery. The Doctrine served as one of the first tools that systematically derogated Indigenous responsibility and worked to override and displace an Indigenous worldview. Operating from this Doctrine, in 1492, Christopher Columbus was sent out to conquer new lands, bring gold, and subjugate the heathens.

In Canada, the origins of the application of the Doctrine stemmed from England as an upholder of the Doctrine. In 1496, the Crown granted a commission to discover countries then unknown to Christian people and to take possession of these lands in the name of the King of England. It is through this Doctrine that the continent of North America was "discovered," and it is through this "discovery" that the concept of English land title can be traced even to this day. The Doctrine described the concept of *terra nullius* as lands that were inhabited by heathens, pagans, infidels, or unbaptized persons and thus to be treated as not existing or non-human and, therefore, for the lands to be inhabitable by Christian peoples. The concept of "terra nullius" has its origins in the specific worldview that lands inhabited by non-Christians were vacant or "unoccupied lands" and, therefore, open to a right of possession by Christians. The application of the Doctrine paralleled the development of the nation of Canada. This at its core is the very essence of the colonial ego.

One of the early applications of the Doctrine in America was first seen by Judge Catron (1786–1865), in the State of Tennessee, who officially identified the Doctrine as part of the law of Christendom. Specifically, he ruled "that the principle of 'discovery' gave title to assume sovereignty over, and to govern the unconverted [non-Christian] peoples of Africa, Asia, and North and South America." The Judge declared that this principle was recognized as a part of the

Law of Nations "for nearly four centuries, and that it is now so recognized by every Christian power, in its political department and its judicial."[14]

Today, the Doctrine of Discovery remains institutionalized into law and policy on national and international levels and is the foundation of the violations of Indigenous Peoples' human rights.

> The Doctrine has resulted in centuries of virtually unlimited resource extraction from the traditional territories of Indigenous peoples, the landscapes of Indigenous worldview. This, in turn, has resulted in the dispossession and impoverishment of Indigenous peoples, and the host of problems that they face today on a daily basis."[15]

A single doctrine, embedded from the tenants of a specific worldview, thousands of miles away, and hundreds of years ago systematically removed Indigenous Peoples from their own humanity, their own worldview, and made the lands "conquerable" by virtue of being "baptized" or not. This principle of "discovery" serves the ego of the descending economy that can still be felt to this day by Indigenous Peoples worldwide. This principle built by the Americas as we know it today. This is the uncomfortable space. This formed the foundation for the systemic "dis-invitation" to the economic table for Indigenous Peoples. This is the structure of colonial shenanigans that remains in place today.

Conclusion

These examples serve to demonstrate the divergence in worldviews that is the source of conflict that reveals the distinct relationship between Indigenous worldview and responsibility. The mainstream worldview sees ownership as rights to the land, whereas Indigenous Peoples see ownership as responsibility. That is a primary source of conflict stemming from distinct worldviews.

Today's modern government and regional structures and policies continue to systematically remove Indigenous Peoples from this inherent sense of responsibility that has existed across time. The Indian Act in Canada has been and continues today to be the fundamental instrument that disconnects Indigenous Peoples from this inherent sense of responsibility.

Today, the Indigenous process of economic development struggles to maintain traditional forms of responsibility and stewardship through the web of government acts, regulations, and policies within the context of nation re-building. These external structures, systems, and processes set the foundation for a strained concept of inherent Indigenous responsibility and create conflict within the context of economic development, prosperity, and progress. These structures further serve the underdevelopment of the Indian reservation and perpetuate the perception of today's "Indian Problem."

Indigenomics is the economy of consciousness: the connection to the nature of reality, universality, cosmology, and philosophy and the development of the whole self—spiritual, mental, emotional, and physical well-being across generations. In the words of Richard Atleo, a renowned Nuu chah nulth scholar and hereditary Chief, in *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth Worldview*, "Wholeness is not an ideology like socialism or communism but the very essence of life. It applies to all created beings."[16]

Indigenomics posits how we see the economy depends on how we see the world. Indigenous Peoples view the economy as a wholly owned subsidiary of the environment, of the Earth, of the whole, extending far out into the cosmology. Through the Indigenous lens, the world reflects back to us reality as seen through our worldview.

REFLECTION

1. Where does an Indigenous sense of responsibility stem from?
2. What are other ways to view risk? How can risk be viewed within an Indigenous lens?
3. What do you understand "relational decision-making" to mean?
4. What does the term "the underdevelopment of the Indian reservation" mean to you?