WORKMANSHIP AND RELATIONSHIPS: *Indigenous Food Trading and Sharing Practices on Vancouver Island*

Johnnie Manson

INTRODUCTION

In Canada, Indigenous[1] nations and peoples are not sovereign, food sovereign, or food secure (Cidro, Martens, and Guilbault 2016; Satterfield et al. 2017). Critical scholars argue that this lack of sovereignty and security arises from the contemporary colonial relationship between Canada and Indigenous nations (Coulthard 2014), which is rooted in dispossession of Indigenous land for the development of the Canadian state and capitalist economies (Daigle 2016), transformation of Indigenous nations into racialized political entities (Rifkin 2011), and elimination of Indigenous people themselves (Wolfe 2006; Million 2013). As such, research has begun to focus on Indigenous social and economic practices that Indigenous people can use to become sovereign at the national and personal level (Corntassel and Bryce 2012).

Critical Indigenous scholars (Coté 2016; Daigle 2016) have advocated for the revitalization of traditional food trading and sharing practices as a mechanism for achieving Indigenous self-determination. These researchers have demonstrated that the food trading and sharing practices of Indigenous peoples are shaped by their Indigenous ontologies. Other research on Indigenous food trading and sharing practices has demonstrated that, in Canada, market-based food practices of Indigenous peoples, such as commercial fishing, were (Menzies and Butler 2008) and are (Brown 2010) informed by Indigenous governing logics.

The insights of the above researchers point to the idea that the traditional and non-traditional food-based practices of Indigenous peoples are *simultaneously* structured by Indigenous *and* liberal governmental logics. Given this, I argue that it is important to contextualize Indigenous

[1] "Indigenous" refers to "the people and peoples who identify their ancestry with original inhabitants of … Canada and other countries worldwide" (Shawn Wilson 2008, 34). See the methodology section for justification of this definition.

peoples' trading and sharing practices relative to Indigenous *and* liberal governmental logics. Thus, I will demonstrate that Indigenous and liberal governmental logics infuse Indigenous peoples' economic exchange processes, while also crossing urban and rural spatial categories. I will further demonstrate that the food trading and sharing practices of Indigenous peoples on Vancouver Island are shaped by two stark moral claims; that is, in liberal legal orders the idea that self-owning[2] individuals are entitled to the fruits of their labour, whereas in the Indigenous ontologies described here, the idea that *giving* food creates relationships that are attached to reciprocal responsibilities.

Hence, I ground the first part of the article in liberal and Indigenous moral theories about self, work, ownership, and freedom, particularly Ian Shapiro's analysis of John Locke's "workmanship ideal"[3] and scholarly theorizations on Indigenous ontologies that look at Indigenous understandings of relationality, respect, reciprocity, responsibility, and recognition via respect.[4] I use these moral theories as a framework with which to analyze the food trading and sharing practices of Indigenous peoples on Vancouver Island. In the second part of the article, I demonstrate that Indigenous ontologies structure how Indigenous people practise traditional food-based practices and how they engage in wage labour practices. I also demonstrate that the workmanship ideal contextually and ideologically shapes the ways in which Indigenous people trade, share, and sell food. Finally, I demonstrate that market logic has not subsumed Indigenous governmental logics, meaning that the ways in which Indigenous peoples trade and share food within spaces defined by market relations is deeply informed by their Indigenous values.

[2] According to Shapiro (2001) and Coleman (2014) the Lockean (1689/1988) concept of self-ownership is simply the claim that people own themselves, aren't owned by others (such as masters, kings, etc.) and as such have the right to do with their bodies as they see fit. I further outline the self-ownership postulate later in this article.

[3] I expand on Ian Shapiro's (1991) analysis of John Locke's (1689/1988) "workmanship ideal." According to Shapiro, the workmanship ideal is the idea that people are entitled to the fruits of their labour.

[4] The term "recognition via respect" is similar to the "Indigenous perspectivism" concept used by Viveiros de Castro (1998). I augment Viveiros de Castro's concept of perspectivism with the observations of Atleo (2004) and Wilson (2008), who argue that Indigenous conceptualizations of respect (which reminds people that they are related to each other) allow people to engage in reciprocal exchanges of recognition and perspectives. I discuss this concept at length below in the section "Indigenous ontologies and communities."

METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

Defining Indigeneity

I use Shawn Wilson's (2008, 34) definition of "Indigeneity," which refers to Indigenous peoples as "people and peoples who identify their ancestry with original inhabitants of … Canada and other countries worldwide." I prefer this definition because it allows for self-definition while also reminding researchers that the term "Indigenous" actually refers to specific Indigenous nations; for example, I would prefer to identify participants by the specific Indigenous nation they claim, rather than calling them "Indigenous." However, because several of the participants are engaged in illegal activities, such as selling without a licence, I chose to de-identify all participants in this article.

One consequence of anonymizing the participants is that I use the generic term "Indigenous" as a signifier of the participants' identity as opposed to the specific Indigenous nations they are from (such as Cree, Chickasaw, etc.). Like Anishinaabe scholar Hayden King (2015), I recognize that categorizing distinct Indigenous peoples (such as the Cree or Haida) under the term "Indigenous" tends to homogenize the experiences of distinct Indigenous peoples. However, I would like to stress that I am not arguing all Indigenous peoples are the same; rather, I am using the term "Indigenous" to protect individuals from harm, while also using a definition of "Indigeneity" that respects and honours difference.

Further, like Métis scholar Zoe Todd (2016), I recognize that there are controversies about researching Indigenous ontologies; namely, that the place-based ontologies of Indigenous peoples are unique and cannot be grouped together under the term "Indigenous ontology." I recognize that fundamental differences between ontologies arise from Indigenous peoples' unique engagements with their territories. Put simply, I draw from research observing that the ontologies of Indigenous peoples share several broad commonalities, such as the concepts of relationality, respect, reciprocity, responsibility, and recognition via respect (Atleo 2011; Shawn Wilson 2008), to analyze the trading and sharing practices of Indigenous peoples. Thus, like Todd (2016), I understand that Indigenous ontologies *as* governing logics shape the ways in which Indigenous people go about being in the world.

Research sites, recruitment, methods, and methodology

My research was conducted in six communities located on Vancouver Island: Nanaimo, Port Alberni, Tofino, and the Tla-o-qui-aht First Nation communities of Esowista, Ty-Histanis, and Opitsaht. I used purposive sampling methods, to the extent that recruitment was accomplished by talking to Indigenous people whom I know trade and share food. Interviews were conducted with nine people who self-identify as Indigenous.

I use the terms "rural" and "urban"; however, it should be noted that "rural" does not necessarily refer only to the Tla-o-qui-aht reserves listed above. Several people in this study live in rural parts of towns such as Port Alberni and Nanaimo, while the town Tofino is for the most part rural. Thus, the term "rural" refers to people who lived in rural parts of Nanaimo, Port Alberni, the town of Tofino, and the Tla-o-qui-aht communities of Esowista, Ty-Histanis, and Opitsaht. The term "urban" refers to people who live in the urban parts of Nanaimo and Port Alberni.

The interviews in this article were face-to-face conversations, lasting approximately 45 minutes to two hours; they were recorded, transcribed, and coded. Results were validated with participants after interviews were transcribed and analyzed. The identities of all people in this study were protected using pseudonyms and by de-identifying information related to their identities.

Conversations were organized around a set of thematic questions, including: What is community? What is home? What is family? What are some of the reasons you trade and share food? Do you think there is an appropriate way to trade and share food? I chose a thematic as opposed to direct line of questioning to encourage a dialogic engagement with participants. Furthermore, I organized conversations around a set of questions that included: What types of food do participants trade and share? In what context do participants trade and share food? How do the goods that participants trade and share circulate temporally and geographically?

During the coding process, I noted that participants often linked their answers to topics such as workspaces and wage labour, and concepts associated with workmanship, such as self-ownership, deserts, choice, and work. Finally, in private conversation, several of the participants told me that they wanted me to contextualize their trading and sharing practices within the context of work and income assistance. As such, I analyzed the trading and sharing practices of the participants with Indigenous ontologies *and* liberal governing logics in mind.

Taking my cue from Indigenous researchers such as Kovach (2010) and Porsanger (2004), I grounded the research relationships I had with participants in Indigenous concepts such as reciprocity, respect, and responsibility, thus ensuring researchers are accountable to their participants. Such research posits that "the relationship with something (a person, object or idea) is more important than the thing itself" (Shawn Wilson 2008, 73).

Methodologically, my approach and analysis draw from critical theory, which describes the ways in which social institutions and social relations are largely shaped by a given mode of production. As Coulthard (2014, 65) notes, critical theory analyzes two interrelated social processes: "resources, technologies, and labor that a people deploy to produce what they need to materially sustain themselves over time, and the forms of thought, behavior, and social relationships that *both condition and are themselves conditioned by productive forces*" [Coulthard's italics].

PART I: WORKMANSHIP AND INDIGENOUS ONTOLOGIES

The workmanship ideal

As liberal democratic theorist Ian Shapiro (2001, 144) notes: "Market relations are the main forces shaping the control of work in the world we've inherited." Given this fact, I think it is important to explore liberal concepts that shape market relations, such as self-ownership and workmanship, as well as concepts associated with the workmanship ideal, such as deserts, choice, and work. I will use insights derived from this analysis to build a theoretical framework for analyzing the food trading and sharing practices of Indigenous peoples.

As Shapiro (2001) observes, we have inherited a dual market system that operates according to the logic of self-ownership and workmanship. As Coleman (2014, 46) notes, for Locke, the concept of self-ownership means that "individuals come to own their existence by virtue of the exertion of their minds and bodies. As authors of all their conscious thoughts and actions, they are accountable for them before civil and spiritual authorities. The self-owning subject stands as the rightful proprietor of both the material and the moral goods it produces." Indeed, as Shapiro (2001, 145–46) observes, the concept of self-ownership plays a crucial role in the division of labour in capitalist economies, noting that "markets in productive capacities affirm individual rights by legitimating the idea of self-ownership. If people did not own themselves they would not, after

all, be in a position to sell the use of *their* productive capacities" [Shapiro's italics].

Conversely, the workmanship ideal is the claim that when self-owning people mix their labour with objects they find in the world, they come to own the "product of the conjunction" (Shapiro 1991, 48). Thus, the workmanship ideal in its simplest terms is the notion that individuals are entitled to the fruits of their labour. In market economies, the workmanship ideal allows self-owning people to expropriate nature, produce commodities, and engage in voluntary exchanges of commodities with other self-owning people. Thus, the dual market system theoretically synthesizes individual rights and utility (Shapiro 2001).

As Shapiro (1991, 49) observes, the workmanship ideal "rests partly on causal and moral fictions." Simply put, the biological and social endowments people are given in life are the product of moral luck (Rawls 1971) and collective work and are not reducible to individual agency (Shapiro 1991). Thus, the workmanship ideal is not so much a scientific fact, but rather, an institutionalized moral claim that structures the ways in which people engage in market transactions (Shapiro 2001).

The workmanship ideal: individualism, work, choice, and deserts

Normative aspects of the workmanship ideal shape how people view and are viewed by others (Shapiro 2001). For instance, the workmanship ideal instills in people the idea that the moral *deserts* they receive in life are products of their *individual* work or choices (Shapiro 1991). This atomized, individualistic view of the world incentivizes hard work and ingenuity, while also allowing people to feel they have some measure of control over their lives and the circumstances in which they find themselves (Shapiro 2001).

Yet the workmanship ideal also has negative aspects. Research has demonstrated that citizens within market economies often see their and other people's inability to work in a "productive" or "creative" manner as a "moral defect" of their own making, even if this "failure" is attributable to processes beyond their control (Lyon-Callo 2008; Workman 2009).[5] Thus, the above research has demonstrated that firms, governments, and individuals posit that since "moral defects" are the product of individual work, they should be rectified by making better life choices. Yet the food

[5] These scholars do not use the term "workmanship ideal." However, they describe a process whereby people think or are told that what they get in life is a product of their own individual work. This process fits our definition of the workmanship ideal.

trading and sharing practices of Indigenous peoples is not only governed by the workmanship ideal; it is also governed by Indigenous ontologies.

Indigenous ontologies and communities

Indigenous peoples inherit communities that are governed according to their Indigenous ontologies (Todd 2016). Thus, this section seeks to critically engage with research on Indigenous ontologies, particularly concepts such as relationality, respect, reciprocity, responsibilities, and recognition via respect, so as to build an analytical framework that can be used to analyze the food trading and sharing practices of Indigenous peoples in this article.

Researchers (Cruikshank 2005; Kimmerer 2013) have noted that the concept of relationality is a foundational concept in Indigenous ontologies. Relationality is the recognition that Indigenous peoples are members of a broad community of beings to whom they are related, through common origin, and connected through a web of complex reciprocal relationships that are attached to responsibilities (Nadasdy 2007; Simpson 2008; Shawn Wilson 2008). Further, as Mark Rifkin (2011) observes, since these relationships occur within the confines of *an expansive* understanding of community that crosses spatial and species boundaries, the obligations that Indigenous peoples have to their relatives also transcend these boundaries.

According to E. Richard Atleo (2004), the ability of Indigenous peoples to recognize their relatives is important because it allows one to recognize those to whom they have responsibilities. Indeed, research has demonstrated that Indigenous peoples such as the Kluane (Nadasdy 2003) or Nuu-chah-nulth (Atleo 2004), use the word "respect" as a mechanism for recognizing one's relations. Indigenous forms of respect, which are different from Western notions of respect denoting reverence, are meant to remind people that they share a common origin with their fellow community members and thus have responsibilities to engage in relationships of reciprocity.

Cree scholar Stan Wilson (2001, 91) argues that an Indigenous sense of self is relationally extensive, noting that "As an Aboriginal person I am constituted by my individual self and by my ancestors and future generations, who will originate in and have returned to the land." Thus, as Atleo (2004) observes, an Indigenous conceptualization of personhood is not a denial of self, but a recognition that the sense of self is born out of a dense and long history of relationships. Research by anthropologists (Viveiros de Castro 1998; Kohn 2007) and Indigenous scholars (Atleo

2004; Shawn Wilson 2008) has demonstrated that Indigenous peoples believe that their individual subjective experience is imbued with the subjective experiences of the earth, and past, present, and future human and nonhuman relatives, while the earth and nonhuman relations are imbued with human subjective experiences. Thus, as Stan Wilson (2001) argues, to be a good relative in an Indigenous sense requires recognizing that a diversity of relations is needed to complete one's sense of self.

As research by Viveiros de Castro (1998) revealed, one mechanism by which Indigenous peoples learn to *respect* diversity is by inhabiting the perspective of their relatives. Research by other anthropologists (Kohn 2007; Nadasdy 2003) also demonstrated that Indigenous peoples who engage in this process of mutual exchange of recognition and perspectives recognize that the distinct lifeways of other relatives carry lessons about the self and the world in which they live. Anthropologists call this process "perspectivism." While such anthropological insights are valid, I think that they tend to treat Indigenous ontologies as something someone *has* as opposed to the logic that shapes how Indigenous peoples *are*. Thus, I propose a concept called "recognition via respect" that builds upon research by anthropologists (Kohn 2007; Viveiros de Castro 1998) and Indigenous scholars (Atleo 2004; Wilson 2008). I argue that this process of recognition via respect is a process whereby the gaze of one's relative is reflected back at one's self, which in turn, makes Indigenous peoples behave in a humble and patient manner with their relatives and themselves.

Reciprocal exchange

Research demonstrates that Indigenous peoples' food trading and sharing practices are shaped by Indigenous ontologies (Coté 2016; Kimmerer 2013). For instance, Indigenous peoples who hunt and gather food often give gifts to the animals they have hunted, animals that have helped them hunt, and to members of their Indigenous nations (Coulthard 2014; Nadasdy 2007). Scholars (Blaser 2009; Todd 2016) argue that these social practices are performed so as to recognize and create a set of respectful relationships with their human and nonhuman relatives that are attached to mutual obligations.

Indeed, Anishinaabe scholar Robin Wall Kimmerer (2013, 28) argues that gifting economies differ from market economies because market economies spring forth from and establish rights, while gifting economies spring forth from and establish reciprocal relationships that are attached to responsibilities. Yet it should be noted that Indigenous peoples have a

long history of engaging in economic activities that are structured around the logics of private property and rights (such as commercial fishing), in a manner that is *informed* by their relational ontologies (Brown 2010; Menzies and Butler 2008). With this in mind, let's turn our attention to the Indigenous peoples on Vancouver Island and their trading and sharing practices.

PART II: RELATIONAL NATIONS: INDIGENOUS TRADING AND SHARING ON VANCOUVER ISLAND

Gifts not commodities

Participants in this article continuously stressed the importance of *giving* gifts to members of their community. For instance, Lou, a male, rural, retired commercial fisher stated:

> Our people used to like sharing. There was no such thing as selling. Our elders used to go out to get [food] and share it with one other … share it with the people. We always say respect. That's not respecting elders when selling [salmon to them]. Respect is when you give to somebody, that's respecting. You sell [salmon], that's not what you call respect. I like it when they just give it, eh?
>
> Author: "Yeah, and don't expect anything in return, eh?"
>
> Lou: "Yeah, that's what our people used to say … 'You share with your people. What you catch, you share with your people.'"[6]

Note that Lou uses the word "respect." Remember that, for Indigenous peoples, the word "respect" is meant to remind people that they share a common origin with their relatives (Atleo 2004; Nadasdy 2003). Further, as Atleo (2004, 16) observes, respect reminds people that they are not the product of their own creation (because they are created by the Creator), meaning that "the Creator owns everything." Thus, from an Indigenous perspective, the things people are given are seen as a relational gift. Indeed, Lou acknowledges that his elders *gave* him the knowledge that stressed the importance of sharing food with relatives. Lou uses this ancestral knowledge to argue that his fellow community members have an obligation to give fish to their community.

---

[6] Lou (male, age 70–80, rural, retired commercial fisher), in interview with the author. March 2015. All quotations referring to Lou are from this interview.

Also note that Lou *agrees* with my utterance of "Yeah, and don't expect anything in return, eh?" and then completes it by stating that members of his community *must* share fish they catch. This statement mirrors that of Kimmerer (2013, 27), who argues that, for Indigenous peoples, "A gift *is* something for nothing, except that certain obligations are attached" [Kimmerer's italics]. Indeed, for Lou, sharing food establishes relationships that are attached to mutual obligations.

Further, Lou argues that selling is *the opposite* of giving, noting that his ancestors never sold fish, and that selling fish to community members is *disrespectful*. And while some Indigenous scholars might agree with such a sentiment (Coté 2016; Kimmerer 2013), as I will demonstrate, Indigenous peoples on Vancouver Island often trade, share, and even *sell* gifts in manners that recognize and respect the fact that the things they have in life are gifts from relatives.

Gifts with obligations

Indeed, Paul has internalized the gifting logic of his elders, telling me that he thinks it is important to give food to relatives.[7] Yet as a commercial shell fisher, Paul also exchanges commodities for commodities, allowing him to accrue profit. Thus, Paul's relationship with his relatives is also shaped by the logic of the workmanship ideal. However, it should be noted that Paul *always* gives away to members of his community shellfish he can't sell. Thus, even Paul's acts of commodification of shellfish are situated within a relational context.

Indeed, beaming with pride, Paul told me how long he has been giving away fish:

> Paul: "I've been giving away fish since I was born …"
>
> Author: "Can you walk me through [the process of trading and sharing]?"
>
> Paul: "So we'll sit there on the dock and fillet it all. Whoever comes along and [we'll] just give it away."
>
> Author: "Okay. How do people know how to get it? Do you tell people?"
>
> Paul: "We just tell them as they are walking down the dock."

---

[7] Paul (male, age 30–40, rural, commercial fisher), in interview with author. April 2015. All quotations referring Paul are from this interview.

Note that Paul gives fish to *anyone* who is willing to take fish from him. Paul Nadasdy (2003) observed similar practices by Kluane hunters who gave away meat to any person who wanted it. Nadasdy (68) notes that such actions "functioned as a principle of social organization, embedding people in sets of reciprocal obligations and reinforcing ties with kin." Thus, Paul's "arbitrary" distribution of fish to his relatives is actually a purposive act that is deeply informed by a relational logic that argues that good relatives establish relationships rooted in reciprocity.

Indeed, in the following conversation, Paul discusses the obligations he attached to the gifts he gave his relatives:

> [Paul's Relatives]: "We don't understand why you are not giving us fish."
>
> [Paul]: "'The reason we are not giving you fish is because of what you did with the last fish. Because you fucking tossed it out in the garbage!' Yeah, they like it, but they don't know how to deal with it. That's a problem with our people."

I thought when Paul said "they don't know how to deal with it" he meant that his relatives don't know how to process fish. Paul clarifies matters in the following conversation:

> Paul: "It's just the smell."
>
> Author: "They don't like the smell, you think?"
>
> Paul: "Yeah, they don't like the smell. It's just the smell. They don't like it."

Here we can see that Paul thinks his relatives are not fulfilling the obligations attached to the gift he has given them, and as such, he stops giving them fish. Paul's actions are similar to those of other Indigenous peoples, such as the Kluane, who sanctioned individuals who behaved in a disrespectful manner towards nonhuman relatives such as moose by denying them gifts of recognition (Nadasdy 2005). Thus, like the Kluane, Paul is using social pressure to change the actions of disrespectful community members to be more in line with communal norms.

Commodities with obligations

Paul's social practices (i.e., giving away seafood) seem to fit comfortably within the confines of Indigenous communal norms. What about the social practices of a commercial fisher such as Penny? Can the act of selling fish exist within the confines of Indigenous communal norms?

Before we investigate this question, here is a little background information about Penny. He has spent most of his life fishing, moving his way up from deckhand to skipper, a position he has held for ten years.[8] It would seem that Penny's relationship with the salmon he catches exists solely within the confines of the workmanship ideal. After all, Penny's crew *sell* their productive capacities to Penny for a wage, and Penny and his crew catch, commodify, and exchange salmon for money. Yet Penny doesn't *just* fish according to the logics of the workmanship ideal as demonstrated by the following conversation:

> Penny: "Usually when we go out fishing we … are out before daybreak. We usually make coffee and breakfast. We have our portion and we always save a portion and put it out on deck … for the spirits [of the fish] out on the water. We usually say a prayer for them … it's just something we've always done."
>
> Author: "Because you were taught by family?"
>
> Penny: "Yup … When we go out hunting, we usually put out tobacco … It's just a way of saying thank you to what's coming to us. Like the animals are giving themselves to us as nourishment."
>
> Author: "And is that a way to pay them back?"
>
> Penny: "Yeah. It helps their spirit go out."

Penny's story recalls Anishinaabe scholar Leanne Simpson's (2008, 34) description of treaties between nonhuman animals and the Anishinaabe. During this treaty process, animals told the Anishinaabe to "not waste our flesh. Preserve fields and forests for our homes. To show your commitment to these things and as a remembrance of the anguish you have brought upon us, always leave tobacco leaf from where you take us. Gifts are important to build our relationship once again." Indeed, Penny explicitly states that salmon is *giving itself* to him as nourishment and this act needs to be acknowledged and "paid back" so that the animals will no longer suffer. Thus, Penny is using gifts – tobacco and food – to establish relationships with nonhuman animals that are rooted in relational logics of reciprocity. Yet recall that Penny's relationship with salmon is also rooted in market logic that allows him to accrue individual profit from the sale of a commodity. Thus, when Penny engages in commercial salmon fishing, he is engaging in two distinct forms of economic exchange at

[8] Penny (male, age 30–40, rural, commercial shellfish fisher), in interview with author. April 2015. All quotations referring to Penny are from this interview.

the same time: one rooted in market logic and the other rooted in the logics of Indigenous ontologies.

Working relationships

The types of economic activity Paul and Penny are engaged in (as independent fishers) seem to allow for the infusion of Indigenous values into the commodification process. But what about people who have to sell their productive capacities for wages? What is the relationship between their economic practices and their Indigenous values? To answer this question, let us turn to two Indigenous workers, Zachary and Poly. Zachary, an urban male who works in the food service industry, also earns a wage by processing salmon his father-in-law catches during fishing season. Zachary's father-in-law is a fisher who hires family and extended family to process fish he catches. Zachary's father-in-law keeps the majority of the profits from the sale of salmon on the black market, a fact Zachary considers uncontroversial, shrugging as he says, "They're his fish."[9] Thus, Zachary's relationship with salmon exists within the confines of the workmanship ideal.

Yet the logics of workmanship aren't the only logics shaping Zachary's relationship to salmon or to his father-in-law. Zachary told me he has quite a good relationship with his father-in-law and his extended family. Indeed, Zachary told me that his father-in-law and his father-in-law's immediate and extended family – who are all Indigenous – helped him develop the skills required to process salmon:

> Zachary: "[My father-in-law] is always trying to show me how they [clean fish] and every time I try, I can't do it as fast as them."
>
> Author: "But, um, so they just mainly joke around with you?"
>
> Zachary: "Yeah … but they also at the same time … walked me through how [to clean fish] properly … so I don't get hurt … or ... waste the fish."

Indeed, note that Zachary's father-in-law patiently and gently walks Zachary through the process of cleaning fish. This process culminates in Zachary being exposed to Indigenous ceremonial practices:

> Author: "Explain, what you guys talk about when you're fishing."
>
> Zachary: "Like when we're cleaning the fish or whatever?"

[9] Zachary (male, age 20–30, urban, service worker), in interview with the author. March 2015. All quotations referring to Zachary are from this interview.

Author: "When did he teach you about the cedar wood thing? Where were you?"

Zachary: "We were at his house, cleaning fish. And he asked if I knew what our ancestors used to do with the fish when they were done with them. I said no. He said his grandpa told him that … when we were done with the fish, put it on the cedar branches and put it back in the water. And say thank you."

Like Penny earlier in this study, Zachary's father-in-law and Zachary give a gift to their nonhuman relations. Scholars note (Coulthard 2014; Nadasdy 2007) that Indigenous hunters often offer gifts (such as tobacco) to their nonhuman relatives as a way to establish and maintain relationships of reciprocal responsibilities with the animal they are hunting. However, unlike hunters, Zachary's and Zachary's father-in-law's relationship with their nonhuman relations occurs within the confines of market relations. As such, Zachary's father-in-law is not only giving gifts to salmon for providing them with direct sustenance, but also for allowing them to generate profit. Thus, like Penny, Zachary and Zachary's father-in-law are engaged in two different types of exchanges simultaneously – relational and market based.

After performing the ceremony of thanksgiving, Zachary became curious about his ancestors:

After I was told what [my ancestors] would do with the fish … that's when I started getting involved, and asking questions. I wanted to know ... what [my ancestors] did with [the salmon]. How they enjoyed it.

As E. Richard Atleo (2004) observes, such transfers of gifts should be viewed through a pragmatic lens: people transfer gifts to each other to keep relationships alive. Indeed, Zachary's father-in-law's decision to transfer knowledge to Zachary is not only heartwarming, but it also keeps the spirit of Zachary's Indigenous ancestors alive.

Like Zachary, Poly, a female rural educator, who trades and shares traditional food she gathers in her spare time, also used the trading and sharing of food to keep the spirits of her ancestors alive. Poly is a prolific harvester of traditional food to the point that she feels quite comfortable teaching other people how to harvest and gather bush foods. Yet notice in my conversation with Poly how she focuses on seemingly "non-traditional" everyday practices, such as eating lunch at work:

Our grandpa used to go out and get salmon and give it all away … I think some of that still happens in some ways. Like when I was

> [working] in search and rescue it was mostly with non-[Indigenous] people, but there was a couple of other [Indigenous people] there. And one of them … always brought smoked salmon and … explicitly shared it with me because we're relatives. It was like this little underground thing going on … we had a different connection than all the other people in that group.[10]

It should be noted that Poly is very distantly related to the person she is calling a relative; indeed, he is from a different Indigenous nation than she is. Regardless, note how Poly links the actions of her ancestors to the everyday practices of her Indigenous relatives. Also note the intentionality that Poly links to the actions of her relative: he deliberately gives her fish because he sees her as family. Thus, it seems that the food sharing practices of Poly's relative work to create familial bonds between two relatives.

Later in the conversation, Poly explicates on the connection between recognition, relationality, respect, reciprocity, and responsibility:

> I still see [sharing of food in] a lot of places. Like, our families are really important. I know now that we say "I'm from this [Indigenous nation] and that person is from that [Indigenous nation] and that person is from that [Indigenous nation]." But more important than that is who our family are.

For Poly, food sharing is linked to the obligation of recognizing members of one's family, which in turn, allows one to recognize the context in which one is situated. This process of recognition via respect is reminiscent of Atleo's (2004, 22) observation, "The apparent differences between life forms are real but not in any essential way. Community is a natural order of existence, and one of its functions can be to reconcile the apparent differences perceived among its members." Indeed, Poly's extensive conceptualization of family allowed her to recognize that, even though the Indigenous person sharing food with her is from a different Indigenous nation, he is her family.

Yet this secret exchange of gifts for gratitude occurred within a workspace where Poly and her Indigenous relative were selling their productive capacities to an employer for a wage. Thus, Poly and her relative's Indigenous values shaped how they engaged in the wage labour process. Indeed, broadly speaking, research has demonstrated that how people engage in wage labour is informed by non-market rationales such

---

[10] Poly (female, age 30–40, rural, service worker), in interview with the author. March 2015. All quotations referring to Poly are from this interview.

as culture (Jenkins 1994), enjoyment (Shapiro 2001), solidarity (Snyder 1999), and pleasure (Cheng and Kim 2014). However, like Penny and Zachary before her, Poly was not only working according to her cultural values, but was also engaged in two different forms of economic exchange at the same time: one rooted in the logics of the workmanship ideal and the other rooted in the logics of relationality.

Morality, workmanship, and Indigenous ontologies

Viktor, a young urban Indigenous male who works at a convenience store, sells "food fish" that his Indigenous nation gives to him and to other community members who live off-reserve.[11] Viktor produces various commodities (such as jarred fish, smoked salmon, fillets, etc.) from his food fish.[12] As Shapiro (2001) notes, the workmanship ideal incentivizes people to work in creative and ingenious ways so as to maximize the fruits of their labour. In turn, the workmanship ideal creates an intangible feeling of pride for creating something that one can call one's own. Indeed, Viktor is quite proud of his ability to make a considerable profit from the relatively small amount of fish he owns. Thus, it seems Viktor produces and sells commodities according to the logics of the workmanship ideal.

Viktor justifies selling his food fish by saying it allows him to buy other necessities such as milk. Viktor also justifies selling salmon by arguing that he owns his food fish:

> The way I think about [salmon that my Indigenous nation gives me] is it's now mine … It's given to me to help me get through the year … I do with it as I please – that's my business.… My mom tries to give me heck for [selling salmon] … But I don't sell all of it either. If there are people that appreciate it … I'll clean it, prepare it for them, and bring it over. And I'm like "Here, I have an extra fish. You guys want it?"

Here, Viktor is explicitly arguing that since he owns his fish he can sell them for profit. Thus, it appears that economically and morally, Viktor's relationship with food fish is shaped by the workmanship ideal. Yet note that Viktor's mother admonishes him for selling fish. Thus, it

[11] Indigenous nations are issued communal licences by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (Brown 2010). Viktor is describing fish that his Indigenous nation caught under this licence (often referred to as "food fish") that were distributed to community members who live off-reserve.

[12] Viktor (male, age 30–40, urban, service worker), in interview with the author. March 2015. All quotations referring to Viktor are from this interview.

seems Viktor's mother also plays an important role in determining how Viktor interacts with food fish.

Indeed, Viktor told me that his mother raised him according to "traditional values." Further, Viktor told me that his mother takes pride in informing off-reserve family members about "[deliveries of] food fish [from her Indigenous nation] … [and deliveries of] Christmas hampers." Thus, Viktor's mother uses food to maintain familial bonds with members of her Indigenous nation who live in the city.

After telling me the above story, Viktor recounts a conversation he had with his mother one summer when he lied to her about why he sold all of his food fish. Viktor told his mother he sold all of his fish because he had no storage, to which Viktor's mother replied:

> [Vitkor's mother]: "Well you could have put it in my freezer."
>
> [Viktor]: "I needed freezer bags, I needed jars, I needed stuff to store it with!"
>
> [Vitkor's mother]: "Why did you sell all of them?"
>
> [Viktor]: "I had buyers!"

It appears that *morally* Viktor's mother is operating from a position that is in opposition to the workmanship ideal. Indeed, if she was operating according to the tenets of self-ownership and workmanship she would not be asking Viktor why he sold his fish. Rather, it appears that since Viktor's mother is a traditionalist who uses food to build relationships, she would agree with Nuu-chah-nulth scholar Charlotte Coté (2016), who argues that it is morally wrong to turn gifts into commodities.

Given that Viktor's mother is morally put off by her son's decision to sell his food fish, one could ask why she doesn't just tell him not to sell fish. As noted earlier, Indigenous peoples such as the Kluane (Nadasdy 2005) use indirect social pressure, such as gossip or shaming, as a means to govern the behaviour of community members they think are acting disrespectfully. Indeed, it appears that Viktor's mother is using a persistent line of questioning to make her son feel guilty about selling fish. As such, Viktor associates his mother's line of questioning with an act of sanction. Thus, it seems that how Viktor sells fish is shaped by the logics of the workmanship ideal *and* Indigenous governing logics.

Like Viktor, Suzie also describes how her relatives use morality to govern her ability to trade and share food fish. Indeed, Suzie told me she thinks administrators of her Indigenous nation treat her poorly because she lives off-reserve. Suzie claims that administrators of her Indigenous

nation refer to her as "city folk."[13] Suzie recalls a conversation with administrators where she was asking why her food fish wasn't delivered to her and the administrators replied in a "sleazy" and "rude" fashion. After recounting this altercation, Suzie angrily declares:

> [Administrators of my Indigenous nation] think we [urban Indigenous people] don't deserve this or we don't deserve that. But I deserve everything, because I'm [a member of my Indigenous nation]. I go over people's heads [to get what I want]."

Later in the conversation, Suzie clarified her comments, noting that "going over people's heads" entailed her calling on-reserve family members to resolve the situation in her favour.

As noted earlier, the logic of the workmanship ideal instills in people the idea that the deserts they receive in life are based on their individual choices and work (Shapiro 2012). Indeed, recall that Suzie thinks that administrators of her Indigenous nation think that off-reserve community members don't *deserve* food fish. Or, put more bluntly, on-reserve people deserve fish; off-reserve people don't deserve fish because they live in the city. Thus, it appears that the administrator of Suzie's Indigenous nation is deploying the logic of the workmanship ideal to try to limit Suzie's access to her shares of food fish.

Suzie's statement that she *deserves* everything is different from the argument of the administrator of her Indigenous nation that Suzie deserves nothing because Suzie links the word "deserve" to her Indigenous nation, while the administrator links the word "deserve" to an on-reserve / off-reserve binary. Thus, Suzie is arguing that administrators of her Indigenous nation have a responsibility to give her food fish regardless of where she lives. Indeed, as Mark Rifkin (2011) observes, Indigenous peoples' expansive definition of family transcends boundaries of geography and even species. From this perspective, relatives have a responsibility to care for their family regardless of where they live. Thus, Suzie is using Indigenous governing logics to argue for her shares of food fish.

It's important to recognize that Suzie's Indigenous nation is also *governing* according to the logic that they have obligations to family that transcend geographic boundaries. After all, Suzie's Indigenous nation delivers and distributes fish to people who live off-reserve. Further, Suzie's on-reserve family persuaded administrators of their Indigenous

[13] Suzie (female, age 50–60, urban, recipient of government income assistance), in interview with author. March 2015. All quotations referring to Suzie are from this interview.

nation to give Suzie her share of food fish. So, it appears Suzie's relative also believes they have relational responsibilities towards Suzie that transcend geography. Thus, Suzie's Indigenous nation, Suzie, and Suzie's on-reserve relative all bypass the governing logic of the workmanship ideal by deploying the idea that family have a responsibility to care for their relatives regardless of where they live.

Working through hard times to build relationships

So far, we have looked at the food trading and sharing practices of Indigenous elders (Lou), fishers (Paul and Penny), and service workers (Zachary, Poly, and Viktor). In this last section, I look at how the food trading and sharing practices of two Indigenous people on income assistance, Suzie and Patti, are shaped by the workmanship ideal and by Indigenous governing logics. Before going any further, I think it's important to introduce Patti, an elderly Indigenous woman living in an urban community who trades and shares food fish, along with other foods such as bread and turkey. Both Suzie and Patti[14] receive their income through the British Columbia Employment and Assistance Program (BCEA). The BCEA is a two-tiered program, providing temporary assistance to people who are able to work and disability assistance to people who cannot work because of medical conditions (Pulkingham 2015). As Pulkingham (156) observes, the BCEA's practice of linking social assistance to whether one is physically capable of working or not entrenches "old divisions between the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor." Thus, social assistance in British Columbia uses the logic of the workmanship ideal on two levels: it explicitly links entitlements to individual work or choices; it implies that *morally* some people deserve social assistance (the disabled) while others (the able-bodied) do not. Thus, since both Patti and Suzie receive their income through disability assistance, their ability to trade and share food is substantially shaped by the logics of the workmanship ideal.

While disability assistance recipients might be seen as "morally worthy" of social assistance, the income they receive from the government is only negligibly different from people who receive temporary assistance (Pulkingham 2015). Indeed, as Pulkingham (157) observes, disability assistance recipients are "considerably worse off financially than they were 20 years ago" meaning that, though they are seen as "deserving" of assistance, their incomes have very little purchasing power. Further,

[14] Patti (female, age 60–70, urban, recipient of government income assistance), in interview with author. March 2015. All quotations referring to Patti are from this interview.

while the BCEA allows people who receive disability assistance to earn a portion of their benefits (Pulkingham), both Patti and Suzie cannot take advantage of these earning exemptions because their physical disabilities prevent them from working. As such, both Suzie and Patti often have to acquire food from food banks, soup kitchens, and their family members to meet their subsistence needs.

In the following conversation, Suzie describes such trading and sharing activities and why she engages in them:

> Suzie: "I share because, even though I feel like I am having a hard time, somebody is having a worse time than I am. And they probably need it more than I do. Like this family just moved to [in to the city] three weeks ago and somebody told her that I would help her with food … [When we met] she [told me], 'Well, we just started and we [have nothing].'"
>
> Author: "White family?"
>
> Suzie: "Yeah … And we [gave her] food. And then I gave her a gift card."
>
> Author: "So why do you help out strangers?"
>
> Suzie: "Just the way I was brought up … by my uncle. He was always such a big giver. I think it is culture … just the people that had a good influence on me. About, you know, giving us food when we are hungry. Giving us shelter. Being nice even if they don't have to."

Note that Suzie links her act of giving food to non-Indigenous people to her culture. Suzie learned the importance of giving from family, whose actions spring forth from and occur within the context of community (her uncles' actions are informed by "culture") and are linked to reciprocal obligations (Suzie's uncle taught her the importance of sharing, so Suzie shares). Thus, one could argue that Suzie, like her uncle, gives gifts to non-Indigenous people because she is situated within a "culture of gratitude" where "everyone knows that gifts will follow the circle of reciprocity and flow back to you again" (Kimmerer 2013, 381). Yet Suzie and the non-Indigenous family she shares food with are part of a group of people whose incomes have very little purchasing power and as such *are forced* to seek out assistance from food banks, soup kitchens, and other people on social assistance. Indeed, the BCEA was designed to encourage people to obtain their income from participating in the market economy or by relying on family for assistance (Pulkingham 2015). Thus, neoliberal welfare programs such as the BCEA *encourage* "self-reliance"

(144), forcing poor people to develop alternative subsistence strategies, such as "privatized familial support" (144),[15] papering over the systemic causes of poverty. Thus, Suzie's ability to create familial bonds with non-Indigenous peoples is shaped by BCEA policy that links entitlements to work as well as to Indigenous relational logics.

Finally, in the following conversation, Patti explains how her food trading and sharing practices are informed by her grandmothers' and father's teachings:

Author: "Why do you offer [fish to friends]?"

Patti: "Because it is very expensive to buy salmon. I don't do it because I expect something [in return]. I do it because it is how I was brought up."

Author: "Who brought you up that way?"

Patti: "My [grandmothers] and my dad."

Author: "What did they tell you about sharing?"

Patti: "It is very good to do it [without] expecting anything in return. [Share food] because that is how we were, how it was. [We] shar[ed] with each other with whatever we [could]."

Here, like other food traders and sharers in this study, Patti attaches the phrase "expect nothing in return" to a normative statement such as "It is very good to do it." These normative statements flow from the confines of community (i.e., "It is how *we* were") and are linked to reciprocal relationships (i.e., "Sharing with each other"). Hence, for Patti, good relationships spring forth from acts of reciprocal exchange that occur in the context of community.

Patti uses the above Indigenous governing logic to establish relationships with other people who are on social assistance. For instance, Patti told me that she learned through social media that a local homeless shelter would *not* be serving Christmas dinner to their clients. As such, Patti decided to cook and share with the homeless shelter one of two turkeys she had in her possession:

Author: "How long did that take?"

Patti: "It took about three-and-a-half to four hours."

---

[15] In the above quote, Pulkingham is referring specifically to policy implemented by the BC NDP under the BC Benefits Program. However, as Pulkingham (147) notes, the BCEA entrenched these policies.

Author: "And where did you get your turkeys from?"

Patti: "I got it from my Christmas hamper."

Author: "And where did you get the extra one from?"

Patti: "I got it from a secret Santa. I like to share what I can. Someone needs the help, I'll do it. It's just how I was brought up."

When Patti says she shares with homeless people because of the way she was "brought up," she is referring to the logics of the gift that her grandmother and father taught her. Thus, Patti shares food with clients of homeless shelters because she was told that sharing is what good relatives do.

Later, Patti tells me another reason she shares food with clients of homeless shelters: "It's very important [to share] because, I can imagine how lonely they are. They have no one, you know? They have nothing."

Here, Patti is using recognition via respect to establish reciprocal relationships with other clients of homeless shelters, which in turn causes Patti to reflect upon her own subject position. Yet as illuminating and inspiring as Patti's actions are, the reason she has developed a relationship with clients of homeless shelters in the first place is because she is governed by policies that link entitlements to individual work. As such, to meet her subsistence needs, Patti is forced to seek out social assistance from non-governmental agencies, such as soup kitchens that serve clients of homeless shelters. Yet the impoverished context in which Patti, Suzie, and their impoverished relations live is not a product of their individual work, but rather complex socio-economic processes (i.e., collective work) (Lyon-Callo 2008). Further, neither Patti or Suzie chose to have disabilities that prevent them from engaging in wage labour. Given these facts, one could question whether Patti, Suzie, or their impoverished relatives deserve to live in the contexts in which they find themselves.

CONCLUSION

The Indigenous peoples in this article taught me the ways in which Indigenous governing logics are demonstrated change to fit the context in which people live. Indeed, all participants were comfortable connecting their Indigenous values to modern, quotidian practices. These quotidian practices themselves exist in contexts that are governed according to the entangled logics of workmanship and relationality. This article further demonstrates that the routine practices of Indigenous peoples who trade and share food, even when informed by the logics of workmanship, are

used to establish relationships that are attached to a set of responsibilities. Thus, it is the hope that this article can contribute to research that begins to explore the ways in which the food trading and sharing practices of contemporary Indigenous peoples are shaped by both Indigenous ontologies and market relations.

REFERENCES

Atleo, E. Richard. 2004. *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth worldview.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

—. 2011. *Principles of Tsawalk: An Indigenous Approach to a Global Crisis.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

Blaser, Mario. 2009. "The threat of the Yrmo: The Political Ontology of a Sustainable Hunting Program." *American Anthropologist* 111 (1): 10–20.

Brown, Kimberly, Linkous. 2010. "Highliners and Moneymakers: Understanding Accommodation and Resistance in the Sto:lo Commercial Fishery." *New Proposals: Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry* 3 (3): 20–31.

Cheng, Sealing, and Eunjung Kim. 2014. "The Paradoxes of Neoliberalism: Migrant Korean sex Workers in the United States and "Sex Trafficking." *Social Politics* 21(3): 355–81.

Cidro, Jaime, Martens, Tabitha, and Lance Guilbault. 2016. "Traditional Indigenous Food Upskilling as a Pathway to Urban Indigenous Food Sovereignty." In *Indigenous Perspectives on Education for Well-being in Canada*, eds. Frank Deer and Thomas Falkenberg. Winnipeg: ESWB Press.

Coleman, Charly. 2014. *The Virtues of Abandon: An Anti-individualist History of the French Enlightenment.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Corntassel, Jeff, and Cheryl Bryce. 2012. "Practicing Sustainable Self-Determination: Indigenous Approaches to Cultural Restoration and Revitalization." *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 18 (3): 151–66.

Coté, Charlotte. 2016. "'Indigenizing' Food Sovereignty. Revitalizing Indigenous Food Practices and Ecological Knowledges in Canada and the United States." *Humanities* 5 (3): 57–70.

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Cruikshank, Julie. 2005. *Do glaciers Listen? Local Knowledge, Colonial Encounters, and Social Imagination.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

Daigle, Michelle. 2016. "Awawanenitakik: The Spatial Politics of Recognition and Relational Geographies of Indigenous Self-Determination." *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien* 60 (2): 259–69.

Jenkins, Alan. 1994. "Just-in-Time, Regimes and Reductionism." *Sociology* 28 (1): 21–30.

Kimmerer, Robin. 2013. *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge, and the Teaching of plants.* Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions.

King, Hayden. 2015. "The Problem with "Indigenous Peoples": Reconsidering International Indigenous Rights Activism." In *More Will Sing Their Way to*

Freedom: Indigenous Resistance and Resurgence, ed. Emma LaRocque. Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
Kohn, Eduardo. 2007. "How Dogs Dream: Amazonian Natures and The Politics of Transspecies Engagement." *American Ethnologist* 34, 1: 3–24.
Kovach, Margaret. 2010. *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Locke, John. 1689/1988. *Second Treatise of Government*. Ed. Peter Laslett. Cambridge University Press.
Lyon-Callo, Vincent. 2008. *Inequality, Poverty, and Neoliberal Governance: Activist Ethnography in the Homeless Sheltering Industry*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Menzies, Charles R., and Caroline F. Butler. 2008. "The Indigenous Foundation of the Resource Economy of BC's North Coast." *Labour/Le Travail* 61: 131–49.
Million, Dian. 2013. *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an age of Indigenous Human Rights*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
Nadasdy, Paul. 2003. *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge, and Aboriginal-State Relations in the Southwest Yukon*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
—. 2005. "Transcending the Debate Over the Ecologically Noble Indian: Indigenous Peoples and Environmentalism." *Ethnohistory* 52, 2: 291-331.
—. 2007. "The Gift in the Animal: The Ontology of Hunting and Human–Animal Sociality." *American Ethnologist* 34, 1: 25–43.
Porsanger, Jelena. 2004. "An Essay about Indigenous Methodology." *Nordlit* 8, 1: 105–20.
Pulkingham, Jane. 2015. "Social assistance in British Columbia." In *Welfare Reform in Canada: Provincial Social Assistance in Comparative Perspective*, ed. Daniel Beland and Pierre Marc Daigneault. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Rifkin, Mark. 2011. *When did Indians Become Straight? Kinship, the History of Sexuality, and Native Sovereignty*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Satterfield, Terre, Leslie Robertson, Nathan Vadeboncoeur, and Anton Pitts. 2017. "Implications of a Changing Climate for Food Sovereignty in Coastal British Columbia." In *Conservation for the Anthropocene Ocean: Interdisciplinary Science in Support of Nature and People*, eds. P.S. Levin and M.R. Poe. Academic Press: London.
Shapiro, Ian. 1991. "Resources, Capacities, and Ownership: The Workmanship Ideal and Distributive Justice." *Political Theory* 19, 1: 47–72.
—. 2001. *Democratic Justice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
—. 2012. *The Moral Foundations of Politics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Simpson, Leanne R. 2008. "Looking after Gdoo-naaganinaa: Precolonial Nishnaabeg Diplomatic and Treaty Relationships." *Wicazo Sa Review* 23, 2: 29–42.
Snyder, Richard. "After Neoliberalism: The Politics of Reregulation in Mexico." *World Politics* 51, 2: 173–204.
Todd, Zoe. "An Indigenous Feminist's Take on the Ontological Turn: 'Ontology' is Just Another Word for Colonialism." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 29, 1: 4–22.

Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 1998. "Cosmological Deixis and Amerindian perspectivism." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 4: 469–88.
Wilson, Shawn. 2008. *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
Wilson, Stan. "Self-as-relationship in Indigenous Research." *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 25, 2 (2001): 91–92.
Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, 4: 387–409.
Workman, Thomas. 2009. *If You're in My Way I'm Walking: The Assault on Working People Since* 1970. Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing.