Having CLOUT:

Becoming an ally and having the power to resist colonialism and neoliberalism in Winnipeg's inner city

By Carole S. O'Brien

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

In partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

Master of City Planning

Department of City Planning
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg

Copyright © 2013 by Carole O'Brien

Abstract

Becoming an ally to Indigenous peoples, as a planner, depends on understanding the oppressive dynamics of colonialism and neoliberalism that invisibilize their everyday realities. Resisting these dynamics as an ally, and as a planner, also depends on becoming liberated from them, and to create spaces for collectivization, since only the collective has the power to resist the oppressive systems and discourses that characterize these ideologies. In Winnipeg, a coalition of Indigenous inner city community development practitioners (CLOUT) is effectively resisting these hegemonies. Contrasting this everyday resistance praxis is the practice of non-Indigenous city planners who are placated in their own everyday by the problems of difference and separation these hegemonies produce; effectively being thwarted in their ability to resist. Alliance building will remain a challenge between these two groups, that is unless the planners learn from CLOUT: become allies to each other, unlearn their euro-western way of thinking and learn the value of practices oriented towards integration, that in themselves counter the divisive nature colonialism and neoliberalism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To the women of CLOUT - your everyday community development praxis inspires me daily.

To the planners - your openness and frankness is truly appreciated.

Merci Pierrette - d'avoir cru en cette aventure dès le début.

Dad - Thank you for all that you are to me.

Shauna - Who would have thought that fateful summer internship project would become such a rich backdrop upon which to hang my intellectual hat? Thank you for showing me the way and for being a support every step of this journey.

Jim - Thank you for your frankness and for your politicized academic struggle for Indigenous social justice

And Richard - THANK YOU for stepping into the breach, for your clarity and for your generosity. I also appreciate the long rope.

Sarah Cooper - for being there;
Val Paape - for teaching me the true meaning of the yamas and the niyamasa;
Ian Skelton - for believing in this project while it was still a kernel of an idea**;**
My classmates - for teaching this old girl some new tricks;
Françoise Morel et Ginette Morel - pour votre appui;
Iain Wight - for lending me your ears;
Mary Warmbrod - for keeping me afloat;
My yoga students - for your interest and gentle inquiries along the way;
and Maintain the Momentum - for being a safe place to test ideas.

I hereby acknowledge the Indigenous peoples who were signatories to Treaty One, the traditional owners of the land upon which I live and work in Winnipeg.

I also acknowledge the generous financial support of the University of Manitoba Fellowship and the Social Science and Humanity Research Council.

À Renée…

Je te dédie ce mémoire de maîtrise.
Ta vie, trop courte et difficile, inspire toutes ces pensées.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ii
Acknowledgements iii
Dedication iv

Chapter 1. ABOUT THIS STORY 1

A film about a media story, and a story about a film 9

Chapter 2. STORYTELLING and ALLIANCE BUILDING 11

I. MOBILIZING: The Power Of Stories 13

Storytelling and planning 16
The tension between power, justice and democracy 18
The story of colonialism 22
The power of neoliberalism 25

II. STABILIZING KNOWLEDGE: Understanding Oppression 32

Stories and myths about Indigenous people 33
The problem of difference: separation and invisibility 35
The struggle for recognition 40
Systems and discourses that prevent collectivization and resistance 43

III. DEVELOPING STRENGTH and FLEXIBILITY: Understanding Liberation 48

Indigenous/anti-colonial resistance 51
Liberation in planning 52
There is a crack in everything 56

IV. ALIGNING ACTION with KNOWLEDGE: Becoming an Ally 60

Being an ally to Indigenous peoples 62
On the art of working together 66

Chapter 3. GENERATING THE RESEARCH DATA 75

Interviewing is not a neutral activity 76
The challenges of analyzing the data 78
Limitations of the research and ethics approval 80

Chapter 4. TELLING THIS LOCAL STORY 82

I. Inciting Incident and Back Story
Responding to everyday politics as allies 83

II. Exposition
Introducing the location 86
Introducing CLOUT 88
Introducing the planners 93

III. Rising Action: Problems with systems and discourse 99

IV. Turning point: Decision time 109

V. Falling Action: Responding with paralysis and resistance 109

VI. Resolution: Potential for becoming allies 117

VII. Dénouement 123

Chapter 5. THAT'S A WRAP ! 128

BIBLIOGRAPHY 138

APPENDICES

A - Summary of Davis & Shpuniarsky 145
B - Bishop's requirements and characteristics of allies 146
C- CLOUT member organizations 147
D - Interview questions 148
E - CLOUT's Principles of alliance building 151
F - The process of becoming an ally and yoga 155
G - Bishop's observations on alliance building 158

Chapter 1. ABOUT THIS STORY

> Academics and new learners who are true allies to Indigenous peoples in the protection of our knowledge "must step outside of their privileged position and challenge research that conforms to the guidelines outlined by the colonial power structure and root their work in the politics of decolonization and anti-colonialism.
>
> Leanne Simpson (2004) (quoted in Hart, 2009, p. 31)

In colonial societies there is a gap in knowledge between knowing that colonialism exists and understanding its effects on the everyday experiences of Indigenous peoples. The same can be said about neoliberalism; while people may know social policies and decisions are based on the notion of free markets and small government, misunderstandings persist about how this ideology negatively affects their everyday lives, even less the everyday lives of Indigenous peoples. In itself, this everyday reality is a barrier to Indigenous-non-Indigenous alliance building. This thesis is an examination of these barriers, especially how colonialism and neoliberalism overlap and work together in creating everyday oppressive structures that challenge the ability to collectivize and therefore build alliances. This exploration also includes the historical, economic, social and political factors that inform everyday Indigenous-non-Indigenous dynamics. Given the differences in worldviews, and the dynamics of homogenization and separation that are produced by colonialism and neoliberalism, an analysis of how these ideologies interact is crucial to understanding how Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples can work together as allies.

The purpose of this research is to analyze the potential for Indigenous-non-Indigenous alliance building between city planners in Winnipeg and Indigenous

community development practitioners who work in the inner city, where a large Indigenous population resides. Framing this analysis are Bishop's (2002) steps to becoming an ally, a journey that starts with understanding oppression in its many forms, to becoming liberated from oppression (especially one's own) and ending with working together. In a perfect world, alliances would be built between two equally powerful and open groups, but this is impossible in the present context of colonialism and neoliberalism. As the planners and the Indigenous community development practitioners describe their everyday it becomes clear that their differences also outweigh their similarities, a reality that negatively affects their potential to becoming allies.

The ultimate goal of this research therefore is to reflect on the practices planners would need to adopt to facilitate alliance building. In the spirit of decolonization, and following the call from Indigenous anti-colonial writers to follow their lead (LaRocque, 2010; Alfred, 1999, 2009; Coulthard, 2007; King, 2003; Maracle, 1996), this thesis chooses to place the onus of doing the brunt of the work of alliance building on non-Indigenous planners, in large part because Indigenous people have been doing the brunt of the work so far (Hart, 2010). This reality exists because non-Indigenous peoples tend to be blind to colonial privilege (Porter, 2010, Bishop, 2002) and to therefore be blind to the need to actively work for social justice. This blindness also exists in academia, where it should not (LaRoque, 2010).

Again in the spirit of decolonization, another goal of this thesis is to create something that could help fill the gaps in people's misunderstandings about the everyday effects of colonialism on Indigenous people, a problem the Indigenous community development practitioners who participate in this research have identified as something they would like to have. The intent to produce something practical also follows bell

hooks' (2008) observation that "a commitment to being progressive leads to a desire to write in a manner that would make my ideas accessible to a world beyond the academy" (p.3). The ultimate shape of this 'tool' will be developed in consultation with participants. The intent is not to provide 'best practices' since they tend to essentialize and erase difference, the very processes Indigenous peoples reject, but to offer orientations to alliance building practices in the context of colonialism and neoliberalism, as a synthesis of the research herein, and of accounts of alliance building in other disciplines - accounts that effectively confirm the reality that theory can rarely provide a clear guide to practice, since it cannot integrate the messiness and the uncertainties of the everyday.

Planning theory is currently awash with anti-neoliberal thought. Anti-colonial literature on the other hand is harder to find. While this reality is partly explained by a dearth of Indigenous theorists in planning, it has created the need in this thesis to incorporate the voices and stories of alliance builders in disciplines related to planning (like social work, or political science and governance studies).

Perhaps the greatest challenge facing planning practice today is the need to become more flexible. While deliberative practices are useful in opening spaces for people to express difference and create a better sense of community, that which planning practices are meant to do, planning needs more; it needs to become politicized. This is a large order however since, as Fainstein (2009) notes, listening to people's stories, and being affected by them, rarely leads to action.

Alliance building is not easy, especially if privilege is not acknowledged, which is also difficult. Both however depend on becoming liberated from oppression, establishing safe spaces and places for authentic dialogue and integrating head and heart in a range of experiential approaches; in other words, taking emotional, political, and imaginative risks.

Breaking planning's institutional silence about colonialism is key. Bottom line, this thesis is an open question about the extent to which planning can transform and be transformative.

> It not enough to simply tell the story, it is equally important that we name, locate, and situate the "story.
>
> Emma LaRocque, 2010, p.33

My journey to write this thesis belongs to a process of becoming, to develop a personal alliance-building justice-oriented planning praxis. In many ways it reads like a manifesto, an approach that underlies my desire to understand the politico-socio-economic dynamics that affect our everyday structures of habit; the reason why I decided to engage in this masters program after decades working as an artist and reporter.

This 'manifesto' is inspired by other manifestos: Taiaiake Alfred's (2009) *Peace, Power, Righteousness,*[1] Libby Porter's (2010) *Unlearning the Colonial Cultures of Planning,* Anne Bishop's (2002) *Becoming an ally*: *Breaking the Cycle of Oppression in people,* and Emma LaRocque's (2010) *When the other is me.* It also incorporates personal experience as a way of expressing the idea that "voice is a recognition of the relationship between power and knowledge, and reveals positionality" (LaRocque, 2010). This means that I acknowledge my societal privilege as I try to work my way through the theory about alliance building while balancing my identity and a sense of belonging to my own culture. This thesis does have a heavy theoretical component, a reality that reflects a personal joy in being in the world of ideas.

---

[1] Taiaiake Alfred is a leader in the Aboriginal Nationalism movement in Canada that is "in favour of political and cultural autonomy, whose institutional expression encompasses collective forms of self-government and a relationship of equals among Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal nations" (Murphy, 2009, p.266). Alfred's *Peace, Power and Righteousness*; *an Indigenous Manifesto* (2009) is a call to mobilize around this view. Libby Porter's *Unlearning the Colonial Cultures of Planning* (2010) can also be seen as a manifesto, as she calls on the need for decolonizing planning practices.

I also use personal experience with the philosophy of Iyengar yoga, in which I am trained as a teacher, since it plays an important part in my understanding of how to be in the world, The literature review is structured along the process of learning yoga in this method: you are first taught to simply move, to be mobile and be aware of body parts; you are then taught fundamental actions, using props to learn how to support self and stabilize; working this way, with more integrity, develops strength and flexibility as well; and as old pains subside, a greater understanding of relationships between muscles groups develops that allow for the learning of more complex poses that require more specific actions. As inner alignment develops, so does clarity of mind.

Each section of the literature review is organized according to this order of learning how to practice yoga. These steps are also paired with Bishop's (2002) steps to becoming an ally, since becoming an ally is a learning process that is similar to the process of learning to control one's body in yoga.

Before I embarked on this journey to acquire a deeper theoretical and practical understanding of the political dynamics that oppress us in our everyday lives, I worked for two decades as an independent filmmaker, exploring the art and craft of storytelling. I also worked for ten years as a TV and radio reporter for Radio-Canada. These experiences taught me the value of storytelling in creating connections; it informs the analysis/narrative section of this thesis that is organized as a five-part dramatic structure. This narrative form was also chosen because the original data for this thesis was generated in the making of a film.

> You don't write because you want to say something,
> you write because you have something to say.
> F. Scott Fitzgerald (1896-1940)

As a visual artist and writer, as someone with a strong need for expression, I am of course writing this thesis because I want to say something. But I am also writing from an understanding of pain, loss, grief, homelessness and placelessness – oppressive aspects of my own everyday. The very act of writing invites reflection, since writing is a way of thinking things through. A choice I made earlier in life to live a life in the margins of the mainstream socio-economic system - while deriving material benefits from it as a non-Indigenous person and as an artist - is also on my mind as I write.

Writing this thesis is also an opportunity to enact a desire for change, in my own life and in society. As someone who like hooks (2008) "only felt at home in the margins" (p.3), and having spent a good part of my life in artistic pursuits, with national and international success, I now wish to turn that energy outward and create a more politicized and more integrated role for myself, to struggle against the systems and discourse that prevent Indigenous-non-Indigenous dialogue – if only locally. In expressing this dream I am keenly aware of LaRocque's (2010) view that 'White' writers "cannot compare their privileged, indeed dominant, positions with Indigenous peoples whose places have been stolen, whose landscapes have been bulldozed, and whose identities have been irreparably disturbed" (p. 167). I can only imagine what being marginalized by colonialism feels like. And clearly my experience of living in the margins is different. My life experience, based mostly on informal knowledge, nonetheless adds substance to this inquiry which is also inspired by Edward Said's praxis of blending his personal and academic lives to make visible the discourses that are

suppressed, or denied, or hidden. My decision to pursue a masters degree in city planning is similarly based on a wish to understand the suppressed, denied and hidden theoretical notions that underpin Canadian politics and to develop a formal, cogent and personal critique of the systems and discourse that support them.

This investigation also takes cues from hooks' (2008) call to unite theory and practice, or "merging critical thinking in everyday life with knowledge learned in books and through study" (p.3), as well as from Indigenous research methods, especially the practice of identifying self, and to situate self in their work, to bridge the space between writer and reader because "our story is who we are" (Kovach, 2009, p. 4). As I attempt to unite theoretical critique, experiential knowledge and everyday language, I am heartened by hooks' view that to do so "is a powerful way to share knowledge, in and outside the academy, across differences, in an oppositional… way" (p.5). This investigation therefore belongs to my growth as an artist, writer, social justice critic, feminist, and seeker of truths. It also combines the many and unique voices I have, as well as the languages I speak; visual talk, head talk, heart talk, gut talk, standard English, standard French, academic talk, vernacular talk, Québecois patois, and the everyday language of the street. As I add my voice to an anti/colonial-neoliberal planning discourse, I also follow Adam Barker (2010) in joining "a dialogue among settlers as we collectively try to figure out our roles and protocols, strengths and weaknesses, and relationships among ourselves and with Indigenous peoples and communities" (p. 316).

I do so aware and thankful for the privilege of living a life of expression, even if, as a non-Indigenous person it was living in the margins; a privilege even for a non-Indigenous person. I know it is built on the colonial marginalization of Indigenous peoples in Canada. I am also cognizant that this privilege allows me to take the risk of

expressing my thoughts in this thesis. My hope is that it will inform activist efforts to build alliances between anti-neoliberal and anti-colonial movements in Winnipeg and join the small number of anti-colonial manifestoes in planning.

A variety of sources were used for literature review and thesis: academic and non-academic literature, peer-reviewed articles, NGO publications, and electronic resources - where many words are used to identify Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. Given that language should validate the everyday, this thesis will use 'Indigenous' and 'non-Indigenous' when referring to the peoples regardless of geography. When referring to the history of colonialism 'settler' is used, and 'colonizer' is used when the context is political. Terms by other writers, like 'Aboriginal', 'White' or 'Indian' are left intact.

A film about a media story, and a story about a film

In the spring of 2010, the City of Winnipeg made a decision to donate over $200,000 per year for 15 years to support the construction of a Youth for Christ (YFC) faith-based recreation and drop-in facility in the inner city. This political decision frustrated the members of a coalition of Indigenous community-based organizations called Community Led Organizations United Together (CLOUT) because they already offered similar youth programs based on Indigenous cultures and values. CLOUT members were frustrated by the lack of opportunity to publicly oppose the project in consultation exercises. Like most Winnipeggers, they only heard about the decision in the local media after the decision was made (Roussin &Christensen, 2010). That YFC stated that its goal in building the drop-in centre was to proselytize Indigenous inner city youth added to CLOUT members' frustration and re-ignited their desire to become more visible. To them, the city's decision was a reflection of their political invisibility outside the inner city community where their community development practices are visible to residents. Faced with this reality, CLOUT's ally, the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives (CCPA), suggested making a film to raise CLOUT's profile outside the inner city community and to redress CLOUT's perceived lack of political clout.

A month before these events occurred, I had been invited to do a summer internship at the CCPA as part of the requirements for a master's in City Planning. My interest in understanding, and working with, the Indigenous community led me to the CCPA, who then capitalized on my previous experience as a filmmaker and reporter in deciding to make a film as a summer research project.

The purpose of the film *Together we have CLOUT* was to give coalition members an opportunity to speak about their community development methods and experiences working within mainstream institutional structures.[2] In the film, we see the women engaging with inner city residents in a variety of community events. They talk about the unstable funding structures that challenge their community development work, the heavy bureaucracy and the complicated reporting demands for efficiency and effectiveness, the barriers to their work, and the lack of meaningful consultation with the city; frustrating realities since their organizations and the work they do are known to politicians.

The film became an opportunity for me to explore CLOUT's perception of the socio-economic-political factors that negatively affect their Indigenous working methods. It led me to ask questions like: Why do planning decisions disregard the voices of inner-city residents? What needs to happen for that to change? How can planners become allies? What are the barriers to alliance building? Why would Indigenous community practitioners, as a group, even want to engage in alliance building with non-Indigenous planners if they feel dismissed? Clearly, I wanted to better understand CLOUT members.

An incident while working on the film crystallized this desire. After the camera was turned off at the end of her interview, CLOUT member I said: "You know, what we really need are translators". The comment felt obvious to me, and I remember thinking "Now, that's something planning-allies could do". When later, I read about colonialism as a form of translation, I remembered what she said. That's when I decided to fully embark on this journey to better understand how to build Indigenous-non-Indigenous alliances. Having built some trust in the making of the film, CLOUT members agreed to participate.

---

[2] The film and its purpose also became the subject of an article for the 2010 State of the Inner City Report *We're in it for the long haul.*

Chapter 2. STORYTELLING and ALLIANCE BUILDING

> It not enough to simply tell the story, it is equally important that we name, locate, and situate the 'story'.
>
> Emma LaRocque, 2010, p. 33

There is a rich literature in planning academia that links storytelling and the power of stories with the need for planning to become a tool for social justice and transformation (Friedmann, 2012; Innes & Booher, 2010; Healey, 2006, 1997; Sandercock, 2003; Eckstein, 2003; Forester, 1993). Of these voices, John Friedmann's stands out; it also led him, in *The Prospect of Cities* (2002), to ask provocative questions like why the official story of cities fails to reflect everyday life, and why people's everyday stories remain hidden in policy decisions. The questions are complex, in large part because they underlie the extent to which people are blind to colonial and neoliberal oppression. These questions also raise other questions like, why are some stories heard and others not, who is telling these stories, and why. Answering these questions is critical to informing practices that seek to transform the social and physical environments that hamper Indigenous-non-Indigenous dialogue.

Exploring the oppressive characteristics of neoliberalism and colonialism is necessary to understanding how to overcome them, and to process of becoming an ally (Bishop, 2002). As a planner, becoming an ally to Indigenous community development practitioners also means recognizing the reality that their everyday practices are related to planning (Marris, 1998). Moreover, these CBOs wield a lot of power locally to mobilize people around local stories of injustice, because they are anchored in the community and to residents in ways planners cannot be. As a planner it is important to understand this

reality as a reflection of the fluid nature of civil society[3] as an interplay between power, politics and citizenship, and between notions of civic duty, responsibility and democracy (Friedmann, 1998) - ideals that are challenged every day, by the simple act of living together in cities. It is also important as planners to learn how to be flexible and strong enough to work within the fluidity of civil society in a self-reflexive manner.

The first section of this literature review presents foundational ideas; namely the power of storytelling, the problems of power and justice in democratic processes as well as the characteristics that define colonialism and neoliberalism - notions that mobilize people to act against social injustice. The need to stabilize this knowledge is the idea guiding section II, an exploration of particular aspects of colonialism and neoliberalism that cause oppression, especially for Indigenous peoples - namely discourse and myths, the problems of difference, separation, invisibility and limited recognition, and problems that prevent collectivization and the ability to resist. The third section examines the idea of liberation from oppression and develops notions to liberate planning practices. Finally, section IV builds on the strength and flexibility gained in section III and aligns these concepts to envision a justice-oriented decolonizing alliance-building planning praxis where transformation occurs through education and empowerment (Friedmann, 2011).

[3] Civil Society is defined here as the organized elements of society that belong neither to the state nor the corporate economy.

I. MOBILIZING: The Power of Stories

> Indigenous people are often, with good reason, preoccupied with unacknowledged and therefore unfinished business of the past. It is particularly important for them to be able to tell their stories.
>
> Leonie Sandercock, 2003, p.163

Stories are seductive, in large part because they speak to people's longing for transformation. Stories also hold communities together when people are able to talk about their shared everyday experiences. The value of these stories is their ability to persuade people to see beyond differences since "the more space a story can make for diverse locally grounded common urban narratives, the more persuasive and the more transformative it will be" (Throgmorton, 2003, p.145). Sharing stories also helps to manage difference in community planning practices, since they can "reconcile the individuated cultural identity with the recognition of the commonality between individuals, who are different" (Healey, 2006, p.44). A critical aspect of the process by which stories can explain, teach and change perceptions is by de-familiarizing and disrupting path dependent thinking processes (Holston, 1998). The disruption becomes a *space* for new ideas to emerge, ideas that can lead to change. Because stories can change ideas and transform people and the places they share, storytelling has become a planning tool of choice for community development, allowing people to talk about the meanings they give to their everyday experience in ways where they can be heard (Sandercock, 2003: Eckstein, 2003; Throgmorton, 2003; Forester, 1998).

Stories however can also be used to oppress people in their everyday. Colonialism and neoliberalism, for example, use stories to create and maintain power over people and social processes (Bishop, 2002). The complex nature of the everyday enables this

oppression in cities; a space and a place where the economy and the everyday are linked, where civil society and the state meet, and where social policies are rolled out. While the everyday is where power over people is activated, it is also where civil society rises up to struggle against power for justice and transformation (Friedmann & Douglass, 1998) in large part through the power of stories about injustice in the everyday.

The growing number of justice-oriented calls in planning theory however are hindered by the challenge of defining justice, in spite of the reality that "moral outrage over an injustice suggests that we have a sense of justice, inarticulate as it may be" (Friedmann, 2002, p.104), or despite the reality that most people will agree on what is right and wrong, since "our knowledge of what constitutes injustice is virtually instinctive" (Fainstein, 2010, p.3).

In *The Just City* (2010) Fainstein argues that justice is a balance between equity, recognition (or diversity) and democracy, with different values given to each element. To her, just planning practices are defined by their outcomes, and just outcomes are more likely to occur if planners' goals are justice-oriented. That planners work in civil society is, to her, a golden opportunity to affect deliberations and to "intrude in the planning process and advocate for the application of normative concepts of the just city" (p.9).

Everyday practices, however, reveal "the reality that unjust ends can result from relatively just processes" (Connolly & Steil, 2009, p.4). A study by Abu-Lughod (1998) also shows that the "goodness" of planning practices does not necessarily lead to good results. Justice-oriented practices are also complicated by the reality that justice is sensitive to time and place, since the history of a locality and its particular economic and social forces, shape the local definition of justice. As Harvey (2002) notes:

> "Justice and rationality take on different meanings across space and time and persons, yet, the existence of everyday meanings to which people do attach importance and which to them appear unproblematic, gives the terms a political and mobilizing power that can never be neglected. Right and wrong are words that power revolutionary changes and no amount of negative deconstruction of such terms can deny that" (Harvey, 2002, quoted in Fainstein, 2010, p. 11).

Another challenge to justice-oriented practices is that while people may be moved by stories of injustice, and while the idea of transformation may spur their imaginations about the struggle for justice, people tend to resist becoming mobilized or change. The challenge, as Fainstein (2009) notes, to "persuade people to transcend their own narrow self-interest and realize that gains can be had from collective enterprise" (p.35), is more acute for the privileged for whom it is more difficult to think in terms of justice. People's ability to embrace the collective enterprises is also challenged by the reality that spaces are inherently agonistic, fragile and temporary (Amin, 2002)[4] and do not inherently promote collectivization. Despite these challenges, justice-oriented planning theorists are nonetheless calling for the creation of spaces in the city that can reduce **uncertainty** because "the less preoccupied we are with defending ourselves, the more energy we can release" (Marris, 1998, p.14). This is the value of storytelling, in releasing a sense of stability (since certainty is as fleeting as the everyday reality about constant change); which explains why storytelling became important to justice-oriented planning practices.

[4] Some justice-oriented planning theorists like Ananya Roy (2006) argue against working to create common spaces because of this agonistic quality (p.21).

Storytelling and planning

The idea that planning can be a tool for justice took off towards the end of the rationalist era, in the early 1970s, an era where storytelling also began being formally used in planning practices. The rationalist era in planning was characterized by a strong belief in scientific objectivity and progress; it is also known for creating a vast number of dehumanizing urban renewal projects in cities around the world. These projects resulted in break down and incoherence because they failed "to include as constituent elements of planning the conflict, ambiguity and the indeterminacy of actual social life" (Holston, 1998, p.46) - because the stories of the residents were not taken into account.

Criticism about these urban renewal projects, which arguably derived from what were believed to be 'good' planning decisions, coincided with a criticism of positivism in the social sciences. This led to the acknowledgement in planning that values inform planning decisions - that value-free decisions do not exist - a paradigm shift that opened the door to qualitative research methods and participatory and/or deliberative methods of public engagement; listening to people's stories. Planners were called to create inclusive and safe spaces where people could speak safely, and where they could listen to a multiplicity of stories (Hayden, 1996; Forester, 1998; Sandercock, 2003; Eckstein, 2003: Healey, 2009; Innes & Booher, 2010).

Deliberative processes have provided planning theory with a rich understanding of the multiplicity of values people give to their everyday experiences, and how people manage to live with difference. As Neveu (2010) notes, these processes aim to solve the problem of collective decision-making in a pluralist world (p. 236). The fact that people are more likely to accept planning decisions if they are involved in making them is an

added value. Deliberative planning theories derive from Habermas' discourse ethics principles (Neveu, 2010), in the belief that uncollaborative communities, institutions and people can make consensual decisions when sufficient time is spent ensuring that everyone is heard, and where the conditions of deliberations are rational, ideal and free from institutional domination (Brand & Gaffikin, 2007).

While deliberative processes do mitigate the uncertainties that arise from everyday difference, the emphasis on process leaves it open to criticism. For instance, Fainstein (2010) dismisses them for being naïve, Connolly and Steil (2009) criticize the failure "to recognize the impossibility of creating truly ideal speech situations" (p.4), and Flyvbjerg (1998) notes that wide differences between people means that arriving at consensual decisions would require unlimited time (p.188). As Neveu (2010) notes, this inability to manage entrenched conflict is common to normative theories, since they are process-based and therefore limited in their ability to bring people in conflict to enter into open dialogue. The desire for a "utopia of transparent communication" (Flyvbjerg, 1996, quoted by Brand & Gaffikin, 2007, p. 289) is the problem.

These criticisms highlight the tendency with deliberative practices to "ignore… the reality of structural inequality and hierarchies of power" (Fainstein, 2010, p.30). While they do provide an understanding of how power structures create injustice (Innes and Booher, 2010; Healey, 2006; Forester, 1998), they also tend to sidestep the political realm and the question of power.

The tension between justice, power and democracy

> A deliberative democratic civil society is a precarious achievement, an ongoing struggle, not a natural fact.
>
> John Forester, 1998, p.213

Critics of deliberative social processes are concerned with power, and tend to be aligned with a Foucauldian understanding that conflicts between power and its subjects are the foundation of democracy. In planning, Flyvbjerg (1998) exemplifies this view in his call for planning practices that are on the lookout for abuses of power, by paying attention to intention, and are "ready for conflict" (p.210).

According to Pickett (1996), the Foucauldian understanding of democracy is that of a process controlled by people concerned with retaining their power by maximizing the production of subjects; the more subjects under one's power, the more power one has. The need for power itself is not questioned in the Foucauldian view since it is perceived as ubiquitous, diffuse and circulating; what is questioned is the opaqueness of power because abuses of power will be accepted in civil society if they are hidden from view (Pickett, 1996). In other words, movements for justice are futile since power still remains in the end, albeit in a different form.[5]

The Foucauldian view also holds that movements for justice are suspect at best, since they are, by nature, about taking power (Pickett, 1996, p.453). Bishop's (2002) view that rebellion is futile is similar; since the reaction of people trying to protect themselves or gain control are often attempts at reversing roles, where power remains (p.42-43).

[5] Which led Foucault to observe that humanity is not progressing; instead "humanity installs each of its violences in a system of rules and thus proceeds from domination to domination" (in Pickett, 1996, p.455). According to Pickett, Foucault also believes that the idea of justice is also futile since as an idea it can be used for or against power (Pickett, 1996).

Foucault's own view about the futility of resisting power was criticized as incoherent, because he simultaneously believed in listening to people's stories about abuses of power and also called for everyday disruptive transgressions where "the world is forced to question itself" (Pickett, 1996, p.449) showing a sensitivity to injustice.

The incoherence of the Foucauldian view is logical quandary, since a belief in the impossibility of justice necessarily leads to a dismissal of justice-oriented goals.[6] As Pickett (1996) notes, Foucault also refused to place limits on the everyday disruptive transgressions, which also left him open to criticism of fostering anarchy – another position determined by logic. This incoherence, however, allowed him to see the paradox that power produces the very thing that comes to resist it (Pickett, p.458) - which explains why everyday struggles will always exist and why he valued them. Foucault also noted that power fears these "anti" struggles and tries to minimize the danger by individualizing and dividing forces (Picket, p.459) - a divide and conquer strategy based on the reality that maintaining power depends on docile and powerless subjects. That people in power own the means of communication also allows them to control the message and people. This view of power is what Bishop (2002) calls power-over, the ability and the practice of defining and controlling people through oppression and violent means.

Democracy is a complex arena that must "deal with the problems of exclusion, difference, diversity and the politics of identity" (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p.186) - dynamics that have a tense relationship to each other and affect levels of justice in society. As noted earlier, Fainstein (2010) defines justice as a balance between diversity, equity and democracy. Imbalances occur, a common imbalance being when equity and democracy

[6] The Foucauldian view of restricting analysis of the everyday as a playground for political power is also problematic because it devalues other powerful dynamics in people's lives.

become conflated, leading to a problem when democracy becomes valued for its own sake. This explains the 1970s paradigm shift in planning towards deliberative practices; in the mistaken belief that widening democracy would solve the tensions in democracy, planning became focused on practices of diversity by highlighting people's stories. However, as Fainstein (2010) states, justice depends on more "substantive outcomes… than democracy for its own sake" (p.33); furthermore, "there is no necessary link between greater inclusiveness and a commitment to a more just society" (p.49). Put simply, focussing on greater citizen participation may provide better local knowledge, but "it is rarely transformative" (p.67). Justice requires better democracy, not more.

Fainstein also observes the tendency for diversity practices to be tokenistic, a problem in planning because people most likely to participate in community planning exercises also tend to be affluent homeowners who support policies that benefit them, creating more problems for democracy. Rowe and Frewer (2005) also note the tendency for political power to play an active role in deciding the quality of planning engagements, and forcing planners to use less reliable tokenistic methods. This leads to public participation becoming confused with 'communication' leading to the reproduction and worsening of social and economic inequality. To Fainstein (2010), these tensions in democracy can be avoided if justice guides planning practices, not democratic participation; while democracy is valuable, justice is more valuable.

How the tension between justice, power and democracy is 'solved' will necessarily be informed by one's beliefs. The belief in justice is strong in civil society, and often perceived as utopian. Fainstein's argument for justice oriented goals in planning

drew this sort of criticism (Harvey & Potter, 2009)[7] which she counters by describing her position as "*realistic utopianism"* (p.20) because, borrowing from Hajer and Reijndorp (2001), utopian thinking will influence policy-makers over time. Feminism and the environmental movement are examples. Bishop (2002) also defends idealism, by pointing out that the real definition of the word is the power of ideas to transform. To her the opposite of idealism is not realism, as is often affirmed by those in power, but materialism, the power of things to transform, which he argues is the real problem with capitalism and its need for a competitive environment to survive. Bishop's own ideal view of justice is an everyday practice of sharing power or power-with.

Pickett (1996) notes that Foucault also valued collaborations in the everyday struggle against power. To him it lead to people learning to relate to each other in terms of their shared experiences of subjugation by power, their "intolerables". This view also informs Flyvbjerg's (1998) belief that people will and should act up against power when they come to understand that the injustices they suffer are caused by abuses of power. Friere's (2006) understanding of the struggle for transformation is more complete however; to him the ability to fight power is linked to personal levels of empowerment, and less on the ability to see abuses of power. Fainstein's (2010) view is also more complex; she calls on planners to harness people's discontent against power and to work with power – a practice that, as will be discussed later, is difficult because it requires the ability to engage in effective dialogue, a practice that also faces a multiplicity of barriers in the colonial and neoliberal everyday. Ultimately all calls for justice are defined by Iris Marion Young's (1990) understanding that justice is to be free from oppression.

[7] It was also criticized for not going far enough politically, philosophically or spatially, and for being too complex (Connolly & Steil, 2009).

The story of colonialism

> Quite frankly, I think most of us, both European and Indigenous peoples were reinvented at the site of our encounters.
>
> Emma LaRocque, 2010, p. 158

Imperial colonization around the world became possible because European settlers had the power to tell stories about Indigenous peoples that labelled them as inferior, because they were different (Porter, 2010; Alfred, 2009; Murphy, 2009; Roy, 2006; Bishop, 2002) in large part because they had philosophical differences in relation to the land. While Indigenous people have a reciprocal relationship with the land, colonizers want to use it to create personal wealth (LaRoque, 2010; Cordova, 2007: King, 2003).

According to Libby Porter (2010), the imperial impulse to control the land and the people is the birthplace of planning. European settlers looked at all the 'terra nullius' and saw a blank canvas onto which they could draw and plan a new world and experiment. In many ways, "the colonies were seen as 'experimental terrains', sites where political, social, and aesthetic experiments could be conducted with few consequences"; the production of space was also depoliticized since it "allow[ed] for notions of innocent and free space that can be manipulated at will" (Wright,1991, quoted in Roy, 2006, p.18).

Indigenous peoples resisted the taking of the land but were stopped with "brute force" (Coulthard, 2007, p.443). Unable to see the violence of their ideas and actions, colonizers disseminated a discourse of fear about 'the other'. As Bishop (2002) notes, the dispossession of Indigenous peoples was also justified by labelling them as lazy and immoral; this was done "all the while anchoring and cloaking themselves in the discourse about their superiority to keep themselves from noticing that what they were doing was wrong; a set of practices that dispossessed Indigenous peoples of their lands, their culture,

their identity" (O'Brien, 2011a, p.1). This story of empire expansion, and its discourse, is the story of Canada's birth as a nation, during which Indigenous peoples were pushed back into smaller and smaller territories, and were then coerced into signing treaties and to live on reserves – on lands poorly suited for cultivation and with poor implements (Carter, 1990). The story of colonialism in Canada may not have included major wars, as was the case in the USA or Mexico, but as Barker (2010) notes our relationship with First Nations is violent just the same; "armed confrontations are the exception here, but it is not proof of moral and cultural superiority" (p.320).

The violence of colonialism also derives from the reality that it is a form of translation - it transforms existing indigenous cultures into something else - because a colony is a copy of an original located elsewhere; the colonial reproduction inevitably turns out differently (Young, 2003). The colonial copy is also superimposed onto all aspects of the original Indigenous culture, a process of reconstruction that systematically devalues it, through discourse, myth making and violence: "translation becomes part of the process of domination of achieving control, a violence carried out on the language, cultures, and people being translated" (Young, 2003, p.140).[8] This colonial transfer takes place at many levels; linguistically, culturally, geographically and personally. The result is that the colonized person becomes a translated person. The translation also extends to being forced to learn a new language and worldview, where the new language leads the colonized person into becoming alienated from their own cultures, language, land and to seeing themselves as other (Young, 2003, p.146). This explains the ease with which

[8] Young (2003) also notes that the word 'translation' itself has two definitions: 1) 'to carry or to bear across' and 2) 'metaphor' in the sense of using a literal meaning in a figurative sense, or a creative lie. For example, the word 'savage' changed Indigenous peoples into what they were not. 'Translation' is also related to 'act of treachery'. As an example, Young tells Frantz Fanon's story of allowing mental patients to define themselves, empowering them to move from passive victimized objects into subjects who could see themselves for themselves (p.144).

colonial discourse can transform Indigenous people into something they are not and how it leads to identity and role dissonance.[9] Studying how Indigenous social workers fare in the Euro-western context, Baikie (2009) observed that conflicting demands means they are "always working within, between and across culturally different contexts" (p.45). To her this need to be continually translating is a problem and it arises because the Indigenous relationship with the mainstream is paradoxical.

Translation also informs the assimilation goals of the *Indian Act,* Canada's premier tool of colonial social control, a document that regulates all aspects of the everyday lives of Indigenous peoples, from cradle to grave. It was originally drafted in 1876 to acknowledge Indigenous difference and to 'protect' Canada's Indigenous peoples who signed Treaties with the Canadian government. Its effect, however, has been the opposite; it created a greater sense of difference, while further undermining Indigenous socio-economic and political positions. As Bishop (2002) observes, "when people with competitive, hierarchical, separation-based values come into contact with people who practice a more connected, cooperative ways of life, the end result is that the more cooperative group eventually is forced to absorb and live with competitive values" (p.42).

The *Indian Act* has also been used as a tool to eliminate Canada's Indigenous peoples by assimilation - by legislating that differences do not exist between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.[10] This idea led to the creation of residential schools, where the 'Indian' was taken out of the child - a disturbing part of Canada's history that is largely suppressed or denied in the education system, to become the focus of many rich anti-colonial revisions of Canada's history (Kulchyski, 2007; King, 2003; Momaday,

---

[9] A distinction should be made between the practice of colonialism and its effects, and the colonial mentality.
[10] Alfred (2009) objects to its paternalistic and subtle language.

1997; Maracle, 1996). These revisionist histories not only reveal that at some level translations are always false but that the *Indian Act* also reveals the problematic nature of Indigenous existence, since it creates a muddy definition of citizenship for all Canadians (Alfred, 2009). Its most detrimental aspect is how it normalizes Indigenous dependence on the state, by keeping Indigenous peoples captive - physically, economically and socially - a dependence that is largely misunderstood in Canada (Alfred, 2009).

Colonialism is "an elaborate system of social control justified on the false grounds of Aboriginal inferiority" (Silver, 2006, p.19). As Alfred (2005) points out, colonialism is a legal, political, and cultural discourse that serves an agenda of silent surrender to an inherently unjust relation whose ultimate consequence "is to weaken the resistance of the colonized Aboriginals to the point at which they can be controlled" (LaRocque, 2010, p.75), facilitating oppression. To this day, planning practices remain embedded in its systems and its layers of discourse.

The power of neoliberalism

> Real control remains in the hands of white society because it is still that society's rules that define our life - not through obviously racist laws, but through endless references to the 'market', 'fiscal reality', 'Aboriginal rights', and 'public will'. And it is still the white society's needs that are met.
>
> Taiaiake Alfred, 2009, p.xiii

Neoliberalism, the economic ideology that currently prevails in Canada, is another oppressive structure that affects all peoples in civil society. The story of its rise to dominance is another example of a process created to benefit people in power, help them maintain their dominant position, while preventing counter-stories from being heard.

After WWII, most western economies experienced a "Golden Age" in the history of capitalism, a period where various global socio-political factors contributed to steady

growth, low unemployment and low inflation (Stanford, 2008). This era is also characterized by Fordism, a dynamic where workers were paid a living wage – that allowed them to afford the products they were making - and where following Keynesianism, government regulations, policies and taxation protected and created stability for workers. This expansionist era was also characterized by a notion that a social contract existed between business and governments and labour (Stanford, 2008). It lasted for 30 years, and then, in the early 1970s, new global socio-political factors slowed economic growth creating loss of profits, rising inflation and unemployment (Stanford, 2008). This crisis of Fordism signalled the beginning of the neoliberal era in capitalism - as industry sought to counteract diminishing profits.

A rich literature exists on the tactics that were used to reduce costs and create greater efficiencies, such as renegotiating employee benefits, reducing the number of fulltime jobs with machines… leading to greater unemployment and income instability, among other things. Tactics also included lobbying governments to deregulate aspects of the social safety net that used to create everyday stability to make way for increasingly larger spaces for the easy flow of money though world markets or through binding trade agreements that benefit business, not people.[11] Those with the economic power to influence governments into sanctioning these deregulatory economic policies used sophisticated manoeuvres to create extreme wealth for themselves while, concurrently, ushering in social policies about austerity and budget balancing. As Harvey (1992) notes, they managed "to get away from any notion whatsoever of a social contract… and to

[11] The financial markets also provided a place to invest money in an economy where manufacturing was diminishing. Pressures were also put onto politicians to deregulate markets for easier manoeuvring of money – leading to several financial crises.

abandon political notions of social rationality in favour of market rationality" (p.597) by favouring individual performance in the market economy distancing themselves from the reality that not all people have the same opportunities to participate. Forty years later, the neoliberalization of capitalism has created an acute income gap, extreme inequality and growing instability in society. Neoliberalism has also eroded a once meaningful social contract between business, governments and labour. To Harvey (1992), the ability to "defang the power of welfare state capitalism" (p. 597) is the most debilitating aspect of the neoliberal strategy.

Neoliberalism succeeded in transforming the everyday by shifting the social and economic agenda to include privatization of public services, an upward redistribution of wealth through tax breaks and, in planning, land grants for developers. It has done so by simply asserting its ideology - by emphasizing efficiency and individualism in the marketplace. In doing so, it also succeeded in shifting social and public policy towards privatization and away from accountable public processes (Keil, 2002, p.234). This shift required discourse that dismissed the legitimacy of the state, while elevating the value of running government like a business. The result of this thinking is to turn social problems into 'objective' money problems, and to create a political environment where the everyday needs of citizens are increasingly dismissed by policy-makers, while they simultaneously fail to question the provision of public funding to businesses that can compete with other cities to attract investments (Mayer, 2012, p.77) – where spending to compete with other cities becomes more important than the everyday welfare of citizens.

The equivocal and contradictory nature of neoliberal discourse is evident. Kiel (2002) uses Ontario's 'Common Sense Revolution' in the 1990s as an example; he states "while the rhetoric embraced small government, groups and organization were forced to

comply with countless interventionist policies and while politicians preached market liberalism, they practiced authoritarian methods" (p.240) - and while the government preached a laissez-faire market approach, it simultaneously "inserted itself into the lives of many groups in a tangible way" (p.240). In other words, neoliberal social policy development maintains Keynesian-interventionist approaches, while preaching an opposite approach. To not appear interventionist, neoliberal regulations and policies are accompanied with the equivocal discourse that "it is the duty of state power to create a good business climate for solid profiteering" (Harvey & Wachsmuth, 2012, p.270), creating a smokescreen that dismisses the power of the state, but not the power of the market. What is invisibilized in this discourse is the reality that free markets are not free – they are highly manipulated through political connections and the power of money. Their purpose is to create space for wealth and power (Friedman, 2002, p.xv), not people.

The need for invasive social policies is explained by the reality that neoliberalism is a hybridized system in constant need of adjustments (Shmuely, 2008, p.217) because capitalism is a fragile system that "goes from one crisis to another" (Harvey & Wachsmuth, 2012, p.267). Were it not for regular government tune-ups, capitalism would have failed. The difference between the neoliberal version of capitalism and the Keynesian model that existed before, is that these tune-ups strengthened the social safety net. [12] As Peck and Tickell (2002) put it, neoliberalism "exists as a self-contradictory form of 'metaregulation', a rule system that paradoxically defines itself as a form of *anti*regulation" (p.53). So, while policies are based on the business models, social initiatives effectively contradict the neoliberal belief in state withdrawal (Gough, 2002).

[12] Paradoxically, the crisis tendencies of capitalism have not led to its demise but to its continual reinvention through processes of implosion-explosion (Lefebvre's term) or creative destruction (Harvey's term) (in Brenner et al, 2012, p. 4). To Rankin (2012), the 2008 financial crisis is a visible symptom of the deep-seated contradictions in a flawed system (p.107).

Social processes like poverty, welfarism, workfarism and housing have also been re-defined by neoliberal discourse (Keil, 2002, p.245). By redefining poverty as social exclusion for example, neoliberal policy-makers need not address the complex causes of poverty, and thus become free to 'solve' it with a discourse about inclusion, without considering the real and potentially negative social repercussions of inclusion. Re-naming social processes also obscures the link between the widening economic gap and neoliberal social policies that enhance the reproduction of poverty. Poverty is then perceived as a business problem, to be solved by offering more training programs. But, as Gough (2002) notes, these "'training' programs are often a way to socialize the poor into low wage labour" (p.70) that are unstable, creating more social uncertainty. Poverty is also a problem for neoliberalism because it causes labour to become unreliable; it also leads to increases in crime and other social ills (Gough, p.70). Interventionist policies aimed at curbing uncertainty have also led, instead, to inefficient production processes and declining standards of life (Marris, 1998). They have also led to increasing policing of people who live in poverty, costs that are also not questioned by policy-makers.

To Harvey (2008) neoliberalism is a "development drive that seeks to colonize space for the affluent" (p.39).[13] As in colonial land expansions of the past, neoliberal economic expansion is violent. It seems non-violent however, because "the forces of domination have found subtler and more insidious means of holding on to power than naked violence" (Marcuse, 2012, p.28). The insidious violent means is discourse. As Kiel (2002) notes, asserting that it is normal to own a house, or for the price of tuna to be low, eventually taught people to think in neoliberal terms; it also shifted people's

[13] Neoliberalism has also grown to encompass taking over the economies of countries (and their lands by association), with trade agreements that protect the flow of money over everything else. To Harvey and Wachsmuth's (2012) this dynamic is "a classic case of accumulation by dispossession" (p.266).

understanding of their role in civil society, encouraging them to accept being subjected to policies that demanded sacrifices, enabling new neoliberal policy reforms to stick, until they became "accepted as naturalized forms of behaviour" (Kiel, 2002, p.236). Today, most people think in neoliberal terms, whether they like it or not (Harvey & Wachsmuth, 2012, p.271).[14] Harvey and Wachsmuth (2012) also note that neoliberal discourse now serves the reproduction of unrestrained capitalism so well that people cannot see that the system is the problem, not their individual role in it (p.271).[15]

The neoliberal colonization of discourse and people's way of thinking - this 'new religion' (Peck & Tickell, 2002) - also prevails in the media where, as Marcuse (2012) notes, "the manipulators have been keeping the talk to issues that are not what needs to be discussed" (p.33).[16] Diverting attention away from the real everyday consequences of neoliberal policies, like harsher economic realities, and the need to spend more energy on everyday survival has led to misunderstandings about social issues and to "the perceived need to deal with everyday crises before long term systemic issues can be addressed" (Brenner et al, 2012, p.8).[17] Put simply, justice-oriented social policies that need to develop over the long term are dismissed for short-term gains, benefitting those in power. As Ananya Roy (2006) sees it, the colonizing dynamic of neoliberalism is the logical progression from imperial/colonial expansion; its aim is to grow the economic power of one group at the expense of another. Looking at these dynamics, Linda McQuaig (1998) can only see the irony in prioritizing capital and free markets since it is akin to putting

---

[14] Harvey and Wachsmuth (2012), also note how neoliberal discourse has become so entrenched that people who were foreclosed during the sub-prime mortgage crisis in the USA in 2000s, perceived it as their fault.
[15] Harvey and Wachsmuth (2012) have also observed that neoliberal economic thinking has also infiltrated the political Left, since Leftist governments are also concerned with saving capitalism (p. 273).
[16] There is also tendency in the media to pay attention to increasingly insignificant 'news' stories, and programming. This observation arises from personal experience working in mainstream media for 10 years.
[17] See CCPA It takes all day to be poor

one's faith into a machine that can't empathize with people. To her it is no surprise that neoliberalism has led to feelings of impotence and paralysis (also Roy, 2006).

Neoliberal injustice and oppression "manifests itself in space; most visibly in the built environment but also in other various forms of less visible (or invisible) spaces of flows, distributions, networks and institutions" (Dikeç, 2009, p.80). In this colonizing and spatialized economic system, new socio-spatial forms are "continually reorganized in order to enhance… profit-making" (Brenner et al, 2012, p.30). In regards to planning, this process has increased inequity in planning processes, by ensuring the institutionalization of tokenistic processes, or "technical/scientific processes [that] incorporate disguised normative biases" (Fainstein, 2010, p.20) – neoliberal biases. As Fainstein (2010) notes, tokenism now prevails in planning because neoliberal capitalism "does not adequately confront the constraints on democracy in a society where resources are privately owned and controlled" (p.28).[18] Brenner et al (2012) also note how this reality creates a clash between use-value of land [everyday uses] and exchange value [using land to create profit] (p.3) and leads to a commodification of urban land and basic social necessities – housing, transportation, utilities, public space, health care, education, water and sewage disposal (p.2). As Sandercock (1998) notes, this clash is between productive and unproductive space (ex: sacred spaces) (p. 167). In this light, it becomes clear that Indigenous peoples' collective approach to land use would be assaulted under neoliberalism, since the Indigenous worldview is based on the use-value of the land while also valuing the land as a sacred space (LaRocque, 2010; Cordova, 2007; King, 2003).

[18] Young (1990) also observed the inadequacy of neoliberal democratic processes to tend towards tokenism, where the extent to which people's interests prevail is uneven. Paradoxically, paternalistic, bureaucratic or insulated modes of decision-making may produce desirable outcomes or more just outcomes than public participation. (Fainstein, 2010, p.32)

II. STABILIZING KNOWLEDGE: Understanding Oppression

This section of the literature review explores aspects of colonialism and neoliberalism that are particularly oppressive to Indigenous peoples, and builds on the notion that becoming an ally depends on understanding the structures that prevent dialogue and collective action. This approach is informed by Anne Bishops's *Becoming an Ally* (2002), an examination of the steps to becoming an ally, based on her life's experience as an ally for social justice. The first step is to understand how power-over creates oppression, and then to become critical of the structures that maintain power-over; as Bishop (2002) states, "a world of systems designed to preserve injustice and inequality is held in place by several interrelated expressions of 'power-over': political power, economic power, physical force, and ideological power" (p.51). She explains that becoming an ally depends on becoming aware of our own oppression(s), as well as our own roles as oppressors, since all people do play both roles, and to thereby "reproduce the social, economic, and political systems that formed us by playing out our internalised oppression against ourselves and others" (p.47). To her, the education system plays a detrimental role in learning oppression - even diversity education, since it is rarely done in a spirit of countering oppressive structural practices, but to reproduce them instead. As Bishop (2002) sees it, being raised in an education system that reproduces the competition and the abuse that cause oppression leads to "understanding no other forms of power besides power-over another and another's power over us" (p. 73). Privilege plays a critical part in all oppressive dynamics; Bishop therefore calls on people to confront oppression personally and professionally, because the personal is political.

Stories and myths about colonialism and Indigenous peoples

> For centuries, the structure and institutions representing the international elite class have had a huge investment in hierarchy, competition, and divide-and-conquer tactics. They put vast resources into keeping the world the way they want it. They prefer to do it quietly, or even invisibly, but, if necessary, they will use the influence they have over our governments. Governments in turn, use such forces as their armies, intelligence services, media, police, schools, and weapons to maintain control of the population.
> Anne Bishop, 2002, p.51

What Bishop is referring to is the use of stories by people in power to quietly oppress and to invisibly maintain the structures of oppression that stories can create, be it colonialism or neoliberalism. In Canada, negative portrayals and myths about Indigenous peoples over the past four centuries have indeed been oppressive and have maintained a separation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, where understanding is prevented and by extension the ability to collectivize.

Myths are powerful because they acquire a ring of truth by the very act of being told and retold over time. And because they sound true, these discourses discourage reflexive questioning, making them even more difficult to displace. To King (2003), even stories portraying Indigenous peoples positively can be problematic, since they tend to derive from the Euro-western myth of the noble warrior; as he states, "in the end there is no reason for the Indian to be real. The Indian simply has to exist in our imaginations" (p.54). The use of myths persists, however, because they allow people in power to maintain their dominant position (Sandercock, 2003). The invisibility and insidiousness of colonial stories and myths are worrisome to LaRocque (2010) because Indigenous versions of the same stories "have been erased, falsified, slandered, or stolen" (p.162). Mythical discourses invisibilize Indigenous peoples and they also prevent people from seeing that Indigenous cultures are living cultures, or recognizing Indigenous

contemporary knowledge (LaRocque, 2010). Myths also create competitive relationships, us vs them, that exacerbate oppression and prevent collectivization.

To Coulthard (2007), the complexity of colonialism itself is what makes it difficult for people to see through these mythical discourses (p.455). Prime Minister Harper's denial of Canada's colonial past is an example. At an assembly of G20 leaders in 2009, one year after issuing an apology to Canada's First Nations peoples about the residential school system, he stated: "We also have no history of colonialism. So we have all of the things that many people admire about the great powers but none of the things that threaten or bother them" (NowPublic.com, 2009). Beyond the irony, that also reveals the extent of Canadians' mis-education, Harper's denial of Canada's colonial history invisibilizes an everyday economic and social marginalization of its Indigenous peoples, and prevents their counter-stories from being heard. It also informs the social policies that *threaten or bother* Indigenous peoples - like the *Indian Act* - and sets the political tone of engagements with Indigenous peoples without needing to recognize their different political rights in Canada. As Barker (2010) notes, this 'official story' also normalizes colonialism and anchors another myth: "our identity as a peacemaker nation" (p.320), an identity that is invalidated by Harper's (violent) denial of history.

The problem of difference: separation and invisibility

The ongoing reliance on myths to dismiss Indigenous peoples is linked to the need to manage difference in society, what Marris (1998) describes as the need to have control over the unpredictability of people's behaviour. He also notes that being in power inevitable leads to the fear of losing power, hence the need to control with dynamics that "provoke cycles of defensive reactions… [and] lead to fear, bigotry, hate and exclusion" (Marris, 1998, p.15). Bishop (2002) also notes that even the perception of powerlessness will also lead to seeking safety through oppression (p.112).

A critical aspect of creating certainty is deciding who has rights and what they are. To the neoliberal mind, those who have rights are those who can participate in the market economy - as individuals. This ethic of "intense possessive individualism" (Harvey, 2008) demarcates neoliberalism from a Keynesian view of capitalism – a view that advocates a mixed economy where the government plays a more interventionist role during difficult times (Stanford, 2008).[19] However, by making people "confront capital as individuals rather than as members of a collective" (Gough, 2002, p.58), neoliberalism has "intensif(ied) social fragmentation, erosion of public space, and exacerbated exclusion of disadvantaged places, milieus, and social groups" (Mayer, 2012, p.77). In other words, it has turned society into a leaner meaner place. Barker (2010) also notes that individualism also characterizes colonialism, in processes that are "functionally similar to selfishness" (p.322).

The process of creating certainty depends on the ability to legislate that rights are homogeneous and to apply rules equally, regardless of context, in the belief that all

[19] Individualism is the idea that we are only responsible for ourselves; it is not to be confused with Individuality, the celebration of people's uniqueness and differences, highly prized in Indigenous cultures.

peoples have the same opportunities to participate in the market system.[20] The problem with homogenising processes is that not all people are equal, and everyone has different needs; as Young (1990) notes, distributing resources equally, leads to deeper and/or more insidious forms of injustice. Another problem is they erase difference and enable the dismissal of differences. The homogeneous treatment of people is also ironic, because it effectively increases uncertainty and socio-economic disparity. Kiel (2002) observed this during Ontario's Common Sense era where, as the conditions for accumulation improved, general security decreased (p.246) - because the neoliberal government reacted with increasingly punitive policies, further compromising its ability to protect people (p.237).[21]

Indigenous peoples are especially vulnerable to homogenising processes because they negate their different political reality and needs. LaRocque (2010) explains this negation with Albert Memmi's colonizer/colonized complex, where invisibility is created in the act of distancing oneself from the Other, creating a sense of absence in which Others become objects (p. 4-6). And because the absence is invisible to the oppressor, it acquires "an appearance of impartiality" (p.29), or a sense of not playing a role in the oppression. The distancing dynamic is manifested in binaries like 'me or the other', that also exist in myths about Indigenous peoples. Edward Said (1988) objected to these labels because they have "systematically suppressed the reality [and the]… experience of dispossession" and led colonizers "to ignore undeniable claims" made by the colonized (quoted in Bayoumi & Rubin, 2000, p.xxvii).

---

[20] Certainty is not the same as stability. And to counter uncertainty with homogeneity creates instability.

[21] Ideological certainty is actually paradoxical because the energy used to try to create a sense of certainty is not reciprocated in the world. Everything is in a state of change at all times, leading to a never ending cycle domination over an ever decreasing stability.

Othering binaries also arise in the act of 'differentiating' where the other becomes invisible. Indigenous-non-Indigenous binaries, like 'civilized' and 'savage', also tend to be defined by Euro-Western standards - which explains why in 'Cowboys and Indians' stories the 'civilized' cowboy always wins, because his plight is the only one that is visible. Othering also leads to accepting uneven structural relations as more or less natural because, as Joyce Green (1992) states, the power of the dominant group "is sustained through popular culture without much critique simply because its very existence is deemed to legitimate it" (quoted in LaRocque, 2010, p.100). To Coulthard (2007) othering explains why 'white' values seep into the minds of the colonized, and why it was inevitable that Indigenous peoples would become dependent on the system that oppresses them (p.449). Borrowing from Fanon (1967), he states "the reproduction of a colonial structure of dominance like Canada's rests on its ability to entice Indigenous peoples to identify… with the profoundly asymmetrical and non-reciprocal forms of recognition" (p.439). In other words, power uses its ability to be invisible to dismiss the Indigenous experience of dispossession.

Larocque's (2010) rejection of the structures that invisibilizes Indigenous peoples in Canada is inspired by Edward Said's (1978) earlier rejection of colonial discourse in the Middle East, where only "the face of the colonizer is made visible in Western techniques of representation" (quoted in LaRocque, 2010, p.4) – where the face of the colonized is only made visible to highlight the violence and decay in inner city neighbourhoods, the effects of colonialism and neoliberalism. In Canada, this dynamic is manifest in a discourse about Indigenous peoples that goes something like this: "They must let go of their attachment to past colonial wrongs if they want to become visible", invisibilzing which oppresses them further, by putting the onus on them to do the brunt of

the work of becoming visible (Hart, 2010)[22], and by effectively blaming them for not performing as individuals in the neoliberal market economy.

This discourse is but a replay of the earlier colonial discourse about Indigenous peoples being in the way of colonization, and is applied now to the colonizing pressure of neoliberalism where Indigenous peoples are seen as impediments to the Canadian economic system. Proponents of this ideology like, Tom Flanagan,[23] believe that supporting Indigenous peoples is to take away from the dominant group – a view that stems from a fear of difference, as in "what will hold us together if we all have different rights" (Murphy, 2009, p.267). The assumption behind this view is that different treatment means to privilege people for being different (Neveu, 2010), which leads proponents to resist enlarging rights since they perceive rights as a sum-zero game where "gain[ing] rights for those that do not have them will involve eliminating rights for those that do; the right to dispossess others, to exploit, to dominate, to suppress, to manipulate the conduct of others" (Marcuse, 2012, p.35). In other words, proponents of this view do not see their own privilege and blame people for not succeeding as individuals - when it is the structures of power that are to blame (Bishop, 2002).

To Bishop (2002), that this discourse developed was inevitable given that capitalism is built on competition, an ideology that implies a need for hierarchy and the need to separate self from Others. If we believe we are separate, we can also believe we can hurt another person and not suffer ourselves (p.16). To her, competition is a major cause of oppression since the process of becoming an oppressor is to become cut off from the ability to identify with the experience of the oppressed (p.112).

---

[22] The Stephen Harper's official denial of this country's history of colonialism can be seen in this light.

[23] Tom Flanagan is a conservative political activist, whose book *First Nations, Second Thoughts* (2000) was contradicted by another book calls *First Nations, First Thoughts* (2010) a compilation of essays highlighting the Aboriginal point of view that was not considered in Flanagan's neoliberal discourse.

Separation and distancing explains why Canada's history of colonialism can be dismissed – because people cannot see themselves in this story and it does not affect their everyday. The real problem of invisibility is one of blindness since colonizers "cannot follow the logic to see that their own actions – leads to brutal consequences for Indigenous Peoples" (Barker, 2010, p.320). This explains how the *Indian Act* became an invisible tool to freeze Indigenous identities (Neveu, 2010, p.245), rendering them invisible politically, while asserting their cultural difference; it also explains why the colonial discourse justifying the taking of Indigenous lands was so effective. The ability to invisibilize the colonized also hides the reality that non-Indigenous people cannot know what it feels like to be colonized. To LaRocque (2010), "the image-making machine is another kind of colonialism" (p.135) – leading to hate literature and violence against Indigenous peoples (p.62). It also forces Indigenous peoples into a defensive position, which is always weaker, and to become 'Safe Indians' and hide their anger in order to be heard, at the expense of their sense of self (Diane Roussin, personal communication, May 31, 2012).

Being in a state of separation eventually leads back to fear of the other, ironically where the need to separate began**.** Managing this fear in the city has historically been the purview of planning (Sandercock, 2003). Mismanagements of this fear did occur, for instance, when it was used to justify the slum clearance of urban renewal projects during the rationalist era in planning. These projects occurred mostly in inner cities, where Others tend to live in poverty, and be less visible. As Sandercock (1998b) notes, their invisibility enabled these homogenizing dynamics because they did not have the individual or the collective economic power to resist and "overlook[ed] the patterns of structural inequality and discrimination and planning policies that have anchored poverty

in inner-city neighbourhoods" (p. 6). The result was increased invisibility. Looking at the ongoing mismanagement of Indigenous-non-Indigenous difference in Canada, Murphy (2009) warns that it is "a recipe for increased conflict and confrontation" (p.267).

The struggle for recognition

> To know means we cannot afford to sit passively on the sidelines.
> John Friedmann, 2002, p.15

Difference is a complex issue that has led to vast areas of misunderstanding, socially, politically and economically. To Shmuely (2008), the most contentious is the belief that difference simply exists, since "difference is not ontological" (p.222); in other words, difference is dialectical, created 'in relating to' where "difference emerges from struggle, conceptual and lived" (p.222). Difference is also a paradox since it can only arise in the struggle to be different, a struggle that implies an a priori desire to be different. The struggle for difference, however, creates political identity and a sense of belonging. Differentiating self from Others, however, does not always lead to recognition.

Recognition is a necessary condition for people to participate in democratic processes. However, the mistaken assumption that Euro-western practices are culturally invisible and neutral (via distancing) creates problems of recognition, since it leads to seeing Indigenous practices as only cultural. As LaRocque (2010) explains, the arguably well meaning emphasis on cultural difference, ostensibly "to free the colonized from Western hegemonies… creates a distancing effect and tends to objectify the people described, ultimately othering them further" (p.140). This invisibility leads Canadians to "accommodate a range of group-specific claims without having to abandon their commitment to a core set of fundamental rights" (Coulthard, 2007, p.441) resulting in

"preserv[ing] the colonial status quo" (p.450). Another result is that "difference can easily become fetishized" (LaRocque, 2010, p.135).

Colonial structures are also maintained when differences and identities become 'essentialized' as people's cultures (Sandercock, 2003).[24] Neveu (2010) also notes that theories advocating different treatments for different identities only trivialize pluralism by asserting there is something universal in all of us. While there are values we do share, what Indigenous peoples want is recognition for their specificity "as deserving of differentiated treatment" (Neveu, 2010, p.236). To her, normative theories of recognition are also problematic for "their incapacity to resolve identity conflicts" (p. 243). Instead, they essentialize differences and freeze the multiplicity of Indigenous identities into one homogenous group (p. 245).

In a critique of Tully and Taylor's normative theories of recognition, Coulthard (2007) explains that recognition of Indigenous peoples is problematic in Canada because the political discourse only asks that Indigenous people be accommodated, as one of many cultures. To him, this kind of recognition has been co-opted; while it expresses the *idea* of transformation, it "does not address the *generative structures"* (p.8) of colonial oppression, and the ensuing failure to challenge the legal, political and economic framework of the colonial relationship only leads to symbolic change (LaRocque, 2010). Contrasting this dynamic, Indigenous peoples "are asserting the distinct nature of their identity, knowledge-base, practices and political and social realities" (Baikie, 2009, p.43). This dynamic also explains why the history of colonialism becomes stripped on its oppressive content, because culture is "presented as anonymous, almost divorced completely from real human beings" (LaRocque p. 140). Looking at this dynamic, Young

[24] Sandercock's *Cosmopolis* is an argument about linking recognition of the other with justice.

(1990) observed that cultural difference is often used as a political tool to "promote the ideal of a heterogeneous public" (p.119), all the while, negating substantial difference.

For his part, Shmuely (2008) also observes that recognition of substantive difference can be negated when difference and particularities are conflated, leading to situations where "dominant groups then function as veiled particularities; by presenting themselves as natural and thus inevitable, they eliminate even the possibility of difference, thus emptying differences of whatever differential content they possess" (p.223) - differences disappear when the dominant group can present itself as a just another different group among all others. It becomes a mere dialectical exercise.

Clearly, non-substantive forms of recognition reproduce the structures of colonial power, especially its racist underbelly creating a problem whereby "in colonial discourse, racial or genetic notions are often veiled as cultural" (LaRocque, 2010, p.139) and "to only focus on cultural differences, is to lose sight of the person" (p.141). To focus on cultural difference also "can have the effect of defending, normalizing, neutralizing, or even legitimizing [racism]" (p.61) because the act of asserting particularities as differences is tantamount to "sanction[ing] racism, sexism, separations and disjunctions" (p.223). Put simply, focusing on cultural difference is "a veiled way of pandering to 'racial difference'" (p.138) and the "dichotomization of cultural difference is one small step away from racializing difference" (p.139).

Racism is an issue of difference and of "Otherness that is not white" (hooks, 1990, in Bishop, 2002, p. 21). To counter racism it is necessary to interrogate whiteness and its invisibility (LaRocque, 2010; Shaw, 2007; Sandercock, 2003, 1998; Bishop 2002). Countering racism also requires a practice of contextualizing difference to rise above the Euro-western practice of focusing on single differences since it separates people and

issues and does not address the whole. As Bishop (2002) notes, all forms of oppressions are interrelated; the struggle against one form of oppression entails the struggle against all forms of oppression. Focusing on single differences or issues also contradicts the Indigenous worldview since it values complexity (Baikie, 2009).

The need for recognition also creates a paradox when marginalized peoples are forced to compete with one another for recognition.[25] For instance, Indigenous peoples will not necessarily want to stand with Black people against racism because they "do not want the common cause of racism to disguise differences between the two groups over the issues of Indigenous rights (Bishop, p.81). As Bishop notes, power needs to foster these kinds of divisions since it reap the benefits (P. 92) by preventing collective action and alliances. Power also benefits when it can argue that different forms of oppression can be solved independently, not as a system.

Systems and discourses that prevent collectivization and resistance

Clearly, the problem of recognition maintains the need to compete with others and prevents people from reach a point of unity where they can challenge those with more than their fair share. Collectivization is also challenged by the institutionalization of individualism, homogeneity, separation and invisibility since they create barriers to the ability to resist and organize social justice actions that are required to build alliances (Bishop, 2002). Mayer (2012) also notes that the neoliberal need to undermine social processes is logical because neoliberalism fears the politicized nature of socialization; people in power need to avoid the dilemma "when people are able to press for the

[25] The problem of difference also creates a paradox; to assert their political difference, Indigenous peoples often need to resort to using a discourse of cultural differences.

satisfaction of their needs" (Gough, 2002, p.59).[26] By shutting down dialogue and the sharing of information, power restrains the forms of socialization that could challenge it - a real fear for power since, as Douglass and Friedmann (1998) note, civil society remains a force to be reckoned with: "citizens the world over have toppled regimes and changed political geographies, and have remained committed to expanding their rights even in the face of faltering economies and severely weakened structures of government" (p.2).

Another effect of maintaining separation is that it depoliticizes activist elements in civil society, and "weakens any expectations that *radical* community action could make a difference" (Gough, 2002, p.71).[27] Borrowing from Henri Lefebvre (1974), Shmuely (2008) also observes that neoliberal power also maintains it power by absorbing this dissent, and does so from a defensive posture, by not counterattacking (p.224). For their part, Peck and Tickell (2002) also observe that neoliberalism simultaneously "denies its political character" (p.53) and de-politicizes socialization by justifying its (non)action as following the dictates of the 'free' market; by simply asserting its ideological position. - The result is that resisters are made to look strident when they go on the attack, which dilutes their effectiveness. [28]

The neoliberal ability to assimilate and absorb is also manifest in civil society in how, over the years, the positions of CBOs and NGOs as centres for the development of community became compromised when they were forced to become the face of neoliberalism in the community, as the "rationers of [increasingly] limited funds" (Gough, p.70). As their role was reduced to distributing funds, the neoliberal decision-

---

[26] An irony, given that proponents of neoliberalism have been able to press for the political satisfaction of their own needs.

[27] Gough also notes that even businesses that join forces often fail because neoliberal policies demand autonomous units of delivery (e.g. individual schools, hospitals) that prevent the integration of policies or the delivery of programs (Gough, 2002, p.73).

[28] A lesson, the feminist and the environmental movements were forced to learn.

makers remained invisible, forcing CBOs and NGOs to become the visible hand of neoliberal policies. They were also forced to take responsibility for the marginalizing effects of these policies. The social housing sector is an example; as neoliberal policies offered less and less room to manoeuvre, housing organizations were also forced to adopt neoliberal community initiatives that countered their *raison d'être* (Dalton, 2009; Gough, 2002). Paradoxically, as their power was reduced, their relevance to the community increased, especially for people living in poverty. Keil (2002) observes that provincial governments were put in a similar position when they were placed "at the forefront of neoliberal restructuring in Canada" (p.240) – a role forced onto them by the federal government as it divested itself of various responsibilities, like housing. As provinces passed some of these responsibilities onto CBOs and NGOs, they have "become unwitting allies of the withdrawal of the state from public policy" (Storper, 1998, p.245), and now play a role in reproducing neoliberalism. To Mayer (2102) these "neoliberal urban policies have proven particularly successful in hijacking rebellious claims and action repertoires" (p.77), where, civil society "can achieve the essential aims of neoliberalism better than 'pure' neoliberalism itself" (Gough, 2002, p.57-58).

Collectivization is also challenged by the everyday assertion that 'this is the way things are' - and the implication that nothing can be done about it. As Harvey (1992) notes, this assertion also negates the big picture until "there is no way to challenge the overall qualities of a social system" (p.594). This reality also leads to a slippery slope until what was once inacceptable as unjust becomes normalized in the everyday - and justice and difference become emptied of their meaning. For his part, Storper (1998) is concerned about the invisible neoliberal dynamic of emptying words of their political and substantive meaning; that focusing on differences "has largely prevented planners from

making substantial contributions to political debates, even though planners should be central to those debates because they are working with people" (p.243). To him the problem of difference occurs "when difference itself becomes a self-contained goal, not a means to a truly public life" (p.243). Such a focus results in the same problems deliberative practices created, limited recognition and cultural differences, where the status quo is not challenged and difference is celebrated for its own sake. When words are emptied of meaning, resistance becomes unnecessary, a moot point.

The colonial and neoliberal valuing of individualism and homogeneity has been asserted so much that it has become legitimized in the mind of the public and "voters and policy elites could [choose] to approve policies to attack poverty, manage ethnic competition, integrate everyone into common public institutions. But instead, they chose to buy protection" (Sandercock, 2003, p.116). In other words, people react to difference and fear of the other, by seeking sameness in the places they live. This has led to city plans that favour fortification, where the elite who can afford it "have abandoned the streets, no longer using them as spaces of sociability" (Sandercock, 2003, p.117) to live in gated communities that are promoted for being secure and heavily guarded against the uncertain actions of the other (these gated communities are also homogeneous to lessen the number of others to fear).[29] Gated communities are really ghettos, where people are legislated out, in contrast to inner city ghettos that are demonized in the media, where people are legislated *in*. A case in point is Wendy Shaw's (2007) observation of the Aboriginal ghetto in Sydney, Australia: the discourse portrays it as a site of physical and/or moral decay, of economic and/or social disorganization, as a place to avoid. There

[29] Borrowing from Marcuse, Fainstein distinguishes between ghettos (where others are legislated in), citadels (where others are legislated out) and enclaves (where others congregate to be with other others) - and notes that enclaves are the least offensive to justice-oriented planning, "as long as it is internally functioning and its boundaries are porous" (Fainstein, p. 32).

is also an invisible (yet clear) line that determines the 'safe side' and the 'no-go zone' from the rest of the city (p.39) further closing the city and opportunities to meet and build relationships and collective struggles for justice.

Looking at these negative effects of spatialization under neoliberalism, Harvey (2008) notes that, "the results are indelibly etched on the spatial forms of our cities, which increasingly consist of fortified fragments" (p. 32) – where "ideals of urban identity, citizenship and belonging… become much harder to sustain" (p.9). This separation also enables neoliberalism "to absorb or displace crisis tendencies, to ride…the very economic cycles and localized policy failures that it was complicit in creating, and to erode the foundations upon which…resistance might be constructed" (Peck & Tickell, 2002, p.53). Put simply, neoliberalism suppresses collective action and resistance, and "hampers… developing a serious challenge to the structures of power" (Gough, 2002, p.77). The end result, as Mayer (2012) notes is "the vanishing of spaces for collectivization" that not only prevents "broad mobilization towards social change" but more critically, also erases the "prerequisites… for building alliances" (p.78). The result is that a sense of community is being lost. Without a sense of community, stories are less likely to be shared, and places become communities without community. These realities are major barriers to Indigenous-non-Indigenous alliance building.

III. DEVELOPING STRENGTH and FLEXIBILITY: Understanding Liberation

> The problem of colonialism is the belief in the superiority and universality of Euroamerican cultures, especially the concepts of individual rights as the highest expression of human freedom, representative democracy as being the best guarantor of peace and order, and capitalism as the only means to achieve the satisfaction of human material needs.
>
> Taiaiake Alfred, 2005, p. 109.

The subtext in Alfred's comment is that none of these claims can be substantiated; human freedom depends on collective rights, democracy leads to injustice, instability and uncertainty, and capitalism only satisfies the needs of those who can participate. And, while colonialism invisibilizes and negates the Indigenous everyday, neoliberalism has further transformed the everyday by intensifying marginalization through economic power and by colonizing various social dimensions. To him, there is a clear link between neoliberalism and colonialism since the "capitalist economics and liberal delusions of progress" are the "engines of colonial aggression and injustice" (p.133) – dynamics where the oppression and inherent violence of colonialism are compounded by neoliberalism.

To Alfred (2005), the vulnerability of Indigenous peoples to colonial and neoliberal dynamics is also manifest in the increasing invisibility of oppression "through a fluid confluence of politics, economics, psychology and culture" (p. 30) – in other words, in the way colonial and neoliberal systems and discourse work together to limit the quality and the number of spaces for collectivization. Bishop (2002) also deplores the view in society that speaking out against oppression is taboo, not oppression itself; this assertion creates fear (p.95) and prevents action. Breaking this taboo is crucial to becoming allies, a process which Bishop notes begins by sharing our concerns and feelings, which also depends on spaces for collectivization. What breaking the taboo does

best, however, is to liberate people from colonial and neoliberal oppression and to see these systems and discourses, for what they are, myths that only serve to maintain injustice. To Bishop, another part of becoming liberated from oppression is to question all myths in society: the myth of separation and competition, the myth of whiteness, the myth of scarcity, the myth of objective information, the myth of stereotyping, the myth of blaming the victim, and the myth of might is right or majority rule. Like Alfred, Bishop believes that none of these mythical claims can be substantiated; they only serve to (re)produce fear of the other and oppression.

Ultimately, becoming liberated from colonial oppression means to decolonize (and "de-neoliberalize"). LaRocque (2010) describes decolonization as a shift in thinking; "to self-reflectively take an ethical and sensitive positionality… [and] dispense with linear and dualistic thinking and be open to complexities and indeterminacies" (p.167). To be sure, decolonization is a challenging process, for all who engage in it – a reality that is compounded by the reality that "we have barely begun to understand the colonial process" (LaRocque, 2010, p.6). But its greatest challenge on the personal level is that it depends on healing from the pain of oppression (Bishop, 2002). Another challenge is that decolonization is different for Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples for whom it is always a matter of choice, including the level of engagement – a reality Barker (2010) deplores because "to be in a position of privilege and power and not to question the source of that power and privilege indicates a deliberate choice of colonial action and intent" (p.319). Put simply, to do nothing is effectively a choice to maintain colonial systems and discourse. Indigenous peoples do not have that privilege.

Given this reality, Alfred (2009) states that decolonization needs to be seen in its larger context: "it is a matter not of red versus white but of right versus wrong, considered

within the broad framework of values we all share: freedom, justice and peace" (p.16) – decolonization therefore entails reconciliation and making things right again. Given that Indigenous peoples have been forced to take a lead position in decolonization efforts until now (Hart, 2010, LaRocque, 2010, Alfred, 2009), it should not be a surprise that Indigenous peoples would expect non-Indigenous peoples to take responsibility for their own process. LaRocque's (2010) view on this is clear: "the responsibility to clean up colonial debris lies first with the colonizer" (p.162) - this means accepting one's complicity in the system, and to see that being a colonizer is to be an oppressor – regardless of one's personal practice. Understanding this dual role is essential to becoming an ally (Bishop, 2002).

Decolonization is a long haul process of rejecting the status quo and asserting a positive sense of difference; this process simultaneously depends on, and creates, the ability to define self rather than being defined by others or the ability to translate self for self. This ability leads to the ability to reclaim the personal power that oppression takes away; the power of sexuality, the power of anger at injustice, the power of sharing grief, the power of our bodies, the power of friendship and social processes, and the power of linking common problems and concerns (Bishop, 2002, p.102). Bishop's understanding that the ability to self-translate is dependent on healing also includes the collective healing that arises through discussion, group study, collective action and group reflection (p.97) – or the healing that arises from 'being in this together'. Ultimately, decolonization is to restore self to its proper place, where "asserting one's agency is a declaration of freedom and power" (hooks, 2008, p.8).

Indigenous/anti-colonial resistance

> Colonization is a process of disconnecting us from our responsibilities to one another and our respect for one another, our responsibilities and our respect for the land, and our responsibilities and respect for the culture. It's that simple and that profound.
>
> Taiaike Alfred, 2009, p. 5

For Indigenous peoples, decolonization is a process of refusing to be defined by others and reconnecting with personal power; it culminates in a new sense of self (LaRocque, 2010; Hart, 2009; Coulthard, 2007; Tuhiwai-Smith, 2006; Alfred, 2005,1999; King, 2003; Maracle, 1996). Coulthard (2007) describes it as a "critically self-affirmative and self-transformative process of desubjectification… [and] our own on-the-ground practices of freedom" (p.456). Borrowing from Fanon (1963), he sees Indigenous liberation and decolonization as "emanat[ing] from the struggle of the colonized to critically reclaim and revaluate the worth of their own histories, traditions, and cultures against the subjectifying gaze and assimilative lure of colonial recognition" (p. 453) – as in the Foucauldian and Lefebvrian understanding of the need to struggle for difference, decolonization is manifest in the struggle.

Decolonization often takes a politicized form as in the anti-colonial movement that "questions institutional power and privilege and the rationale for dominance, and acknowledges the intertwining role state, societal and institutional structures play in producing and reproducing inequalities" (Hart, 2010, p.30). Anti-colonialism often takes the form of storytelling, where as LaRocque (2010) notes, contrapuntal language prevails[30] because anti-colonial storytelling is mostly about speaking back against colonial binaries like civilized/savage with counter charges like "We were not the savages, you were" (p.111). Using voice as resistance is important, says LaRocque

[30] LaRocque here is borrowing from Said's contrapuntal language in Cultures and Imperialism (1993).

(2010), because "[we] carry our worldview through our language" (p.18). Anti-colonial versions of Canada's story have also become vehicles for Indigenous peoples' anger about the ongoing colonial experience since "there is nothing postcolonial about the native experience" (p.76). To her, being labelled 'bitter' or 'political' for objecting to the official story only fuels that anger since these discourses "imply there is something emotionally or psychologically wrong with [Indigenous peoples]" (p.70).[31]

Given the failure of colonial translation, it was inevitable that colonialism would become "a force of resistance" (Young, 2003, p.142) as well as a political struggle for self-translation. The struggle needs to be political, states Coulthard (2007), because liberation cannot be a gift or else the terms of recognition remain with those in power, "white liberty and white justice" (p.449). Such a gift would also not provide the substantive recognition Indigenous people need, nor prevent the reproduction of colonialism. Liberation must come from within. Coulthard also states that this struggle needs to be waged at all levels to ensure liberation is complete (p.445). It becomes clear from these views of liberation why Indigenous peoples would view decolonization as a proactive-resistance practice (LaRocque, 2010; Coulthard, 2007; Tuhiwai-Smith, 2006) - where "resistance is part of moving on" (LaRocque, 2010, p.6).

Liberation in planning

Systems and discourse may be thwarting anti-colonial efforts by Indigenous peoples to be being seen and heard, but this movement and its stories are unsettling mainstream institutions, by highlighting the problematic nature of belonging to Canadian

[31] Edward Said (1978) also challenged how the word 'political' is used against decolonizing academics who approach their work from a non-neutral position: "the adjective 'political' is used as a label to discredit any work for daring to violate the protocol of pretended suprapolitical objectivity" (p. 76)

society, for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. The root of this dynamic, the problem of difference and it repercussions, separation, invisibility and the challenges of collectivization, is also thwarting planning practices, since its purpose is to manage fear of the other in the city (Sandercock, 2003). This reality, however, is based in another reality, that planning tends to be path dependent because of its institutional ties with colonial and neoliberal processes - where planning is used by the elite to maintain power (Sandercock, 2003, p.128). Roy (2006) describes this reality as being inside the system and "contaminated" by it, preventing planners from being radical and/or to expose the "ruses of empire" (p.21).[32] She calls this the "silence of planning" since planning is not challenging the status quo. The silence of planning in regards to colonialism, planning's birthplace, also animates Porter's (2010) call to planners, to unlearn the colonial culture of privilege and the Euro-western ways of ways of thinking - a call that is mostly going unheard in mainstream planning practices.

The institutionalized complicity of planning is much questioned in regards to neoliberalism (Rankin, 2012; Healey, 2006; Roy, 2006; Sandercock, 2003). [33] According to Rankin (2012) notes, this complicity raises two paradoxes for planning: given its institutional role in land use policy (which capitalism/neoliberalism seeks to protect with landowners' rights), planning acquired "a critical role in mitigating class struggle", a role it should not have, and planning has become a pawn "to the cyclical fixing of capitalist urbanization" (p.104). In other words, planning has been "aiding and abetting neoliberal

[32] This reality also resembles Baikie's (2009) description of the colonial dissonance that occurs for Indigenous community development practitioners working within a different worldview.
[33] It should be noted that women are making this call, a reflection perhaps of greater sensitivity to dominating dynamics, given that women tend to experience oppression more.

strategies and projects" (Keil, 2002, p.246).[34] Borrowing from the anti-colonial movement, liberation is to become liberated from delusion - of colonialism and neoliberalism – requiring, as Dikeç (2009) notes, a practice in planning as "a political project to rescue individuals from oppressive and homogenizing processes" (p.74).

Being politicized means to be "on the edge, push the limits, and disturb the conventional and acceptable politics of representation" and cross boundaries "to take another look, to contest, to interrogate, and in some cases to recover and redeem" (hooks, 2008, p.5). Critical Urban Studies is political movement in planning whose proponents are politicized and who are resisting neoliberalism by calling for practices that *expose, propose* and *politicize,* or as Marcuse (2012) puts it, "to expose and evaluate both the strengths and weaknesses of the existing system and the ultimate nature of its crises, thus informing practice as to what its strategic potential actually is, as well as analyzing the strategies that practice might adopt" (p.28).

Henri Lefebvre's *Le droit à la ville* (1996), the right to the city, informs many neoliberal resistance practices. He derived this philosophy of justice from his observation that spaces in the city don't just exist, but are produced and re-produced everyday in both the material and non-material world; between people, and between people and institutions. Lefebvre's views were heavily inspired by the 1960s counterculture and the politics of that lived space (Kiel, 2002, p.235) and his observations led to a radical critique of power, where justice was linked to managing cities that are more inclusive and with more egalitarian access to social, cultural, political and economic capital. In his words, "the right to the city stipulates the right to meetings and gathering… the need for

[34] Rankin also notes that planning practices also play a silent role in reproducing the legitimacy of neoliberalism when it supports the Creative City discourse, a tenet that forces cities to compete against one another, leading to the commodification of culture and difference in cities (p.105).

social life and a centre, and the need and the function of play, the symbolic function of space“ (Lefebvre, 1996, p.195).

Marcuse’s justice-oriented planning praxis borrows from Lefebvre. He sees the right to the city as *THE* right to the city, a *totality of rights* that exceeds the right to individual justice (or individual rights), and where “to secure rights for all means no one has the right to deny them” (Marcuse, 2012, p.35). In other words, it resembles the set of rights that define citizenship and provides status in society. For her part Mayer (2012) sees it as being “about democratizing cities and their decision-making processes NOT about inclusion in a structurally unequal and exploitative system” (p.70). In this light, and as Marcuse (2012) sees it, the right to the city is more than a political claim to be active participants in the management and administration of the city; it is also a moral claim.

The need to struggle plays an integral part in the right to the city; as Lefebvre (1996) states, “The right to the city does not abolish confrontations and struggles. On the contrary!” (p.195). This struggle is for the right to participate in the social and political productions of cities. This right is also created, much like differences are created, “through social and political action [and] can only exist if people appropriate it” (Mayer, 2012, p.71). For Dikeç (2009) this right is “an *enabling right* to be defined and refined through political struggle” (p.76). Put simply, the right to the city depends on the capacity to struggle, which in turn depends on being liberated from oppression. Pickett (1996) also notes that Foucault also believed that liberating the desire to struggle depends on engaging in the struggle. In the end, as Harvey and Potter (2009) state, “the inalienable right to the city rests upon the capacity to force open spaces of the city to protest and connection to create unmediated public spaces” because transformation “is not a gift. It has to be seized by political movement” (p.49).

Lefebvre (1996) himself admitted that *le droit à la ville* was utopian, but the right to the city is mobilizing various urban struggles in space, for space - struggles that are highlighting the links between spatial and social justice.[35] Its value is in liberating resistance practices in planning and provoking the imagination about what to do about living together in cities. To Harvey (2008), it has become both a slogan and a political ideal (p.40); "it is a right to change ourselves by changing the city "(p.23). While he has high hopes for the right to the city as a form of resistance, he worries about it becoming absorbed by neoliberalism and emptied of its meaning in order to promote the neoliberal city, that which will result if it becomes "too narrowly confined, restricted in most cases to a small political and economic elite who are in a position to shape cities more and more after their own desires" (p. 38). A true Lefebvrian liberated practice, however, would include the desires of all citizens, because of the right to the city.

There is a crack in everything

> There is a crack in everything. That's how the light gets in.
> Leonard Cohen, *The Future,* 1992

Given the complexities of civil society, and the complex nature of the sense of separation and invisibility that derive from colonialism and neoliberalism, it is no coincidence that the right to the city has become a mobilizing force. Its value is that it is a substantive vision of justice because it addresses the whole system. To express this idea, Lefebvre used the concept of "centrality" [36] because it is both normative – as in "a utopian longing for a radically different way of being" - and descriptive – as in "an epistemological sensitivity to grasp the complexity and interrelatedness of social life"

[35] See http://www.righttothecity.org/
[36] Lefebvre rejected the notion of totality since it was too difficult to work with.

(Shmuely, 2008, p.214). To Keil, (2002) the value of the idea of centrality is that it can counter the together and apart processes that characterize neoliberal cities as "machines of differentiation" (p.238); processes that fragment communities into complex centres of power and margins.

The value the right to the city puts on the need to struggle also adds to its substance as a resistance practice – because struggles disrupt the status quo (Shmuely, 2008, Holston, 1998; Lefebvre, 1996). Noticing that marginalized people in cities often use alternative, non-official forms of planning as a revolt, or to oppose the contradictions in the system, led Holston (1998) to study this dynamic. He notes that their actions disrupted normal everyday activities in the city; but more importantly, their actions de-familiarized homogeneous systemic thinking and created cracks in the system, forcing it to respond. As Holston (1998) states, these spaces of disruption worked to "reveal a realm of the possible that is rooted in the heterogeneity of lived experience" (p.48). Rankin calls these spaces of disruption **"**cracks of power" or "weak points in the dominant apparatus, exposing the fragility of hegemony" (p.109). Understanding that the neoliberal city is a complex and crisis-oriented fragile system offers many cracks where new meanings, values and imaginative practices can emerge; as LaRocque (2010) states, "it is the stuff of resistance to reinvent and to recreate" (p.160).

One such crack is the distinction between the centre and the margins. This is linked to the reality that neoliberal processes are becoming increasingly diffuse and complex. A crack develops because a complex structure may seem stable and strong, from having many interconnected parts that are difficult to separate, but it is also fragile, for the very same reason. Looking at this dynamic from the point of view of hegemonic power at the centre, what it fears is the possibility that marginal elements will become

new centres of power. (Shmuely, 2008). What this means is that being in the margins can be an asset because as they can be "truly oppositional cultures [and] engage directly with the hegemonic formation for a position of centrality" (Shmuely, 2008, p.218) – especially if neoliberal processes are unable to absorb them. Shmuely (2008), also sees a crack in the reality that "the hegemony of neoliberalism is a process" (p. 218) that is not hermetically sealed. Because it must be continually renewed, recreated, defended and modified "it can be resisted, limited, altered and challenged" (p. 218). As Mayer (2012) notes, there are many cracks in the constantly shifting and contradictory contours of the neoliberal city, despite social policies aimed at imposing certainty and homogeneity – because they do not lead to certainty, but to socio-economic and democratic instability. [37] Borrowing from Lefebvre (1972), Kiel (2002) notes these cracks create a "constantly virulent source of subversive action, never pacified, never resting" (p.235).

In regards to colonialism, Ananya Roy (2006) notes a crack in the "paradox of empire" – the dynamic whereby empire building requires the destroying something else – that colonialism is a form of translation is an example. To her empire building hides a deep-seated fragility that "has to be constantly constructed" (p.16). Barker (2010) also sees cracks in the fragility and the complexity of Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationships. An important crack emerges for him in the sense of unsettledness that accompanies the work of becoming liberated from colonial delusion since "imagining one's own end is not something we want to do" (p.318). In other words, decolonization includes the ex ante understanding that it will transform the complex socio-politico-economic relationships between Indigenous peoples, colonizers and settler-states.

[37] The neoliberal need for efficiency also presents a crack because it has effectively led to greater inefficiencies. Another crack is the neoliberal economic view that "fails to take account of nonmaterial forms of oppression" (p.42) - like family, religion, and culture, where identity is rooted. These are good places from which to mount a counter-hegemonic challenge to the status quo.

Barker notes, that this loss of colonial privilege should be embraced and explored because these moments reveal the weak points of colonialism: "we become unsettled when we are confronted with the inconsistencies of colonial logic, and the paradoxes of colonial ideals" (p.323). Another crack for Neveu (2010) is to see recognition "as a factor of stability rather than as a factor of instability" (Neveu, 2010, p.240). In other words, recognizing that Indigenous people bring "legitimate collective ways of knowing…to their practice environments based on their worldview, which includes their cultural knowledge base and their individual and collective practice knowledge" (Baikie, 2009, p.46) will lead to stability because recognition implies power-with, contrary to the destabilization that results from power-over.

The ability to expose, propose and politicize, within an alliance building critical urban planning practice requires no less than an understanding of how to capitalize on cracks when they appear in time and place in the real world. To Harvey (1992), transformation really comes down to seeing "what kind of change we can anticipate, plan for, and proactively shape" (p. 601). [38] Friedmann (1998) also favours an incremental approach: to him the goal of a resistance planning practice should not be to overturn the state; it should be "a transformative politics for the long haul" (p.35).[39] An incremental approach is like a drop of water, over time drops of water can completely erode a structure, which why it is important for hooks (2000) to celebrate changes as they occur, even small ones. [40]

---

[38] Bishop (2002) also favours an incremental approach to alliance building.

[39] Incremental approaches are challenged by the fact that forces of homogenization will have time to absorb and/or fragment dissenting views in the movement before civil society can truly understand the alternative message. The ease with which the Occupy movement was fragmented and absorbed is a case in point.

[40] The Occupy movement was a disruption to the everyday. While participants were dismissed in the media, and while the movement was absorbed by the system, the message was heard, yielding incremental results.

IV. ALIGNING ACTION with KNOWLEDGE: Becoming an Ally

Alliance building is a complex practice that includes understanding how and why oppressive structures are established and maintained, understanding privilege, engaging in one's own liberation from oppression, and applying the lessons learned from that experience in supporting others' liberation (Bishop, 2002). To Bishop (2002) becoming allies is based on three assumptions; 1) that we all have experienced oppression and oppressing others, 2) that the experience of oppressing others is invisible because privilege is invisible, 3) that oppressing others is based on unhealed, often unconscious pain of being oppressed. In a colonial and neoliberal context, however, building alliances is like swimming against the current**,** since the oppressive dynamics of these ideologies create separation and loss of a sense of community and inaction whereas becoming an ally is the opposite, working together.

The root of these oppressive ideologies is the problem of difference and competition, a problem that is continually reproduced by these systems and discourse in order to maintain power-over, or as Bishop (2002) puts it, "the quiet, invisible, self-perpetuating methods of control the elite classes have established" (p.55). Bishop also notes that the denial of difference and history is why oppression ultimately works.

The problem of difference is the ideological dynamic that problematizes difference, or in Porter's (2010) words, "the problem of difference is not difference itself" (p.35). The problem of difference is the challenge of engaging in the struggle for justice – because it implies the need to struggle for difference, a source of fear, even when struggling to establish one's own differences. This is a paradox to be sure, but as Sandercock (2003) notes, a politics of difference is a necessary condition of peaceful co-

existence (p.86). In other words, conflict is needed for authentic recognition and it leads to agency and empowerment. To her this dynamic can be achieved "not by transcending difference but by acknowledging and fully engaging with it" (p.165) and by asking questions like "which differences exist, but should not, and which differences do not exist, but should" (Sandercock, 2003, p.102) – answers to which should reveal cracks and lead to more imaginative practices in planning.

The ease with which the problem of difference can be used to oppress and prevent collectivization and alliance building is linked to the mainstream education system since its goal is individual learning, for the sake of the individual. As Bishop (2002) notes, it is in the interest of power to maintain an education system that teaches the value of value of competition, because as long as there is competition there will be oppression (p.19). [41] Diversity education, based on celebrating cultural differences, is also suspect to her, because it serves to maintain separation and discourage collectivization.

Overcoming the dynamics that turn differences into competition, to Bishop (2002), requires looking at power-over and oppression as a whole structure, not as parts to be addressed separately, because "all oppressions are interdependent, they all come from the same worldview, and none can be solved in isolation" (p.20). In other words, the struggle against one form of oppression entails the struggle against all forms of oppression. Borrowing from Friere (2006), LaRocque (2010) calls for a liberated decolonizing practice based on looking at more than both sides of the colonial story, since to do so is to short-circuit understanding (p.6). To her, countering oppression means

[41] Bishop also notes that often people will not fight for what they need, or see as right, because they fear reprisals (p.54) – this is maintained by competition and power-over.

looking beyond the story of oppressor and oppressed because colonialism is more than the sum of its parts (this is also true of neoliberalism).

Being an ally to Indigenous peoples

Bishop's (2002) lifelong experiences of becoming an ally taught her that storytelling is critical to alliance building since it leads to analysis; analysis leads to strategy, strategy leads to action, actions leads to another round of reflection, analysis, strategy and action, in a spiralling process (p.100). Given the colonial and neoliberal contexts, and given the problems these ideologies (re)produce, it becomes incumbent upon alliance building planning practices that they be based on the idea that if neoliberal and colonial storytelling can teach people to accept socio-economic injustices, then stories can also teach to think in terms of social justice.

There is also a growing call in planning to engage in solidarity and alliance building practices (Marcuse, 2012; Rankin, 2012; Mayer, 2012; Friedmann, 2011; Fainstein, 2010; Porter, 2010; Jojola, 2008; Sandercock, 2003).[42] To Rankin (2012) alliances are better because the ability to resist "depends on the capacity of people to recognize their material struggles and their emotional discontent in collective rather than individual terms" (p.107). For Friedmann (1998) the value of the collective enterprise is that it strengthens civil society because democracy can only work if civil society is strong at the local level (p.33). To Bishop (2002), the collective needs to be more than a preference in transformative practices, it needs to be a requirement because countering power and oppression is not the kind of work to be done alone – allies are needed to effectively resist colonialism and neoliberalism. As Rankin (2012) explains, effective

[42] These calls are for alliance against neoliberalism, but the need to work together is being recognized.

resistance practices tend to be collective, grassroots and local. Subversion, on the other hand, is usually practiced by individual agents, and is more ambiguous and covert. Subversion is also problematic in everyday life because it seems like public accommodation when it is not (DeCerteau, 1980, in Rankin, 2012, p.109). In other words, subversive cultures may deviate from the dominant culture, and look like resistance, but it is "not inherently progressive and may reinforce existing hierarchies" (Rankin, 2012, p.109). Moreover, the dominant culture may simply be tolerating these subversive elements in the margins (Shmuely, 2008). This is not to say that subversion cannot cause some things to change; it can better reveal the local context (Holston, 1998); it can be "a window on the conditions people face" (Rankin, 2012, p.110); and it can be an effective diagnostic of power (Abu-Lughod, 1998).[43] But as Rankin (2012) explains, resistance movements tend to better succeed at creating substantial, or transformative change because they cut across class lines in overcoming the problem of difference. The ultimate value of collective resistance movements is that you are not alone.

Transformation depends on exposing oppression as everyone's cause; it also depends on alliances since the collective "produces critiques that are potentially more potent than those that might be formulated exclusively within planning institutions or planning academia" (Rankin, 2012, p.113). Natural allies in mobilizing a counter-hegemonic planning practice are Indigenous peoples, especially people involved in community development since the nature of their work resembles planning (Marris, 1998). Being an ally to Indigenous peoples necessarily means engaging in decolonization, but given that colonialism is less of an everyday need for non-Indigenous peoples,

[43] A distinction should also be made between struggling and resisting. One can struggle but not resist - a kind of subversion – or resist without struggling (as in resistant to) - a kind of paralysis - neither is transformative.

because dominant systems and discourse benefit them, it becomes critical that alliance building practices take into account the reality that Indigenous peoples have a superior everyday experiential knowledge of the struggle for liberation. This knowledge needs to guide Indigenous-non-Indigenous alliance building practices (LaRocque, 2010; Porter, 2010: Hall, 2009, Coulthard, 2007) - or as Coulthard (2007) puts it, non-Indigenous recognition "ought to be more sensitive to the claims and challenges emanating from… dissenting Indigenous voices" (p.447). Put simply, what Indigenous peoples know better than non-Indigenous peoples is the need and the practice of resisting structures of oppression. Following the lead of Indigenous people is critical because you can't take people where you haven't been yourself (King, 2003).

To LaRocque (2010) listening to Indigenous wisdom is key to negotiating a new sense of collective identity, a process that can only be meaningful if "understanding is taken from the words of those who have suffered" (p.35). What Indigenous peoples' wisdom offers is a different worldview with 'wholistic' approaches to anti-colonial community and land development resistance practices (Larocque, 2010; Cordova, 2007; King, 2003; Alfred, 1999, 2009) The collective nature of these approaches and practices, in themselves, counter the divisive pressures of colonialism neoliberalism. Another advantage of working with a collectivizing worldview, and with the dissonance "with being inside and outside at the same time" (LaRocque, 2010, p.31), is that it is also bound to reveal cracks through which new planning practices can arise. The liberation of new practices needs to extend to institutional structures in a process that Young (1990) notes, "requires not the melting away of differences, but institutions that promote the reproduction of and respect for group differences without oppression" (p.47).

Something new that is emerging in academia, across many disciplines - by women mostly – is a call on practices of love as a means to create justice (LaRocque, 2010; hooks, 2000). As hooks (2000) observes, "there can be no love without justice" (p.104). Calls for love as a planning praxis are also being made and are informed by the belief that it would create sharing and fellowship in civil society (Porter, 2010; Sandercock, 2003).

Beyond understanding oppression and the need for substantial recognition and the struggle for difference, becoming an ally to Indigenous people also means looking for common ground; Foucault's shared intolerables. The IDLE NO MORE movement is such a convergence of struggles against shared intolerables – a movement whose potential is to teach non-Indigenous peoples about colonialism as they share their frustration about neoliberalism with Indigenous peoples.[44] This re-education is imperative to Bishop (2002) since these ideologies are maintaining control over the education system while "developing methods of childrearing and education that ensure North Americans do not understand power and how it works (p.110).

Given the growing neoliberal inequality gap, the number of shared intolerables is bound to increase, creating a greater need for the active support of an educated civil society. Arguments to persuade people in the dominant group that community is a better idea will however need to make visible their tendency to not see their colonial privilege, and to not think in social justice terms (Fainstein, 2009). The need is for people who understand that we are socialized to be controlled by power, and for people who are willing to unlearn the oppressive practices they learned from their personal experiences of oppression (Bishop, 2002). Becoming an ally also depends on understanding the

[44] My observation as a non-Indigenous person is that non-Indigenous allies in the movement seem to do so from a desire to no longer be separated from each other.

weaknesses and the cracks in colonial and neoliberal systems and discourses, since doing so will lead to new ways of seeing. To not do so is tantamount to encouraging people to lower the bar on what is acceptable in the everyday - until what was once unacceptable becomes normalized. What is at stake in becoming allies is nothing less than the city itself (Keil, 2002; Lefebvre, 1996).

On the art of working together

Being an ally to Indigenous peoples, is to understand the difference between knowing colonialism exists and decolonization; a conflation that LaRocque (2010) notes, is also common in academia, where it should not. Being a good ally also means learning to share power in order to "discover how we can restore the skill, methods and culture of power-with" (Bishop, p.44)**.** The need to establish power-with was a key insight of non-Indigenous participants in the Davis and Shpuniarsky study (2010) on alliance building, a lesson that also hinged on being open to learning, being critical of self, and being truthful about personal limitations. In the words of one participant: "It's very hard learning how to do this kind of work. It's like jumping into cold water of the end of a pier when you don't know how to swim. It's hard building trust. It's very hard work to do. It's very painful work to do. You have to spend a lot of time. You have to really look at yourself." (p.343). While alliance building was challenging to all participants, Davis and Shpuniarsky (2010) also noted that alliances "offer a stronger chance of achieving goals by enlarging and strengthening the pool of political voices, resources and energies" (p.334)[45]

Perhaps the hardest challenge to working together as allies is sharing power, the only form of power that is non-oppressive (Bishop, 2002). Participants in the Davis and

[45] See Appendix A. Summary of findings, Davis and Shpuniarsky, 2010.

Shpuniarsky study also noted that learning to share power went hand in hand with learning that the personal is political. This lesson was also a key insight of feminism, a movement against women's oppression and an everyday that was divided between home and world; private and public (Bishop, 2002). As hooks (2000) explains, early proponents of feminism were forced at one point to learn to become allies – a change that occurred in large part from anti-colonial criticism from within, calling on the movement to decolonize and be more inclusive (hooks, 2000). Recognizing the needs of colonized women forced the women's movement to recognize the problems of power-over within its own ranks and to shift away from an equal rights agenda, an agenda that mostly benefitted privileged women, to address issues related to colonial marginalization, like literacy (hooks, 2000, p.111). The promotion of power-with inside the movement also created more flexible alternatives to patriarchy, as well as the strength to "face critique and challenge while still remaining wholeheartedly committed to a vision of justice, of liberation" (hooks, 2000, p.58). The movement's ability to become liberated from structural oppression was arguably guided by a practice of love - an approach that also led to healing and imaginative new forms of activism (hooks, 20000, p.8). To LaRocque (2010) the feminist movement is an example of good "corrective scholarship"; in "refusing to remain distant from their words and works" (p.29), feminists learned to practice what they preached. In the process, they also accepted the need for an incremental approach for the long haul.

Another challenge of being an ally is that working together is "dialogically and agonistically constituted" (Sandercock, 2003, p.104); in other words, working together is both dialogical and antagonistic, or opposites - a paradox that is explained in part by the reality that spaces are inherently agonistic (Amin, 2002, in Sandercock, 2003). While this explains why working together is bound to be a complex process, Neveu's (2010)

experience working as an ally on community projects with Northern Cree taught her that "better knowledge of each other at the local level will create a climate to engage in dialogue" (p.245) – that dialogue will occur by neutralizing antagonistic spaces; by sharing time together. The ability to dialogue is essential to alliance building.[46] As the women's movement reveals, the ability to create a power-with kind of dialogue was critical to achieving its positive outcomes.

Dialogue is also challenged by power and privilege, something Porter (2010) learned from her own experience as an ally to Australia's Aboriginal peoples on land management projects; as a result, she notes, alliance building "must proceed as a complex renegotiation of values, knowledge, meaning, agency and power between planning and Indigenous peoples, and within planning itself" (p.153). Dialogue is indeed complex; it involves stating a position, while remaining open to disagreement, an attitude that depends on the courage and faith that arise from a liberated and self-translated sense of self. In other words, effective dialogue engages all the senses. Porter also notes that Indigenous-non-Indigenous dialogue/alliances need to be based on "see[ing] recognition as relational, mutual and multiple" (p.154) – or, put differently, on seeing recognition as dialogical, egalitarian and complex.[47] These realities about dialogue led Lefebvre (1996) to see it as a political practice because it is active and outside the self. Shmuely (2008) also notes that Lefebvre believed that only dialogue can challenge power directly (p.215). Hence the importance of dialogue in a context of allies whose goal is affect transformation of the status quo. The view that planning needs to become more political

[46] While storytelling can also neutralize antagonism, and help to manage difference and fear of the other, dialogue goes a step further.

[47] Porter's understanding effectively aligns with Coulthard's (2007) vision of substantive recognition.

is growing (Marcuse, 2012; Friedmann, 2011; Fainstein, 2010; Sandercock, 2003), and is informing the various calls for alliance building in planning.

> Being an ally involves being able to listen and tolerate the differences between people, expecting to make mistakes, knowing there will be anger, and learning to take it.
>
> Margaret Green, 1987, quoted in Bishop, 2002 p.119

As this quote reveals, the emotional component of being an ally and working together also needs to be addressed. Emotions arise because our roles as oppressor and oppressed are deeply rooted in us and "cooperation, equality, consensus, negotiation, and power sharing are constantly sabotaged by fear and the beliefs about reality sealed in our old scars" (Bishop, 2002, p.71). Bishop (2002) also observes that oppression is exacerbated when the emotional scars of the oppressions we experience go unhealed; this "pain seems to be a key mechanism for learning how to behave as oppressors and oppressed" (p.67). Oppressed people also tend to internalize the pain of oppression, which leads to feeling invalidated, objectified and fearful. Given that these emotional realities will exist in Indigenous-non-Indigenous alliances, Bishop warns that the focus of alliance building needs to be more substantial than merely getting along since doing so "denies a long, complicated history and all the terrible scars that need healing, collectively, before we can live together in peace" (p.20). To her, effective alliances need to make space for people to express their emotions because "understanding one's oppression releases a great deal of energy and propels the process forward" (Bishop, p.113). Creating space for emotions means that non-Indigenous allies need to be ready to become the focus of the Indigenous anger that accompanies the pain of decolonization.

In Canada, structures that invisibilize the marginalizing effects of policies like the *Indian Act* and Residential schools remain a source of pain and anger for Indigenous

peoples because "written out of the story is any sense of respect for the anguish or the agency of those who were subjected to colonial rule or any sense that those who were responsible for their subjection have a moral case to answer" (Murphy, 2009, p.269). So while Indigenous anger is visible in the media, what is invisible is the cause and the depth of the pain. As LaRocque (2010) states, colonialism is an experience, not a theory – it is lived everyday. Anger is what drives Taiaiake Alfred's (2009) efforts to mobilize people to become liberated and break "the rusty cage of colonial oppression" (p.10).

Ted Jojola's alliance-building practice as an Indigenous planner is also guided by anger, at seeing how colonial planning practices fragmented traditional Indigenous knowledge and arrested the development of Indigenous planning. He is challenging planning, as an institution, to recognize Indigenous planning practices – practices that, contrary to conventional practices, are community-led, value-based and participatory (Jojola, 2011). A critical aspect of Jojola's strategy is to develop a collective network of planners sensitive to the Indigenous reality (his work to support IPEX - the Indigenous Planning Exchange - is part of this plan).

The value of Indigenous anger, as a precursor to mobility, is also revealed in the IDLE NO MORE movement, as a mobilizing action against shared intolerables. While non-Indigenous allies need to accept being the focus of this anger, they need not accept being mistreated (Green, 1987, in Bishop, 2002, p.119). In dealing with Indigenous anger, Davis and Shpuniarsky (2012) learned that listening with compassion is key.

Understanding the need to allow for emotions in practice is growing in planning academia (Friedmann, 2011; Innes & Booher, 2011; Sandercock, 2003; Healy, 2006). For her part, Sandercock (2003) is calling for planning to let go of its roots in rationality, and the lines that divide reason and emotions. This means letting go of binaries and aligning

actions with values, not theory. In other words, there is a need to align the head with the heart, or knowledge with action, as was the case within the women's movement. To her, an emotional decolonizing praxis is about "organizing hope, negotiating fears, mediating collective memories of identity and belonging, and daring to take risks" (p.179). Harvey and Wachsmuth's (2012) anti-neoliberal call in planning is also based on emotions: to them, this struggle depends on "tenacity and determination, patience, and cunning, along with fierce political commitments borne out of moral courage at what [oppression] is doing to people's everyday lives" (2012, p.274). The most compelling argument for allowing emotions, as a practice, is Bishop's understanding that denying emotion ultimately leads to inaction and paralysis; "denial of emotions separates people from their deep moral sense and therefore makes people obedient and "adaptable", that is, capable of being used for anything" (p.66) – capable of working against justice.

That emotions are connected to the body is a given, a reality that leads Sandercock (2003) to state that "what has been missing [in planning] is a recognition of *the need for a language and a process of emotional involvement,* of embodiment" (p.163, italics original). The idea of the embodiment of power was a key aspect of Foucault's critique of power. As Pickett (1996) notes, Foucault believed that all human struggles are about the body, where it is in space and where we want it to be. The need of those in power to have power-over people, have put the body under increasing control, to eventually become a mere object. The body, however, is also what we all share and where we come to recognize our shared experiences of oppression, our 'intolerables'. More importantly, the body is the tool through which we act; as LaRocque (2010) observes, it is individuals, not abstract cultures that become agents of change (p.156; also Friere, 2006). It therefore becomes incumbent on non-Indigenous allies to create anti-oppression decolonizing and

justice-oriented discourses that make visible the embodied fears of Indigenous peoples: "the fear of being hungry, homeless, jobless, of having no future in the city, of being unable to provide for one's children, the fear of not being accepted in a strange environment, the fear of police or citizen violence against them" (Sandercock, 2003, p.124). Messages based on what all people share could indeed be more effective in changing people's minds than appealing to their minds only since effective anti-colonial and anti-neoliberal movements need to get to where people live, in their bodies.

Barker's (2010) experience as a non-Indigenous ally to Indigenous peoples taught him that questions like 'What should we do?' need to be honest ones and cannot be motivated by **guilt** or shame. In other words, being an ally is unsettling, he notes, but it "must come from a profoundly uncomfortable place" (p.323). Ultimately, being a non-Indigenous ally entails learning to live simultaneously on both sides of the oppression/privilege binary, to accept that we always belong to the oppressor group no matter how liberated our personal actions may be. Also unsettling in this dynamic is knowing that you cannot see what is going on as clearly as the oppressed group can (Bishop, p.113). To Barker, it comes down to being willing to become unsettled as a colonizer and as a person, or as part of a system and as an individual.[48]

For her part, Bishop (2002) observes that people become good allies when they are compelled to do so, not when they feel personally responsible. This is why the collective is important: it provides support and the sense that we are all in this together. To her, the most important aspect of being an ally is "understanding that you are part of something much larger and older than you are" (Bishop, 2002, p.110). This statement is

[48] In Bishop's experience, the ability to balance individual and collective identities is rare in our culture (p.113), and so is the understanding of power relationships.

more profound than it may seem. Under its obvious meaning that being an ally belongs to what is, or that in being an ally you belong to an ongoing movement, what this really means is that you, as an ally, need not take on the responsibility for all the oppression in the world, past or future; that oppression simply exists. While this may seem defeatist, it is in reality liberating since it effectively removes the sense of personal guilt that can arise for non-Indigenous peoples in Indigenous-non-Indigenous alliances when contemplating their privilege. To Bishop (2002), guilt is not only "a useless and draining non-emotion" (p.113) but it is also misplaced in alliances because it develops from personalizing the issue, as in personally taking on the responsibility for colonial (and/or neoliberal) oppression. When "the guilty fail to see the collective aspects of the oppression and take on too much personal responsibility" (Bishop, p.110), the result is a feeling of powerlessness, which leads to defensiveness, and paralysis. This reality highlights the critical need to create a balance between understanding self as an individual and as part of a collective. Bottom line, to her, being an ally means being yourself, to know your own history and to celebrate it.[49]

Hope is the ultimate outcome of being an ally. Bishop (2002) explains that this feeling arises when one looks at power as a structure and when one accepts one's limitations against it; which is why the collective is essential. To her, being an ally cannot be practice based on a sense of duty because duty does not create hope (p.107). To Bishop, hope also depends on not being attached to outcomes since doing so ultimately creates despair when outcomes are not just. In fact, not being attached to outcomes is how hope is maintained. This is the paradox of hope; it is also where Fainstein's argument for

[49] not for its own sake, however, since doing so would lead to the problem of cultural difference that empties difference of its meaning.

justice departs from Bishop's since her argument is built on an attachment to justice outcomes[50] To be sure it is easy to lose sight of this larger picture when scrutinizing and colonialism and neoliberalism at close range, but this paradox needs to be embraced in alliances, however unsettling it may be.

In the end, hope is really a matter of choice, about learning to see things in a particular way. Deciding on hope in planning means seeing through Arturo Escobar's (2012) eyes, and recognizing that while planning may be linked to oppression via its silent complicity in colonialism and neoliberalism, planning as a practice is not inherently oppressive and need not be. Hope is also the result of accepting what is, as in Jojola's praxis in planning of creating a network of allies – a hopeful approach to addressing the fear of the other. Looking back on his own lifelong critical praxis, Marcuse also expresses hope in his understanding that much can be done in civil society if people are made to feel like they can accomplish something (Peter Marcuse, address to students, University of Manitoba, September 2012).

Clearly being an ally is a balancing act in a process of developing clarity: a balance between patience and confrontation, flexibility and limits, boundaries and allowances, learning and opinion, humility and self-confidence, your own oppression and others' struggles (Bishop, 2002, p. 121). Clarity comes from observation, reflection and analysis. Over time the ongoing balancing act becomes a "knowing" – where you know what to do and what will happen when you do it. As Barker (2010) observes, alliance building boils down to developing a feel for the game where every experience or action produces a new space, and where over time, the 'how to do' will reveal itself in the doing.

[50] see appendix B – Bishop's (2002) requirements and characteristics of allies.

Chapter 3. GENERATING THE DATA

The data for this thesis were generated from interviews conducted in the spring and summer of 2012 with four members of a coalition of Indigenous community development practitioners called CLOUT (Community Led Organizations United Together) as well as four city planners.[51] These interviews build upon interviews conducted in the summer of 2010 for the film *Together we have CLOUT,* about CLOUT'S inner city community and capacity building methods and the socio-economic policies that affect their practices. To understand how these systems and discourses affect Indigenous-non-Indigenous opportunities for alliance building, and because both groups had limited experience working with each other, the 2012 interviews focused mostly on their everyday experiences. Both groups were also asked to respond to a series of open-ended question about their perceptions of the barriers to alliance building as well as ideas on how to engage in alliance building.[52]

The planners' responses centered on the uncertainties, ambiguities and processes that affect their everyday, the political pressures that frame their practices and the normative understandings they draw upon to do their work. Interviews with CLOUT members yielded similar yet different results. Because they had experience working with non-Indigenous peoples on inner city community projects - projects not led by planners but whose purpose was to build community - they were also asked to discuss the quality of these processes. This led to an invitation to propose principles non-Indigenous people

[51] see appendix C for CLOUT member organizations
[52] see appendix D for interview questions

should follow when working with them as a coalition and with Indigenous community based organizations in general.

All interviews were recorded and transcribed by me. I took care to note various qualities in speech like laughter, hesitations and excitement, to create a better picture of these moments for the analysis stage. All recordings are being kept in a locked file drawer in my home. To protect the anonymity of participants, they were all assigned a letter alongside the group to which they belonged.

Interviewing is not a neutral activity

> All observation involves the observer's participation in the world being studied… the effects of the observer's presence can never be erased.
> Denzin and Lincoln, 2003, p. 49

Interviewing is a qualitative method of choice, because researchers can "reach areas of reality that would otherwise remain inaccessible such as people's subjective experiences and attitudes" (Peräkylä, 2005, p.869). While I know this to be true from my experience as a reporter, I also know interviewing "is not a neutral tool…for at least two people create the reality of the interview situation" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p.48). The same interviewer and interviewee, at another time and another place, will produce different content data or mutual understandings. The interview is, therefore, a "negotiated text, a site where power, gender, race and class intersect…it changes and is modified as it is being used" (p.48). This notion of knowledge being created between interviewer and interviewee reflects a post-modern understanding of knowledge as being constructed - not objective or absolute.

Interviews are best done with as an active listening activity (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995, p.16) - an ethical stance where interviewer and interviewee are "coequals who are

carrying on a conversation about mutually relevant issues" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p.48). Every interview for this research was approached in this manner; there was a set of mandatory questions about key themes, but the rest was open-ended where space was mad for detours and for complementary information to be shared. Active listening approaches are also feminist-based (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Their challenge as well as the value is that it "requires openness, emotional engagement, and the development of a potentially long term, trusting relationship between interviewer and respondent" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p.48). They may not be as comprehensive as formal interviews, but their more participatory nature tends to lead to mutual learning experiences and to creating trust; enough in the case of CLOUT members to participate in a second set of interviews two years later – despite minimal contact during that time. The open-ended quality of the feminist approaches, however, can create uneven data, which was also the case in this research since time and space played a different role in each encounter. As a result, questions were never asked in the same order. The open-ended approach however created opportunity to ask complex questions and to probe more deeply; it also allowed me to go with the flow, since I could observe the participant's body language.

The interviews with the four CLOUT members were also an occasion to engage in "retrospective introspection" (Bloor et al, 2001, p.5) after making the film two years earlier. This allowed me to sharpen my preliminary interpretations of the values, norms and meanings that activate their Indigenous approach to community development. These interviews also provided a forum for CLOUT members to play a more collaborative role in the research – especially in formulating principles for non-Indigenous peoples to follow. To create a more trusting environment, I took some time at the beginning of each interview to expose my self and tell stories about my efforts to decolonize. I cannot know

how well this strategy worked, but it was a good exercise for me on my own decolonizing journey. These interviews also became an occasion for invaluable knowledge sharing.

The challenges of analyzing the data

> The spoken or written word has always a residue of ambiguity, no matter how carefully we word the questions and how carefully we report… the answers.
>
> Fontana and Frey, 2003, p. 61

A loose phenomenological approach was used to explore the perceptions and the experiences of participants. This approach was chosen in part because this analysis is an attempt to translate the Indigenous worldview, and my interpretations as a non-Indigenous person needed to be supported by the generated data – with the use of direct quotes so that participants' voices can foreground the research. To reflexively mitigate problems of translation - and in keeping with anti-colonial theory and practice – this analysis also gives precedence to CLOUT's Indigenous viewpoint. This approach follows LaRocque's (2010) observation that non-Indigenous people, even supportive academics, tend to write about the views of Indigenous peoples while "blocking-out the Aboriginal voice" (p. 166) and because "writing is about social power" (p.13). Wanting to foreground CLOUT's strong anti-colonial criticism, I allowed for "extensive quotations…to stand for themselves, perhaps as voices that are not in tune with the speaking subject's and allows for dissonance of a kind similar to those which occur in conversation or discussion" (LaRocque, 2010, p.12). This approach also recognizes that CLOUT is best positioned to interpret the everyday consequences of colonial and neoliberal systems and discourses on the lives of urban Indigenous peoples in Winnipeg's inner city. It is also done in the spirit of reconciliation and affirmative action where making things right means to adopt Indigenous ways of doing. My role in his narrative

then is to guide a complex and open conversation, to derive common themes that summarize the content of interviews and to interject where needed to provide context.

Analyzing 'talk' data is complex because all 'talk' is up for interpretation, including the researcher's own frame of cultural referents (Fontana & Frey, 2003, p.87). Understanding context is also challenging because context can never truly be understood (Rowe & Frewer, 2005) – a reality that is especially problematic when a non-Indigenous peoples research Indigenous values. While research is also questioned because "theory-free observations cannot exist" (Smith & Deemer, 2003, p.431), and while this notion questions knowledge itself, it does promote an exploration of differences and contexts. This is important because context and processes shape each other (Healey, 2006), where meaning is truth in context.

To counter my influence as researcher I adopted a reflexive attitude in the sense of questioning my position at all times, and understanding that what I see as the truth is merely a reflection of my identity as "historically contingent and inherently relational" (Sandercock, 2003, p.104), or a construct based on personal history and relationships. This reflexive framework also belongs to an understanding that unequal power dynamics and distribution of knowledge can affect research processes (Rowe et al, 2005). Such an attitude, however, helps to remain detached from personal identities and to better decipher the embedded context of discourse and the values of interview participants.

Being reflexive can also create problems of meaning. To counter this dynamic, Smith and Deemer (2003) borrow from Richard Rorty's understanding that choosing criteria for analysis is not an abstract task but "is a practical and moral affair, not an epistemological one" and that criteria can be what "we think, or more or less agree at any given time and place, characterize good versus bad inquiry" (p. 454).

My overall goal in analyzing the generated 'talk' data was to maintain awareness of these challenges, while also trying to understand the substantive issues of importance to both CLOUT members and city planners. I did so by teasing out the subtext of the data, and by identifying emerging themes that could be indicators of barriers to alliance building. (It should be noted that the process of editing the film became the equivalent of doing a first analysis of the generated data. It should also be noted that tangential 'talk' was not transcribed, but hesitations and excitement were.)

Indexing involved sorting out emerging themes and comparing responses between members of the same group and between CLOUT and planner. The process was broad at first, and narrowed with each reading. It was also done with an eye to ensuring that I understood the context of speech extracts – in the case of CLOUT, as much as I could given my non-indigenous status. In selecting quotes, I followed Silverman's (2003) admonition to "let the data guide you as to what is important" (p. 357). While participants used two different kinds of talk, 'experience' (fact) and 'narrative' (interpretation), most of the quotes that are chosen are interpretive rather than factual. This approach also produced new links between 'talk' data.

Limitations of the research and ethics approval

Soliciting people to participate in this research did introduce some biases. For instance the planners were pre-selected with the help of my advisor. The goal was to narrow the field to individuals we believed would be interested in participating, from our personal knowledge of them and their practice. Of the 8 pre-selected planners, the four who responded are not necessarily representative of planning practices in Winnipeg, since they were individuals with some experience working in urban or rural Indigenous

contexts. While their current practices were different from each other, there was a consistency in their attitude towards the systems and the discourses that affect their ability to work in general, and with Indigenous peoples in particular. The small sampling is also a limitation of the research, and contributes to my inability to know how representative the participants' comments are to the larger planning community.

Another potential for bias is my connection to the four CLOUT members via my involvement with the CCPA, and in making the film with them prior to doing the second set of interview with them – an activity that led me to greatly appreciate their work and them as individuals. I believe vestiges of these feelings remain in this thesis.

Looking back on the analysis, it would have been beneficial to ask more questions about how participants would envision breaking through the barriers they see to alliance building, strategies and/or tactics they could use in the future.

It should be noted that the four CLOUT participants, speak very much as one voice, the nature of their coalition and their intimate knowledge of each other informs this reality. The planners on the other hand, had similar things to say but did not speak as a unified voice. The analysis will exemplify this distinction between the two groups.

The film part of the research was covered by an ethics protocol from the University of Winnipeg, since the producer of the film, CCPA-MB, works through this institution. During the film interviews, participants knew I was a Masters student doing preliminary research for a potential thesis. The 2012 interviews were covered by an ethics approval from the University of Manitoba. I received a first approval in the fall of 2010, and an extension in January 2012.

Chapter 4. TELLING THIS LOCAL STORY

The analysis portion of this thesis explores the colonial and neoliberal pressures that inform the everyday reality of non-Indigenous city planners and Indigenous community building practitioners. These stories are then further analyzed to assess the potential to liberate decolonizing practices in planning that could lead to new alliance building stories. As a reflection of the power of stories, the structure of this analysis is modelled on a seven part dramatic format. The first half of the story sets the stage, introducing these groups of characters and their respective everyday realities as well as their perceptions of the similar yet different pressures they face. After the turning point, the second half compares and contrasts their responses to their everyday experiences, exposing the political realities that inform these responses, leading to an understanding of the barriers that affect their (in)-ability to build alliances. Responses are also analyzed in relation to planning theory about colonialism, neoliberalism, storytelling, transformation, and social justice.[53] In the end, their story offers a few principles and qualities to nurture alliance building in Winnipeg.

[53] For the sake of clarity, tangential comments have been edited out.

I. THE INCITING INCIDENT AND BACK STORY

> The inciting incident is the event that begins the action of the story and causes the characters to act. Since this event affects the characters' everyday, the inciting incident also becomes the basic conflict, without it there is no story.

Responding to everyday politics as allies

In the spring of 2010, the City of Winnipeg made the controversial decision to provide financial assistance to build a drop-in centre for youth in the inner city. The developer was *Youth for Christ*, (YFC) a faith-based organization, whose goal is to proselytize youth using their facilities. Inner-city Indigenous community-based organizations reacted strongly against this political decision, since many already offered culturally sensitive drop-in services to Indigenous youth who live in the neighbourhood. To a coalition of inner city CBOs called CLOUT (Community Led Organizations Untied Together) this was another political decision being made without consultation and without sensitivity to the real needs of the inner city residents. With the support of their allies, the CCPA, they decided to make a film to raise CLOUT's profile.

The story of how they became allies begins in 2005, when CLOUT assisted the CCPA with an inner city research project. Seeing the CCPA's resolve to empower inner city research participants and take the risk of using Participatory Action Research (PAR) principles [54] - an approach that resembles CLOUT's own approach to hear as many voices as possible before making decisions - led CLOUT to ask the CCPA to do more research for them. Coalition members wanted to assess the positive impacts of their capacity building model and to develop a qualitative measurement of the outcomes of their work.

[54] PAR is recognized for empowering people since they are encouraged to lead the research processes. PAR is also known for being messy, complex and unpredictable and complex – the reason why researchers tend to shy away from it. As Shauna McKinnon, the director of the CCPA states, results were uneven but the CCPA kept to its principles as part of its own anti-colonial goals (personal communication, April 2011).

Their goal was also to see if an alternative measurement could be developed in contrast to the heavily bureaucratic and quantitative measurements imposed by neoliberal funding systems, since these criteria clash with their Indigenous values where effectiveness is evaluated in qualitative terms. The difficult to quantify impacts of participating in CLOUT programs [55] were evaluated as a collaboration between the CCPA and inner city residents. The result was *Is Participation Having an Impact?* (2007), a positive first experience that led to a yearly collaborative research project assessing the state of the inner city.

Both groups benefitted and gained much needed clout from the experience; CLOUT, from having access to researchers who could translate their worldview for them to a wider audience, and CLOUT by becoming a 'go to' organization for community projects involving an Indigenous element, especially on issues of racism, poverty or housing. In becoming allies, both groups had to overcome important barriers to develop trust and understanding. Important to this process was the CCPA's openness to follow a decolonizing process that allows Indigenous collaborators to lead the way (LaRocque, 2010; Davis & Shpuniarski, 2010; Tuhiwai Smith, 2006; Kovach, 2009). The decision, about the contents of the yearly *State of the Inner City Report* is made by CLOUT members and its other community partners. This decolonizing approach on the part of the CCPA contributes to maintaining the high levels of trust that were built over the years. Sharing knowledge and expertise also helps.[56]

---

[55] The collaborative research project revealed that Indigenous participants measure 'success' differently, more by people's ability to overcome the effects of institutional policies and systems than by the level of independence gained, the measurement used by mainstream agencies. Another theme that emerged was the need for Indigenous-run CBOs, since conventional social institutions are not equipped to deal with colonial realities. Participants also identified overcoming the effects of government systems, lack of money and fragmented relationships as the top three causes of stress in their everyday.

[56] CLOUT's readiness to make the film *Together we have CLOUT* is due to this pre-existing trust.

Here then is a story about CLOUT and the planners. It begins with a film to raise CLOUT's profile – for which I was the filmmaker – and ends with a thesis about how colonialism and neoliberalism are connected, and how these divisive dynamics affect the potential for creating Indigenous-non-Indigenous alliances in Winnipeg.

II. EXPOSITION

The exposition is where background information is provided about the plot, the characters, the setting, and the theme.
The background to this story are the everyday experiences that contribute to CLOUT's and the planners' perceptions of their everyday realities.

Introducing the location

Winnipeg is home to the highest urban Indigenous population in Canada (Census 2006) – people who "suffer from overwhelming levels of disease, starvation, alcoholism and any other indicator that can track poverty, as well as racist treatment from individuals, courts, governments, and corporate interests" (Barker, 2010, p. 319). Most Indigenous peoples in Winnipeg live in the inner city, a place where housing is sorely lacking, social assistance incomes are inadequate, and access to good jobs, childcare and training is limited. As Silver (2006) notes, Indigenous peoples in the inner city also experience lower incomes, higher rates of unemployment and poverty than the general population, a higher incidence of single parenthood and domestic violence and lower levels of educational attainment, and high mobility and household crowding.

Peoples in these neighbourhoods are also struggling with the consequences of modernist urban renewal planning projects that fragmented the close relationships that existed before the 1960s (CLOUT member A). Borrowing from Sandercock (2003), these renewal projects would likely not have occurred had area residents been valued and/or been visible.

Historically, the North End neighbourhood in the inner city of Winnipeg has always been home to people living in poverty - from the immigrant working class population in the late 1800s and early 1900s to today's mostly urban Indigenous

population. The CPR rail lines and yard that mark the southern edge of these neighbourhoods, has also historically divided the more affluent residents in the south from local residents, be they immigrants in the past or Indigenous peoples, now – physically cutting them off from the rest of the city. As the financial situation of immigrants improved after WWII, they moved into the growing suburbs. The cheap rental housing they left behind became home to the growing number of Indigenous peoples moving into the city from distant reserves.

While they are living in poverty, today's Indigenous residents are also dealing with the marginalizing effects of colonialism and racism, a complex dynamic that is creating different and deeper levels of poverty (Silver, 2006: Peters, 2005). These 'invisibilizing' racist attitudes are barriers to their ability to move out of poverty because as MacKinnon and Stephens (2007) note, healing from the damage of colonialism needs to occur at the same time, a process that for many Indigenous people takes a long time because it takes place in a context of recurring racism and marginalization. In other words, while immigrants of the past and today's Indigenous peoples are both perceived as 'other', the socio-economic-political reality of Indigenous peoples is different.

Winnipeggers rarely venture into the North End, because of fear of the "other". These colonial fears, kept alive today by the media, feed into discourses about more policing and 'tough on crime' policies. While the gang violence reported by the media is real, the majority of residents are law-abiding citizens who only want to have a job and raise their children (CLOUT member I). The dominant message about the North End has resulted in a kind of ghettoization of the area, made worse by slum landlords who over the years have allowed the housing stock to deteriorate, arguably because their North End tenants are not valued. Wendy Shaw (2007) observed this dynamic in all countries with a

colonial history where colonized subjects become urbanized; an invisible line is created in the urban fabric to demarcate "no go" areas, "igniting deep anxieties" in the dominant culture. Media stories in Winnipeg have succeeded in transforming the North End into a "no go" area, with the not so invisible demarcation line being the CPR railroad line.

The North End neighbourhood is now an area one drives through to get somewhere else; an area perceived as a blight on the city's image. This image was created by discourse and is now supported by more discourse. And by remaining silent about the reality behind the image, institutions and systems are de facto supporting the discourse, a response that only serves to perpetuate the colonial domination while failing to respond to the needs of inner-city residents. Reactive approaches like increasing police presence in the area is seen as 'solutions' by politicians, but it effectively contributes to deepening the cycle of poverty and further fragmenting the North End.

Introducing CLOUT

CLOUT was formed in 1999, in the wake of the decision by the newly elected Manitoba NDP government to abide by the 1991 Aboriginal Justice Inquiry (AJI) Report to transfer Aboriginal Child and Welfare services to the Aboriginal community (MacKinnon, 2009). The Child Welfare Initiative devolution process created many challenges for existing Indigenous community-based organizations (CBOs). They were especially concerned about being excluded from the decision-making process. Some of these CBOs joined forces to ensure their perspective was heard. As they worked together to manage a difficult situation, they realized shared a similar philosophy about community development and would benefit by continuing to work together in a more

formal setting. In November 2003, CLOUT was launched as a coalition of eight organizations. Its goal was to mitigate the changes in Manitoba's child welfare system and to support Indigenous children and families (CLOUT, 2008).

> We've done it the mainstream way and it doesn't work. We've been told by the community that it doesn't work. The model of CLOUT works and I think it's effective because…it's about what we bring to the table and that's the voices of the people we work with.
>
> Excerpt from *Together we have CLOUT*

The coalition decided to improve social services in the inner city by integrating the various services they offered. The vision was to offer services based on a continuum of needs; for instance, as a child, or woman, or family outgrows one organization, another member organization can address their new needs. In this manner, a connection always exists between where people were, and where they are going - lessening the possibility of people falling through the cracks. As MacKinnon and Stephens (2007) show, CLOUT's integrative approach is particularly effective at raising individual capacities; residents are learning how to work within Western-based systems, destructive cycles are broken, children are reunited with healthier parents, while others are going back to school and finding jobs. People are also more willing to become involved in community projects. As residents move from being users of CLOUT programs to becoming volunteers and then mentors to new participants, a spirit of hope, reclaiming culture, neighbourhood revitalisation and community building is growing in the North End.

> All the parents in this area, everybody here, they want the best for their kids. They want them to be successful, to be happy, to accomplish things. And I'm just a little tool in that box, to help.
>
> Excerpt from *Together we have CLOUT*

CLOUT members describe their approach as a common sense and practical response to the everyday problems of inner city residents – a complex mixture of systemic poverty, housing, health and education – and the same kind of issues that led to

the creation of Winnipeg's first Friendship Centre in the 1950s. Over the years, a number of Indigenous CBOs began to operate in Winnipeg's inner city, offering programs aimed at developing colonial and racism awareness. These programs, based on the Indigenous worldview and values, also used anti-colonial stories to educate and create a sense of belonging and identity - an approach that aligns with Freire's (2006) understanding that transformation begins when individuals can tell their story and in the process become aware of the structures that oppress them. As these decolonizing efforts brought urban Indigenous peoples together, a community began to appear in the inner city. CLOUT's integrated programming builds on this legacy. And like the first Indigenous CBOs, CLOUT member organizations operate in the shadow of systems and discourse that negate their Indigenous values. [57]

While decolonization is a challenge - an issue mainstream organizations and non-Indigenous people do not need to address - CLOUT must also contend with neoliberal social policies that exacerbate the negative effects of colonialism. Coalition members say they spend a lot of time trying to raise funders' awareness about the need for stable funding to support long term decolonizing efforts in the inner city. They especially question being forced to rely on project funding to fund core programming – which means being forced to apply more often and to compete with other inner city CBOs for small project grants. This reality also forces CLOUT organizations to run more programs than is needed or effective, since funding policies require that funds be used for particular purposes only. CLOUT also questions the increased reporting demands project funding entails – a situation that is ineffective and unsustainable. Counting the number of people

[57] CLOUT also belongs to Indigenous political efforts to ensure the stability and self-determination of Indigenous peoples and communities.

who are employed, or in school, is unrealistic to CLOUT, given that the greater issue facing inner city residents is learning how to address everyday basics, like access to food and shelter (SIC 2009).

> We manage close to 50 programs, not because we want to but because the funding structure imposes that on us. It's a horrendous waste of talent and energy.
>
> CLOUT member I

> Our challenge is to work within that funding model but to somehow use those funds to also provide opportunities for people… because people don't want to come in just as a problem…. Nobody wants to be seen like that, you know. We can provide opportunities where people can come and participate based on their strengths. Then…there's a way you can deal with that other stuff [effects of colonialism].
>
> Excerpt from *Together we have CLOUT*

Clearly, CLOUT spends a lot of valuable time trying to re-interpret neoliberal economic tenets in human terms - time away from their everyday work. An ongoing source of frustration is the general lack of understanding among Canadians about the Indigenous everyday experience of colonialism – a problem CLOUT links to the education system where stereotypes and misconceptions are formed, and the near absence of political discourses about Canada's colonial history (as Stephen Harper's dismissal of Canada's colonial past shows). They also deplore how education system also failed them, since they all spoke about only coming to understand colonialism, as adults when they began to decolonize, with the help of other inner city Indigenous CBOs, a time when they came to understand their internalized feelings of being "less than" as a consequence of colonial power-over. This personal transformation helped them understand the empowering value of stories.

> Live their lives. Go through what they went through and see how many tools you have to work with, and see how your life goes. Like really <u>see</u> that.
>
> Excerpt from *Together we have CLOUT*

CLOUT members say their ability to connect with non-Indigenous people is often hampered by the need to disguise their Indigenous identity to make non-Indigenous people feel comfortable. As CLOUT member O states, her efforts create mixed results, since non-Indigenous people often respond with opinions or 'solutions' that expose the misunderstanding she was trying to overcome in the first place.

> I know I present like a 'Safe Indian' and I know… people are a little bit more open to what I might be saying because I'm very safe…. So they'll say things like "You know, Winnipeg's got an Indian problem" and "How are we going to fix that?" And I know their intentions are good, but... what they end up doing can be very harmful.
>
> CLOUT member O

CLOUT members also deplore how the stories they tell about the North End contrast sharply with the negative media portrayals of the inner city that contributes to the ongoing myth of Winnipeg as a dangerous place to live.

> I see how people must see the inner city, how they see Aboriginal people and how they get a bad rap, you know. They don't see the joy and all the kids happy and cared for, and all the people in the inner city who are working and trying to make a life… They want the same things that everybody wants.
>
> Excerpt from *Together we have CLOUT*

CLOUT's everyday presence in the North End, as individuals and as a collective, has resulted in establishing a strong sense of trust between inner city residents and CLOUT. Stories play an important part in CLOUT's practice since they use them to understand the needs of residents. CLOUT members are especially attuned to stories that reveal gaps in services or programs. When a gap is identified, solutions are developed with the community's input. Once a solution is agreed upon, CLOUT members decide which organization should be responsible for delivering the new program, with the support of the other eight organizations. This family-like support allows CLOUT members to be more flexible with program delivery.

> It's a model that's respect. Believe that people have something to offer. If you try to help someone, then you need to know from that person what it is they need. And what they have already, you know?
>
> Excerpt from *Together we have CLOUT*

CLOUT members say that working in a circle, as a family, reduces a sense of isolation, and keeps them grounded as individuals. Given its family structure, CLOUT members decided to not compete with each other for funding, to ensure diminishing funds get into the community.

> I think inner city organizations really make a buck stretch. And there are a lot of resources out there that could be used in a much more effective way.
>
> Excerpt from *Together we have CLOUT*

That CLOUT was formed without political expectations or interference, by their own hands, allows members to define themselves and decide who may join the coalition - usually organizations with natural long-standing working relationships with CLOUT. Currently the coalition is an all women group, as there are no male directors of the nine member organizations. Members believe the group has reached its potential and the level of trust is high, a trust that is maintained by keeping lines of communication open and being available for each other.

Introducing the planners

The four planners were all at different places professionally but, at some point, however they all worked as city planners for the City of Winnipeg.[58] In the summer of 2012 Planner R, owned a planning consultancy firm, Planner T was employed by an engineering firm that did a lot of contract planning work for the City of Winnipeg,

[58] Eight planners were contacted via email and by phone. Four agreed to participate in the research.

Planner K had been working for about 10 years as a planner for the City of Winnipeg, and Planner G was retired and doing some community activism work. The interview with Planner G was less comprehensive and was conducted over the phone.

The planners all understood colonialism and how it contributes to the everyday marginalization Indigenous peoples face everyday, especially in Winnipeg's inner city. They also had some knowledge of the history of urban Indigenous peoples in Winnipeg. Like Planner R, they also understood the need to transform this reality.

> We need to change the system so that people understand why Aboriginal peoples are living in poverty, why there are so many in prison, and that we can change things so that opportunities can be made available, for kids in particular.
>
> Planner R

All the planners also understood how Canada's 'official' history creates an inability to see the link between social policies directed towards Indigenous peoples, like the residential schools, and the Indigenous everyday. One of the planners, whose first job was with a rural community that bordered a First Nations community, told a story about her experience managing community meetings and how she wished she had had prior knowledge of Indigenous worldviews and practices, because it created some tensions for her too. She also saw the link between planning as a profession and the colonial system.

> As a planner, what bothers me about it are the systems and the regulations and everything that frames up the world that we work in as planners…. So when you talk about our value on property and land that drives all the regulations that are behind our planning work, and when we work on zoning; that is purely colonial. It is based on one culture's perception of the way things should be, the ways things should be carved up, the way things should be managed. And there is absolutely no regard for [people]. So to me that is the colonialism I see in planning. It is reproduced in everything we do.
>
> Planner G

None of the planners had ever worked directly with CLOUT on a project from start to finish, but they all knew about CLOUT (or at least the member organizations) and

the nature of their community building work and its benefits to inner city residents. Of the three planners who had been involved with projects in the North End, two had participated in community meetings where CLOUT members were present. These two planners expressed a sense of respect for the strength and the power the women possessed as community organizers, leaders and lobbyists:

> It was humbling because it was a powerful kind of leadership that you could feel the strength beyond anything that you could ever feel in a boardroom room or in a municipal council meeting. I could feel a sense of wisdom and collective action…. To me it was powerful because it was women around a table doing something, I wonder if I felt it so strongly because they were predominantly Aboriginal women.
>
> Planner T

> CLOUT are strong women, done an incredible job for youth. Able to advocate for their programs and the people they are serving.
>
> Planner R

Planner R could also appreciate CLOUT's funding dilemmas, that they must walk a tenuous line between asking for funding and not criticizing government too loudly – as "not biting the hand that feeds them". While planners had an understanding of the effects of colonialism, they did not denounce its dynamics; what affected them more closely (being non-Indigenous) were the effects of neoliberalism, which they denounced easily.

> Neoliberalism is now in everything. It's a sign of the times, and it's manifested everywhere…. Some mayors are more pro-business… but it seems too very far to the right. It's frustrating
>
> Planner K

All the planners deplored the dynamics of neoliberalism, especially the practice by politicians of favouring planning approaches and decisions based on efficiency and cost cutting. This was especially visible to the planners who worked for the city who said they witnessed a sharp turn towards a pro-business focus in recent years. This neoliberal focus on efficiency led politicians to restrict the city planners' responsibilities (as well as cutting costs), forcing them to work within a narrow structure and preventing them from

doing much beyond reviewing and approving development projects for compliance with the City's land use policies. [59]

> Our priorities are our day-to-day jobs, and there's not a lot of resources. So when it comes time to do extra things, it's more challenging.... And we don't have the staff to do it either.
>
> Planner K

There no longer exists a formal process for planners to meet with community representatives on a regular basis, as was the case 10 to 15 years ago, when there was funding for residents' committees allowing planners to know what was happening.

> In the City of Winnipeg, the planners are not really doing the planning. They are either contracting it out [often to engineering firms, with a planner on staff]... or simply administering funds to get the planning done, or just regulating things - being a regulatory eye.
>
> Planner T

Most planners believed Winnipeg's history also explains the pro-business mentality, specifically the aftermath of the 1919 strike where the business community banded together against the strikers (most of whom belonged to the immigrant working class, who also lived in Winnipeg's North End neighbourhood at the time) to force them into submission. This historical pro-business strategy reproduced, over the years, a mentality that overvalues the point of view of the business community. To Planners K and T, this "squeaky wheel gets the grease" dynamic explains why the planning department had little input into planning decisions.

> The city [planning dept] is not the leader in those processes, so all we can do is guide the development, but if we were really serious as a city, then council would direct us to be the ones to create those plans. Then we would get the developments we want and not the development that the developer wants. We can guide discussion now, but not much more.
>
> Planner K

---

[59] It would seem that the planners are in for the long haul. See: http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/breakingnews/City-councillors-cool-to-bylaw-changes-214527181.html

Planner K and T noted that planners are forced to focus on the technical aspects of planning projects, leading to an increase in the number of planning decisions that favour input from engineers and less on planning principles for building community.

The planners' concerns about working in a dismissive political atmosphere are also compounded when their authority is undermined in areas that should fall under their purview. For instance, they do not have the authority to enforce Winnipeg's new planning policy *OUR Winnipeg – Complete communities.* While the document specifies that developers consult with communities, city planners cannot enforce it.

> If a private developer wants to develop a site, we always tell them you need to do consultation, but we can't force it, it is not a requirement.
>
> Planner K

He also noted that planners do not even have the authority to force developers to spend government project funds in the manner prescribed by the political pre-determined parameters of projects. The political devaluation of planning also extends to the appointment of the director of the planning department, and many of the managers, who are not trained as planners. To Planner K this means that the concerns of planners are even less likely to be brought to the attention of politicians and/or explained in proper planning terms. He adds that planners can rarely explain their work themselves, and are thus prevented from raising their profile with politicians or the public. To him, the devaluation of planning as a service to the city is also linked to ability of developers to influence the negative views of citizens. He envies city planners in other cities who have the authority to direct all consultation processes with citizens.

> There are very few cities in North America that don't have a planner in the position of leader. Planners have a different lens. Our first responsibility is to the public… if you don't have the planning background you cannot articulate to the politicians what is going on.
>
> Planner K

The combination of being historically undermined and the current neoliberal restrictions on planners to engage with citizens has led to loss of opportunities to address everyday issues. The current political culture also means that planners in Winnipeg are struggling just to be heard. To Planner T this is also evidenced by her perception of a lack of professional support between planners, compared to the support she sees engineers show for one each other's work.

III. RISING ACTION: Problems with systems and discourse

The rising action is the series of events that build up and create tension and suspense; the complications from the conflict between characters and context. The complicating events in this story are systems and discourse.

> Bureaucracy is entangled in everything.
> Planner G

> I think government is so focused on the immediate 'Now' and everything is going to the immediate now, so there's not a whole lot of forward thinking and visionary thinking.
> Excerpt from *Together we have CLOUT*

These statements sum up the view of both groups about the systems that limit their practices and prevent change – a problem related to neoliberal/political short-sightedness, where the political focus is to ensure the system survives rather than be responsive to the real needs of people.

The link between systems and the political devaluation of planning in Winnipeg as a service to citizens was obvious to planners, leading to further frustration with politicians who fail to see the irony in spending more on police or on development projects like the Youth for Christ project - to enhance the city's image - while cutting planning resources and creating confusion about its purpose as a service to citizens.

While the planners' frustration can be partly ascribed to concerns about job security, Planners T and R noted the establishment of Winnipeg's development corporation, Centre Venture, as a manifestation of the system supporting the political view about planning. Its agenda to maximize the city's value for tourism, places more value on planning projects that enhance the look of the city and its downtown than on the city's functionality for people.

> There is no respect for process, no respect for dialogue. It is deemed to be a waste of time. It gets in the way, a hurdle. They just need to make a decision and get things done.... They know what they want. And they are motivated to find a way to make it happen. They don't want to hear what people have to say about it... The tendency right now is to go for the Youth for Christ approach - to just go make a deal a corporate decision and you move on....
> ...Sure, there were market forces and other dynamics that dictated these choices. But he [the director of Centre Venture] does it by doing the opposite of what CLOUT would do. They decide and then they just do it. Engagement is minimal.
>
> Planner T

Planner T also noted that the neoliberal approach of dismissing people's everyday needs and spending instead on project like the Youth for Christ project is not good business practice. To her it also muddies the difference between engaging with people vs tokenistic consulting, or just announcing decisions, as was the case for YFC. Seeing an increase in tokenistic consultations, a change she linked directly to the neoliberal turn at City Hall, she decided to leave her position as a planner for the city. What became untenable to her was the growing tendency for politicians to pressure city planners into consultations with the sole aim of reducing risks and costs.

> Our systems tend to reward us for not engaging, but to be able to manage situations instead, where the outcomes or the solutions are predetermined, and to only look for feedback.
>
> Planner T

Notwithstanding these internal planning issues, the planners also noted that systems create special problems when working with Indigenous groups. Planner G told a story about when she worked as a community planner in the North End of Winnipeg in the 1990s. Indigenous community workers had high expectations of her and had trouble differentiating her slowness at getting projects approved - their perception - with the slow bureaucracy she was working in; it led to a great deal of anger and mistrust. As Planner G noted, the system was as challenging as trying to understand the projects these North End groups were proposing

While CLOUT members experienced similar dynamics in their everyday practices, they linked the problems with systems and tokenistic planning consultations with path dependency. As CLOUT member N states, this explains why they are often approached at the end of the planning stages for a project, not at the beginning when real dialogue can take place – even though CLOUT is known to city officials as being bona fide community representatives.

> They have a history of who they've gone to in the past. And they find people who have the same way of looking at things…That's the issue… We want a deal that starts with the grassroots. Not when the idea is already developed… And coming to CLOUT will complicate things. Absolutely… I also feel that they will go to people who have…like a masters or a doctorate, because that will give them more credibility… Who do you think they are going to listen to? Even though I know a lot more about the people here… I also think that the universities have played a part in that. It's all a system, and you can easily make them to say what you want them to say.
>
> CLOUT member N

To CLOUT members, the more crucial problem with tokenistic planning exercises is that they do not promote dialogue. To CLOUT dialogue is crucial to any community development process, if only to mitigate negative fallout, for residents, for developers and for all citizens. Dialogue would also help to alleviate misunderstandings, like when politicians avoid consultations with the inner city community under the false assumption that CLOUT will automatically oppose development projects.

To be fair, regular dialogue has never really existed between city planners and inner city community workers, but to CLOUT this reality simply reflects an ongoing and historical lack of political recognition for the local knowledge and expertise that exists in the inner city. It also undermines trust and explains why community reports are shelved to make way for pro-business decisions that do not take into account the wishes of citizens.

> When you are going to have an impact on people, you need to hear those people … Have that conversation with me… I might just compromise with

> you. And I might even be okay with it you know. I just want the opportunity to talk with you.
>
> CLOUT member H

CLOUT members recognize that tokenism and lack of substantive participation is a problem for other neighbourhoods and other community development groups in Winnipeg. What they deplore is how systems maintain the inner city in a disempowered position. They noted, as Hart (2010) does, that in a colonial/neoliberal context Indigenous people living in poverty always rank lower as citizens, even if everything else is the same; to them this reality also explains why inner city residents are rarely consulted by city planners. The fallout about the YFC decision, to them, was in reminding them again of how little power CLOUT has outside the inner city, when their role as representatives of inner city residents is established and known to politicians and planners.

This sense of being invisible also fuels CLOUT members' frustration with the neoliberal funding system, since it also negates their proven track record at creating effective programs that build capacity in the inner city. They object to a system that views Indigenous peoples as "less than" since there is little awareness of the difference in economic opportunities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. Like Alfred (1999, 2009), CLOUT believes people conflate the effects of colonial and neoliberal economic processes, leading to blaming individuals for not performing in the economy – a dynamic in which Indigenous children are especially vulnerable.

> Why do they live in such poverty? In our own backyards! And yet we turn a blind eye to it. And blame them for their state! And I don't understand that. …For us success is about the little things… . It's talking to our kids and hearing from them about the impact the programs had on them. To me that's the greatest value. That they are in a better a place because of 'this' [program]. It's not how many participants you had, or how many activities you ran. It's that stuff that you can't always count.
>
> Excerpt from *Together we have CLOUT*

What also frustrates CLOUT members are neoliberal/mainstream initiatives to 'solve' poverty in the inner city by teaching people how to budget when the everyday problem is lack of resources and opportunities. CLOUT connects these band-aid solutions with the neoliberal view about equality as treating everybody the same. To CLOUT, equality should be defined as "everybody needs to be same" (CLOUT member N), which means giving more to some if necessary, to create a level playing field. To CLOUT members, fairness is a better criterion of equality, and the mark of good leadership.

> So when I think about equality, it's that idea that you strip away everything else and you are just two people… it's really based on the opportunities that you were provided with in your life that make the difference…. For so many of our young people in our community, so much has happened in their lives…. And again, even [when non-Aboriginal people understand that], there's still that mentality, "Oh, my god! Let it go!". And it's like you can't! It's who you are.
>
> CLOUT member H

> Good leadership is about understanding fairness. Equality is different, because half a glass is enough for one person, and a full glass is enough for someone else. That may not be seen as equal, but it is because that's what they need. Right? So it's a fairness. Everyone should be allowed the same thing. The same opportunities.
>
> Excerpt from *Together we have CLOUT*

CLOUT members also object to the illness model that characterizes mainstream systems, in the sense of waiting for disease to appear before doing something about a problem. To them, their approach based on creating integration and health is more proactive. They also object to the mainstream tendency to focus on single issues, like a woman's lack of housing, and not address the root causes of her poverty, which are systemic. Addressing social dynamics as a whole is crucial to CLOUT because we are complex beings with complex stories – not just parts. CLOUT members also note that systems modelled on illness are geared to eradicate problems, whereas systems based on health look for connections and integration. Paradoxically, for CLOUT, looking for

connections means looking for cracks in people's stories in order to improve the integrative approach they have established in the inner city.

CLOUT also deplores the common neoliberal response to the problem of poverty with hands outs and charity. To them supporting inner city residents means creating opportunities - because charity is a band-aid solution and what CLOUT wants are opportunities for youth and families.

> I like what Mary Richard did. She asked Mayor Susan Thompson for three things: recognition, responsibility and opportunity. She said "I'm not asking for money"... I'm in a similar position. When I talk to the business community...I am not interacting with these people because I want their money. I am interacting because I want them to understand me, and I want to understand them. I want them to recognize the strengths and the resilience in our community and I want to help leverage their influence for opportunities for our young people... Everybody just needs the opportunity but so often we are not even in the same playing field.
>
> CLOUT member O

For their part, the planners also deplored neoliberal processes of fragmentation, especially the political pressures they are under to perform specific planning duties like zoning, since these kinds of everyday activities prevent the creation of conversations across the city, and crucial connections that would provide an overall picture of people's planning needs. Planner K also commented on the fact that city planners were also stymied by a lack of integration and information sharing across city systems, contributing to a greater sense of fragmentation.

> Many communities in Winnipeg are fragmented and segregated and our system is linear and it compartmentalizes things. It's also bureaucratized and hierarchical. It's a problem to me, as a planner and as a woman.
>
> Planner T

The discourse supporting these systems was also problematic to both groups. The planners objected mostly to the equivocal nature of neoliberal discourse, while CLOUT objected to the colonial discourse that reveals how much people misunderstand the Indigenous everyday. CLOUT members also linked colonial and neoliberal discourse, since the two are often conflated and often lead to discourses like "get with the program".

> You get really angry when you see some people's reactions, and seeing it over and over again… And I go "Okay. I will just keep walking my walk here" …and not let that get me down. I need to stay with what I know to be true and keep going. I get patted on the head a lot, and I choose not to let that get to me. I have my dignity and I have my line as well. I don't think people are ill-intended and I don't think people do it on purpose. They just don't know they are potentially being condescending. They don't know the privilege in which they walk.
>
> CLOUT member O

Like LaRocque (2010), CLOUT members are concerned with how colonial discourse creates problems of definition for all people, especially when trying to describe everyday issues in the inner city. They were weary of the mainstream language that favours binaries while obscuring the interrelatedness and complexities of everyday colonial and neoliberal problems for Indigenous peoples.

> It is easier to describe a problem because you can use very simple and short sentences to describe it, and people will understand what you are saying. But trying to describe the solution for CLOUT, it takes longer, because it is based in our values. The thing is that the problem can be compartmentalized [in the mainstream approach], and you can point to it. But the solution to CLOUT is much more holistic and integrated. The solution isn't compartmentalized. You can't just deal with housing, without dealing with all the rest of it, and that is based on a worldview of seeing the solution as being holistic.
>
> CLOUT member O [60]

The planners were somewhat sensitive to colonial discourse as in Planner K's comment about his experience with people who try to disguise racist/colonial discourses

[60] The word 'simple' and 'short sentences' is used here to mean binaries.

by calling Indigenous people 'renters' – a word that also reflects the prevalent neoliberal view that non property owners are 'less than'.

> It's weird you don't hear the word [racism] anymore. People come to consultations and they use certain words, and you know what they are saying. And I've prodded them "What do you mean 'those' people. What do you mean by 'renters'… Or they say, "I have no problem with 'renters' but...". I often find myself having to say back "Well, if you have no problem with renters, then what's the problem?".
>
> Planner K

While he was sensitive to this marginalizing discourse, he did not denounce it, reflecting the colonial reality that awareness of colonialism does not necessarily lead to seeing the need to struggle for liberation – especially given that non-Indigenous people doe not need to decolonize (Barker, 2010). In other words, the planners may have shown awareness and sensitivity about the effects of colonialism on Indigenous peoples, overall, their own discourse revealed a limited engagement with decolonization.

A similar dynamic occurred when planners expressed (real) sympathy for the need for better education about colonialism; their comments also revealed a limited understanding about the political nature of Indigenous differences – as in this comment in response to a question about why there is little consultation in the inner city:

> The Aboriginal community is not alone in not being heard in Winnipeg, and women too. It's a matter of degree. But to overcome it, there has to be a coalescing, there has to be a dynamic of putting your differences aside and figure out what you have in common and focus energies to make the difference.
>
> Planner R

While Planner R's analysis of what can be done to build alliances shows sensitivity to the need for differences, his assessment as a matter of degrees sounds like the problematic discourse about difference being cultural difference that dismisses Indigenous difference in Canada as a political matter of substance (LaRocque, 2010; Coulthard, 2007: Alfred, 1999). This was likely not his intention, but it does point to the

reality that while planners may be sensitive to racist/colonial discourse, their own discourse tended to reflects the difficulty of displacing colonial discourse in Canada. This reality became another subtext in planners' responses to why there is little consultation in the inner city and the possibility of future development plans for the North End:

> I guess it's just not on the political radar. It's not important to do planning in those areas, or secondary plans. Because [politicians] think nothing is happening there…. And there is no one banging on the door at City Hall to plan from those areas. And then some people will say well do they really need a plan? Is a plan really going to help the area? Well…maybe not, but [a plan] does provide some assurance and some input of the vision of what those people want to see in their neighbourhood, right? The residents and the business community. And developers like to go where there is certainty.
>
> Planner K

The subtext here is that if North End residents want to engage in a formal planning process, the onus is on them to ask. This supports Hart's (2010) comment that Indigenous peoples are doing the brunt of the work of decolonizing and creating spaces for dialogue with non-Indigenous people. Planner K's comment, however, should also be seen in light of community plan exercises in Winnipeg that are routinely hijacked by business interests, even in affluent neighbourhoods, where residents have more of a voice politically – as has been his experience a month before being interviewed for this thesis. What Planner K is also saying is that if this can happen in affluent neighbourhoods, where people do go banging on the doors of City Hall, the North End is even less likely to be consulted by city planners, because it boils down to who is important politically.

One planner was asked to comment about the possibility of going to the North End to meet with Indigenous peoples on his own time (because, given the system, this may likely be what planners would need to do). The answer was ambivalence. When pressed, he did admit that factors like racism and poverty were factors in the unlikelihood

that a community planning process will occur in the North End. His reticence shows sensitivity but the problem for CLOUT is that they need allies who will say it like it is.

> When I think about the impact of colonization I think it's about ownership. On both sides. It's an experience, and it is mostly an Aboriginal experience…. And how we move forward, you need to consult with people who have experienced it. Non-Aboriginal people don't think of themselves as colonized people, because they don't want to be.
>
> CLOUT member H

While the planners knew about colonialism, their discourse reflected the general problem in Canada with conflating colonial and neoliberal ideologies, and minimizing Indigenous differences. This conflation is a problem for CLOUT members, since it means spending more time educating people, and limits the number and the quality of dialogues they can have with potential allies. Another problem is that mainstream approaches do not address the different needs of Indigenous peoples and serve to reinforce the dynamics of colonial privilege and marginalization. CLOUT is also concerned with the invisibility of privilege, which was also reflected in the planners' discourse.

> We need people… [to] understand that a western worldview is not the only worldview. Because the assumption out there is that it is THE worldview and everybody's got to get with that program.
>
> CLOUT member O

IV. TURNING POINT: Decision time

The turning point is a moment when the course of events is changed by a decision to overcome obstacles. This decision defines the rest of the story.
In this story, both groups are faced with similar dynamics as community planners in the eyes of policy makers and the public. They both also have a strong need to be seen and recognized politically for their expertise and to wield more influence on municipal decisions. As the next section will show, each group's ability to choose a response to the everyday dynamics is highly dependent on the kinds of relationships they nurture in their everyday.

V. FALLING ACTION: Responding with resistance and inaction

Falling action is the gradual subsiding of action after the turning point.
In this story, CLOUT and the planners respond differently to the systems and discourses that create invisibility for them – but while the planners are stuck in a kind of paralysis, CLOUT resists.

> Planning is a four-letter word in our city; we are persona non grata.
>
> Planner R

This statement sums up the planners' frustration with the neoliberal approach by Winnipeg city leaders to limit the authority of planners by limiting their ability to engage with citizens, (or do more than superficial community feedback exercises), and forcing them to concentrate their work on the technical aspects of development projects. Being prevented from engaging in ongoing dialogical processes with citizens also prevents the planners from doing what planning is meant to do, create community.

The planners ascribed this everyday reality to the pro-business mentality that condones a practice of "backroom deals" (Planner R), where developers and business people regularly bypass proper planning channels to talk directly to City Councillors about development projects or planning policies that negatively affect their bottom line. Some planners used a recent planning controversy as an example: an instance where business people succeeded in derailing a community planning process in a popular and

affluent part of the city by appealing directly to sympathetic City Councillors. To Planners K and T, this "squeaky wheel gets the grease" dynamic also explains why the planning department had little input into the political decision to support the Youth for Christ development project.

Given these everyday realities and their fragmentation as members of a profession, it comes as no surprise that the planners would respond with inaction. Contrary to CLOUT members, the planners are working mostly in isolation from each other, as well as from Winnipeg residents, in various types of practices scattered around the city. While as individuals they could see through as well as link the systems and discourses that affect their ability to work and be recognized for their expertise, their field of view is filled with the overwhelming nature of these systems and discourse – a reality that reveals how much the planners are being absorbed by the systems they denounce and deplore, exemplifying the neoliberal ability to prevent resistance via fragmentation. And while the planners could imagine what an alliance building planning praxis could look like, or how to go about doing it, they were ultimately rendered inactive, by virtue of being fragmented.

The extent of the planners' paralysis was evident in a view that seemed to also blame Winnipeg citizens for not seeing through the systems and discourse that are negatively affecting the ability of the community as a whole to create effective planning processes in Winnipeg.

> The public generally believes in planning but they will not go to City hall to demonstrate and say we need more planners. We do, however hear "We need more police". That's the reality and that's a political decision.
> Planner R

To be sure, some of the planners who witnessed the neoliberal turn in city policies decided to do something, they decided to leave their position at the city; Planner T, to start his own planning firm, where he chooses his own projects, often with Indigenous people - and Planner R, to work as a planner for an engineering firm, where she says she does what she can to adapt planning processes to the groups she is hired to work with - (Planner G retired around that time). While these planners chose new paths that provided them with more control and more wriggle room in their practices, these alternative practices belong to Rankin's (2012) subversion type of practice in that they are not aimed at transforming the system, but to change personal circumstances. This quandary was evident to Planner T, whose pride at being able to push the envelope (subverting prescribed planning parameters) when working with various groups was also tinged with awareness that the changes she was making were minimal and only relevant within that specific planning context.

The irony about the planners' difficulty in becoming mobilized is that they have more societal power than CLOUT members – by being mostly 'white' and male. In theory they should wield more power in civil society. Planner K was most aware of his sense of paralysis – perhaps because he was still working for the city. Responding to how alliances could be built, he commented that unless the city were to develop a big planning project in the inner city, the chances of planners and Indigenous peoples starting a regular dialogue would be 'next to zero'.

> It's those high level projects that bring in that kind of consultation. But aside from those projects, I'm not sure what the process [of building alliances] would be.
>
> Planner K

It was however clear to him, and to other planners, that such a project was wishful thinking given the lack of political will to support meaningful everyday community building planning processes - not only in the inner city but across the city; to Planner R "there is no political leadership to back this kind of initiative". [61]

It is clear from CLOUT members' responses that they are resisting the Euro-Western worldview that prevails in the mainstream. Their resistance is also visible in their contrapuntal talk style (LaRocque, 2010) and their strong sense of purpose based on their Indigenous worldview, especially the value it places on integration.[62] CLOUT was indeed created to integrate the fragmented social programs that existed in the inner city during the Child Welfare Initiative devolution process. And despite the marginalizing effects of colonialism and neoliberalism, this collaborative effort to build community has contributed to a new decolonizing community spirit in the North End. Slow yet steady social and spatial changes are also happening and people are experiencing a sense of their own value and a greater ability to stand up for justice (MacKinnon & Stephens, 2007).

The positive outcomes of CLOUT's integrative practice (MacKinnon & Stephens, 2007) affirm Fainstein's (2010) argument to align goals with practice.[63] But as CLOUT members state, they could not do this work without the support of the community – a community whose ability to support CLOUT was created by CLOUT's capacity building practices by being present, building trust and sharing power. Coalition members describe

---

[61] The planners also deplored the lack of political leadership in relation to the recent *Speak Up Winnipeg* cross-city planning exercise. While it generated a lot of civic enthusiasm, the parameters of the project raises some questions about the extent to which citizens could really talk about other kinds of planning issues that might have been on their minds. In other words, the exercise was more hype than a real planning exercise - a tokenistic consultation process that was designed to not challenge the status quo where politicians decide what to do according to their wants, not those of citizens. This is evident in the recent decision by City Council to sell off municipal golf course to raise cash, a decision that was done mostly behind doors despite a vocal faction of citizens disputing the decision.

[62] Planner T felt this sense of purpose when she met a few of the CLOUT members at a community meeting. She also commented about the power she felt in their presence.

[63] The inner city of Winnipeg is indeed a place where the word 'decolonization' is understood and used openly.

this support as the source of their power; it gives them the strength to struggle against systems and discourse and for recognition. They also credit the community's support for giving them the power to take political risks, and to the point if necessary of putting their jobs on the line to speak back to politicians or and people.

> My power is that the community is behind me… I have the power to bring people together, because they believe in what we do. And they see the results in what we do, and they are a part of it. So there's ownership. And they would fight for it also.
>
> CLOUT member N

CLOUT's practice of sharing its power with the community has stabilized the neighbourhood, in concert with other local programs. In this light, CLOUT does not completely conform to the Foucauldian view that all struggles for justice and equality are inherently about acquiring more power, since CLOUT goes one step further by sharing its power because CLOUT members understand that there is more power to be gained by sharing power, albeit a different kind of power. This view about power informs CLOUT's approach to leadership as being primarily about listening, a view they also ascribe to their Indigenous worldview. Listening to as many voices as possible may complicate decision-making processes, but as CLOUT members note, listening in an egalitarian way creates the high level of trust they enjoy, with all residents, Indigenous and non-Indigenous.

> I may be the director [of the organization], but I don't consider myself any higher than a 14 year old kid living off the street. His opinion is as valuable to me as any other person, even professionals. Because in the end it will impact him…And he might bring me another point of view that I didn't even think about…. And that's about giving the community the opportunity to have ownership and let them know that their voice is important… And they become more invested in what's going on…
>
> CLOUT member H

While these everyday grassroots relationships are a source of power for CLOUT members and contributes to their ability to resist, and while their praxis of building these relationships aligns with their worldview, a more important source of power and

resistance is the reality that CLOUT members are allies to each other. To get to that point, however, they had to work through the steps to become allies (Bishop, 2002); understanding oppressions (theirs and others) and becoming liberated through healing. All the women spoke of their experiences of engaging in decolonization earlier in their lives, which led to an ability to translate self and then to their careers as community building practitioners - a time when they also came to understand that being a leader means you cannot teach what you do not practice yourself (Bishop, 2002).

CLOUT's collaborative practice conforms to Rankin's definition of resistance as a movement that is local, collective and overt, while its specific nature of seeking integration, in and of itself, challenges the colonial and neoliberal pressures that devalue this approach. To them the greatest value of working together is that it allows them to better criticize the systems and discourses that negatively affect their everyday (Rankin (2012). In this light CLOUT's work is political in the sense advocated by Edward Said (2000) as an open critique of the status quo. It also echoes Marcuse's understanding of a Critical Urban practice of exposing, proposing and politicizing.

Bayoumi and Rubin (2000) note that Said's politicized academic life provided crucial leadership, especially his belief that he had a "duty to be embarrassing, contrary even unpleasant" (p.xiv). This personal practice of grounding his criticism in everyday practice revealed many cracks in colonialism, views that continue to unsettle society. CLOUT members are providing a similar kind of leadership outside of the inner city. As for the listening/egalitarian leadership and governance they are providing within the inner city, it supports Friedmann's (2002) definition: "Good governance requires leadership to articulate a common vision for the polity, build a strong consensus around this vision and mobilize the resources necessary for carrying it out" (p.27).

So while the North End community is fragmented and fragmenting, by dint of historical and ongoing systemic marginalization, CLOUT is not only countering colonialism and neoliberalism, but the coalition has become a point of stability and security for its members, allowing them to deal with everyday uncertainties and unpredictability. CLOUT organizations have become points of stability in the inner city – and CLOUT has become a centre of power in the margins (Gough, 2002).

CLOUT's struggle as inner city community practitioners resembles the philosophy that informs the right to the city; they are working to ensure that people in the inner city are recognized in the city, and they are doing so by developing people's capacity to struggle with a range of decolonizing programs. Their own capacity is also raised in tandem with the people they serve.

CLOUT's struggle to self-translate and define self, according to one's values, reflects a critical aspect of Indigenous liberation and recognition (LaRocque, 2010; Coulthard, 2007) – especially from the discourse about 'getting with the program' – a discourse whose real meaning, to accept homogeneity and absorption, is plain to them. CLOUT wants and needs to be different, because their approach to community development is different. Their assertion about the distinct nature of their identity and approach is also not only cultural, but is presented as a different knowledge-base practice (Baikie, 2009).

As CLOUT member O stated, the need to work within, between and across culturally different contexts has created conflicting demands for CLOUT leading to identity and role dissonance (Baikie, 2009). CLOUT however, accepts the struggle, affirming Lefebvre's (1996) view of the need to struggle as well as the Foucauldian view that the struggle needs to be ongoing.

> I'm always fighting for the underdog. I don't appreciate the people who have the power and the money and who can just go out there and make these things happen. I also like the struggle of it all. I don't think I would want anything handed over. It just wouldn't feel right. I think we need to fight for everything we have to get and it only makes us stronger.
>
> CLOUT member A

To be sure, CLOUT's relationship and struggle with the mainstream is complex, and often leads to anger. But like Jojola, Alfred, LaRocque (among many anti-colonial voices), this anger has become a mobilizing tool and coalition members express it in a way that does not define them – but helps them, rather, to focus their energies. Accepting the struggle also makes CLOUT stronger and deepens their sense of identity and belonging. To them, resistance is part of moving on (LaRocque, 2010).

In contrast to the planners, CLOUT members are attempting to change the system, to the extent they can without "biting the hand that feeds them" (Planner R). CLOUT's anti-colonial approach also exemplifies Foucault's observation that the ideological inconsistencies of an ideology create its own countering forces. There is no question that working with a worldview that inherently counters colonialism and neoliberalism is bound to be a struggle. There is also no question that different worldviews will lead to different responses to political pressures. That the planners are caught inside the system reflects their Euro-western worldview. It also reflects the reality that planners in Winnipeg are not working as allies to each other, something Planner T recognized, as well as planners not having a sense of a common goal. To CLOUT member H, this reality is explained by the reality that planners are not connecting knowledge with action or theory with practice.

> When it comes down to it... we need to tie things to how people see things, but they can't seem to put 2 and 2 together.
>
> CLOUT member H

VI. RESOLUTION: Potential for becoming allies

> The resolution is the part of a story where the complications of the plot are explained or simplified. Resolving these conflicts releases built-up tension. This is typically where the story ends and where loose ends are tied up.

> To be allies, non-indigenous people will need to learn, understand and lend a hand.
>
> Justice Murray Sinclair
> speech at CCPA event, November 27, 2011

In a colonial and neoliberal context, alliance building is a resistance practice that involves asserting one's self-translated and liberated identity. The story of the planners and CLOUT reveals that currently the potential to becoming an ally is weak, in large part because of their different responses to colonialism and neoliberalism.

There are many steps to becoming an ally; a journey that involves understanding oppression and personal oppression(s) and becoming liberated of these dynamics (Bishop, 2002). While CLOUT is well advanced on this journey, by virtue of being engaged in decolonization, the planners are at the beginning stages of their journey to becoming liberated from the devaluation of planning at City Hall, a culture that was exacerbated by the neoliberal turn in municipal politics. Some of the planners attempted liberation, by adopting alternative practices that were, however, not aimed at transforming planning practices in Winnipeg. In other words, the planners are in the process of understanding their own oppression, but have not begun the process of healing, in part because they work in isolation from each other.

Taking a cue from CLOUT's praxis, the journey to becoming allies to CLOUT, for the planners, would likely need to begin with becoming allies to each other, as CLOUT did. Doing so would help on two fronts: creating a sense of security and stability to counter the everyday unsettledness the planners described from working within the

rules of the system while refuting the system, and promoting more difficult conversations around the need to become more politicized.

To be politicized, means to be on the edge, to push the limits, and disturb conventional politics (hooks, 2008). To be sure, the planners did recognize the need to become politicized and educate people about the marginalizing effects of colonialism on Indigenous peoples, and the exacerbating effects of neoliberalism.

> We need to change the system so that people understand why Aboriginal people are living in poverty, why so many in prison, so that we can change things so that opportunities can be made available, for kids in particular.
> Q) What can planners do?
> They would need to become more political…to make sure people get educated.
>
> Planner R

But while planners understood the nature of their oppression and that of Indigenous peoples, that understanding did not translate into self-translation or becoming liberated or mobilized. Understanding the need to become politicized also did not translate into seeing that the current neoliberal lack of resources need not be a barrier to alliance building with CLOUT, nor prevent planners from building alliances during personal hours – an idea that was mostly dismissed by the planners to whom it was asked.

Notwithstanding these real life and systemic barriers to alliance building between planners and CLOUT in Winnipeg, what are some of the conditions CLOUT members would place on such a practice? The first condition would be CLOUT's expectation that potential allies work within their Indigenous values. Given that CLOUT's success as a community development practice is based on these values, about integration, this expectation is reasonable. CLOUT would also expect potential allies to follow their lead. Echoing LaRocque (2010), CLOUT member N explains that following CLOUT's lead means to think in terms of seeing the whole.

> They [planners] need to think of working for the good of everyone… because you can't keep us separate, where Aboriginal people only take care of Aboriginal people.,. We've got to be at the same place, and they've got to stop looking at us as if we are out to get them, if possible, and we need to do the same too. I know it sounds idealistic but that's a goal at least.
>
> CLOUT member N

Given that both groups deplore neoliberalism, an ideology built on the Euro-western worldview, an ideology that is the opposite of the Indigenous worldview upon which CLOUT's praxis is based, CLOUT's expectation that allies follow their lead would also be a necessary condition for alliance building. The final condition is related to the other two; CLOUT's expectation that potential allies be engaged in a process of decolonization. Given that Indigenous people have so far been doing the brunt of the work of decolonizing (HART, 2010), this condition is also necessary.

As CLOUT member A notes, decolonization to her is visible by people's actions, not by their words, and by their willingness to take responsibility for colonialism, in the sense of owning it, not in their words – or as LaRocque (2010) states, as an experience that needs to be made right again. CLOUT member A also recognizes that decolonization involves a choice for non-Indigenous people, a choice she doesn't have (Barker, 2010). The question about whether or not to decolonize is also muddied in Winnipeg by the absence of a discourse in planning about decolonization, a reality that reflects the lack of anti-colonial and politicized leadership at Manitoba Professional Planning Institute (MPPI), the professional planners' association.[64] In other words, its mandate to focus on the professional interests of its members - reflecting the path dependency of planning as an institution - and its silence on colonialism (Porter, 2010; Roy, 2006) – means that decolonization is not discussed as a group. In the absence of a

[64] See: http://www.mppi.mb.ca/

message about the need to decolonize, planners in Winnipeg are on their own.

In this climate, individual planners who want to develop a decolonizing and politicized practice should remember Arturo Escobar's (2012) observation that while planning as an institution may be linked to colonial and neoliberal oppression, via its silent complicity, as a practice planning is not inherently oppressive and need not be. The future of planning in Winnipeg depends on this transformative idea.

> In Winnipeg we have not come together yet in a big way, in a critical mass kind of way. There is some bridging going on, but for me, this doesn't feel like it is happening in a big way. Given Winnipeg's demographics, we should be leading the country in this [learning to work together], because we have a huge Indigenous population here, and it is the birthplace of some important [Indigenous people and events]... Winnipeg is so positioned to be the leader in this and it seems that we have not been able to do that.
>
> CLOUT member O

Winnipeg is indeed well positioned to be a leader in Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations and alliance building practices, given its unique history and its large urban Indigenous population. The other reality about Winnipeg, however, is that it is a physically divided city, with divisions made worse over the past three decades by neoliberal social policy and colonial discourses - barriers to alliance building that are maintained everyday by the media with messages discouraging people from venturing into the North End, for fear of the other, and of gangs and violence. CLOUT members try to counter these myths about the inner city, but the time they have is limited and is usually spent educating potential non-Indigenous allies. To them that's where allies could fit in, to help spread alternative positive messages about the inner city and to share the work of challenging colonial and neoliberal socio-economic policy.[65] This is something the planners understood:

[65] See appendix E – CLOUT's principles of alliance building

> Any planner working for the public good would not be doing their job by ignoring the Aboriginal community in the North End, given the statistics [that Winnipeg has the largest urban Indigenous population in Canada].
>
> Planner R

For their part, CLOUT members were sympathetic to the everyday challenges faced by people, like planners, who work within the Euro-Western worldview, even while criticizing its systems and discourse.

> Committees and funders are more open now. We have good relationships with our government and funding partners. But overall there is still a lot of work that still needs to be done.... And then there are those who get it, but are stuck by their government cookie cutter... There's nothing they can do because of the red tape. Sometimes it's the system that really blocks them and that's unfortunate because you can see how much they want to help and make things better, but they are stuck.
>
> CLOUT member H

Even though alliance building is onerous to CLOUT members, they stated that it was a priority for them. This view was supported by their answers to being asked to imagine a world with stable funding - a situation that would create self-sufficiency and possibly remove the need for alliances; they all replied that stable core funding would simply give them the time to create better relationships, leading to better opportunities people, and a richer sense of community for everyone.

> I don't want to be disconnected from the rest of the city because I would want the rest of the community to get the same as what I have...And, of course, we could meet to get ideas... We always want to know what's happening on the other side, in order to make your side function better, or to help with ideas that you've got through looking at others.
>
> CLOUT member N

> If we had sufficient funding we would have a heck of a lot more time to build relationships with our allies because I think, right now, because of the inadequate funding... we are spending a lot of energy to get that stabilization. We don't have a lot of time to make those relationships with our allies stronger, unless we involve them in a project... It's working together that's the important thing.
>
> CLOUT member A

Despite CLOUT's openness to creating alliances, there was a clear hesitation on the part of both groups about working with the other. While the planners acknowledged their limited understanding of the Indigenous worldview, CLOUT members said they did not understand the practice of planning (not surprising given the dearth of planning engagements in the inner city).

> If I had to speak to a group of city planners I have no clue if what I am saying will make any sense to city planners, because I don't know who they are, how they think and what they do.
>
> CLOUT member O

> The ability to understand the assumptions of an Aboriginal community project is not easily revealed to a non-Aboriginal person.
>
> Planner G

Given the current realities in Winnipeg, it would become incumbent upon planners to become more visible to CLOUT since the planners' own invisibility means that they do not come naturally to CLOUT's mind as potential allies. That the responsibility to start the process of becoming visible, falls onto the planners reflects the anti-colonial position of this thesis, since the onus of cleaning the debris of colonialism falls on non-Indigenous peoples (LaRocque, 2010).

Visibility arises from dialogue. As the research shows, however, regular dialogue is also practically non-existent between the planners and CLOUT members organizations; a reality that is not likely to change soon. Taking a wider view, this reality also reflects the colonial reality in Canada of two separate nations sharing the same land.[66] This complex everyday, where different worldviews co-exist and collide simultaneously, means that CLOUT is operating in something like parallel universe in Winnipeg – or to use a different image, as if planners and CLOUT are moving on different train tracks.

[66] Daniel Paul Bork, an Indigenous community development consultant, told me this during an interview for SRC-CBC. The image was clear and I understood at once what was at stake. I was also filled with fear and a sense of mobilization all at once.

VII. DÉNOUEMENT

> The dénouement is the unravelling of the repercussions of the story - what comes out of the story. Beyond the different ability to resist the status quo, another tangible-intangible outcome of this research is CLOUT's ability to be hopeful in the face of the current everyday context.

CLOUT members' ability to resist is what ultimately demarcates them from the planners – a practice based on decolonization and becoming liberated from being defined by the dominant systems and discourse. What also demarcates CLOUT members' responses from the planners is a tangible sense of hope, affirming Bishop's (2002) understanding that hope arises from having allies. This sense of hope, in turn, allows them to accept the reality that there is only so much they can do.

> Sometimes the work is stressful because they have stressful lives and it's hard because you feel for them and there's nothing you can do for them sometimes.
>
> CLOUT member N

Accepting their limitations, has also led CLOUT members to adopt a strategy of incremental change. Focusing on shaping institutional processes and mitigating their negative effects is also more manageable in the everyday. As CLOUT member N notes, when undesirable outcomes occur, approaches are re-adjusted, and they move on. This conscious decision to focus on positive outcomes also provides them with a sense of security while opening a space for the imagination (Bishop, 2002) that liberates CLOUT members from seeing themselves in the way the system and the discourse sees them. Simply put, much depends on what you look for, and CLOUT is seeing what its members are looking for - connections.

Planners were also seeing what they were looking for: how systems stand in the way of connecting knowledge with action. And because they are focussing on these barriers, they see what is missing, leading to a sense of paralysis, a continued sense of separation and fragmentation and a limited ability to engage with the imagination. Given that the planners all deplored the devaluation of planning in Winnipeg, planners looking to build planning into valuable urban practice in Winnipeg would do well to borrow from CLOUT's resistance and integrative practice. In other words, if they want the support of the community, they must act as a support for the community and work at creating connections. It's that simple and that profound.

The need for allies as a support system is something CLOUT teaches. In this light and in the absence of institutional supports fro decolonization in planning in Winnipeg, and given that creating alliances with CLOUT would need to come down to individual planners, these planners may need to consider joining forces with other professional associations whose work resembles planning to get the kind of support they need.[67] They may also need to create a group of like-minded professionals across many disciplines.

In creating the conditions for a hopeful planning practice, CLOUT's resistance practice is also a teacher *par excellence.* Borrowing from CLOUT, the following table presents some orientations to planning practice to support alliance building in Winnipeg.

[67] There are progressive planning groups in Winnipeg, but the work they do also tends to be safe. There is no appetite for controversy or for disruptive types of practices that could open up cracks towards understanding.

Table 1. Resistance orientations to planning practice to support alliance building

RESIST	planning's silent complicity in reifying Indigenous difference in re/producing marginalization
RESIST	the institutional focus on cultural differences and processes of "othering";
RESIST	tokenistic gestures and make sure actions mean something, and since they only bring back the pain of colonialism.
RESIST	using binaries (*'either/or')* and adopt mediated language ('*both/and*')
RESIST	colonial discourse and use contrapuntal language to counter the 'official' story
RESIST	the tendency towards individualism and focus on the struggle to be different, to be an individual and individuated
RESIST	the fear of Indigenous anger
RESIST	the fear of agonistic spaces where people can meet and struggle together to assert their differences in a deliberative and respectful way
RESIST	fragmentation and absorption by working collectively
RESIST	being defined by dynamics of power-over, choose to practice self-translation and power-with

A common theme that also emerged in this research, since members of both groups made the same statement, is the recognition of the need for a big community project to start the process of alliance building. This "solution", a situation where both groups would have the opportunity to learn about the other, could also potentially raise their visibility in the larger municipal context – an irony also, given that what they would be sharing is their invisibility. But as this CLOUT member states, the mere act of sharing information would be transformative.

> People don't realize how much could change if they had the right information [acquired through sharing].
>
> CLOUT member H

Responding to the image of two separate nations moving on separate train tracks, CLOUT member H offered a new image; a vision of the two trains on parallel tracks going in the same direction at the same speed, with several stations and bridges along the way, where dialogue and exchange can take place. The many bridges are crucial in her vision to ensure the two worlds keep up with each other and share information. [68]

The relationship between CLOUT and the CCPA creates a strong precedent for an alliance built on looking for positives and hope. It also highlights the reassurance that allies can provide. In this relationship, the CCPA learned from CLOUT the need to highlight the positive outcomes of research (MacKinnon, personal communication, April 29, 2011). The CCPA also learned the importance of building and maintaining connections through dialogue, and the need for both to share their knowledge and expertise. Becoming an ally for the CCPA also meant eschewing academic writing to ensure the research was accessible to inner city residents. This aspect of their alliance with CLOUT became a resistance practice for the CCPA, an approach that sometimes also included eschewing academic rigour for its own sake, since the realities in the inner city are not conducive to such standards, especially when unpredictable and messy participatory methods are used.

[68] At the beginning of this thesis I wondered aloud about planning's ability to transform. This comment was made in regard to my use of yoga as a guide to learning about the world and relationships. To follow up on this idea, I created a document that relates CLOUT's praxis and yoga practice. It can be found in Appendix F.

In this alliance, the role of CLOUT members is foremost to be 'Safe Indians' for the CCPA. This means being present and grounded in the everyday activities of the inner city community, being a point of contact – a mediator, being open and available for dialogue and sharing knowledge and skills.[69] The ultimate key to alliance building is an everyday practice of being a learner (Bishop, p.109), being present, being there, and seeing the struggle against one oppression as a struggle against all oppression. To CLOUT members, the basis for learning is to align head and heart.

> The light bulb comes on when they start to decolonize, but it really starts to happen when it gets into their heart, not into their head. Our elders tell us that it's sometimes a long journey to the heart for non-aboriginal folks. They think that once you get it in the heart that you got it.
>
> CLOUT member A

[69] See appendix G – Bishop's observations on alliance building for members of both groups

Chapter 5. THAT'S A WRAP !

The Man Made of Words by N. Scott Momaday (1997) is a series of essays about the importance of storytelling to Indigenous peoples. In cultures based on oral tradition, stories are told to entertain, but more importantly to transfer values, culture, and identity; they are "a means of reaffirming the relationship that native people have with the land, a practical matter that balances respect and survival" (King 2003, p.113). Crucial to this transfer of knowledge is the relationships stories build, a central tenet of the Indigenous worldview, where stories are "not subject to the imposition of such questions as true or false, fact or fiction, stories are realities lived and believed. They are true" (Momaday, 1997, p.3). My understanding of this concept is that stories are vehicles for telling truths about human relationships and the world (physical, emotional and intellectual). This concept also reflects what we know from scientific knowledge and personal experience, that truth is a construct that can only be understood in context; truth is a story; a theory.

> Want a different ethic? Tell a different story.
>
> Thomas King, 2003, p. 164

Transforming planning practices is to tell a different story. It may be a simple proposition but it is also profound in that telling a different story is to change what is true. This explains why change is unsettling. Aligning goals with practices that will create change can also be unsettling as the planners in this research reveal. CLOUT's story of aligning goals with practice is effectively achieving needed change in the inner city, and the different story they are telling is that of a community where social justice and resistance are increasingly becoming part of the everyday, in part because a coalition of CBOs decided a few years ago to integrate their services and work together as allies.

CLOUT members are also doing so by not attaching themselves too closely to outcomes, and trusting that together they will manage negative outcomes when they arise. However, this hopeful story is rarely heard outside of the North End, since the media continues to portray the area as dangerous, effectively ensuring its continued separation from other communities in Winnipeg.[70]

The planners' story is different, because they are following a script that creates and ensures a continued sense of separation, and therefore, inaction. Their story is largely unchanging, because they are not looking towards each other for support and imagination. As a result, planners were primarily looking for solutions from the outside – based on their belief that not much can be done with what they have (or don't have). They were seeing what they were choosing to see - a choice that was effectively informed by political pressures to limit their everyday practices. While the planners were not resisting these pressures, their inaction is a resistance of a different kind: they are resisting change - or they limit their practices by picking and choosing what they will do; a subversive kind of resistance that does not lead to change. Unlike CLOUT, their actions do not really align with their hearts – with what they know to be true. As a result the Indigenous-non-Indigenous space in Winnipeg is not being addressed by planning as an institution – or by individual planners or in collaboration with other community development practitioners.

This underlying difference between the two groups is the barrier to Indigenous-non-Indigenous alliance building in Winnipeg – a process that is also challenged by the divisive and competitive nature of colonialism and neoliberalism as well as the local

[70] Though not the focus of this research, this fear of the other discourse is also used to justify more policing.

history and the physicality of the city. As bell hooks (2008) states, "revolution can happen only as we learn to do everything differently" (p.8) [71] -if we learn to tell different stories.

> People who are organized and who become effective in rendering their environment relatively more malleable will begin to perceive themselves differently, as subjects not objects, as people who develop a vision of a better world and who can act coherently to achieve it.
>
> Bill Lee, 1986 (in Sandercock, 2003, p. 160)

CLOUT is an example of people who are organized, who have become effective in transforming their environment and who, as a result, perceive themselves differently. In this vein, CLOUT members all shared a hopeful vision, that their integrative practices would become more common in Winnipeg, leading to a greater sense of community, fearlessness and trust, and benefitting everyone. CLOUT's self- assessment reflects Coulthard's (2007) "understanding that our cultures have much to teach the Western world about the establishment of relationships within and between peoples and the natural world that are profoundly non-imperialist" (p.456). At this point in my reflection I believe CLOUT's self-assessment is correct. In light of the growing calls for theories and practices that are grounded in experiential knowledge of resisting colonialism (and neoliberalism), I also believe that building Indigenous-non-Indigenous alliances depends on planners following CLOUT's lead. As Alfred (2009) states, it is time "to give voice to a long-silenced wisdom" (p.15) - CLOUT's integrative anti-colonial-anti-neoliberal-alliance-based-grassroots-collective-resistance praxis. This would entail adopting planning practices based on unlearning Euro-Western practices (Porter, 2010) or decolonization – a concept that is difficult for non-Indigenous people to grasp, in large part because it is not necessary for people who benefit from the status quo.

---

[71] As an artist, I also cannot dismiss the role of art in creating alliances, but also in creating resistance practices, since the role of artist's work is to de-familiarize, create cracks in thinking as well as different and new ways of doing.

As the research reveals, CLOUT's attempts at integrating services in a colonial and neoliberal context also proves to be a complex practice that requires much cobbling, in ways that are often wasteful and/or damaging to their community building efforts. CLOUT members nevertheless continue their integration practices since to them it is common sense. That CLOUT's approach also counters the competitive nature of colonialism and neoliberalism that lead to separation and to the problem of difference and invisibility is another reason to follow their lead. The reality that integrative approaches are hardly common in Winnipeg is a barrier for CLOUT in building alliances with planners or with other CBOs, organizations who like the planners tend to work with a script that maintains separation by approaching social problems as an illness, and to focus on single issues in isolation from other dynamics in people's lives.[72] As Baikie (2009) states, the mainstream needs to recognize the legitimate ways of knowing Indigenous peoples bring "to their practice environments based on their worldview, which includes their cultural knowledge base and their individual and collective practice knowledge (p.46) – tools that are distinct but also compatible with Euro-western approaches.

To create or not to create new stories together.
That is the question.
And the answer.

This thesis was an occasion to reflect on how colonialism and neoliberalism interact in creating oppression and injustice, and to reflect on how to create a space for a politics of alliance building in Winnipeg. To be sure, a critical purpose of planning is to create spaces for community development, the more political the better, for the sake of transformation. However, while the idea that planning is about creating community is

[B] Is it because the need for integration is considered a feminine value? – a value that has been systematically devalued by the Euro-western patriarchal worldview? While a legitimate question, it is not the focus of this research.

implied in planning literature, it largely left unsaid. This may be due to the need for neutrality in academia, a position that leads to the dismissal of arguments that are perceived as political, personal, or emotional. The ability to expose, propose and politicize in a critical urban studies practice also depends on understanding that academic criticism is largely based on a need to remain politically neutral, a problem because in practice being neutral means to stand against taking risks and transformation; it also inures the critic from needing to come up with critical alternatives. As Bruno Latour (2004) argues, criticism needs to do more than debunk theories and practices; it must offer ways to reassemble as well (in Connolly & Steil, 2009, p.2); it must offer something new and whole; criticism needs to develop from lived experience.

This idea about lived experience is not new in planning; in 1973 Friedmann was already saying that it is in "the face-to-face transactions between planners and the affected population that a basis in knowledge adequate to the problem can be found" (p.484). Looking back on his long life's praxis, Friedmann (2011) states that planning should be about "creating new institutional arrangements, inventing financial strategies and helping influence public opinion" (p.30). As the research show the planners are not engaging in this kind of practice, reflecting the slowness of planning to change. That they did speak out during this research, however, shows their awareness of their oppression – an important first step in the transformation they will need to undergo in becoming allies.

There is no question that becoming an ally is hard work; as the research shows, it is more a commitment than a practice, since the commitment needs to come first and the practice follows. In many ways, what matters most is how planning is done. Moreover, in keeping with what CLOUT teaches, an anti-colonial/neoliberal practice needs to be based on values. Allowing for emotions and passions is another key to transformation, more so

because alliance building is a practice of working together as emotional beings. The research also shows that new planning practices need support to develop, like allies, people planners may need to look for and find in other professions.

In the end, CLOUT and the planners make important contributions to understanding colonial and neoliberal dynamics in Winnipeg and the nature of their effects on creating barriers to alliance building locally. An analysis of these forces is essential to shaping a more just future in Winnipeg, where understanding the local reality and history is crucial.

> The solution can't come from outside, it has to come from right there, and what we know in our community work. We understand a lot of broad concepts and we understand what is the right way to think about things or what to do, but the solution is here. And a Winnipeg solution will be different than for another city. So that's that local opportunity and local solutions that we talk about at CLOUT. There has to be a focus on that local solution building, it's right there in front of us, it comes from us, it comes from within us.
>
> CLOUT member O

What CLOUT member O is saying is that focusing on the local context is the best way to find solutions because doing so means focusing away from the systems and discourses that are painful to them. As the research shows, focusing on the local also allows CLOUT members to think in terms of incremental steps – a liberating approach that also prevents them from becoming entangled in the bigness of the problem. Knowing that justice depends on time and place also creates a more manageable emotional space in which to develop new and imaginative resistance practices. Of these practices, the one CLOUT teaches that is perhaps most important is the importance of not settling - to not accept something less than what you value - since it leads to a slippery slope where eventually what was once inacceptable becomes acceptable and normalized in the everyday. This leads to mediocrity and complacency because fear of uncertainty leads to

lack of imagination. This is also what the planners' response to systems and discourse teach us, that the line between uncertainty and inaction is really thin.

Notwithstanding that the local political context muddies planners' awareness about the need to decolonize, and prevents alliance building, the research suggests there are things planners can still do to become more visible to CLOUT. The first is linked to the reality that planning's historical role in civil society is to mediate divisions and differences (Roy, 2006; Sandercock, 2003), while concurrently being a practice of translating people's wants and needs into community plans and/or policy. As Ananya Roy (2006) notes, a mediator is someone who translates from a position of being both inside and outside the system. While this position creates dissonance, it can also create a space where new critical thinking can occur. In other words, in their dual roles as mediators and translators, planners can learn to develop new alliance building practices in Winnipeg. The planners would do well to look at the role the CCPA has played in mediating and translating the wants and needs of inner city residents and CLOUT into the language supporting the Euro-western worldview.

Another point that emerges from the research is the dearth of visionary leadership in planning to enhance life and community in Winnipeg - a dearth Sandercock (2003) also notices in planning generally. To her, leaders are needed to provide "organizational and discursive strategies that are designed to build voice, to foster a sense of common benefit, to develop confidence among disempowered groups and to arbitrate when disputes arise" (p.94). At the moment, the Professional Planning Association is not providing the kind of leadership that would inspire planners to decolonize or build alliances.

There is no question that uncertainty and unsettledness are inherent to resistance and alliance building practices. Countering these emotions requires courage, something that is more likely to emerge when support(s) exist. Supports also create a sense of hope and positivity (Bishop, 2002). However, the ability to believe institutions and cultures can change is perhaps the most crucial condition to committing to a practice aimed at transformation. This sense hope may be utopian or naïve, but it needs to be, because the ability to engage in transformative practices depends on seeing it. Ted Jojola's practice of creating a network of planners sympathetic to Indigenous planning is a good example since it is based on a prior decision "to see people like they are beautiful already" (IPEX, 2011). Like Jojola, CLOUT members choose to be positive; this emotional aspect is critical to their collective approach and is just as important to them as the analytical or political aspect of their work. The planners' responses also revealed a potential for rising above their sense paralysis; they could all imagine themselves becoming mediators and translators in educating the larger community – a first step towards liberation, if anything,

> There can be no "WE" until there is justice.
> CLOUT member M

What ultimately emerges from the research is an understanding that the struggle for liberation is an everyday practice and a wisdom that needs to be shared. The word 'liberation' implies the struggle is over, when liberation is effectively an everyday practice. This is the paradox of liberation, to be always struggling. Becoming educated in the process of becoming an ally is also an ongoing effort (Bishop, 2002) – a process that will ultimately create a liberating praxis for self.

In her work on storytelling and planning, Eckstein (2003) observes that "the Inuits say that the storyteller is the one who makes space for the story to be heard" (p.21), in large part because the story does not belong to the storyteller, but to what is. This notion of the storyteller presents a crack through which new planning practices can arise, in that a planners can play a critical role in making a space for stories and becoming engaged in a mass educational movement to teach people about colonialism and neoliberalism. Another crack that emerges from the research is the reality that anti-colonialism and anti-neoliberalism are but two sides of the struggle for the right to the city, to be recognized and to have a space to participate in telling our stories. Managing the inherent agonistic quality of shared spaces and difference would depend on developing a liberated sense of self; in practical terms, it would entail a fluency in a range of ways of knowing, the use of various forms of communicating, including contrapuntal language and images people can understand in order to displace mainstream media as the primary source for learning about Indigenous peoples, as well as deliberative practices, even training in negotiation and mediation. But in the spirit of allowing Indigenous peoples to lead the way, such a practice would answer the deepest needs and desires of CLOUT members.

> If we could share our story, if we could share our success, and describe how that has worked for us, if that sparks an inspiration or sparks a vision for someone out there, then maybe that's what's needed for that way of working together to be expanded. CLOUT has a lot of ideas... And we are willing to be a part of figuring out the solution. We want to have a responsibility in that solution as well.
>
> Excerpt from Together we have CLOUT

There is no question from this research that civil society needs to be built on integration and cooperation. There is also no question that alliances with clout are needed to influence people in power. The city is at stake, and so is democracy. In a world where

powerful social movements like Occupy and Idle No More can, and do, fizzle out, it is important to understand how to maintain momentum when important political mobilizations happen. Maintaining the momentum on movements that can challenge the status quo depends on the support, and the sense of security, emotional stability and hope that allies can provide. A plan of action is needed. Becoming allies is such a plan.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu-Lughod, Janet (1998). Civil/Uncivil Society: Confusing Form with Content. *Cities for Citizens*: eds: Friedmann and Douglass. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Ltd: pp. 227-238

Alfred, Taiaiake (2009). *Peace, Power and Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto.* (2nd edition). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, Taiaiake (2005). *Wasase, Indigenous pathways of action and freedom,* Toronto: Broadview.

Arendt, Hannah (1970). *On Violence.* New York: A Harvest Books/Harcourt, Inc.

Barker, Adam (2010). From Adversaries to Allies: Forging Respectful Alliances between Indigenous and Settler Peoples. *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships,* edited by Lynne Davis. Toronto: University of Toronto Press: pp 316-333.

Bayoumi, Moustafa and Rubin, Andrew (2000) *The Edward Said Reader.* Eds: Bayoumi & Rubin. New York: Vintage Books.

Bishop, Anne (2002, 1994) *Becoming an Ally: Breaking the Cycle of Oppression – in People –* Second edition. Halifax, Fernwood Publishing,

Bloor, M., Frankland, J., Thomas, M., Robson, K. (2001). *Focus Groups in Social Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Brand, R., and Gaffikin, F. (2007) Collaborative Planning in an Uncollaborative world, *Planning Theory:* Vol 6(3): pp 282-313.

Brenner, Neil, Marcuse, Peter, and Mayer, Margit (2012). Cities for People, Not Profit: an introduction, *Cities for People, Not Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*. New York: Routledge; pp 1-10.

Brenner, Neil, (2012). What is critical urban theory, *Cities for People, Not Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*. New York: Routledge; pp 11-23.

Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-MB. (2009). *State of the Inner City Report: It takes all day to be poor.* Winnipeg: CCPA-MB.

Carter, Sarah (1990). *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

CLOUT (2008) *Community Led Organizations United Together: Forging Partnerships… Strengthening Families & Communities*. Informational literature: Winnipeg.

Connolly, J. and Steil, J. (2009) Introduction: Finding justice in the city, *Searching for the Just City: Debates in Urban Theory and Practice:* eds: Marcuse et al. New York: Routledge; pp 1-16.

Cordova, Viola (2007). *How It Is. The Native American Philosophy of V.F. Cordova.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Coulthard, Glen (2007) Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'Politics of Recognition' in Canada. *Contemporary Political Theory:* Vol 6 pp 437-460

Dalton, T. (2009). Housing Policy Retrenchment: Australia and Canada compared. *Urban Studies*: Vol 46 (1): pp 63- 91.

Davis, Lynne and Shpuniarsky, Heather (2010). The Spirit of Relationships: What we Have Learned about Indigenous/Non-Indigenous Alliances and Coalitions. *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships,* edited by Lynne Davis. Toronto: University of Toronto Press: pp 334-350.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2003) Methods of Collecting and Analyzing Empirical Materials, *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials, second edition:* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications: pp 47-60.

Dikeç, Mustafa (2009) Justice and the spatial imagination, *Searching for the Just City: Debates in Urban Theory and Practice:* eds: Marcuse et al. New York: Routledge; pp. 72-88.

Douglass, M. and Friedmann, J. (1998) Editor's Introduction, *Cities for Citizens*: Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Ltd: pp 1-8.

Eckstein, Barbara (2003). Making Space; stories in the practice of planning, *Story and Sustainability: planning, practice, and possibility for American cities,* Boston: MIT, pp.13-36.

Escobar, Arturo (2012,1995). *Encountering Development.* Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Fanon, Frantz (2004, 1963). *The Wretched of the Earth.* New York: Grove Press.

Fainstein, Susan. (2010). *The just City.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Fainstein, Susan (2009). Planning and the Just City, *Searching for the Just City: Debates in Urban Theory and Practice:* eds: Marcuse et al. New York: Routledge; pp. 19-39

Flyvbjerg, Bent (1998). Empowering civil Society: Habermas, Foucault and the Question of Conflict, *Cities for Citizens*: eds: Friedmann and Douglass. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Ltd: 185-211

Fontana, A. and Frey, J. H. (2003). The Interview: From Structured Questions to Negotiated Text: *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials, second edition:* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications: 61-106

Forester, J. (1989). *Planning in the Face of Power.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Forester, John (1998). Rationality, Dialogue and Learning: What Community and Environmental Mediators Can Teach Us about the Practice of Civil Society, *Cities for Citizens*: eds; Friedmann and Douglass. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Ltd: 213-226

Forester, John (1993). Learning from Practice stories: The priority of Practical Judgement, *Readings in Planning Theory,* Carlton, Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 507-528.

Freire, Paulo (2006). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 30th Anniversary Edition*. New York: Continuum.

Friedmann, John (2011). *Insurgencies: Essays in Planning Theory*. New York: Routledge.

Friedmann, John (2002). *The Prospect of Cities.* Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Friedmann, John (1998) The New Political Economy of Planning: the Rise of Civil Society. *Cities for Citizens*: eds: Friedmann and Douglass. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Ltd: pp.19-38.

Friedmann, John (1993) Toward a Non-Euclidian Mode of Planning. *APA Journal:* Autumn 1993:pp 482-485.

Friedmann, John, (1979) *The Good Society.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Friedmann, J and Douglass, M. (1998) Editor's Introduction, *Cities for Citizens*: eds: Friedmann and Douglass. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Ltd: pp.1-8.

Gough, Jamie (2002). Neoliberalism and Socialization in the Contemporary City: Opposites, Complements and Instabilities, *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd: pp 58-79.

Green, Joyce (2007). *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism.* Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Harper. S. (2009) Statement to assembled G20 leaders, *Now Public.* Retrieved on October 12, from: http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/harper-g20-canada-has-no-history-colonialism#ixzz1afjPJlmu

Hart, Michael (2010). *Colonization, Social Exclusion, and Indigenous Health. The Social Determinants of Health in Manitoba.* CCPA-MB. Winnipeg: Hignell Press.

Hart, Michael (2009). Anti-Colonial Indigenous Social Work: *Reflections on an Aboriginal Approach, Wicihitowin: Aboriginal Social Work in Canada:* eds: Sinclair, Hart and Bruyere: Winnipeg, Fernwood Publishing: pp 25-41.

Harvey, D, and Wachsmuth (2012). What is to be done? And who the hell is going to do it?, *Cities for People, Not Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*. New York: Routledge; pp 264-274

Harvey, D. and Potter, C. (2009) The right to the Just City, *Searching for the Just City: Debates in Urban Theory and Practice:* eds: Marcuse et al. New York: Routledge; pp. 40-51.

Harvey, David (2008) The Right to the City. *New Left Review.* Vol. 53: *pp. 23-40*

Harvey, David (1992) Social Justice, Postmodernism and the City. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research.* Vol.16: pp 588-601

Hayden, Dolores (1995). *The Power of Place.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Healey, Patsy (2006, 1997). *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Holstein James A. and Gubrium Jaber F. (1995). *The Active Interview* - Qualitative Research Methods, Volume 37:Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

Holston, James (1998). Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship, *Making the Invisible Visible; A Multicultural Planning History.* Berkeley, University of California Press, pp 37-56.

hooks, bell. (2003). *Teaching Community: A pedagogy of Hope.* New York: Routledge.

hooks, bell (2000). *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. Cambridge: South End Press.

hooks, bell (1994, 2008). *Outlaw Culture.* New York: Routledge.

Innes, Judith. & Booher, David (2010) *Planning with Complexity: an introduction to collaborative rationality for public policy:* New York, Routledge.

Jojola, Ted (2011) Presentation at the Indigenous Planning Exchange and Conference, February, 2011, San Cristobal de las Casas, Mexico.

Jojola Ted (2008). Indigenous Planning – An Emerging Context. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research.* Vol. 17: 37-47

Jojola, Ted (1998). Indigenous Planning: Clans, Intertribal Confederations, and the History of the All Indian Pueblo Council, *Making the Invisible Visible; A Multicultural Planning History,* Berkeley, University of California Press, 100-119.

Keil, Roger (2002). "Common-Sense" Neoliberalism: Progressive Conservative Urbanism in Toronto, Canada, *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd: pp 58-79.

King, Thomas (2003). *The Truth about Stories, A Native Narrative,* Toronto: Anansi Press.

Kingwell, Mark (2000). *The World We Want: Virtue, Vice and the Good Citizen.* Toronto: Penguin Canada.

Kofman, Eleonore and Lebas, Elizabeth (2006, 1996). *Writings on Cities: Henri Lefebvre.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Kovack, Margaret (2009). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations and Contexts.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kulchyski, Peter (2007). *The Red Indians: An episodic, informal collection of tales from the history of Aboriginal people's struggles in Canada*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

LaRocque, Emma (2010). *When the Other is Me: Native Resistance Discourse 1850-1990.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Lefebvre, Henri (1996). *Writings on Cities.* Translated and edited by Kofman and Lebas. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

MacKinnon, Shauna (2009). Building capacity through participatory action research: the state of the inner-city report project. *Community Development Journal, 2009:* pp. 1-14.

MacKinnon, S. & Stephens, S. (2007). *Is Participation Having an Impact? Measuring Progress in Winnipeg's Inner City through the voices of Community-based program participants*. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives – Manitoba Office.

Maracle, Lee (1996). *I Am Woman: A Native Perspective on Sociology and Feminism.* Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers

Marcuse, Peter (2012). Whose Right(s) to what city? *Cities for People, Not Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*. New York: Routledge; pp. 24--41

Marris, Peter (1998) Planning and Civil Society in the Twenty-first Century: An Introduction. *Cities for Citizens*: eds: Friedmann and Douglass. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Ltd: pp 9-18

Mason, Jennifer (2010, 2002). *Qualitative Researching* (Second Edition). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Mayer, Margit (2012). The "right to the city" in urban social movements, *Cities for People, Not Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*. New York: Routledge; pp. 63-85

McQuaig, Linda (1998). *The Cult of Impotence: Selling the Myth of Powerlessness in the Global Economy.* Toronto; Penguin Books.

Momaday, N. Scott (1997). *The Man Made of Words,* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Murphy, Michael (2009). Civilization, Self-Determination and Reconciliation. *First Nations, First Thoughts: The Impact of Indigenous Thought in Canada.* Edited by Annis Timpson: Vancouver: UBC Press: pp 251-278.

Neveu, Lily Pol (2010). Beyond Recognition and Coexistence: Living Together. *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships,* edited by Lynne Davis. Toronto: University of Toronto Press: pp 234-255.

O'Brien, Carole (2009). *Train of Thought: A guided tour through the mind of a storytelling planner-in-training fascinated by the idea of transformation and indigenous planning.* Paper for CITY 7030, University of Manitoba.

O'Brien, Carole (2011). *It makes a difference*: *Thinking about Indigenous planning as mobility, stability, strength and alignment.* Paper for IPEX, University of Manitoba.

Patton, Michael Quinn (1987). *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation:* Newbury Park: Sage Publications

Peck, Jamie and Tickell, Adam (2002). Neoliberalizing Space, *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd: pp 33:57.

Peräkylä, Anssi (2005) Analyzing Talk and Text, *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, Third Edition:* London: Sage Publications: 869-886

Peattie, Lisa (1981). *Thinking about Development.* New York: Plenum Press.

Peters, Evelyn (2005). Indigeneity and Marginalisation: Planning for and with Urban Aboriginal Communities in Canada. *Progress in Planning.* Vol. 63: pp.327-404

Porter, Libby (2010) *Unlearning the Colonial Cultures of Planning.* Burlington: Ashgate.

Porter, Libby (2004). Unlearning One's Privilege: Reflections on Cross-cultural Research with Indigenous Peoples in South-East Australia. *Planning Theory & Practice.* Vol. 5:104-109

Rankin, Katharine, N (2012). The praxis of planning and the contributions of critical development studies, *Cities for People, Not Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*. New York: Routledge; pp. 102-116

Roussin D. and Christensen, T (2010). *Public funds for Youth For Christ. Have our politician learned nothing from past mistakes?* Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Fast-Facts, February 23, 2010.

Roy, A. (2006). 'Praxis in the Time of Empire', *Planning Theory* 5:1, 7-29.

Rowe, G., and Frewer, L. (2005) A typology of Public engagement mechanisms, *Science, Technology & Human values:* Vol (30): 251-290

Rowe, G., and Frewer, L. (2004) Evaluating Public-Participation Exercises: A Research Agenda, *Science Technology and Human Values:* Vol (29): 512-556

Rowe, G., Horlick-Jones, T., Walls, J. and Pidgeon, N. (2005) Difficulties in evaluating public engagement initiatives: reflections on an evaluation of the UK GM Nation? public debate about transgenic crops, *Public Understanding of Science:* Vol (14) :331-352.

Roy, Ananya (2006). 'Praxis in the Time of Empire', *Planning Theory* 5:1, 7-29.

Said, Edward (2000). *The Edward Said Reader,* eds Bayoumi, M. & Rubin, A. Toronto: Vintage Books.

Sandercock, Leonie (2004). Interface: Planning and Indigenous Communities. *Planning Theory & Practice.* Vol.5:95-97.

Sandercock, Leonie (2003) *Cosmopolis II Mongrel Cities in the 21st century.* London: Continuum

Sandercock, Leonie (1998). *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Sandercock, Leonie (1998b). Introduction: Framing Insurgent Historiographies for Planning, *Making the Invisible Visible; A Multicultural Planning History,* Berkeley, University of California Press, 1-36.

Sandercock, Leonie (1998c). The Death of Modernist Panning: Radical Praxis for a Postmodern Age. *Cities for Citizens*: eds: Friedmann and Douglass. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Ltd: pp. 163-184.

Shaw, Wendy (2007). *Cities of Whiteness,* Carlton, Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.

Shmuely, Andrew (2008) Totality, hegemony, difference: Henri Lefebvre and Raymond Williams, *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre:* eds. Goonewardena, Kipfer, Milgrom and Schmid. New York: Routlege: pp 212-230

Silver, Jim (2006). *In Their Own Voices: Building Urban Aboriginal Communities.* Winnipeg; Fernwood Publishing.

Silverman, David (2003) Analyzing Talk and Text, *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials, second edition:* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications: 340-362

Smith, John K. and Deemer, Deborah K. (2003) The Problem of Criteria in the Age of Relativism, *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials, second edition:* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications: 427-45

Stanford, Jim (2008) *Economics for Everyone: a Short Guide to the Economics of Capitalism.* Black Point, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.

Steil, Justin and Connolly, James (2009). Introduction: Finding justice in the city, *Searching for the Just City: Debates in Urban Theory and Practice:* eds: Marcuse et al. New York: Routledge; pp. 173-193.

Storper, Michael (1998) Civil Society: Three Ways into a Problem. *Cities for Citizens*: eds: Friedmann and Douglass. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Ltd: pp 239-246.

Throgmorton, James (2003). Planning as persuasive storytelling in a global-scale web of relationships, *Planning Theory*, Vol. 2(2): pp 125-151.

Timpson, Annis M. (2009). Introduction: Indigenous Thought in Canada. *First Nations, First Thoughts: The Impact of Indigenous Thought in Canada.* Vancouver: UBC Press: pp

Tuhiwai-Smith, Linda (2006). *Decolonizing Methodologies: research and Indigenous Peoples.* New York: Zed Books.

Turner, Dale (2006). *This is not a peace pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Young, Iris Marion (1990). *Justice and the politics of Difference.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Young, Robert J.C. (2003). *Post-colonialism; A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford; Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A - Summary of findings Davis and Shpuniarsky (2010)

The study also revealed that in spite of good intentions and a reflexive attitude, Indigenous-non-Indigenous coalitions tend to embody three dynamics. The first tendency occurs when disagreements arise, where coalitions can become a microcosm of colonial relationships. These can be reproduced when Western agendas are too narrow for Indigenous peoples who prefer to look at the broader picture and at future repercussions, not single issues. Building trust is crucial, a process that requires a respect for protocol, being open, honest and clear about motivations and by not talking a lot since it is perceived as taking over by silencing them. It also means to refrain from controlling the agenda, and allow the Aboriginal voice to be central. The second tendency occurs when non-Aboriginal allies awaken to their colonial histories, where the coalition becomes a site of learning whereby Indigenous peoples are forced into a time consuming teaching and mentoring role. Knowing the history of colonialism in Canada helps, such as what Treaty territory you live in, and which Treaty violation you are benefitting from. It is also good to know that First Nations are diverse. Each has its own history, culture and protocols. The third tendency is when a coalition becomes a site of colonial pain since even with the best of intentions non-Aboriginal allies can still be arrogant. This potential can be mitigated however by not minimizing or de-contextualizing the everyday experience of Aboriginal peoples, and by remembering that Indigenous peoples know what they are doing. When mistakes occur, it is important to correct them, by being honest and by seeing them as opportunities to grow as a collaborator.

Let go of the agenda
Just Be

Let go of talk
Listen

Let go of leading the process
Participate

Allow Indigenous peoples to lead the way
Follow their lead

Allow Indigenous peoples to assess whether gains are made or not
Let them decide if things are working out

Allow Indigenous anger and contrapuntal language to be unsettling
Be there and listen

APPENDIX B - Requirements and Characteristics of Allies (Bishop, 2002)

REQUIREMENTS to becoming an ally

Be critical of power structures and look at the world from a structural perspective

Understand the need to act with others to contribute to change

Understand you are part of something much larger and older than you are

Take responsibility for helping to solve problems of injustice without taking on individual guilt

Be strategic in what you can do, with others, and accept limitations

CHARACTERISTICS of allies

A sense of connection with other people, all other people

A grasp of the concept of social structures and collective responsibility

A lack of an individualism and ego, although they have a strong sense of self

A sense of process and change

An understanding of their own process of learning

A realistic sense of their own power

A grasp of "power-with" as an alternative to "power-over"

An honesty, openness, and lack of shame about their own limitations

A knowledge and sense of history

An acceptance of struggle

An understanding that good intentions do not matter if oppressions are not countered with actions

A knowledge of their own historical roots

APPENDIX C - CLOUT member organizations

COMMUNITY LED ORGANIZATIONS UNITED TOGETHER

Andrews Street Family Centre
220 Andrews St

CEDA/Pathways to Education - Community Education Development Association
470 Stella Avenue

Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre, Inc
445 King Street

Native Women's Transition Centre
105 Aikins St

Ndinawemaaganag Endaawad Inc.
361 Flora Ave

North End Women's Centre
394 Selkirk Ave

Rossbrook House
658 Ross Ave

Wahbung Abinoonjiiag
225 Dufferin Ave

Wolseley Family Place
691 Wolseley Ave

APPENDIX D - Interview Questions

All interviews started with an overview of the thesis:

INTRODUCE THE PRINCIPLES THAT GUIDE MY EVERYDAY

- yoga
- tell my awakening story

PRESENT THE GOAL OF THESIS

Exploring how planners and Indigenous community-based organizers (CLOUT) can become allies for social and spatial justice in Winnipeg's inner city

EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF THESIS

- to explore CLOUT's collaborative community-building practices, based on Indigenous worldview and storytelling
- to understand how colonial and neoliberal systems affect the everyday working realities of CLOUT and the planners
- to explore why CLOUT remains invisible to policy-makers and planners
- to explore how CLOUT's approach and practices could inform planning practices
- to explore how to improve the meeting point between Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous planners
- to explore the potential of building alliances

INTERVIEWS WITH CLOUT MEMBERS

The interviews with CLOUT members all started with an explanation of what planners do, since CLOUT members did not know, and with a commentary on the colonial history of planning, its silent complicity as a means to set that issue aside from the start in order to concentrate on the research questions.

QUESTIONS ABOUT PERCEPTIONS

Given that CLOUT's community development practices are effective and successful responses to colonialism and racism, and given that policy makers are aware of their activities in the inner-city:

Why is CLOUT not consulted when decisions are being made that affect the people they serve? (ex: Youth for Christ)

Imagine, you have adequate and stable funding...

What would CLOUT also need to do its work better?
Is it desirable to have non-Indigenous allies? why? why not?

QUESTIONS ON HOW TO WORK TOGETHER

- Assuming CLOUT members believe there is a need to have relationships with others
- Given that White peoples created colonialism, and are therefore morally responsible to do the work to transform the system
- Given that planning has been complicit in maintaining the power relationships that define the system
- Given that there are planners who want to work as allies towards social justice,

What does a process of building alliances look like to you?
Who makes the first move? What does it look like?

What role does CLOUT play in alliance building?

How can CLOUT and planners both have a positive effect on the process of working towards one another?

What do non-Indigenous peoples need to know/understand to work with CLOUT, or other CBOs?

Principles to follow?

EXTRA QUESTIONS

During the film interviews, a CLOUT member said that CLOUT needed translators
What does that mean to you?
Taiaiake Alfred says that White peoples should not look to Indigenous peoples for advice on how to become allies, that they should figure it out for themselves…
Do you agree?

INTERVIEWS WITH THE PLANNERS

The interviews with the planners were done after the interview with CLOUT members. They were much more open-ended, since the direction the conversation took depended a great deal on their prior knowledge of CLOUT and their understanding of colonialism and neoliberalism. The interviews with the planners were also guided more by a need to understand their political reality. Once an understanding of the planner's point if view was established, the interviews tended to follow a similar path.

Do they know CLOUT? + follow up questions
Explaining the colonial history of planning, its silent complicity

QUESTION ABOUT PERCEPTIONS

CLOUT's community practices are effective and successful responses to colonialism and racism, and policy makers are aware of their work in the inner-city…

Why is CLOUT not consulted by the city (via planning dept) when decisions are being made that affect the people they serve? (ex: Youth for Christ)

Questions about their frustrations about their everyday political reality.

Questions about their perceptions of the barriers to alliance building.

QUESTIONS ON HOW TO WORK TOGETHER

- Assuming CLOUT members believe there is a need to have relationships with others
- Given that non-Indigenous peoples are morally responsible to transform the system
- Given that planning has been complicit in maintaining the power relationships that define the system
- Assuming that planners want to work as allies towards social justice,

What does a process of building alliances look like to you?
Who makes the first move? What does it look like?

How can CLOUT and planners both have a positive effect on the process of working towards one another?

What do you as a non-Indigenous peoples need to know/understand to work with CLOUT, or other CBOs?

APPENDIX E - CLOUT's Principles for alliance building

During their interviews, CLOUT members were asked to talk about how they perceived working as allies with non-Indigenous planner. To them working with people who are engaged in a process of decolonizing is most important, a principle that to them means acknowledging privilege. They also expressed a need to know the ally as a person, because to CLOUT members, alliance building is foremost a process of getting to know one another by taking the time, prior to starting work, to meet face to face.

> *When I first meet a non-Aboriginal person, I like to know where they are coming from. I like to know, what is your history, where is your place in the world... And I also appreciate a non-Aboriginal person saying you know what? I know I have privilege, I know I have that. And they recognize it. And for me too, actions always speak louder than words. I've been with people who say "Oh yes. I know I have privilege, blah blah". And as time goes by, I observe them, and I shake my head and I go "Oh yeah, you've got privilege alright!". I can see that. So for me, well, I learned to live with it because I don't have that privilege. So I learned to cope with it…[but] it's hard, knowing where we are in this place, in this world.*
>
> ***CLOUT member A***

Working with CLOUT, as an ally, also means recognizing CLOUT's grassroots power, an recognition that arises from being self-reflexive and understanding one's colonial and neoliberal assumptions.

> *They [planners] need to see us CLOUT as a group of people with power, instead of seeing us as people without power, and coming to help us. They need to see us as having just as much power. And then we help each other. That's how it's got to be. Start at the right place. Equal.*
>
> ***CLOUT member N***

> *They need to know why they think the way they think, where they come from and why.... It's easier to accept people if you know they know why they think the way they think…*
>
> ***CLOUT member N***

CLOUT members would also like allies to be transparent and clear about goals and desired outcomes. It is also important that allies look for and see what is going right in the inner city and refrain from focusing on the negatives. This means refusing to blame Indigenous residents for their marginalization. Doing so requires a spirit of generosity, something Hart (2010) states is difficult for non-Indigenous peoples, since they tend to force Indigenous into doing the emotional work of building alliances.

> *If we don't become generous it will never stop because if we are accusing each other, people who created the situation will say, "well you don't want to change anything" and so it continues and they don't have to do*

anything about it….To stop blaming is a tall order, but if we do it in little bits, it's going to happen.

CLOUT member N

As CLOUT members state, applying these principles will create a safe place where people can be honest, even about their own ignorance. The more that is known about the other, the more trust develops; and as trust develops, the more challenging or important conversations can take place. CLOUT members also state that they prefer to deal with mistakes, than have no dialogue at all. In this light, potential non-Indigenous allies to CLOUT need to understand that trust is non-negotiable to them, because of the history of colonialism. To them, lack of trust leads to concerns with abuses of power that get in the way of alliance building. It is also imperative to CLOUT that allies share their power, work and responsibilities, and not behave like the funders in this comment.

Often a funder will bring their money, but the funder always gets to make the call, and if something doesn't go right, they can walk away with their money. That's not a collaboration because that's not an equal power dynamic. A true collaboration is we each bring something, and now we are locked into this, and we have to figure this out. And then, if we both mutually decide it's not going to work, then we can both walk away. But it's not only one side saying "I'm going".

CLOUT member O

Sharing power to CLOUT also means refraining from controlling the agenda, and allowing them take the lead. It also means to trust that the process will yield something; the outcome may not be what was envisioned but that is because results cannot be imposed beforehand, as is often the case in the euro-western way of doing things.

They need to learn to think big…They have to see… [that] we do the beginning and just get to the end. We hope that the end is what we had hoped for, but we don't put everything in place so it gets to that end… Sometimes you go off and your end is different, and we are okay with that, whereas they are not.

CLOUT member N

To CLOUT, "thinking big" means engaging with them as early as possible in the process of developing a project. It also means developing a spirit of reciprocity where each party has expertise and shares it, as they work together. To CLOUT, reciprocity is not co-dependence but a proactive attitude of interdependence.

It's why suburbs need to care about the inner city, because it will eventually catch up to your kids, and you in your home, if we don't all take care of the whole thing. To me it's a huge concept that if we could all get our heads around it and live it.

CLOUT member O

The bottom line for CLOUT members, is they want to feel good about the people they work with, people who are accountable, open and courageous.

Consolidating CLOUT members' comments into a set of principles produces the follwing tables. These are also the principles the CCPA learned to adopt in order to develop a high level of trust with CLOUT members. CLOUT's principles for alliance building are then compared to the findings of the Davis and Shpuniarsky (2010) study. It is interesting to note how well they match, almost word for word.

CLOUT's Principles for alliance building

- Understand privilege
- Let go of the agenda
- Listen deeply
- Respect the power of the people
- Define common goals
- Create opportunities
- Engage with us early in the project
- Build trust
- Look at the big picture
- Learn about colonialism
- Know that CLOUT knows what it is doing
- Get to know us first
- Create dialogue
- Align goals with practice
- Focus on the positive outcomes
- Allow processes to become messy
- Look for local solutions

CLOUT's Qualities of the non-Indigenous ally

- Be open
- Be patient
- Be persistent
- Be willing to work
- Be there
- Be willing to colour outside the lines
- Be creative
- Be willing to learn
- Be honest
- Be generous with your privileged power
- Be compassionate
- Be dialogical
- Be honest
- Be trustworthy
- Be broad minded
- Be willing to work for the good of everyone

Comparing CLOUT's principles with Davis & Shpuniarsky

Principles of alliance building

CLOUT	DAVIS & SHPUNIARSKY
Understand privilege Let go of the agenda Listen deeply Respect the power of the people Define common goals Create opportunities Engage with us early in the project Build trust Look at the big picture Learn about colonialism Know that CLOUT knows what it is doing Get to know us first Create dialogue Align goals with practice Focus on the positive outcomes Allow processes to become messy Look for local solutions	Understand privilege Let go of guilt Let go of the agenda Let go of talk Let go of leading the process Listen Allow Aboriginal peoples to assess gains Allow Indigenous anger Build trust Look to the future Learn about colonialism Respect protocol just meet first before work starts Indigenous pples know what they are doing Do not dismiss Do not minimize Do not decontextualize

Qualities of non-Indigenous allies

CLOUT	DAVIS & SHPUNIARSKY
Be open Be patient Be persistent Be willing to work Be there Be willing to colour outside the lines Be creative Be willing to learn Be honest Be generous with your privileged power Be compassionate Be dialogical Be honest Be trustworthy Be a listener Be broad minded Be willing to work for the god of everyone Be clear about motivations be accountable	Be accountable to those telling their stories Be Respectful Be trustworthy Be angry Be reflexive Be open Be courageous Be honest Be broad minded Be future-oriented Be ready to learn Be ready to be the focus of anger Be compassionate Be clear about motivations

APPENDIX F - The process of becoming an ally and yoga

The process of learning to do Iyengar yoga, the style in which I am certified as a teacher, is similar to the steps in becoming an ally, especially the need to arrive at an understanding of how one is oppressing one's body with false assumptions and the to counter this oppression through correct action.

The notion of resistance is central to yoga since it is crucial to doing poses correctly. Doing the poses correctly in yoga however does not mean doing the final version of the pose, it means working correctly with the arms and legs, to create the desired effects in the pose – usually to lengthen the spine. For example, to get a long spine in Ado Mukha Svanasana (downward facing dog pose) one needs to lift the front of the thighs and press them back. This action of resistance stabilizes the tail of the spine and lifts the hips to make room for the actions of the arms, which lengthen the spine. This is a simplified explanation of the actions, since there are other more intricate actions that also come into play and also build on each other. The point is that the spine will not lengthen if it is not fixed at one end. Imagine a piece of rope lying on the floor; to get the rope taut one needs to hold it at one end while pulling on the other. It is the same for the spine in all yoga poses, there is always an action to stabilize one part of the body to allow another part of the body to be mobile and lengthen. With time, correct actions results in greater overall flexibility and strength, and eventually inner alignment.

A common misconception about yoga students is a belief that the goal is to perform the poses. Most people however have issues of strength or flexibility - too much or too little of either. When faced with these limitations, people commonly push harder, usually against the correct anchoring actions, which results in bypassing areas that need to work to lengthen the spine. Incorrect actions leads to misalignment and then, to more pain. It also creates hardness in the body, especially in areas that need to stay soft, like the abdomen or the mind.

The real problem with pushing harder and misalignments is that people do so from a place of certainty – the idea that the only one way to deal with limitations is to use force; oppression of the body. The challenge as an Iyengar yoga teacher is to lead

students into letting go of this false certainty and to understand the need to work correctly and be an ally to their body. Being an ally to one's body, however, does not mean not working hard. It means to accept the need for supports (props) to assist with body limitations - other allies. The props effectively allow the body to do the actions correctly, and allow the body and spine to open up. When props are accepted (because people usually resist using them at first), students come to understand that doing poses with integrity and purpose, to the extent they can with their body, is more important than their ability to do the final version of the pose. Doing the poses correctly, with props if need be, also brings the desired effect in the body – as well as a quiet mind, the ultimate goal of yoga.

The greatest barrier to doing poses correctly in yoga, is the fear of pain. It leads to avoiding and/or hating poses that challenge the body. The value of doing poses correctly for one's own body, is that one becomes more attuned to the body, and pain can become a teacher, when it is accepted as a part of doing the pose. Approaching one's practice in this way reduces frustration because it leads to not expecting more from working in the poses than what the body can really do today.

Maturity develops as one learns to override the mind's message to bail and work correctly with the pain. Pain signals that change is happening. Working correctly diminishes pain over time, leading to inner alignment and transformation.
Accepting reality and pain also leads to seeing the possibilities and the connections between actions and between poses; it also leads to trusting that change will occur over time - incrementally, but surely.

Working correctly as an ally to the body is a sign of maturity in practice. But more importantly it is a liberating feeling that leads to a reflexive attitude and a critical mind, in the sense understanding the difference between good and bad resistance, good and bad pain, working too hard or hard enough. Knowing that you belong to a group of people all struggling with the same reality, the body, also helps to accept what is. It also leads to hope, and to an understanding that the most important action in yoga is to go to one's mat, that it what matters is less the poses you do than being present in body and mind.

When done in alliance with others and with a non-guilty frame of mind, what follows is a process of unfolding critical reflection, and a conscious revision of

assumptions. The most common assumption about yoga is that it is an exercise to benefit the body. The real beneficiary is the mind, in the form of a greater sense of quiet and self. It also creates inner alignment between head, heart and body. Working correctly, also means following principles of behaviour in the external world, the yamas (*Ahimsa* (non-violence), *Satya* (truthfulness), *Asteya* (non-stealing), *Brahmacharya* (non-excess) and *Aparigraha* (non-possessiveness)), as well as the niyamas, the personal qualities one needs to cultivate to withstand pain and change (*Saucha* (purity), *Santosha* (contentment), *Tapas* (self-discipline), *Svadhyaya* (self-study) and *Ishvara Pranidhana* (surrender)). Following these principles and values ultimately leads to hope and non-attachment to outcomes; and, similarly to the ultimate result of being an ally, it is the most freeing aspect of yoga. As with alliance building learning to work properly in yoga boils down to developing a feel for it, where every action produces new spaces in the body and where over time, the 'how to do' will reveal itself in the doing.

This table interprets CLOUT's views on becoming an ally in yogic terms - an exercise that is supported by CLOUT members. CLOUT member A even commented that it resembled her own approach to community development.

Stability comes from:

- Family
- Togetherness
- Community
- Relationships
- Integration

Strength and flexibility develops in the process of:

- Resisting
- Healing
- Communicating
- Working together
- Sharing
- Taking time
- Creating a sense of trust
- Developing one's individuality

Alignment is found in:

- Dialogue
- Being accountable
- Ability to manage complexity

APPENDIX G. OBSERVATIONS on alliance building (Bishop, 2002)

FOR MEMBERS OF THE OPPRESSOR GROUP – how to become an ally

Struggle for your own liberation. Understand oppression.

Listen and reflect.

Everyone in the oppressor group are oppressors (at best a recovering oppressor or an anti-oppressor). The need is to change the politics and the economics of oppression.

Learn to separate guilt from responsibility – no need to take on the weight of history as an individual – no need to deny oppression.

See that your oppression is more invisible to you – do not leap to your own defence. Some members of the oppressed group may claim that all you do is oppressive and focus their anger on you. This is all part of the process – their process. Do not defend yourself, deal with your own feelings and turn the encounter into a discussion to learn about your oppression. You will be less vulnerable to manipulation. Defensiveness or guilt is the hook of manipulation. Use your own experience of liberation to understand the anger of the oppressed, and accept it as a member of a group, not as an individual.

Count your privileges. Break the invisibility of privilege.

Speak up against oppressive comments.

Be patient.

Avoid the trap of "knowing what is good for them". Do not lead. Refuse to act as spokesperson, unless given the authority by the oppressed group.

Do not expect everyone to agree.

Learn all about oppression. Your ignorance is part of the oppression. Find teachers in the oppressed group who are willing to take the time and energy to teach you.

Encourage unlearning oppression in your group. Share your journey of becoming an ally.

Go out of your way to maintain friendships with members of the oppressed group.

Do not look for emotional support in the oppressed group.

Be yourself. Know your own roots. The oppressive history of the group you belong to is a burden you carry. Look for allies in your own group.

Be honest. Express your feelings. When in doubt, ask people you trust.

Assume you are a learner; good learners are open.

FOR MEMBERS OF THE OPPRESSED GROUP – how to work with allies

Decide if, why, when and how you will work with allies. Be clear about your degree of openness. Working with allies will involve a struggle. Be sure you are ready to enter in it.

Decide who in your group has the patience to provide support and information to allies.

Be wise and canny about who your allies are. Don't work with people who are working out of guilt.

Do not lump all members of the oppressor group together. Remember that they too have experienced oppressions, a different kind of oppression. Remember that people identify more with the parts of themselves that have been oppressed.

Listen.

Be kind. Allies are taking risks and exposing themselves to a painful situation as well.

Be clear about who the enemy is. Allies are typically people who do not have a great deal of power in the system. They are therefore more vulnerable to your anger. Do not waste energy fighting them.

Be yourself.

Be honest. Express your opinions. Be open, you too are in a process of learning.