

aboriginal policy studies



Editor's Introduction *aboriginal policy studies*

Chris Andersen

Editor, aboriginal policy studies

aboriginal policy studies Vol. 7, no. 2, 2019, pp. 1-2

This article can be found at:

<http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/aps/article/view/29330>

ISSN: 1923-3299

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5663/aps.v7i2.29354>

aboriginal policy studies is an online, peer-reviewed and multidisciplinary journal that publishes original, scholarly, and policy-relevant research on issues relevant to Métis, non-status Indians and urban Aboriginal people in Canada. For more information, please contact us at apsjournal@ualberta.ca or visit our website at www.nativestudies.ualberta.ca/research/aboriginal-policy-studies-aps.

Editor's Introduction

Dr. Chris Andersen

We would like to welcome our readers to volume 7, issue 2 of *aboriginal policy studies*. This issue contains four articles, one commentary, a book review and a foundational document. The contributions to this issue continue to follow the journal's scope, which is to publish "original, scholarly, and policy-relevant research on issues relevant to Métis, non-status Indians and urban Aboriginal peoples in Canada." As we have emphasized in previous introductions—and as we will continue to emphasize—*aps* welcomes relevant submissions from all geographical and political regions of Canada. We still do not receive an adequate number of submissions on issues pertaining to Métis policy, nor do we receive an adequate number of submissions on urban Aboriginal issues in central and eastern Canada. We would also like to give a special shout out of encouragement to submissions that touch on subject matter of importance to Indigenous women and youth and LBGTQ2+.

The first article in this issue explores the urgent matter of family violence (and resilience) in Indigenous communities, situating it within the complex dynamics of family, community, and historical trauma vectors. Emphasizing the role of education in improving quality of life outcomes for Indigenous youth in particular, Linda DeRiviere undertakes analysis of four community-university engagement initiatives emphasizing Indigenous children, youth and their families in order to explore their positive policy and practice implications. The author concludes by recognizing the value of these kinds of alliances, particularly in the context of vulnerability reduction for their participants, but she notes that they must be used in the context of a broader set of strength-based policies and programs—including an imagining of how universities can contribute.

The second article, written by Kevin J. Gardam, Audrey R. Giles, Steven Rynne, and Lyndsay M.C. Hayhurst, undertakes a comparative discourse analysis of federal Indigenous sport for development policies in Canada and Australia. Demonstrating the national commitment to the use of sport as a contributor to Indigenous social and economic well-being, the authors nonetheless tease out several interesting differences regarding how the two governments have gone about carrying out these policies, both in terms of the organization of their infrastructure and the character of their directives. They conclude that, regardless of their successes, both Canada and Australia can and should do more to understand sport and its purported effects in terms of both countries' statements regarding their commitment to reconciliation. Likewise, they call for more understanding of the complex linkages between sport infrastructure and other government agencies' involvement in sport for development policies.

The third article for this issue, written by Métis scholar Cindy Gaudet, presents a fascinating discussion around her work with decolonizing methodologies, particularly as it relates to what she refers to as the *visiting way* methodology. With a focus on relationality (to human and non-human beings), and tied crucially into Métis and Cree notions of "*milo pimatisiwin*" ("living well in relation"), Dr. Gaudet explores the manner in which methodologies like visiting

exist relationally within a broader context of local “social values, kinship, an understanding of women’s contribution, and self-recognition in relation to the land, history, community, and values.” Her discussion ultimately asks us to move away from Western-centred, hierarchical understandings of research (and ultimately, humanity), and move toward a relationship-building and relationship-centred understanding of methodology.

Finally, in the fourth article of this issue, Taylor-Neu et al. undertake a historical analysis of welfare reform in Canada as it relates to Indigenous peoples with an eye to demonstrating the extent to which the early tropes of the “lazy Indian” continue to shape the manner in which Indian welfare policy in Canada is ethically conceived, implemented and evaluated. Though early discussion of this tended to rotate on a “civilized/savage” axis, Taylor-Neu et al. demonstrate convincingly how this binary has morphed into an analogous ethic of “productive and unproductive” that is rooted in an individualizing neo-liberal ethic of self-sufficiency. They conclude that as such, Canadian welfare policy fails to understand the manner in which historically rooted precariousness like that endured by many Indigenous communities continues to shape social welfare relationships broadly today. In doing so, it reproduces the enduring legacy of their original dispossession by naturalizing the individualized/individualizing discourses around the “lazy Indian.”

Following the articles, this issue includes a commentary by Dr. Chelsea Gabel, a Canada Research Chair in Indigenous Well-Being, Community Engagement, and Innovation at McMaster University. Dr. Gabel’s commentary muses on the meaning of reconciliation in a Canadian university context, particularly considering the added workloads for Indigenous scholars and the tensions between the kinds of research that make a difference for Indigenous communities and the (often) narrower standards of universities for assessing professorial performance. Detailing her impressive research portfolio, Dr. Gabel ends with an appeal for more robust efforts by universities to recognize the particular complexity of community-engaged research, particularly that connected to Indigenous research projects.

This journal issue also includes a book review by Meredith Palmer of Larry Krotz’s *Diagnosing the Legacy: The Discovery, Research, and Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes in Indigenous Youth* (Winnipeg. University of Manitoba Press). Palmer undertakes a chapter-specific discussion of the book, noting the presence of Indigenous voices and Dr. Krotz’s careful inclusion of social/structural determinants beyond those often emphasized in diabetes research. While engaging in a sympathetic critique of what she views as reductive moments in the book’s analysis, Palmer ultimately positions the book as a helpful primer for those working in the various health arenas connected to diabetes.

Finally, the foundational document for this issue involves a recently signed accord between the Government of Canada and the Métis National Council. This accord sets out a framework for the MNC to negotiate on a nation-to-nation and government-to-government basis with the Government of Canada on issues relating to Métis rights and the improvement of socio-economic conditions, as well as to resolve currently unresolved claims and grievances, among other issues.