

2008



**KEY RESEARCH ISSUES ON
URBAN ABORIGINAL
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

INTRODUCTION:

For many generations, Aboriginal peopleⁱ have lived in urban areas.ⁱⁱ Prior to colonization, at different times and in different places, First Nations across North America created dense settlements which acted as trade centres, places of residence, and gathering places for important events. With populations numbering in the thousands, these were important cultural, economic, and social centres for First Nations.

Aboriginal people still live in urban areas, but urban life today is dramatically different. Surrounded by non-Aboriginal people and often separated from their cultural practices and their territories, Aboriginal people in urban areas face serious challenges in maintaining their identity, building their communities, and developing their economies.

Increasingly, the face of the Aboriginal community in Canada today is an urban one. According to the 2006 Census, over 60% of First Nations people now live off-reserve, and this trend is expected to continue. But this dramatic demographic shift has not been accompanied by an economic shift: in general Aboriginal people living in urban areas continue to be marginalized from the larger economy. While urban Aboriginal people are socio-economically slightly better off than their on-Reserve counterparts, they remain significantly behind the non-Aboriginal population.

In response to the need to support the economic development of urban Aboriginal communities, a group of scholars, practitioners, and others have come together and initiated a project to both increase our understanding of the factors that lead to successful economic and business development in urban Aboriginal communities, and to disseminate that knowledge between academics, policy analysts, and community practitioners. Funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and the Office of the Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, the project is aimed at establishing a network of scholars and practitioners who, together, can deepen the dialogue about urban Aboriginal economic development, and find ways to use current and future knowledge to support urban Aboriginal communities in their goals and aspirations. The intent is to create a strong policy, program, and knowledge utilization context to support the work of urban Aboriginal communities.

This *Research Issues Paper* is intended to guide discussions in the first stage of the Network, by identifying an initial set of issues which arise from the academic literature on urban Aboriginal communities. The *Paper* is organized around a series of *contexts* that confront those as they

work to develop their economies, participate in the wage economy, and develop a business sector. These include:

- the socio-demographic context
- the jurisdictional context
- the policy context
- the institutional context, and
- the program context.

For each section, an attempt is made to set out the key *strategic* questions or issues facing communities, and the key *research* questions that are generated by our current state of knowledge about urban Aboriginal communities.

As this Paper is not written as a literature review, the references are limited, with the expectation that as the Network develops more intensive descriptions of the existing literature will be created for the various topics adopted by participants.

DISCUSSION: CONTEXTS FOR URBAN ABORIGINAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

One of the motivations behind creating a National Network on urban Aboriginal economic development was the need to ensure that policy, practice, and research kept pace with the changing demographics of Aboriginal peoples, in particular the rapid increase in the urban population. This attentiveness to demographic realities, it turns out, is shared by the literature: as an organizing scheme it has deeply shaped the analyses of urban Aboriginal communities.ⁱⁱⁱ The assumed centrality of socio-demographics factors has led researchers to develop a wide body of knowledge about the characteristics of the urban Aboriginal population. While that body of work is limited by the available data-sets (typically Statistics Canada data and vital statistics collected by Provinces), a significant effort has been made to mine that data for insights into the situation of urban Aboriginal people and communities. As a result, detailed and thoughtful analyses of important dimensions of urban Aboriginal life are now available: residency patterns, income levels, movement between urban and home communities, class composition, age and gender distribution, population growth over time, employment patterns, and changes in Aboriginal identification over time and across locations.^{iv}

The analysis is welcome and is of considerable value in understanding urban Aboriginal communities and in designing policies and programs that reflect the unique situations of Aboriginal people.

The focus on socio-demographic data, however, has meant the analysis of urban communities has remained descriptive, providing little analysis of how to use that data to design better programs, or to better target the activities of Aboriginal organizations. As well, placing socio-demographic data at the core of our understanding of Aboriginal communities has meant that other issues, such as urban Aboriginal political development, identity^v, or the nature of community interactions^{vi}, have tended to take a backseat in the Canadian literature to generalized descriptions of population characteristics. From a research perspective, this socio-demographic focus has also been at the expense of a clear linkage to broader issues such as the political economy of urban areas or the role of statistics in the ‘governmentalization’ of Aboriginal communities.

More crucially, from the perspective of Aboriginal research methodologies a socio-demographic focus does not encourage us to turn to Aboriginal ontologies, epistemologies, and research paradigms that would suggest more holistic and integrated ways of understanding urban Aboriginal communities.^{vii} Finally, from a practical perspective, socio-demographic approaches draw attention to the gaps between Aboriginal people and the larger society, but by themselves they cannot indicate how Aboriginal people, as active agents, are finding creative ways to respond to their circumstances, and thus are not always a helpful resource for community organizations who turn to academic work for strategic guidance.

A potential line of activity for the Network, then, is to more clearly identify what data actually matters to program managers, community organizations, or policy makers, on the one hand, and on the other, to draw a tighter connection between the characteristics of the community and the impact these have on the economic and business activities of community members and Aboriginal organizations. The goal will be to add a strategic dimension to a discussion that is often focused on empirical issues.

As well, work is needed on ‘thicker’ descriptions of the characteristics of the urban Aboriginal community; that is, descriptions that go beyond demographic features, and give us a deeper sense of the intricate and complex relations that Aboriginal people in urban areas have to the economy, other community members, and to governments. There are a number of ethnographic studies of urban Aboriginal communities^{viii}, but these do not explicitly link their findings to strategy and policy questions relevant to urban Aboriginal economic development. This is a gap in the literature that the Network can perhaps begin to address.

THE JURISDICTIONAL CONTEXT

One of the key contexts to be considered in urban Aboriginal communities is that of jurisdiction. If you include municipalities, responsibility for decision making and service provision is divided between five levels of government:

- 1) *First Nations* across Canada have long asserted their right to exercise jurisdiction over community members wherever they may live^{ix}
- 2) Many Métis are represented politically, and receive services from, governance structures associated with the *Métis National Council*
- 3) The *federal government* in turn asserts that it has jurisdiction in its fields of competence, but that its responsibility for Status Indians under 91(24) essentially ends at reserve boundaries
- 4) Particularly for health and social issues, *provinces* also assume responsibility for decisions that impact on economic development in urban Aboriginal communities
- 5) Finally, *municipal governments* have often stepped into the picture to provide services or to engage Aboriginal people in urban initiatives.

This jurisdictional context is problematic, in particular because it leads to an unclear policy framework, confuses lines of accountability and responsibility, and results in inadequate or inappropriate program responses^x. It is also burdensome for Aboriginal people: as is well known, the hard work of connecting and coordinating the different governance levels typically rests on the shoulders of the community.

But we also know that this jurisdictional complexity is not necessarily a barrier to successful economic development. We know that, despite contested and unclear jurisdictional boundaries, some communities have made significant advances in their ability to participate in the economy and establish viable Aboriginal businesses^{xi}. So it would be important to clarify the specific conditions under which this jurisdictional complexity inhibits development, and to examine the strategies used in different places to reduce or eliminate the impact of the multiple claims to jurisdiction on economic or business development.

This question of jurisdiction goes beyond the issue – common to discussions of creating a ‘positive investment climate’ – of ensuring certainty and clarity for potential investors. For Aboriginal communities, the question of jurisdiction is a political question as much as it is a business issue, in that it is closely tied to debates about the legal and political status of urban Aboriginal communities. One way in which First Nations with a land base have been able to develop their economies is through the (limited) leverage over industry and government they

possess by virtue of a legal right to be consulted and the potential existence of Aboriginal title. In some cases, benefits agreements and employment opportunities have flowed from that position. But most of the legal arguments for the duty to consult and for Aboriginal title are derived from the fact of continued First Nations occupation of (or historic control over) their traditional territory.^{xii} As a result, there are few legal or conceptual resources available to make the case for a distinct form of jurisdiction attached to an urban Aboriginal community.^{xiii} However, we also know that the Courts have not been silent on this issue; both in *Corbeire* and in *Misquadis*, the Courts in Canada have extended legal recognition to urban members of First Nations, and to urban Aboriginal communities in general.

Strategically, the issue is the degree to which some form of control, even when that control falls short of jurisdiction, supports or enables economic or business development initiatives. While Aboriginal control over policy and programs is a clear normative goal of most urban organizations, it is not always so easily achieved, and so one line of inquiry for the Network is to understand how best to plan and implement initiatives in an environment in which Aboriginal control is uneven, limited, or absent.

From a research perspective, then, there are substantial issues that remain unaddressed. In particular, work is needed on the conceptual bases which could underpin urban Aboriginal community control (to supplement existing discussions of the potential forms or models) and on the exact relationship between enhanced Aboriginal control and success in economic and business development.^{xiv}

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT:

Probably the single most influential research for Aboriginal people and economic development is the work produced by the *Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development*. At its core, the many projects that have come out of the Harvard Project share a central insight: institutions matter. While there is some question about exactly *how* they matter, and what the impact is of well formed governing institutions, this general line of analysis emphasises the decisive role of governance in economic development for American Indian Tribes^{xv}. This general approach has found currency in a Canadian context^{xvi} as a number of First Nations organizations, such as the British Columbia Assembly of First Nations, have made efforts to incorporate this approach in their economic development strategies.

But of course this work has been done in the context of land-based communities. The institutional and legal context in urban communities is hugely different. There are, for instance, very few of the governing institutions that resemble those described in the findings of the

Harvard Project. The majority of urban Aboriginal organizations are service providers, focused on social, health, or advocacy services: they do not set the ground rules for commercial transactions or allocate property rights. The aspirations of urban communities have found expression, though, in relatively durable political organizations, and a good deal of community life revolves around the activities or the roles of service organizations, so analyses of the role and impact of urban Aboriginal organizations still seems a fruitful path. A potential site of inquiry for the Network, then, is to try to understand the role of political bodies in supporting or facilitating economic development, and the role of Aboriginal service providers in supporting the economic activities of community members.

As well, the institutional landscape is considerably more complex in many urban settings: there are both a multitude of Aboriginal providers in some settings with no overarching governing body, and there are alternative non-Aboriginal organizations that offer services not available to even the largest reserve community. In addition, non-Aboriginal governments can (and do) claim to provide the framework for investor confidence and procedural fairness central to the prescriptions of the Harvard Project. Urban Aboriginal institutions thus face the double difficulty of both establishing themselves and displacing other, more powerful institutions.

This raises the question of the role of institutions in urban Aboriginal economic development. While there have been a number of attempts to describe the institutional environment^{xvii} little work has been done in Canada on the specific ways in which the organizational context impacts community dynamics as these effect economic development^{xviii}. From a strategic perspective, it would be productive to have more analysis about what kinds of institutional arrangements facilitate or inhibit economic development in urban areas. Given the dominance of non-Aboriginal institutions and their near monopoly on contract enforcement and legal decision making, in what sense do institutions matter for urban Aboriginal people interested in developing their economy? Is it an issue of procedural fairness and governance, or more an issue of building social capital or establishing community networks that can support early stage entrepreneurs^{xix}? Or is it the *content* of the technical assistance provided by Aboriginal service providers to community members that constitutes the value-added of urban Aboriginal organizations?

From the perspective of a research agenda, then, there is a need to deepen the research on urban Aboriginal organizations beyond a description of their formal features, and to try understand the role they play in community life, in mediating the relationship between community members and non-Aboriginal governments, and in protecting Aboriginal identity from being absorbed into the assimilative thrust of market based social relations.^{xx}

THE POLICY CONTEXT:

All levels of government have developed policies with respect to urban Aboriginal people^{xxi} but the evidence suggests that most governments do a poor job of this: they approach urban Aboriginal policy with various combinations of hesitation, lack of knowledge, blind hope, and indifference. Thus, it is not the complete *absence* of policy that is the issue; it is rather the *character* of those policies that is problematic. First, in part because of the jurisdictional complexity, those policies are not well coordinated. Second, they tend to be fragmented, with important issues left unaddressed. Third, where policies for urban Aboriginal communities do exist, they are often built upon assumptions drawn from land-based communities, and fail to address the social and economic realities of urban communities. Or, alternatively, they are derived from urban policy in general and so miss the unique dynamics of Aboriginal communities. Current policies do not, in other words, express a clear and coherent vision of economic development for Aboriginal people in urban areas.

The inadequacy of the current policy context seems easy enough to demonstrate. However, a number of key questions remain. While we can see the value of a strong policy context, we need more discussion about the concrete ways that existing policies enable or constrain the activities of community leaders and entrepreneurs to develop an urban Aboriginal economy. As well, there are questions about the policy framework for urban Aboriginal communities. What kinds of recognition or support or affirmation are appropriate? Are existing mechanisms for involving urban Aboriginal people in policy adequate, and - given the diversity of urban Aboriginal communities - how would an inclusive policy process be organized.^{xxii}

Strategically, what kinds of policy analysis and research are needed to enable urban organizations to meet their goals and serve their members? And, given that it is unlikely that the sources of policy weakness in this sector will disappear in the short term, what practices enable communities and entrepreneurs to minimize or avoid the limitations in the current policy environment? Put another way, are gaps in policy potential sites of creative development and experimentation?

In the service of both strategy and research, and with the goal of policy change, we could also benefit from a better understanding of the process inside government through which policy is generated and implemented. This is true overall for Aboriginal issues, but the relatively undeveloped nature of the urban Aboriginal policy community means that the problem is deeper and more in need of scrutiny. It also means that the opportunities are greater, as there is less policy inertia to overcome in pursuit of change. This calls for both more studies of the

dynamics of change in this urban Aboriginal policy, and more detailed studies of particular policy areas.

THE PROGRAM CONTEXT:

From the perspective of Aboriginal organizations in urban areas, the most important feature of daily life is programmatic: the core business that allows most urban groups to survive is service delivery. Unlike land based communities, urban organizations rarely have core funding, or any other source of long term financial stability. To survive, and be able to meet community needs, urban Aboriginal organizations need to attach themselves to program streams. In urban Aboriginal communities, programs matter: program delivery is a defining feature of organizational and community life, both because services are needed, but also because programs and the organizations that deliver them offer a point of strategic intervention for larger community aspirations, and a mechanism for collective action. For community members, involvement in service delivery organizations is often an important mechanism for entry into larger community dynamics, in addition to providing much needed personal development and assistance.

This program landscape has been surveyed at different times and places in an attempt to get a better understanding of the range, scope, and impact of programs for people in urban Aboriginal communities.^{xxiii} Programs, though, are not static, so exercises in program mapping in and of themselves tend to have a limited lifespan, notwithstanding the important insights they can generate about economic development. From the perspective of funders and community members, what is important is the long standing question of program effectiveness (including value for money), and the related issue of how to ensure that programs are delivered - and preferably managed - by Aboriginal organizations.

This points us towards some areas of focus for the Network. First, what is the actual impact of the various programs targeted to economic, business and labour force development? What works and what doesn't? What determines if a given program is successful in supporting economic development? Second, what are the strategies used by Aboriginal organizations to ensure that programs reflect the cultural and social norms of community members, and what is the impact of having programs delivered and managed by urban Aboriginal organizations? Using the language of the Harvard Project, what kinds of technical assistance matter, and what kinds don't?

Third, from the perspective of Aboriginal communities, programs can only be effective if they adopt a holistic perspective that treats community members, not as clients with a specific

deficit, but as whole human beings, where all dimensions of that person's life are addressed. Given this, how should we understand the interaction *between* programs, and what practices allow us to ensure that community members are not transformed, through the service delivery system, into clients of the administrative state?

From a research perspective, there are significant issues associated with the dominance of a service delivery perspective in discussions of urban Aboriginal communities. Does a focus on service delivery have a de-politicizing effect that obscures questions of Aboriginal community control and Aboriginal rights? Do the constraints of government models of service delivery limit the ability of urban Aboriginal organizations to articulate, support, or advocate for the economic needs of their members? Does the programmatic focus on managing budgets and running formal organizations limit the opportunities to build on the natural, non-bureaucratic social support systems that exist in urban communities?

SUMMARY: CONTEXTS DISCUSSION

The above discussion has pointed to some of the key issues that face urban Aboriginal communities as they respond to the need to develop an economic development strategy that is both successful in raising standards of living and in strengthening the cultures, traditions, and identity of Aboriginal community members. The goal of the Network is clear: to enable Aboriginal people in urban areas to participate in the economy as equals; to thrive and prosper as Aboriginal people in an environment that is often hostile to their aspirations and practices, even while it holds out significant promise for a better future.

For practitioners, the Network holds out the promise that their effectiveness can be enhanced with access to the best available knowledge about urban Aboriginal communities. For researchers, the Network is a tremendous opportunity to engage deeply with practitioners, policy makers, and other researchers, and discover ways to enable their research to make a real difference in the conditions in urban Aboriginal communities.

June 2, 2009

ENDNOTES

ⁱ 'Aboriginal people' in this discussion paper includes Inuit, Métis, and First Nations.

ⁱⁱ See, e.g., Jack Forbes, "The Urban Tradition among Native Americans", in Lobo, S. and K. Peters, *American Indians and the urban experience*. (Walnut Creek, Calif.: Altimira Press. 2001)

ⁱⁱⁱ A representative text in this regard is *Not strangers in these parts*. (E. J. Peters, D. Newhouse, et al, Eds. Ottawa, Policy Research Initiative, 2003). An excellent overview of the issues associated with urban Aboriginal communities, a significant portion of the contributions focus on the social and demographic realities of urban Aboriginal communities, reflecting the centrality accorded to this aspect of urban Aboriginal life.

^{iv} On migration patterns, see S. Clatworthy, *Factors Influencing the Migration of Registered Indians Between on and Off-Reserve Locations in Canada*. (Ottawa: Research and Analysis Directorate, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 2000), and Mary Jane Norris, Martin Cooke and Stewart Clatworthy, "Aboriginal Mobility and Migration Patterns and the Policy Implications", in *Aboriginal Conditions: Research as Public Policy*, J. P. White, P. Maxim and D. Beavon, eds. (Vancouver UBC Press, 2003: 108-130). The US literature on urban Indian communities has numerous examples of detailed discussions of 'migration factors', representing the influence of 'push pull' analyses of urban settlement patterns, a framework drawn by and large from immigration studies. A representative example is James LaGrand, *Indian metropolis: Native Americans in Chicago, 1945-75*. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002).

On residential patterns (i.e., neighbourhood clustering), see Paul Maxim, Carl Keane and J. White, "Urban Residential Patterns of Aboriginal People in Canada", in *Not Strangers in these Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples*. (D. Newhouse and E. Peters, Eds. Ottawa, Policy Research Institute, 2003: 79-91).

Generally, see Jerry White, Paul S. Maxim and Daniel J. K. Beavon, *Aboriginal conditions: research as a foundation for public policy*. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2003).

^v For a more theoretical (and less demographic) discussion of changing Indigenous identity in an urban context, see M. Barcham, "De)constructing the Politics of Indigeneity", in *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples*. D. Ivison, P. Patton and W. Sanders, eds. (London New York, Cambridge University Press, 2002).

^{vi} For a discussion of urban Aboriginal community dynamics, see Craig Proulx, *Reclaiming Aboriginal Justice, Identity, and Community*. (Saskatoon: Purich Publishers, 2003).

^{vii} See generally, Smith, Linda Tuhiwai, *Decolonizing methodologies: research and Indigenous peoples*. (London; New York: Zed Books, 1999). In a Canadian context, see Richard Atleo/Umeek, *Tsawalk: a Nuu-chah-nulth worldview*. (Vancouver UBC Press, 2004).

^{viii} Two examples, one older, one more recent, are Hugh Brody, *Indians on skid row*. (Ottawa: Northern Science Research Group, Dept. of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1971), and Craig Proulx, *Reclaiming Aboriginal Justice, Identity, and Community*.

^{ix} See for instance the Assembly of First Nations' resolution in response to the *Misquadis* court decision (AFN Resolution #37, July 22, 2004). The Resolution asserts First Nations' jurisdiction over their members regardless of residency.

^x See Ian Peach, *The Charter of Rights and Off-Reserve First Nations People: A Way to Fill the Public Policy Vacuum?* (Regina: Saskatchewan Institute on Public Policy, 2004), and Janice Stokes, Ian Peach and Raymond B. Blake, *Rethinking the Jurisdictional Divide: The Marginalization of Urban Aboriginal Communities and Federal Policy Responses*. (Regina: Saskatchewan Institute for Public Policy, 2004).

^{xi} Wanda Wuttunee, *Living Rhythms: Lessons in Aboriginal Economic Resilience and Vision*. (Montreal: McGill Queens University Press, 2004).

^{xii} For a discussion of recent court decisions, see Kent McNeil, "Aboriginal Title and the Supreme Court: What's Happening?" (*Saskatchewan Law Review*. 69(2), 2006).

^{xiii} See Gordon Christie, *Challenges to Urban Aboriginal Governance*. (Toronto: Osgoode Hall Law School, 200).

^{xiii} The relationship between development and attempts to gain self-determination have also found interesting expression in the work of Chandler and Lalonde on suicide rates in Aboriginal communities. Chandler, M. J. and C. E. Lalonde (2000). "Cultural continuity as a protective factor against suicide in First Nations youth." [Lifenotes: A Suicide Prevention and Community Health Newsletter](#) 5 (1): 10-11.

^{xv} See generally, Stephen Cornell, and Joseph P. Kalt, *What can tribes do? : strategies and institutions in American Indian economic development*. Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center, University of California 1992), and Stephen Cornell, Joseph P. Kalt and Terry L. Anderson, "Culture and Institutions as Public Goods: American Indian Economic Development as a Problem of Collective Action", in *Property rights and Indian economies* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1992: 215-252).

^{xvi} In part because of a more developed tradition of neo-institutionalism in Canadian social science. See A. Lecours, *New institutionalism: theory and analysis*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 2005).

^{xvii} See, e.g., Katherine Graham, "Urban Aboriginal Governance in Canada: Paradigms and Prospects", in *Aboriginal self-government in Canada: current trends and issues*, J. H. Hylton, ed. (Saskatoon, Purich Publisher, 1991: 377 - 410.), and David Newhouse, "The Invisible Infrastructure: Urban Aboriginal Institutions and Organizations", in *Not strangers in these parts: urban Aboriginal peoples*, pp: 243-255).

^{xviii} Exceptions to this point include: John Loxley, *Aboriginal Economic Development in Winnipeg*, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 2002), and Craig Proulx, *Reclaiming Aboriginal Justice, Identity, and Community*.

^{xix} See generally Jerry White, Paul S. Maxim and Daniel J. K. Beavon (2003). *Aboriginal conditions : research as a foundation for public policy*.

^{xx} In a Canadian context, John Loxley and Fred Wein have also taken steps in this direction. See, for example, the discussion of institutional capacity for economic development in Winnipeg in J. Loxley and F. Wein "Urban Aboriginal Economic Development", (in *Not strangers in these parts: urban Aboriginal peoples.*, 2003) pp: 217 – 242.

In American context, see some of the works on Chicago, including Beck, D. (2002). "Developing a Voice: The Evolution of Self-Determination in an Urban Indian Community." *Wicazo Sa Review* 17(2): 117-141, and James LaGrand, (2002). *Indian metropolis : Native Americans in Chicago, 1945-75*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

^{xxi} As discussed in Calvin Hanselmann, *Uncommon Sense: Promising Practices in Urban Aboriginal Policy-Making and Programming*. Calgary: Canada West Foundation, 2002), and *Shared Responsibility: Final Report and Recommendations of the Urban Aboriginal Initiative. A Western Cities Project Report*. (Calgary: Canada West Foundation, 2003).

^{xxii} For a recent discussion of urban Aboriginal involvement (or lack thereof) in policy making, see Nathan Cardinal, "The exclusive city: Identifying, measuring, and drawing attention to Aboriginal and Indigenous experiences in an urban context." (*Cities* 23 (3): 217-228, 2006). A good discussion can also be found in Evelyn Peters, "Indigeneity and marginalisation: Planning for and with urban Aboriginal communities in Canada." (*Progress in Planning* 63 (4): 327-404, 2005).

^{xxiii} From the *Hawthorn Report* onwards, attempts have been made to map out the relationship between urban Aboriginal communities and governments in terms of the programs and services available to community members. See for instance, Edgar Dosman, *Indians: the urban dilemma*. (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1972); Calvin Hanselmann, *Uncommon Sense: Promising Practices in Urban Aboriginal Policy-Making and Programming*. (Calgary: Canada West Foundation, 2002). For analyses focused on one particular policy area, see Emma LaRocque, "Re-Examining Culturally Appropriate Models in Criminal Justice Applications" in *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada: Essays in Law, Equality, and Respect for Difference*. M. Asch, ed. (Vancouver, UBC Press: 75-96, 2002), for a study of a particular community, see James Silver and Joan Hay *In their own voices: building urban Aboriginal communities*. (Black Point, N.S.: Fernwood Publishers, 2006).