Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development
ISSN: 2152-0801 online
https://foodsystemsjournal.org

Resurgence, refusal, and reconciliation in a food movement organization: A case study of Food Secure Canada's 2018 Assembly

Heather L. Elliott [a] * and Monica E. Mulrennan [b]
Concordia University

Alain Cuerrier [c]
Université de Montréal

Submitted August 4, 2020 / Revised November 23, December 14, 2020, and January 11, 2021 / Accepted January 11, 2021 / Published online June 8, 2021

Citation: Elliott, H. L., Mulrennan, M. E., & Cuerrier, A. (2021). Resurgence, refusal, and reconciliation in a food movement organization: A case study of Food Secure Canada's 2018 Assembly. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development, 10*(3), 265–285. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2021.103.009

Copyright © 2021 by the Authors. Published by the Lyson Center for Civic Agriculture and Food Systems. Open access under CC-BY license.

Abstract

Indigenous food systems have been sites of deliberate and sustained disruption in the service of the settler colonial project on Turtle Island. The revitalization of traditional foodways is a powerful and popular means through which Indigenous Peoples are practicing cultural and political resurgence. We are at a crucial moment of societal reckoning reinforced by recent anti-racist uprisings and Indigenous Land Back actions. In this context, food movements have an important role to play in addressing ongoing colonial impacts on Indigenous food systems by supporting Indigenous Food Sovereignty as a way to advance reconciliation

---

[a] * *Corresponding author:* Heather L. Elliott, M.Sc., Department of Geography, Planning and Environment, Concordia University; 1455 de Maisonneuve West, H 1255-26 (Hall Building); Montréal, QC H3G 1M8 Canada; heather.l.elliott@gmail.com

[b] Monica E. Mulrennan, Professor, Department of Geography, Planning and Environment, Concordia University; 1455 de Maisonneuve West, H 1255-33 (Hall Building); Montréal, QC H3G 1M8 Canada; Monica.Mulrennan@concordia.ca

[c] Alain Cuerrier, Botanist and researcher, Jardin botanique de Montréal, Institut de recherche en biologie végétale, Adjunct Professor, Université de Montréal; 4101 rue Sherbrooke Est; Montréal, QC H1X 2B2 Canada; alain.cuerrier@umontreal.ca

Author Note
This paper was prepared as part of a manuscript-based thesis by the lead author in partial fulfillment for the degree of master of science in Geography, Urban and Environmental Studies at Concordia University.

Funding Disclosure
This work was supported in part through the Joseph-Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate Scholarships Program, a Masters Scholarship of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the France and Andre Desmarais Graduate Fellowship and the Bourse de maîtrise en recherche of the Fonds de recherche du Québec- Société et culture (FRQSC), as well as the FRQSC funded CICADA (Centre for Indigenous Conservation and Development Alternatives), McGill University.

between settlers and Indigenous Peoples. Since its founding in 2005, Food Secure Canada (FSC) has become a national leader in food movements in Canada and its biennial Assembly is arguably the largest food movement event in the country. Despite its sustained engagement with Indigenous Peoples and significant efforts toward inclusion, its 2018 Assembly saw Indigenous people, Black people, and other people of color expressing important concerns, culminating in a walk-out on the last day. To understand how these events might guide transformative reconciliation in and through food movements, we analyzed 124 post-Assembly qualitative questionnaires, held 10 interviews, and analyzed organizational archives, in addition to conducting participant observation throughout the following year. This research portrays the actions taken at the Assembly to be a refusal of settler structures and processes, and the creation of a caucus space for Indigenous people, Black people, and other people of color as an act of resurgence. Engagement with FSC by a number of those involved with the protests throughout the year that followed, and the resultant commitment to center decolonization in FSC's work, reveal the intimate connection between resurgence and reconciliation. These acts of generative refusal and resurgence are an essential part of efforts toward reconciliation without assimilation, aligned in a shared struggle toward the decolonized futures at the heart of food sovereignty for all.

Keywords

Food Movements, Indigenous Food Sovereignty, Social Movement Organizations, Reconciliation, Resurgence, Refusal, Settler Colonialism, Ethical Space, Organizational Development

Introduction

Food systems are networks of relationships, connecting different peoples to each other and to the land (Whyte, 2017). Because all food systems are inherently land-based[1], they have been powerful sites of interference and disruption in the service of settler colonialism (Leblanc & Burnett, 2017; Matties, 2016; Turner & Spalding, 2018). Food systems build interdependence across communities, and as such, they are also places where both resurgence and reconciliation come to life in practice (Coté, 2016; Delormier et al., 2017; Hoover, 2017; Jäger et al., 2019; Kamal et al., 2015; Levkoe et al., 2019; Martens, 2015; Morrison, 2011). Food activist and scholar of community sustainability, Kyle Whyte (Potawatomi) (2017), describes this property of food as being "hub-like, in the sense of a centripetal force pulling certain people, nonhumans and ecosystems together in ways that promote collective action" (p. 10). His work on Indigenous Food Sovereignty (IFS) movements shows that food systems engage Indigenous peoples and settlers[2] in relationships of interdependence with each other and with the Earth.

The social movements that coalesce around food engage these cross-cultural relationships in support of many social and environmental goals. Food movements bring together a diverse collection of actors, practices, and discourses which food systems scholar, Gail Feenstra (2002), describes as "a collaborative effort to build more locally based, self-reliant food economies—one in which sustainable food production, processing, distribution, and consumption [are] integrated to enhance the economic, environmental, and local health of a particular place" (p. 100). While they have long sought more sustainable ways of relating to the land (Blay-Palmer, 2010; Feenstra, 2002), in the past decade food movements have increasingly begun to address social inequalities reproduced in movements that have been dominated by White, middle-class actors (Garzo Montalvo, 2015; Guthman, 2008; Kepkiewicz & Rotz, 2018; Matties, 2016; Moore & Swisher, 2015; Slocum, 2006).[3] Food movements provide particularly poignant sites for the work of reconciliation for two reasons. Firstly, we believe that the long history of colonial interventions in Indigenous food systems has left a legacy for which settlers must take responsibility. Secondly, food movements' paired goals of working for sustainability on the land and justice between peoples parallels what political scientist James Tully (2018) calls the two interrelated projects of reconciliation: reconciling Indigenous Peoples and settlers to each other and reconciling all peoples to the land.

---

[1] We use the term land inclusively to refer to territory, soils, air, waters, and all the life they support.

[2] We use the word "settler" inclusively to refer to all non-Indigenous peoples living on Turtle Island, as proposed by Regan (2010) and developed by Lowman and Barker (2015). In using this term, we do not wish to reproduce a binary that centers whiteness to the exclusion of recent immigrants, Black people and other people of color; rather, we want to highlight that unless these peoples are subscribing to Indigenous laws and protocols, they are citizens of the settler state.

[3] It is to make space for the diverse sites of struggle of those most often excluded from white-dominated food movements that we refer to food movements in the plural.

In this article, we examine how relationships of interdependence between Indigenous Peoples and settlers make food systems a potentially powerful site of transformative reconciliation, despite a long history of colonial interference. As White settlers—a graduate student and food movement activist and two academic researchers, working for food sovereignty, we focus on communities of which we are a part, and to which we ourselves are accountable, focusing on a particular "moment of reckoning" that occurred at Food Secure Canada's 2018 Assembly and the subsequent response elicited. Food Secure Canada (FSC) is an influential national food movement organization in Canada. Although many, if not most, of the 124 Assembly participants who completed the post-Assembly questionnaire (out of about 800 total participants) shared positive experiences of the Assembly, a number of Indigenous people, Black people and other people of color[4] raised significant protest, ranging from the disruption of a prominent public plenary to a walk-out on the final day, followed by two separate letters of concern sent by groups of food movement practitioners (Indigenous people, Black people and people of color).

At FSC's 2018 Assembly, protesters refused what reportedly felt like settler-oriented structures and processes. In this article, we use this particular moment of refusal to gain insight into the challenges, tensions, and disconnects of doing the work of reconciliation. We understand refusal not only as the refusal of colonialism, but as the concomitant generation of a reality which centers the material and spiritual needs of Indigenous communities (A. Simpson, 2014) and, as such, as part of the movement of Indigenous resurgence. By resurgence we broadly refer to practices of Indigenous self-determination and cultural revitalization (Asch et al., 2018; Corntassel, 2012). Our use of reconciliation is in relation to the reconciliation of settlers and Indigenous Peoples, as well as the reconciliation of all people with the land (Asch et al., 2018). Using these understandings, we examine the dynamic tension between resurgence and reconciliation in practice at FSC. We accomplish this by first situating this particular moment in the context of food movements and IFS. We consider the theoretical framework of resurgence (Alfred, 2009; Coulthard, 2014; L. B. Simpson, 2017) and how it is being enacted through the revitalization of Indigenous food systems, as well as the frameworks of reconciliation (Asch et al., 2018; Regan, 2018) and ethical space (Ermine, 2007). To show how this is happening in practice, we share case studies of the few food movement organizations who have, like FSC, attempted to bring reconciliation to and through their work. After establishing this groundwork, we describe recent protests at FSC and their context, as well as FSC's ensuing response. In our discussion, we identify resurgence and its assertion of difference as necessary to create the ethical space needed for reconciliation to be transformative and avoid the pitfalls of assimilation, for which reconciliation frameworks are often critiqued (Alfred, 2009; Ladner, 2018; L. B. Simpson, 2017). Settler colonialism undermines the foodways of Indigenous Peoples, Black people and other people of color, albeit in different ways (Penniman, 2018; Wolfe, 2016), and the protests at FSC's Assembly involved all groups. However, the limited scope of this paper and the distinct histories of and impacts upon each group limit our focus primarily to the concerns of Indigenous Peoples and, as settlers, our distinct and treaty-bound responsibilities with them.[5]

---

[4] Where possible, we use the racial identity used by participants themselves. However, we use the term "people of color" for situations involving people of differing racial identities (who self-identify as being "non-white") to acknowledge a shared experience of racism. In recognition of the prevalence of anti-Black erasure and the separate history of Indigenous Peoples, we specifically name Black people and Indigenous Peoples outside of this term.

For this research, we took guidance from the Teioháte Kaswenta, known in English as the Two-Row Wampum, a treaty created in 1613 between representatives of the Dutch government and the Haudenosaunee confederacy (which includes the Kanien'kehá:ka, in whose territory the events analyzed here took place). The Teioháte Kaswenta outlines a relationship of two nations coexisting side by side without interference, but with mutual respect, peace, and friendship (Powless, 2000). Since its creation, this treaty has held enormous cultural, spiritual, and political significance that extends far beyond the Haudenosaunee to represent more broadly the framework for right relationships between settlers and Indigenous Peoples in North America (Hansen & Rossen, 2017; Hill, Sr. & Coleman, 2018). We use the treaty here as a conceptual framework that makes space for both resurgence and reconciliation to coexist.

The protests at FSC's 2018 Assembly illustrate the importance of working toward reconciliation in food movements; they also bring to light the discomfort and fundamental challenges of doing so. Because of FSC's history of sustained, if fraught, engagement with Indigenous Peoples, the events at FSC's 10th Assembly and the response thereafter provide a compelling opportunity to understand the challenges and potential of reconciliation within and through food movements in Canada. The concerns brought forward reveal the intimate connection between resurgence and reconciliation, showing that the refusal of settler processes and structures to make space for resurgence can create the conditions needed for reconciliation as transformation, rather than assimilation. From this perspective, settler-led initiatives may need to make space for Indigenous resurgence not as conflicting with, but as part of the work of reconciliation. The lessons learned apply widely across community organizations, advocacy groups, and social movement spaces as well as public and private institutions working toward reconciliation and decolonization.

Literature Review

Background and Context

Indigenous Peoples around the world have been practicing their own versions of food sovereignty for millennia. They have developed a wide range of hunting, gathering, fishing and cultivation practices that "have shaped, supported and sustained [their] distinct cultures, economies and ecosystems… [and are] based on [their] responsibilities to uphold [their] distinct cultures and relationships to the land and food systems" (Morrison, 2011, p. 97). According to Indigenous Food Sovereignty activist Dawn Morrison (Secwepemc) (2011), there can be no single definition of Indigenous Food Sovereignty (IFS), because it is based on processes specific to each nation:

> Indigenous food sovereignty describes, rather than defines, the present-day strategies that enable and support the ability of Indigenous communities to sustain traditional hunting, fishing, gathering, farming and distribution practices, the way we have done for thousands of years. … In this context, an Indigenous food is one that has been primarily cultivated, taken care of, harvested, prepared, preserved, shared, or traded within the boundaries of our respective territories based on values of interdependency, respect, reciprocity, and responsibility. (pp. 97–98)

This description emphasizes relationships and processes, rather than end products. Through this lens, the devastating impact of the disruption of Indigenous food systems on Indigenous Peoples can be understood: while end products can be substituted, relationships must be nurtured, are specific to place, and are central to nationhood. Kyle Whyte (2017) compares such commodity products as commodity cheese, Spam, and microwave meals to traditional foods, such as *Manoomin* (wild rice) and sturgeon for Anishinaabek, and corn for the Diné to emphasize the importance of relationality. He argues that the long relational history of these foods /relatives empowers them to convene these nations for cultural, political, and ecological renewal in a way that other, imported foods such as commodity cheese or microwave meals cannot. He shows that food has value "that extends beyond its taste and nutrient content. For communities with comprehensive practices associated with particular foods, immediate threats to those foods are also threats to the fabric of the communities" (p. 8).

---

[5] Numerous Indigenous scholars and activists argue that early treaties between European nations (and later, the Canadian State) and Indigenous Peoples should form the foundation for renewed political relationships, a concept known as "treaty federalism" in Canada (Asch, 2018; Hansen & Rossen, 2017; Ladner & Dick, 2008; Simpson, 2008; Starblanket, 2019; Turner, 2006).

From the earliest settlement on Turtle Island,[6] through to the creation of the Canadian state and its over 175-year history, colonial powers have disrupted Indigenous food systems in support of the settler colonial project. Insisting on the relevance of this history to Indigenous food insecurity today, scholar and self-described "actionist" Joseph Leblanc (Anishinaabe) and historian Kristin Burnett (2017) point to some of the most damning colonial policies. The relocation and forced sedentarization of many communities, often on reserves distanced from their traditional territories, cut off or reduced their access to the lands they had cared for and which had supported them for centuries. The Indian Act of 1876, and its 50 major amendments over the next century banned important traditions central to Indigenous food systems, in particular the potlatch, and other giveaway ceremonies. Turner and Spalding (2018) emphasize that:

> an under-recognized function of the potlatch is its role in regulating resource use, production, and dissemination. In other words, the potlatch embodied a political institution that oversaw and directed people's land use and occupancy, and their proprietorship over lands and resources. (pp. 274–275)

Residential schools, operating from the 1870s through to 1996, sought to restrict the intergenerational transmission of cultural knowledge and practices, including language and foodways, and replace them with Euro-Canadian ways (Tait Neufield, 2020). Although residential schools are now closed, this intergenerational disruption continues, with more Indigenous children currently in the child welfare system than at the height of residential schools (Kassam, 2017). To Leblanc and Burnett's list, we add the explicit policy of Canada's first Prime Minister, John A. Macdonald, to extirpate the buffalo population (Daschuk, 2013). Buffalo were a key food source for many Indigenous Peoples of the Plains and central to their way of life; this policy had the express purpose of 'clearing the plains' of Indigenous Peoples to make space to expand settlement. For more recent forms of colonial disruption, we point to the impacts of large-scale development projects on Indigenous lands and foodways. For example, Thompson and Pritty (2020) document the impacts of hydro development megaprojects on the ability of the O-Pipon-Na-Piwin Cree Nation to practice food sovereignty, and specifically to meet food security needs. Author Lee Maracle (Sto:lo) (2017) highlights how the genocide of missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls, and two-spirit people continues to undermine IFS, as these populations have traditionally been, and continue to be central to food systems. Priscilla Settee (Cree) (2020) expands this list beyond the borders of the Canadian state, arguing that the ongoing disruption to IFS stems from "the larger neoliberal socio-political systems that gave rise to the many free trade agreements that currently dominate and set the terms and conditions for trade, resource extraction, and human rights the world over" (p. 215).

The impacts of these policies and actions weigh heavily on Indigenous Peoples. The recent First Nations Food, Nutrition and Environment Study (2019), conducted as a collaboration between the University of Ottawa, the Université de Montréal, and the Assembly of First Nations, found that a full 48% of Indigenous households were food insecure, compared with only 12% as the Canadian average, with 77% of Indigenous households unable to access as much traditional food as they would like. Indigenous people also suffer from significantly shorter life expectancies and a disproportionate burden of chronic and acute diseases compared with non-Indigenous people in Canada (National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health, 2013). The impacts on spiritual and community well-being as well as Indigenous nationhood have been particularly devastating. As foodways "form the basis for Indigenous individual and community well-being—physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual—as well as Indigenous identities" (p. 94), Leslie Dawson (2020) connects the disruption of Indigenous food systems to social, mental, and spiritual intergenerational trauma. Despite this heavy history of colonial oppression, Indigenous Peoples have maintained their foodways and continue to adapt to changing realities (Beaudin-Reimer, 2020; Morrison, 2011). Indeed, foodways have become a major site of investment in the wider project of Indigenous resurgence (Kamal & Ithinto Mechisowin Program Committee, 2020), a phenomenon we explore further below.

---

[6] Turtle Island is a term used to refer to the Indigenous lands currently occupied by the Canadian and American settler states, making reference to Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe creation stories. Because we are writing in unceded Kanien'kehá:ka territory (part of the Haudenosaunee confederacy), we use the term here with the intent to shift the focus from colonial narratives of erasure to ongoing Indigenous presence and ontologies.

Resurgence, Refusal and Reconciliation in Canada

Resurgence and reconciliation are the two major schools of thought with respect to Indigenous-settler relations in Canada today, describing different pathways to relational futures on shared land (Asch et al., 2018). Over the last two decades, these terms have become popularized, but also criticized in many fields, both in theory and in practice. For some, resurgence requires self-determination outside of settler structures and paradigms and is seen as a form of refusal: refusing the politics of recognition of the settler state (Coulthard, 2014). This refusal allows Indigenous Peoples to turn inward for renewal and revitalization on their own terms instead of responding to settler agendas, structures, and processes (Coulthard, 2014; A. Simpson, 2014; L. B. Simpson, 2017). Political scientist Taiaiake Alfred (Kanien'kehá:ka) is a strong proponent of the return to traditional Indigenous values and governance with a clearly articulated separatist view: "If we are to emerge from this crisis with our nations intact, we must turn away from the values of the mainstream of North American society and begin to act as self-determining Peoples" (2009, p. xii). In her "radical resurgence project," author and activist Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (Anishinaabe) (2017) describes resurgence not only in the negative terms of refusal, but also as being generative in its own right. According to her, refusal can shift energy away from Indigenizing the structures of settler colonialism to instead investing in the place-based values and ontologies of Indigenous nationhood. This rejectionist resurgence thesis may not be accepted by the majority of Indigenous people—Alfred claims that only 5% of Indigenous people embrace it (cited in Poelzer & Coates, 2015, p. 45)—however, it provides an important counterweight to the theories of reconciliation.

While resurgence must self-evidently be led by Indigenous Peoples, reconciliation is primarily a settler responsibility (Antoine et al., 2018; Asch, 2018). The framework of reconciliation has received significant national attention through the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC). Coming out of the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement in 2008, the TRC published its final report in 2015, and has defined for many—Indigenous Peoples and settlers alike—what reconciliation should look like in Canada. The TRC defines reconciliation as "coming to terms with the events of the past in a manner that overcomes conflict and establishes a respectful and healthy relationship among people moving forward" (TRC, 2015, vol. 6, p. 3). Paulette Regan (2018), a settler scholar and commissioner for the TRC, describes how the TRC expanded the scope of how it viewed reconciliation beyond the dark history of residential schools to "encompass the whole settler colonial project" (p. 211), as well as "reconciliation with the natural world" (TRC, 2015, vol. 6, p. 13, cited in Regan, 2018).

The framework of reconciliation has been adopted widely by public, private, and community institutions, but the differences in how it is applied have been a source of much contention (Asch et al., 2018; Regan, 2010). Some proponents of resurgence argue that state-centered approaches seeking to reconcile Indigenous Peoples within the settler state are just another face of assimilation and ongoing colonialism, and seek to reconcile Indigenous people to the settler colonial status quo (Coulthard, 2014; Ladner, 2018; A. Simpson, 2014; L. B. Simpson, 2017; Starblanket & Stark, 2018). Others suggest that reconciliation is a continuation of a long history of relationality between settlers and Indigenous Peoples and as such, it is congruent with Indigenous ontologies and practices and not necessarily at odds with resurgent approaches (Asch, 2018; Borrows, 2018; Ladner, 2018; Mills, 2018). Indeed, Native Studies scholar Gina Starblanket (Cree/Saulteaux) and political scientist Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark (Ojibwe) (2018) insist that reconciliation comes from the "resurgence of relational modes of being" (p. 178). Law scholar Aaron Mills (Anishinaabe) (2018) goes further to say that in their refusal to engage in relationships with settler society, those who espouse the resurgence paradigm can reproduce an ontological settler form: disconnection. In their recent volume, Asch, Borrows, and Tully (2018) argue for a "transformative" reconciliation, "empowered by robust practices of resurgence" (p. 5). They seek to do away with the binary between reconciliation and resurgence to show that resurgence is necessary for reconciliation to be able to meaningfully address the ongoing violence of settler colonialism and change the status quo.

To deepen our understanding of transformative reconciliation, we draw on ethicist Willie Ermine's (Cree) (2007) concept of ethical space as a framework for enabling cross-cultural engagement. Relevant to our discussion is Ermine's insistence that ethical space requires the recognition of difference without one trying to subsume the other. Ethical space, he writes, "is initially conceptualized by the unwavering construction of difference and diversity between human communities. These are the differences that highlight uniqueness because each entity is moulded (*sic*) from a distinct history, knowledge tradition, philosophy, and social and political reality" (p. 194). This insistence on upholding difference explains in part the importance of resurgence for the project of reconciliation: resurgence strengthens nationhood, generating a place of power from which to establish relationships while resisting efforts at assimilation.

Indigenous Resurgence Through Food Systems

Indigenous Peoples are practicing cultural and political resurgence across North America. One key form that this resurgence has taken is the revitalization of Indigenous food systems (Kamal & Ithinto Mechisowin Program Committee, 2020). The popularity of this approach is widespread, manifest in the growth in associated scholarship over the past decade, principally led by Indigenous scholars (see, for example Bagelman, 2018; Coté, 2016; Cyr & Slater, 2019; Delormier et al., 2017; Hoover, 2017; Kamal et al., 2015; Martens, 2015; Rudolph & McLachlan, 2013; Settee & Shukla, 2020). Two studies provide a particularly helpful survey of the field. For her Master's research, food activist Tabitha Martens (Cree-Métis) (2015) describes 24 Indigenous food initiatives in Western Canada. She uses a circle metaphor to describe four elements that she found to be key to IFS: history, connection to the land, relationships, and identity, all of which situate IFS very much in line with Indigenous resurgence. Scholar and food activist Elizabeth Hoover (Kanien'kehá:ka/Mi'kmaq) (2017) similarly describes 34 IFS projects across the United States, linking resurgence of Indigenous political sovereignty with the revitalization of Indigenous food systems. She cites food activist Winona LaDuke (Anishinaabe) as saying: "you can't say you're sovereign if you can't feed yourself" (p. 62). LaDuke's assertion aligns with L. B. Simpson's (2017) insistence that cultural resurgence is always tied to political resurgence. Simpson argues that the separation of the two is a colonial construct seeking to limit the threat that this resurgence presents to the settler state. She argues that "within Indigenous thought, however, the cultural and the political are joined and inseparable, and they are both generated through place-based practices—practices that require land" (pp. 49–50).

There are many examples of cultural and political resurgence in IFS initiatives. Michelle Daigle (Mushkegowuk Cree) (2019) examines everyday acts of resurgence used by Anishinaabe in Treaty 3 territory (Ontario) to protect and renew their food harvesting grounds, waters, and foodways. She finds that this resurgence centers "Indigenous political and legal orders that, in one way, shape everyday practices of protecting and regenerating Indigenous foodways and, in another way, are simultaneously cultivated through food practices" (p. 2). Charlotte Coté (Nuu-chah-nulth) (2016) describes her people's efforts to develop food policies that actively restore and strengthen their spiritual and cultural bonds with their *ha-huulhi* (ancestral homelands) as forms of decolonization and sustainable self-determination in practice. Aligned with Daigle and Coté's work, Whyte (2017) shows that using food systems as a site for resurgence is common practice among Indigenous communities, describing the revitalization of Indigenous food systems as a strategy of negotiating settler colonial erasure for political, cultural, and ecological renewal. In applying L. B. Simpson's lens to IFS work, these examples show that the revitalization of Indigenous foodways is both cultural and political resurgence in practice.

Reconciliation Through Food Systems

Compared with the rich scholarship on the revitalization of IFS, our literature review found the publications addressing reconciliation between Indigenous Peoples and settlers through food systems to be fairly sparse, generally consisting of case studies co-authored by the settler and Indigenous scholars and practitioners involved. Influential author and activist Dawn Morrison (Secwepemc) (2011) shares her experience developing the Working Group on Indigenous Food Sovereignty in response to the need to create space for Indigenous voices within the largely settler-led B.C. Food Systems Network. Morrison sees food sovereignty as a potential site for reconciliation as it provides a "restorative framework for identifying ways that social and political advocates from the settler communities can work to support IFS in a bottom-up approach" (p. 104). Levkoe, Ray, and McLaughlin (2019) provide another example of the creation of such a 'restorative framework' by sharing their experiences with the creation of the Indigenous Food Circle as separate from, but supported by, the Thunder Bay and Area Food Strategy:

> Considering the ongoing strain on Indigenous-settler relationships in the Thunder Bay area, the Indigenous Food Circle presents a unique opportunity to demonstrate ways that food can be used as a tool for reconciliation and resurgence. The Indigenous Food Circle was built on the idea that Indigenous peoples should have control of their food systems and is rooted in the theory and practice of food sovereignty, emphasizing self-determination and a re-connection to land-based food systems. (p. 11)

A third example of a promising approach to reconciliation through food is found in the Indigenous Foods Knowledges Network (IFKN). This network connects Indigenous communities to researchers across the Arctic and the U.S. Southwest to collaborate on research and community capacity-building related to IFS, basing their approach to working together upon the concept of relational accountability (Jäger et al., 2019). According to Shawn Wilson (Opaskwayak Cree) (2008), relational accountability reflects the centrality of relationships to Indigenous ways of being and knowing, and the responsibility of upholding good relationships based on respect, reciprocity, and responsibility. For the IFKN, relational accountability guides the ways that they gather (placed-based, hosted to the benefit of local Indigenous communities) and the ways that they work together (emphasis on storytelling, Indigenous ways of knowing, and Indigenous languages). Though their work is far from over and consensus on the way forward has not necessarily been reached by all involved, these three examples help give shape to what transformative reconciliation might mean for food movements.

In this context of colonial disruption to Indigenous food systems and its ongoing impacts, as well as the resiliency and revitalization of Indigenous food systems and Indigenous Peoples, we see the importance of transformative reconciliation through food, and by extension, food movements. We also see the challenges inherent to doing this in a good way that this fraught legacy carries forward.

As settler food movement activists and scholars, we turn to our own communities to take on the responsibility to address this colonial context in the present and work to make our movements accountable to Indigenous Peoples as a foundation for reconciliation moving forward.

Methodology and Methods Used

This research emerges from our own positionalities as White settlers working for food sovereignty each in our own ways. Heather has been doing food movement work over the past fourteen years, during which time she has co-founded and co-managed a cooperative vegetable and meat farm, coordinated networks of collective gardens, and co-managed a cooperative farmers market. This research was done as part of her master's thesis at Concordia University. Monica has supported the creation of community-led protected areas in Eeyou Istchee through her research as a strategy to enhance Eeyou (Cree) authority over decisions about development while also fulfilling Cree responsibilities to care for their lands and waters. An ethnobotanist and researcher, Alain has worked to support the revitalization of Indigenous medicines in Cree and Inuit communities, among others.

From these social locations, we follow settler social work scholars Susan Strega and Leslie Brown (2015) in their suggestion for academics to "reverse the gaze," by shifting the focus from Indigenous Peoples themselves to the settler society and movements of which we are a part. Our methodology is based on participatory action research (Adelman, 1997) and informed by Elizabeth Carlson's (2017) work on anticolonial methodologies for use by settlers. We follow Kim Tallbear's (Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate) (2014) call for academics to study the communities in which they are invested and for which they care in a process that she names "studying across." This is very much applicable to food movements for us. We ourselves have struggled to do our work in a good way and have been repeatedly confronted by our own Eurocentric blind spots. It is therefore with appreciation, care, and humility that we offer this uncomfortable and personally invested research.

Within this framework, we established a research agreement with FSC in the fall of 2018. FSC has encouraged this work from its conception and participated with transparency throughout in order to gain a better understanding of the concerns raised and how to move forward. Our research received ethical approval from Concordia University's Office of Research in February 2019, with certification number 30010746. Shortly after establishing the research agreement, the primary author analyzed the 124 responses to the post-Assembly qualitative questionnaires designed by the FSC board of directors (hereafter referred to as the "board") and sent to all registered Assembly participants (794 people in total) in the week following the Assembly. Of the 16 questions in the questionnaire, nine sought to unpack personal experiences and suggestions regarding the Assembly, and seven sought to understand the respondents' identities and background experiences with FSC and food movements. We explain our methods in detail here in order to establish our method of thematic analysis as being trustworthy, that is to say, credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable, according to Nowell and coauthors' (2017) definition.

Questionnaire responses were anonymized and coded using NVivo software according to a modified grounded theory (Perry & Jensen, 2001) in which we used both deductive codes supplied by the FSC board for its own evaluative purposes and inductive codes generated through the analysis itself. Eleven of the 14 codes used focused on specific themes (*subcodes in parenthesis*): Advocacy, Communication, Convening, Logistics (*Space & Location; Schedule*), Membership, Organizational Governance, Representation, Sessions (*Facilitation, Format, Content*), Sharing, Social, Safety (*Accessibility, Accountability, BIPOC, Decolonization, Gender, Microaggression, Racism, Tokenism*). The remaining three were qualifiers based on the researchers' subjective interpretations—Positive, Negative, and Change—in order to get a broad sense of the strengths and difficulties of the Assembly, as well as where respondents felt change was needed at future Assemblies. This initial analysis was the basis of a report produced for FSC's board, co-authored by the primary author and Joyce Liao (2019), which was shared with all Assembly participants in November of the same year.

To gain depth and a background perspective to Assembly events, we used the initial questionnaire coding, as well as the lead author's participant observation, to guide 10 semistructured interviews with past and present FSC staff, members of FSC's board, and other academic and community partners (whom we will refer to here inclusively as "participants" to protect confidentiality). Interviewees were selected initially based on their involvement with Assembly organizing and the events in question, and then through snowball sampling (Reid et al., 2017) as we were referred to others. Consent forms were shared with interview participants, who were offered full confidentiality (which most participants requested) as well as full ownership of their transcript and its use in accordance with our research ethics protocol. We recorded and transcribed all interviews, then read and sorted the relevant data into five codes and eight subcodes that we established inductively: Organizational accountability (*Stakeholders; Process of accountability*); Relational accountability (*Enacting values; Personal work; Conflict; Consultation*); Policy; Convening (*Leadership; Capacity-building*); Solidarity across movements. We finished with a second reading to ensure consistency in the coding process.

From this process of sorting both the questionnaire responses and interview transcripts into codes, we moved on to a thematic analysis to identify themes and patterns with which to structure our analysis. Guided by Aronson's (1995) description of how themes can be identified from disparate data, we combined and catalogued the data previously sorted into various codes into recurring themes. The lead author's own participation in the Assembly enabled us to begin with several pre-identified themes, but most were established inductively from similar experiences showing up across codes. After themes were identified, we grouped them into what Aronson calls "patterns," which we triangulated to our literature review and by checking back with research participants for feedback. These patterns are the three overarching concepts that structure the analysis we share below: refusal, resurgence, and reconciliation.

In addition to these two sources of data, the lead author conducted participant observation consistent with what Adler and Adler (1994) call an "active-member researcher" at the 2018 Assembly and other public food movement events (22 events from October 2018 through October 2019). Her observations were informed by concomitant analyses through her various involvements as participant, organizer, or volunteer. In addition to public events, participant observation at FSC consisted of three levels: (1) Meetings and discussions with various staff and board members outside of formal interviews; (2) Reading newsletters and other public communications (Facebook, blog posts); and (3) Reading internal notes and summaries of staff and board meetings. We used the observations noted at these events and from these documents to triangulate the questionnaire and interview data and the resultant analyses. In line with our constructivist orientation—that is to say, our understanding that "concepts, models, and schemes [are invented] to make sense of experience" (Schwandt, 2021, p. 38)—we understand the themes as insights generated through our own interactions with research participants, with the partner organization, and with the events themselves. To validate our interpretation of events, we shared drafts of this article with research participants and representatives of the partner organization, and with five participants and five FSC staff and board members contributing to the analysis presented here. The many complex experiences of Indigenous Peoples and settlers working together at FSC cannot be fully described in a study of this scope, although when combined the questionnaires and interviews represent a meaningful proportion of Assembly participants (approximately 15%). Nevertheless, this research points to important if often hidden dynamics to which we draw attention to help guide the unsettling work of transformative reconciliation.

Food Secure Canada

Food Secure Canada is a pan-Canadian alliance of food movement actors and organizations in Canada. Its biennial Assembly convenes producers, community organizers, activists, and industry and governmental representatives, among others, from across the country in the largest food movement event in the country. The groundwork for FSC's creation was laid in 2001 at the Civil Society Input for Food Security in Canada conference hosted by Ryerson University in Toronto, where the need for a national Canadian Food Security Network was identified (Food Secure Canada, 2018a). After hosting its first Assembly in 2004, FSC was officially launched at the 2005 Food Security Assembly with the goal of bringing together "all the very different perspectives of groups working on food issues … to create a coherent food movement in Canada that could strengthen local projects and support a national food policy for a just and sustainable food system" (Kneen, 2011, p. 80). FSC's strategic plan seeks to mobilize and build the capacity of food sovereignty movements in order to engage decision-makers and affect policy at the national level. Throughout its sustained history of engagement with Indigenous Peoples and its significant efforts toward inclusion, tensions around governance, representation, and the sometimes-competing interests of stakeholders, complicated by interpersonal conflicts, have co-existed with productive collaborations in an uneasy balance. These tensions came to the fore at FSC's 10th Assembly in November 2018, forcing the organization to contend with colonialism internal to the organization and to the food movements it convenes.

Results: A Moment of Reckoning at Food Secure Canada

Although FSC is a predominantly settler-run organization, it has prioritized working with Indigenous Peoples from its very beginnings. At its first annual general meeting in 2005 there was consensus to focus on building relationships with Indigenous Peoples (Kneen, 2011). In 2009, an informal circle of Indigenous leaders, thinkers, and activists got together to convene discussions and ceremonies about food sovereignty, often in conjunction with FSC's biennial Assemblies. This circle also served in an informal advisory role to the organization for almost a decade. While this group, known as the Indigenous Circle, was active, FSC provided logistical and occasional financial support. At a 2016 strategic retreat of the circle, some of the circle's leadership made moves to "constitute itself as an independent body, the Indigenous Food Sovereignty Learning Circle, with the aim of moving beyond an advisory role in FSC to an autonomous equal relationship" (Food Secure Canada, n.d.), although we were told by one participant that this was not a decision agreed upon by all present. However, due to a lack of financial resources, divisions within the group related to internal governance, and estranged relationships between some Indigenous leaders and FSC, the circle has been more or less inactive from 2017 until recently.

FSC played an active role in the People's Food Policy Project (PFPP) from 2008 to 2011. The PFPP was a grassroots process—initiated by members of FSC, but remaining independent—to develop a food sovereignty policy for Canada that mobilized approximately 3,500 people across the country (Kneen, 2012). The PFPP emphasized Indigenous partnership through a distinct, parallel process led by the Indigenous Circle. Through this process, the circle contributed the first chapter, on Indigenous Food Sovereignty, in the resulting policy document entitled *Resetting the Table: A People's Food Policy for Canada* (Food Secure Canada, 2015). The PFPP was a positive experience of engagement for several of the Indigenous participants we consulted. FSC subsequently formally adopted the PFPP's proposals in their entirety as its policy platform. During the 2013 visit of the United Nations' Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, one participant shared their appreciation for FSC's efforts to uplift Indigenous voices. More recently, FSC has focused on improving the representation of Indigenous Peoples in the organization by specifically recruiting Indigenous board members, by hiring Indigenous consultants to curate and increase Indigenous content at its Assemblies, and by forefronting Indigenous concerns in its public communications and articles.

Food Secure Canada's 2018 Assembly

Inclusion and diversity were explicit goals held by both FSC staff and its board for their 2018 Assembly. The Assembly is a major event—arguably the largest food movement event in Canada. The 2018 edition hosted around 800 people, with a total of 127 activities spread over four days of events[7] and three scheduled blocks where eight to 10 sessions were offered concurrently, grouped into 12 thematic streams. To enable participation from more diverse attendees for whom cost might otherwise have been a barrier, a full 30% of the Assembly budget was reserved for bursaries, with at least 52% of total bursaries going specifically to Indigenous participants. The stream of sessions and events focused on IFS was the largest of the 12 Assembly streams, and the only one for which a specific curator was hired (an Onondaga food activist and scholar). The Assembly also began with a Kairos Blanket exercise, an experiential workshop teaching the history of colonialism in Canada, and Indigenous presenters had an exclusive space reserved for a full day of networking. In addition to these efforts, linguistic diversity was and continues to be a priority for FSC, at least as far as colonial languages go. In fact, 55% of programming at the 2018 Assembly was either bilingual or in French, with the balance offered in English.

---

[7] Program available at http://archives.foodsecurecanada.org/2018.resettingthetable.ca

In many respects, these efforts were successful, with several participants describing it as the most diverse Assembly to date; seven questionnaire respondents noted appreciatively this diversity. One research participant insisted that it was actually because the efforts toward inclusion and diversity were so successful that longstanding tensions erupted to the surface at this particular Assembly. They told us that though present ubiquitously in food movements, "these tensions don't come up very often because Indigenous people and BIPOC [Black, Indigenous, and people of color] just don't show up because it's not a safe space." (Participant _02). For them, the very fact that these tensions came up is a good sign, showing that FSC's efforts to increase diversity had been effective; so effective, in fact, that it was no longer acceptable to run an Assembly in the same ways as for a mostly White, settler audience.

The post-Assembly questionnaire showed that many respondents had overall positive experiences at the Assembly (52 of 124 respondents). Appreciation was shared for the opportunity to network with others from across the country and to share strategies and hear different perspectives (10 respondents). Many participants (14 respondents) noted that the Assembly helped them understand the impacts of systemic racism in food systems and increased their awareness about Indigenous food issues (10 respondents). Alongside these positive experiences, a significant number of respondents shared experiences of racism, marginalization, and feeling unsafe (23 respondents). Five respondents decried the exhausting and extractive experience of Indigenous people, Black people, and other people of color presenting at the Assembly who felt that they were expected to retell their painful experiences with food and colonization to a mostly White audience. Four respondents commented that there was a siloing of Indigenous concerns and that most panels tended to ignore how their content intersected with colonialism. Five respondents expressed concern that communities were being discussed without the opportunity to represent themselves. One participant denounced the Assembly's refusal to accommodate Indigenous diets through offering entirely vegan meals (chosen by staff in recognition of the environmental impact of meat), causing at least three Indigenous people to source more culturally appropriate foods (i.e. meat) elsewhere.

The ways in which racism and colonialism were present at the Assembly are in no way unique; as two participants pointed out, they were a specific manifestation of systemic patterns present across food movements in their experiences. A member of Meal Exchange's Racialized Student Caucus told us that in their experience, "the tokenizing of BIPOC folks [in food movements], it's a continual thing. I think because it was bigger—I mean it was gathering people on a national scale—that it [tokenism] was painfully obvious to some people, but not a rare occurrence I would say" (Participant_04). Another participant shared a related experience of tokenism and told us that "we deal with this on a daily basis at work. I work for an environmental organization—it's a constant problem. We're still a mostly White organization doing White environmentalism which is based on settler colonialism. I deal with agriculture which is fundamentally about land. This is all over the place" (Participant_07).

The Assembly was a valuable space of learning for settlers in particular; this learning became unsettling—in both the sense of emotional discomfort as well as in the sense of challenging to settler colonization—for some through two significant public protests. In the first, an Indigenous woman interrupted the public plenary on IFS to insist that the long-seated conflict between settler farmers and Indigenous Peoples needed to be addressed before these groups could work together as part of a same movement. While this was a very impactful intervention, it did not represent an approach that all Indigenous Assembly participants supported. Two Indigenous research participants described how much effort went into organizing that plenary in order to hold that very conversation in a way that non-Indigenous Assembly participants could receive. As one told us, "to come out in this call-out framing to say 'You all, how dare you?'… You know, people were already in tears during the panel. We'd already gotten to that space in a more articulate way" (Participant_03).

In the second significant protest, a group of about 15 people—food movement leaders that were Indigenous, Black, and people of color, and their allies—walked out on the final day of the Assembly. After three days' immersion in what protesters described as a white settler-oriented event, these food movement leaders refused to offer their scheduled workshops or talks, they refused to participate in the day's schedule, and they refused to continue to bear the burden of change. Leaving the Assembly in protest, they reconvened elsewhere to create a caucus space to connect to others who shared some of their experiences and build relationships of support with mentors and allies in a way that they felt the Assembly had not enabled.

Marginalization at the Assembly and in the Organization

The creation of this alternate space responded to the sentiment expressed to us by five research participants that despite the diversity of Assembly participants, elements of the event still catered to a White, settler audience. Accordingly, we were told that this spoke to a wider tendency by FSC to marginalize Indigenous people, Black people, and other people of color in their work. One Indigenous participant put it this way: "If they're only going to represent the food movement of upper middle-class White neighborhoods, then just say so. Stop telling people that you're representing people who are hungry in my community" (Participant_01). Another Indigenous participant explained that, in their experience, it seemed that FSC prioritized their relationship with federal officials over them and other Indigenous People and dismissed concerns that they raised. They went on to insist that making space for the concerns of Indigenous Peoples is necessary for the organization: "It's these relations that empower that organization to even come close to saying 'We're the voice for the movement' or 'We're a legitimate community entity'" (Participant_03).

This perceived dismissal of concerns by FSC and the conflicting interests of some of its stakeholders have undermined relations with the Indigenous Circle, contributing to feelings of marginalization. Listing four Indigenous leaders doing food sovereignty work, one participant told us that "all of those relations are strained, from that act of respecting our knowledge base when it was comfortable and then when it was something uncomfortable, seeing it as conflict" (Participant_03). One Indigenous participant told us how this pattern leads them to self-censor and not bring up their concerns: "It's painful and I just have to shut my mouth and not look like an irate Indian" (Participant_05).

In the context of these estranged relationships, although the walk-out during the Assembly's final day was unexpected, it was understandable to every research participant we consulted. For some participants with a long-term involvement in FSC, it was consistent with past dynamics; for some new to FSC, their experiences at the Assembly were enough to explain the need to walk-out. The protests at the Assembly brought these issues up in a way that could not be ignored; the public nature of these protests insisted on a public reckoning. One participant told us that in order to maintain legitimacy as a national food movement organization, FSC needs to contend with the limits of its approach to inclusion and reorient itself to center reconciliation and anti-racism at the heart of all of its work.

Centering Reconciliation

In numerous communications and events since the

Assembly, it appears that FSC is indeed in a process of reorientation. For example, in a letter written to all Assembly participants immediately following the event, FSC's board wrote that 'dismantling systems that perpetuate inequality and discrimination should not be understood as additional work for the food movement; as a Board and organization we recognize that this *is the work"* (Food Secure Canada, 2018b, emphasis in original). It is notable that refusal and resurgence were not named explicitly by any research participants, nor addressed in any events we attended. Reconciliation, on the other hand, was discussed by three participants and named explicitly as a goal at FSC's 2019 annual general assembly.

Getting to this point has been a process that has evolved throughout our research timeframe and is still in evolution. In a second letter, sent to all Assembly participants exactly one year after the first, FSC's board and executive director offered an explicit apology 'for creating an assembly where people felt unheard, hurt, and unsafe' (Food Secure Canada, 2019) and shared some of the work being done to address the issues raised. This work has included meeting individually with many of those who raised concerns and in wider stakeholder meetings to document and unpack issues stemming from the Assembly, and from collaboration with FSC more broadly. This work has also included several board meetings to explore using reconciliation and responsibility to relationships as a guide for all of FSC's work, as outlined by the Indigenous Circle in the People's Food Policy Project (2015). Education at both personal and organizational levels is a key component of the work, and FSC is implementing more dedicated anti-oppression trainings for staff, as well as continuing to learn through readings, discussions, and events.

Structural changes to the organization are also in the works. Board members and staff have insisted that the 2018 Assembly will be the last of its kind, and that going forward the organization will prioritize smaller, more regional meetings, including appropriate gatherings focused on Indigenous concerns. Additionally, these gatherings would seek to provide more space for discussions, rather than the academic panel format that has previously dominated not only FSC Assemblies, but many conferences in the West.[8] There is also a commitment to restructure the organization's governance to center the experiences of, and relationships with, Indigenous Peoples, Black people, and other people of color. FSC has proposed the creation of an Anti-Racist Advisory, subject to available resources, and is supporting the re-emergence of the Indigenous Circle; both initiatives are part of a larger exploration into the possibility of a new cross-cultural governance framework for the organization. Since the 2018 Assembly, FSC has been supporting leaders from Indigenous communities in their efforts to reconvene the circle, bolstered by the renewal of relationships and new connections that the walk-out enabled. In addition to personal engagement with a number of those involved, FSC's support for the circle has included funding to send its Indigenous board members (as well as potentially other members of the circle) to participate in regional IFS gatherings. Two Indigenous members of the board also supported the circle in convening a formal gathering that was slated for August 2020. The board acknowledges the need to shift power in its governance model and is working to understand what ethical space could look like in this context. Rather than rush to bring in "settler solutions-oriented thinking" (Participant_08), the board is taking the time to restore relationships with the Indigenous Circle in order to seek guidance on how governance could be shared in a good way.

---

[8] In November 2020, after this paper had been submitted for publication, FSC hosted its first major gathering since the 2018 Assembly, which the primary author attended, along with over 1,200 other participants—50% more than in 2018. It was held entirely online and consisted of 19 events spread over five days. According to Gisèle Yasmeen, FSC's current executive director, the gathering had three objectives: (1) Build consciousness and capacity for anti-racist and decolonized approaches in food systems work; (2) strengthen allyship within the food movement; and (3) showcase the work of Indigenous, Black, and racialized food leaders. Although an evaluation by participants and a formal analysis of the event's impacts still needs to be done, the organizational learning and structural and procedural change underway at FSC were evident. Rather than two isolated streams among many in 2018, racial justice and decolonization were central to every event, whether it was the specific topic of discussion or the lens through which food system issues and practices were discussed. Although the gathering events mostly retained a panel-discussion format, opportunities for personal reflection were built into the program, separate spaces were created for Indigenous and Black people to debrief and discuss, and individual therapy sessions were offered to all. A number of those involved with protests in 2018 were present, including one who expressed gratification, saying that although she has worked with FSC for over 15 years, FSC has finally "stepped up" and "did a great job in organizing this gathering in a way that meaningfully centers our experiences." She insisted, however, that there is still more work to do at the organizational level, in particular adhering to the terms of reference for engagement created by the Indigenous Circle in 2016. For this person, FSC could show a path to the rest of society as to how ethical engagement could go.

For one Indigenous participant, cogovernance with Indigenous people is the change that will allow FSC to meaningfully translate its talk of reconciliation and decolonization into action. This participant suggested that cogovernance of the organization would be a recognition of and commitment to "the primary relationship that gave birth to the sharing of the land. And that, of course, is the Indigenous-Western relationship" (Participant_06). They told us that the creation of ethical space is needed as a foundation for cogovernance: "If you have two disparate societies, ethical space is the way that you negotiate, that's part of it." This participant went on to insist that "if you're calling yourself a Canadian organization, all governance should be developed with Indigenous Peoples and built to respectfully share those responsibilities of the governance of the organization. ... I call it a polishing of the wampum belt. ... So that's where FSC ultimately has to go."

Discussion

> *People seeking harmony and balance must embrace the process of contention.*
>
> —Taiaiake Alfred (2005, p. 76)

The protests at the 2018 Assembly, and the walkout in particular, were a rejection of settler paradigms and practices in food movements in general and at FSC in particular. Although research participants did not explicitly refer to it in this way, we interpret the Assembly protests as a refusal in the sense described by author Audra Simpson (Kanien'kehá:ka) (2014) as the rejection of the terms of engagement set by colonial authorities. To this we apply Leanne Betasamosake Simpson's (2017) conception of "generative refusal," linking the act of refusing settler paradigms and practices to that of resurgence, although this term was also not used explicitly by research participants. In our interpretation of the Assembly protests, this small but impactful action fits what Daigle (2019) calls the "everyday acts of resurgence" (p. 1). She argues that these day-to-day cultural practices—in the case of the Assembly making space to honor the relationality integral to IFS—renew Indigenous political and legal orders because they are "based on Indigenous ontologies and respectful and reciprocal relationships with the human and non-human world" (p. 2). The cultural space created outside of the Assembly has been connected to Indigenous political resurgence at FSC through the resultant re-invigoration of the Indigenous Circle. From this resurgence, and the position of increased strength it has generated, we see the possibility of reconciliation, which was named explicitly as a goal by staff and board members at FSC and discussed by three research participants. FSC's board has committed to shifting the organization's governance model to create the ethical space needed to work across Indigenous and settler ways of being, doing, and knowing. According to one research participant, cogovernance between the FSC Board and the Indigenous Circle is the practical framework that would create the ethical space in which both of these constitutive groups' histories and practices could co-exist and enrich each other. This appears to be in line with the circle's intention in 2016 to re-establish itself as the Indigenous Food Sovereignty Learning Circle, independent of FSC, in order to move to an "autonomous equal relationship" (Food Secure Canada, n.d.) with the organization.

The refusal at the Assembly, as conflict-laden as it may have felt, did not represent the cutting of ties with the organization. While not all those who raised concerns have maintained a relationship with FSC, many people have continued to engage through phone calls, the exchange of letters, stakeholder meetings, and even as board members. This commitment to engagement with FSC is consistent with the relationality that Morrison (2011) and others have described as integral to IFS, as well as with the basis for transformative reconciliation (Asch et al., 2018). This ongoing engagement demonstrates that despite Mills' (2018) warning that resurgence can reproduce the settler ontology of disconnection, refusal to engage with settler structures *on settlers' terms* can also create space for renewed relationality from a place of Indigenous strength, on terms that make transformative reconciliation a possibility.

As of this writing, almost two years since the 2018 Assembly, FSC is still in the midst of an ongoing journey toward understanding and enacting what reconciliation means for its work in supporting not just IFS, but food sovereignty for all. But perhaps the journey is part of the work. Perhaps, as FSC has suggested, it is itself the work. Indeed, as Hoover (2017) found in her survey of IFS projects in the United States, for Indigenous Peoples, food sovereignty is a process, not an end result. The experiences described here have outlined the importance of care and attention to relationships in attempting to do this work together. As Morrison (2011) has described, at the heart of Indigenous food systems are the values of interdependency, respect, reciprocity, and responsibility—the very same values Wilson (2008) attributes to relational accountability. Starblanket and Stark (2018) maintain that reconciliation depends on this "resurgence of relational modes of being" (p. 178). As described by one of our research participants, upholding these values by being accountable to the many relationships inherent to foodways is a way to uphold our shared treaty responsibilities. In describing this relational accountability as "polishing the wampum belt," he uses symbolism derived from the oldest known treaty (1613) between Europeans (the Dutch) and Indigenous Peoples (the Haudenosaunee confederacy) in North America, the Teioháte Kaswenta (known as the Two-Row Wampum in English). Polishing the wampum belt is another way to describe reconciliation and is a poignant metaphor, particularly for those of us doing food movement work in Haudenosaunee territory. This participant powerfully reminds us of our treaty commitments and gives an example of what honoring these commitments could look like in practice: cogovernance of our organizations and institutions.

Through this examination of the "moment of reckoning" sparked by FSC's 2018 Assembly, and the resulting engagement in the years that followed, we glimpse at what *resurgence and reconciliation,* together, might look like in practice. As Asch, Borrows, and Tully (2018) argue, "robust resurgence infuses reciprocal practices of reconciliation in self-determining, self-sustaining, and inter-generational ways such that 'transformative reconciliation' cannot exist without robust practices of resurgence" (p. 5). We are hopeful that the resurgence through Assembly 2018 events will strengthen the efforts toward reconciliation at FSC, enabling it to avoid the pitfalls of the dominant narrative of reconciliation that Kiera Ladner (Cree) describes as "predominantly a settler project and one that is typically grounded in denial" (Ladner, 2018, p. 246). With Caroline Dick (2008), Ladner has argued that "true reconciliation" must begin with recognition of Indigenous Peoples as partners in Confederation—the process by which early colonies united to form one country in 1867: Canada—and of the fact that this relationship continues to this day. As one research participant insisted, establishing cogovernance with Indigenous food movement leaders at FSC would be a way to recognize this ongoing treaty partnership with Indigenous Peoples, and the work of apology, engagement, learning, and gathering differently will provide the groundwork needed to support this fundamental shift. We support the board's intention to start by rebuilding relationships with Indigenous leaders, allowing for the terms of engagement to be established by Indigenous Peoples themselves.

While the focus of this research has been on the particular relationships and responsibilities of settlers and Indigenous Peoples, important concerns were raised at FSC's Assembly by Black people and other people of color that must also be attended to and which are being addressed in a parallel process at FSC. We extend this analysis elsewhere (Elliott, 2020) by discussing settler colonialism as a root cause of the disproportionate food insecurity experienced by Indigenous Peoples, Black people, other and people of color and examine the particular responsibilities of White settlers in food movements in taking it on. We hope that others will expand the analysis presented here to address the overlaps and differences in experiences of Black people and other people of color in future work. We suggest bringing in the lenses of organizational change and management studies to examine if and how meaningful change takes root at FSC. These perspectives could add a valuable contribution to understanding the longer-term potential of the strategies for change, used by both protesters and the organization, that we have described here.

Conclusion

> *Food will be what brings the people together.*
>
> —Secwepemc Elder Jones Ignace,
> cited in Morrison (2011)

Revitalization of their foodways is a powerful and popular way that Indigenous Peoples are practicing cultural and political resurgence across North America. As Indigenous Peoples continue to invest in the restoration of their nationhood and relationships to their homelands through the revitalization of their foodways, settlers have the responsibility of reconciling their food systems and movements to the reality of Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination. Revitalizing Indigenous foodways and tending the relationships of interdependency, respect, reciprocity, and responsibility they put forward can be the basis for reconciliation, not just for Indigenous Peoples, but for all inhabitants of North America—Indigenous, settlers, and all of our nonhuman relations as well.

To get there, some will choose resurgence as refusal and invest their energies toward their own nations outside the often-contentious relationships with settler society. This is understandable, and for some, the way to honor and restore the relationships and responsibilities denied by settler colonial structures, as L. B. Simpson (2017), Coulthard (2014), Alfred (2009), and others have suggested. Whether resurgence takes the form of renewed relationality with settler neighbors or takes the form of refusal, settler-led organizations would do well to support it, for as the case of FSC has shown, resurgence may guide reconciliation to ensure that reconciliation can reach its transformative potential. Although reconciliation may be a settler responsibility, as FSC is modeling, settler-led organizations must take the lead from Indigenous Peoples as to defining the terms of engagement. As the differences in approaches exemplified in the disruption to the FSC public plenary demonstrated, there is no consensus on the single best way forward, nor need there be.

Acknowledgments

This research would not have been possible without the participation and support of Food Secure Canada (FSC). The Board of Directors and various staff members encouraged this research project from the start and engaged with the primary author with transparency and humility. In particular, we thank Susanna Klassen (via FSC) for her work on the post-Assembly questionnaire and her significant contribution to the framework of its analysis. We thank Joyce Liao who also contributed greatly to the analysis. We are grateful to Adrianne Lickers-Xavier for her valuable guidance during the early stages of this work and to Charles Levkoe for his insight on community-research partnerships.

Thanks are also due to the three anonymous reviewers from this journal whose thoughtful and thorough comments have made this paper much stronger.

References

Adelman, C. (1997). Action research and the problem of participation. In R. McTaggart (Ed.), *Participatory action research: International contexts and consequences* (pp. 79–106). State University of New York Press.

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 377–392). Sage Publications, Inc.

Alfred, G. R. (2005). *Wasa'se: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom.* Broadview Press.

Alfred, G. R. (2009). *Peace, power, righteousness: An indigenous manifesto* (2nd ed). Oxford University Press.

Antoine, A., Mason, R., Mason, R., Palahicky, S., & de France, C. R. (2018). Indigenization, decolonization, and reconciliation. In *Pulling together: a guide for curriculum developers*. BCcampus. https://opentextbc.ca/indigenizationcurriculumdevelopers/chapter/indigenization-decolonization-and-reconciliation/

Aronson, J. (1995). A pragmatic view of thematic analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, *2*(1), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/1995.2069

Asch, M. (2018). Confederation treaties and reconciliation: Stepping back into the future. In M. Asch, J. Borrows, & J. Tully (Eds.), *Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and earth teachings* (pp. 29–48). University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487519926-003

Asch, M., Borrows, J., & Tully, J. (Eds.). (2018). *Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and earth teachings.* University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487519926

Bagelman, C. (2018). Unsettling food security: The role of young people in Indigenous food system revitalisation. *Children & Society*, *32*(3), 219–232. https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12268

Beaudin-Reimer, B. (2020). Perspectives from Métis harvesters in Manitoba on concerns and challenges to sustaining traditional harvesting practices and knowledge: A distinctions-based approach to Indigenous Food Sovereignty. In P. Settee & S. Shukla (Eds.), *Indigenous food systems: Concepts, cases, and conversations* (pp. 229–250). Canadian Scholars.

Blay-Palmer, A. (2010). *Imagining sustainable food systems: Theory and practice.* Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Borrows, J. (2018). Earth-bound: Indigenous resurgence and environmental reconciliation. In M. Asch, J. Borrows, & J. Tully (Eds.), *Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and earth teachings* (pp. 49–82). University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487519926-004

Brown, L. & Strega, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Research as resistance: Revisiting critical, indigenous, & anti-oppressive approaches* (2nd ed.). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Carlson, E. (2017). Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies. *Settler Colonial Studies*, *7*(4), 496–517. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2016.1241213

Corntassel, J. (2012). Re-envisioning resurgence: Indigenous pathways to decolonization and sustainable self-determination. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 86–101.

Coté, C. (2016). "Indigenizing" food sovereignty: Revitalizing Indigenous food practices and ecological knowledges in Canada and the United States. *Humanities*, *5*(3), 57. https://doi.org/10.3390/h5030057

Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition.* University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816679645.001.0001

Cyr, M., & Slater, J. (2019). Honouring the grandmothers through (re)membering, (re)learning, and (re)vitalizing Métis traditional foods and protocols. *Canadian Food Studies / La Revue Canadienne Des Études Sur l'alimentation*, *6*(2), 51–72. https://doi.org/10.15353/cfs-rcea.v6i2.339

Daigle, M. (2019). Tracing the terrain of Indigenous food sovereignties. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *46*(2), 297–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2017.1324423

Daschuk, J. W. (2013). *Clearing the Plains: Disease, politics of starvation, and the loss of Aboriginal life.* University of Regina Press.

Dawson, L. (2020). "Food will be what brings the people together": Constructing counter-narratives from the perspective of Indigenous foodways. In P. Settee & S. Shukla (Eds.), *Indigenous food systems: Concepts, cases, and conversations* (pp. 83–97). Canadian Scholars.

Delormier, T., Horn-Miller, K., McComber, A. M., & Marquis, K. (2017). Reclaiming food security in the Mohawk community of Kahnawà:ke through Haudenosaunee responsibilities. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, *13*(S3), e12556. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12556

Elliott, H. L. (2020). *Unsettling the table: Refusal, resurgence and decolonial prefiguration in food movement organizations* (Master's thesis). Concordia University.

Elliott, H. L., & Liao, J. (2019). *Food Secure Canada Assembly questionnaire response executive summary.*

Ermine, W. (2007). The ethical space of engagement. *Indigenous Law Journal*, *6*(1), 193–203. https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ilj/article/view/27669

Feenstra, G. (2002). Creating space for sustainable food systems: Lessons from the field. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *19*(2), 99–106. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016095421310

First Nations Food, Nutrition and Environment Study. (2019). *Summary of key findings for eight Assembly of First Nations regions*. http://www.fnfnes.ca/

Food Secure Canada. (n.d.). *Indigenous Circle*. Food Secure Canada. Retrieved April 24, 2020, from https://foodsecurecanada.org/community-networks/indigenous-circle

Food Secure Canada. (2015). *Resetting the table: A people's food policy for Canada, 2nd Edition*. https://foodsecurecanada.org/sites/foodsecurecanada.org/files/fsc-resetting-2015_web.pdf

Food Secure Canada. (2018a). *Our story*. Food Secure Canada. https://foodsecurecanada.org/who-we-are/our-story

Food Secure Canada. (2018b). *Letter from FSC board of directors to Assembly participants*.

Food Secure Canada. (2019). *2018 Assembly: Moving forward*.

Garzo Montalvo, M. F. (2015). To the American food justice movements: A critique that is also an offering. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, *5*(4), 125–129. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2015.054.017

Guthman, J. (2008). Bringing good food to others: Investigating the subjects of alternative food practice. *Cultural Geographies*, *15*(4), 431–447. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474008094315

Hansen, B., & Rossen, J. (2017). Activist anthropology with the Haudenosaunee: Theoretical and practical insights from the Two Row Wampum renewal campaign. *Anthropology in Action*, *24*(3), 32–44. https://doi.org/10.3167/aia.2017.240304

Hill, Sr., R. W., & Coleman, D. (2018). The Two Row Wampum-Covenant chain tradition as a guide for Indigenous-university research partnerships. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, *19*(5), 339-359. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708618809138

Hoover, E. (2017). "You can't say you're sovereign if you can't feed yourself": Defining and enacting food sovereignty in American Indian community gardening. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, *41*(3), 31–70. https://doi.org/10.17953/aicrj.41.3.hoover

Jäger, M. B., Ferguson, D. B., Huntington, O., Johnson, M. K., Johnson, N., Juan, A., … Rest of the Indigenous Foods Knowledges Network. (2019). Building an Indigenous foods knowledges network through relational accountability. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, *9*(B), 45–51. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2019.09B.005

Kamal, A. G., & Ithinto Mechisowin Program Committee. (2020). Cultivating resurgence from the Indigenous Food Sovereignty lens: A case study from Northern Manitoba. In P. Settee & S. Shukla (Eds.), *Indigenous food systems: Concepts, cases, and conversations* (pp. 119–134). Canadian Scholars.

Kamal, A. G., Linklater, R., Thompson, S., Dipple, J., & Ithinto Mechisowin Committee. (2015). A recipe for change: Reclamation of Indigenous food sovereignty in O-Pipon-Na-Piwin Cree nation for decolonization, resource sharing, and cultural restoration. *Globalizations*, *12*(4), 559–575. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2015.1039761

Kassam, A. (2017, November 4). Ratio of indigenous children in Canada welfare system is "humanitarian crisis." *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/nov/04/indigenous-children-canada-welfare-system-humanitarian-crisis

Kepkiewicz, L., & Rotz, S. (2018). Toward anti-colonial food policy in Canada? (Im)possibilities within the settler state. *Canadian Food Studies / La Revue Canadienne Des Études Sur l'alimentation*, *5*(2), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.15353/cfs-rcea.v5i2.202

Kneen, C. (2011). Food Secure Canada: Where agriculture, environment, health, food and justice intersect. In H. Wittman, A. A. Desmarais, & N. Wiebe (Eds.), *Food sovereignty in Canada: Creating just and sustainable food systems* (pp. 80–96). Fernwood Publishing.

Kneen, C. (2012). *The People's Food Policy Project: Introducing food sovereignty in Canada* (pp. 1-6). Retrieved from Food Secure Canada website: https://foodsecurecanada.org/sites/foodsecurecanada.org/files/PFPPforJapan.pdf

Ladner, K. (2018). Proceed with caution: Reflections on resurgence and reconciliation. In M. Asch, J. Borrows, & J. Tully (Eds.), *Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and earth teachings* (pp. 245–264). University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487519926-010

Ladner, K. L., & Dick, C. (2008). Out of the fires of hell: Globalization as a solution to globalization—An Indigenist perspective. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, *23*(1–2), 63–91. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0829320100009583

LeBlanc, J., & Burnett, K. (2017). What happened to Indigenous food sovereignty in Northern Ontario: Imposed political, economic, socio-ecological and cultural systems changes. In M. A. Robidoux & C. W. Mason (Eds.), *A land not forgotten: Indigenous food security and land-based practices in northern Ontario.* University of Manitoba Press.

Levkoe, C. Z., Ray, L., & McLaughlin, J. (2019). The Indigenous Food Circle: Reconciliation and resurgence through food in northwestern Ontario. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, *9*(Suppl. 2), 101–114. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2019.09B.008

Lowman, E. B., & Barker, A. J. (2015). *Settler: Identity and colonialism in 21st century Canada.* Fernwood Publishing.

Maracle, L. (2017). *My conversations with Canadians*. Book Thug. http://www.deslibris.ca/ID/453921

Martens, T. (2015). *Good news in food: Understanding the value and promise of Indigenous food sovereignty in western Canada* (Masters thesis). University of Manitoba. http://hdl.handle.net/1993/30825

Matties, Z. (2016). Unsettling settler food movements: Food sovereignty and decolonization in Canada. *Cuizine: The Journal of Canadian Food Cultures / Revue Des Cultures Culinaires Au Canada*, *7*(2). https://doi.org/10.7202/1038478ar

Mills, A. (2018). Rooted constitutionalism: Growing political community. In M. Asch, J. Borrows, & J. Tully (Eds.), *Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and earth teachings* (pp. 133–174). University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487519926-006

Moore, K., & Swisher, M. E. (2015). The food movement: Growing white privilege, diversity, or empowerment? *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, *5*(4), 115–119. http://dx.doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2015.054.013

Morrison, D. (2011). Indigenous food sovereignty: A model for social learning. In H. Wittman, A. A. Desmarais, & N. Wiebe (Eds.), *Food Sovereignty in Canada: creating just and sustainable food systems* (pp. 97–111). Fernwood Publishing.

National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health [NCCAH]. (2013). *An overview of aboriginal health in Canada.* https://www.ccnsa-nccah.ca/docs/context/FS-OverviewAbororiginalHealth-EN.pdf

Neufield, H. T. (2020). Socio-historical influences and impacts on Indigenous food systems in Southwestern Ontario: The experiences of elder women living on- and off-reserve. In P. Settee & S. Shukla (Eds.), *Indigenous food systems: Concepts, cases, and conversations* (pp. 251–268). Canadian Scholars.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *16*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Penniman, L. (2018). *Farming while Black: Soul Fire Farm's practical guide to liberation on the land.* Chelsea Green Publishing.

Perry, C., & Jensen, O. (2001). Approaches to combining induction and deduction in one research study.

Poelzer, G., & Coates, K. S. (2015). From treaty peoples to treaty nation: A road map for all Canadians. UBC Press.

Powless, I. (2000). Treaty making. In G. P. Jemison, & A. M. Schein (Eds.), *Treaty of Canandaigua 1794: 200 years of treaty relations between the Iroquois Confederacy and the United States* (pp. 15–34). Clear Light Publishers.

Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the settler within: Indian residential schools, truth telling, and reconciliation in Canada.* UBC Press.

Regan, P. (2018). Reconciliation and resurgence: Reflections on the TRC final report. In M. Asch, J. Borrows, & J. Tully (Eds.), *Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and earth teachings.* University of Toronto Press.

Reid, C., Greaves, L., & Kirby, S. (2017). *Experience, research, social change: Critical methods* (3rd ed.). University of Toronto Press.

Rudolph, K. R., & McLachlan, S. M. (2013). Seeking Indigenous food sovereignty: Origins of and responses to the food crisis in northern Manitoba, Canada. *Local Environment*, *18*(9), 1079–1098. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2012.754741

Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry, 3rd ed.* https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412986281

Settee, P. (2020). The impact of climate change on Indigenous food sovereignty. In P. Settee & S. Shukla (Eds.), *Indigenous food systems: Concepts, cases, and conversations* (pp. 211–228). Canadian Scholars.

Settee, P., & Shukla, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Indigenous food systems: Concepts, cases, and conversations.* Canadian Scholars.

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states.* Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780822376781

Simpson, L. (2008). Looking after Gdoo-naaganinaa: Precolonial Nishnaabeg diplomatic and treaty relationships. *Wicazo Sa Review*, *23*(2), 29–42. https://doi.org/10.1353/wic.0.0001

Simpson, L. B. (2017). *As we have always done: Indigenous freedom through radical resistance*. University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt1pwt77c

Slocum, R. (2006). Anti-racist practice and the work of community food organizations. *Antipode*, *38*(2), 327–349. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2006.00582.x

Starblanket, G. (2019). Constitutionalizing (in)justice: Treaty interpretation and the containment of Indigenous governance. *Constitutional Forum*, *28*(2), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.21991/cf29383

Starblanket, G., & Stark, H. K. (2018). Towards a relational paradigm- Four points for consideration: Knowledge, gender, land and modernity. In M. Asch, J. Borrows, & J. Tully (Eds.), *Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and earth teachings* (pp. 175–208). University of Toronto Press.

TallBear, K. (2014). Standing with and speaking as faith: A feminist-Indigenous approach to inquiry. *Journal of Research Practice*, *10*(2), Article N17.

Thompson, S., & Pritty, P. (2020). Damming food sovereignty of Indigenous Peoples: A case study of food security at O-Pipon-Na-Piwin Cree Nation. In P. Settee & S. Shukla (Eds.), *Indigenous food systems: Concepts, cases, and conversations* (pp. 195–210). Canadian Scholars.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada [TRC]. (2015). *Canada's residential schools: Reconciliation. The final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* (Vol. 6). https://nctr.ca/records/reports/

Tully, J. (2018). Reconciliation here on earth. In M. Asch, J. Borrows, & J. Tully (Eds.), *Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and earth teachings* (pp. 83–132). University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487519926-005

Turner, D. (2006). *This is not a peace pipe: Towards a critical Indigenous philosophy*. University of Toronto Press.

Turner, N. J., & Spalding, P. (2018). Learning from the Earth, learning from each other: Ethnoecology, responsibility, and reciprocity. In M. Asch, J. Borrows, & J. Tully (Eds.), *Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and earth teachings* (pp. 265–292). University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487519926-011

Whyte, K. P. (2017). Indigenous food sovereignty, renewal and U.S. settler colonialism. In M. Rawlinson & C. Ward (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of food ethics* (pp. 354–365). Routledge.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Publishing.

Wolfe, P. (2016). *Traces of history: Elementary structures of race*. Verso.