11 Just enough to survive

Economic citizenship in the context of Indigenous land claims

Nicole Gombay

In Canada the 'taxpayer' has become ubiquitous in the country's public discourse, and is used both by the state and by citizens to justify or repudiate particular courses of action. It reveals a great deal about how both individuals and collectivities are constructed, and thus come to construct, their relations not only to one another but also to institutions that exist to represent and ensure their well-being and interests. It reflects a form of economic citizenship in which the forces that bind individuals to one another and to the state have become thoroughly defined in monetary terms.

Such constructions of citizenship suggest that capitalism is the essential mechanism through which people understand their relations to one another and to the state. As Marx points out in *Capital* (1983), capitalism is inherently crisis-prone. Despite this tendency, and despite the fact that capitalist production has repeatedly precipitated environmental crises whose ultimate expression can be found in a changing climate and the proposed geological era of the Anthropocene, for many, a capitalist framing of citizenship continues to be unquestionably axiomatic.

Although 'economic citizenship' sounds rather impressive, hiding behind this seemingly tidy expression are a number of interlocking questions about what we mean by citizenship, what we mean by economies, and what we understand to be the processes that structure the relations between the two. The taken-for-granted basis for discussions of economic citizenship in much of the literature essentially reflects a set of expectations about the nature of the individual, the collectivity, and the state, as well as the functioning of economic systems within which they operate that is grounded in Western European liberal ideals of personal freedom, individualism, and the market economy (cf. Kessler-Harris 2003; Turner 1986; White 2003; Woodiwiss 2002). Such literature naturalises and universalises this historically and culturally specific set of values. But for many Indigenous peoples, assumptions about the role of the individual, the nature of their ties to the collective, the meaning and role of state-like institutions, and the values underlying their economic conduct are grounded in altogether different sets of principles.

In the Canadian context, Indigenous peoples have become increasingly vocal in their opposition to capitalism-as-usual, stressing that its

repercussions have not only been profoundly harmful to their well-being but also go hand-in-hand with environmental destruction. They can thus be *Idle No More* (cf. Kino-nda-niimi Collective 2014). Many are therefore calling for the need to practise sustainable forms of self-determination grounded in Indigenous values of sharing and reciprocity between human and nonhuman worlds (Corntassel and Bryce 2012; Coulthard 2014).

This chapter seeks, then, to examine the conjunction between Indigenous collectivities, their economic expression in the aftermath of land claims, and the sets of values that are at the root of Indigenous economies. It will explore debates about how citizenship has been configured in response to capitalist relations and assess the degree to which, in spite of these configurations, Indigenous peoples have been able to adopt forms of "insurgent citizenship" (Jeffrey et al. 2012: 1256), through which they have appropriated some aspects of citizenship whilst resisting others. Using Inuit as an example, it will interrogate whether the values that inform their economies actually shape how citizenship in their polities is expressed and performed. At root is the question of the extent to which Indigenous peoples are able to shape economic practices that reflect the sort of 'altermodernity' advanced by Hardt and Negri (2009: 106), whereby alternative models for conceiving of and enacting economies express Indigenous peoples' values and assertions that they should have "the right not 'to be who [they] are' but rather 'to become what [they] want'". The emphasis, then, is not on hearkening back to a frozen past, nor on being stuck in an unwished for present, but rather on shaping a desired future.

I have been grappling with these questions for some time. Since the early 1990s I have worked and done research with Inuit in Nunavut and Nunavik (Northern Quebec), two administrative regions of northern Canada with a total population in 2011 of 46,252, of whom approximately 85% were Inuit. These territories can be reached primarily only by air or, once the winter ice has melted, by sea. Their physical isolation and climatic conditions have meant that Inuit have historically been less affected by resource development and the permanent presence of settler colonial residents than Indigenous peoples in the southern Canada. As a result, and at the risk of oversimplifying their circumstances, the daily practices of northern Indigenous peoples tend to be more readily visible and convergent with customary values than is at first glance evident amongst many Indigenous peoples in southern Canada. But their state of relative independence from settler colonialism has progressively eroded since the latter half of the 20th century as vast hydroelectric, and mineral and hydrocarbon extraction schemes have moved northwards. To legitimise legally their access to these resources, since the mid-1970s federal, territorial, and provincial governments in Canada have negotiated and settled a series of comprehensive claims with the region's Indigenous peoples. These have given birth to a series of Indigenous corporations tasked with safeguarding the collective political, social, and economic interests of the 'beneficiaries' to these claims. Thus, for example, Makivik Corporation is responsible for representing the political interests of the Inuit of Nunavik, and for managing the moneys received

when Inuit signed a land claim in 1975. Similar corporate structures have been designated in the USA, Aotearoa/New Zealand, and Australia (cf. Nehme and Juriansz 2012; Paulin 2007; Thornburg and Roberts 2012).

Given their mandate to represent the political, social, and economic interests of Indigenous collectivities, these institutions embody a marriage between new formations of citizenship for Indigenous peoples, and new collective economic practices that engage with national and international forces in the name and interests of these peoples. As such, in theory one might reasonably assume that they are manifestations of economic citizenship that articulate Indigenous peoples' values. The question is what they demonstrate in practice.

Some argue that these Indigenous corporations embody new forms of political and economic practice that allow Indigenous peoples to develop according to their particular values (Wilson and Alcantara 2012; Wuttunee 2004), whilst others argue that the capital and landholding institutions created subsequent to land claims, embody and impose inherent relations of imperialism that link treaties, resource extraction, and wider capitalist relations at the root of settler colonialism (Altamirano-Jiménez 2004; Kulchyski and Bernauer 2014). By such a reckoning, settler colonialism is structured by a logic of elimination that seeks to wrest lands and resources from the hands of Indigenous peoples and place them squarely in those of the settler colonial state (Wolfe 2006). As a consequence, the very terms of reference through which land claims have been conceived necessarily co-opt and absorb Indigenous peoples into the capitalist relations framing settler colonialism, thereby furthering the acquisition of Indigenous lands (Alfred 2005; Blackburn 2009; Cattelino 2010; Coulthard 2014; Meltzer 2013; Valdivia 2008). The founding of corporations and the particular framings of Indigenous peoples as 'citizens' within the context of land claims can thus be understood as setting structures in place that produce, enable, and reinforce ongoing processes of settler colonialism and Indigenous peoples' dispossession (cf. Brown 2014; Wolfe 2006).

It is in the context of such debates that I propose to consider how the institutions that have come into being subsequent to the signing of land claims have combined with socio-economic forces whose sources are both local and alien. What has this combination resulted in? How might Indigenous forms of economic citizenship present contemporary models for collective economic action grounded in ideas of sharing and reciprocity rather than purely that of isolated, self-interested individuals who are both the foundation and product of capitalist economies? My goal is to point toward larger theoretical concerns that merit consideration as we examine how Indigenous peoples' search for political sovereignty has been expressed via interlinked relations of citizenship and economic practice.

Citizenship and Indigenous peoples

The Oxford English Dictionary defines a citizen as, amongst its various meanings, one who is an inhabitant, occupant, or denizen (in contrast to an alien) of a given locality. One might split hairs and point out that a person who inhabits is different from one who occupies (Ingold 2007), and that the encounter between Indigenous peoples and colonisers is precisely about this distinction. One might equally ask who determines, and on what basis, who is a denizen and who is an alien? Again, Indigenous–settler colonial encounters are telling in this regard. In essence, however, discussions about citizenship are necessarily about relationships and the rules and entailing rights and responsibilities that govern those relationships. These rules are, to varying degrees, formally defined by institutions (which these days generally correlate to some version of the state). Generally, citizenship is both about relationships amongst individuals, which form collectivities, and between those individuals and the institutions that define and sanction the rules and obligations determining people's membership in collectivities. Although rarely stated clearly in the discussion on citizenship, ideally the relationship between citizen and 'state' ought to be two-way, i.e., just as citizens have rights and obligations vis-à-vis the state, so states should have rights and responsibilities vis-à-vis their citizens. In considering this dynamic, the question I wish to explore is the degree to which the rights and obligations of states to citizens reflect the socioeconomic values held by those citizens, with a particular emphasis on Indigenous peoples.

To contextualise this debate it is necessary to understand that there is an extensive literature that argues that in the terms of recognition granted by the state, which are then formalised through land claims, Indigenous peoples have been obliged to adopt institutions that are essentially not of their own making. Instead they impose on Indigenous peoples beliefs and behaviours inherent to the settler colonial state, thereby further subjugating and enmeshing them in the capitalist relations at the heart of that state (Alfred 2005; Altamirano-Jiménez 2004; Coulthard 2014; Kobayashi and de Leeuw 2010).

The literature discussing modern European notions of citizenship, underscores that a citizen is a full member of a political community that is enacted via legal and administrative rules and regulations on the basis of which an individual's civil, political, and social rights and responsibilities are determined vis-à-vis the community (cf. Kymlika and Norman 1994; Marshall 2009). Western notions of citizenship are closely linked to socio-economic transformations that occurred with the rise of capitalism, coupling liberal ideals of personal freedom and state defined and enforced rights. These occasioned the growth of autonomous, egocentric individuals and market economies based on contractual rather than communitarian social relations (Marshall 2009; Weber 1961). Since the end of the 20th century, the increasing neoliberal framings of citizenship that have dominated the ways states formulate their relations with citizens have intensified this dynamic with an accompanying emphasis on private care rather than public virtue (Oswin and Olund 2010; cf. Cheshire and Woods 2009; Mooers 2014). For Dean (2003: 27) the links between capitalism and citizenship have ultimately resulted in an "impossible partnership" that dehumanises people and depends on abstractions that cause economic actors to ignore their interdependence with one another and the natural world, and have ultimately provoked both social alienation and severe environmental degradation.

For Indigenous peoples in settler colonial states Western understandings of citizenship have been fundamentally problematic. As I shall discuss below, the rules and regulations that are at the root of their own understandings of 'citizenship' were not recognized, understood, or adopted by settler colonial states, whilst Indigenous polities were subordinated to edicts alien to their own. Although initially engaged in nation-to-nation diplomatic relations of alliance and protection, as the settler colonial state became more secure and sought to widen its territorial control, so its treatment of Indigenous peoples evolved into one of tutelage and trusteeship. The result was that Indigenous peoples were made wards of the state with such things as reservations and residential schools being amongst the outcomes of this relationship.

To overcome the perceived lack of capacity preventing Indigenous peoples from being full citizens, settler colonial states have attempted to reshape Indigenous peoples into economic actors with the skills, habits, and attitudes of 'responsible', individualised participants in the market. They should learn how to save money, act independently, and develop attitudes of care, cleanliness, and punctuality (cf. Altamirano-Jiménez 2004; Meltzer 2013). In short, they must emulate the comportment of Western labourers. But they are damned if they do and damned if they don't: where their commitment to the collective is reckoned to hold them back economically, they have been deemed to be morally flawed, and encouraged, for example, to divide their collective lands into individual allotments; and where judged to be too successful and 'Western' in appearance and/or behaviour, their treaty rights to hunt, fish, and gather, for example, have been called into question (cf. Cattelino 2010; Norrgard 2014).

A sense of concurrence with others, which is a fundamental component of any collectivity, exists only amongst individuals if they share categories of thought (Douglas 1986). Recognizing neither themselves nor the principles that govern the functioning of their societies in the constructions of citizenship of the settler colonial state, many Indigenous peoples have taken issue with the concept on the grounds that it is incompatible with their own conceptions of what such relations entail (Alfred 2005; Coulthard 2014; Porter 2005; Simpson 2014). For example, Johnson (2007), a Cree lawyer, describes how his ancestors, in signing a treaty in 1889, understood that they were adopting the colonisers as their cousins, and that each was charged with caring for the other. This reflects customary notions guiding Cree ideals of how to incorporate 'aliens' in their polities: one became kin, with all the requirements of trust and negotiation that such connections necessitate. In considering the notion of citizenship, then, we ought to consider how Indigenous peoples conceive of the individual in relation to the collectivity, for clearly this has implications not only for how they apprehend the ties that bind them, but also for how they behave as economic actors whereby certain behaviours are sanctioned and others are repudiated.

If, as Marshall states, "[c]itizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community" (2009: 149), then we need to think about how community is constituted for Indigenous peoples. Let us return again to the case of Inuit. Like the Cree, for Inuit the extended family is a crucial unit of the collectivity, but kinship relations are fluid, expansive, and subject to choice. So, for example, such relations can be built through systems of naming, through connections with, and understandings of the land and animals, or simply through elected connections of "fictive kinship" which customarily ensured that strangers have been integrated into Inuit communities (Nuttall 1992: 85; cf. Guemple 1976). This willingness to integrate individuals quickly into the collective is a distinguishing value for hunter-gatherers. As Ingold contends, "whereas for [Western society ...] every individual is an independent element of the aggregate collectivity, for [hunter-gatherers] the collectivity is present and active in the life of every individual" (1986; 24). Such behaviours reflect reciprocal bonds of solidarity. The question that arises is whether the values that inform the reciprocal bonds of hunter-gatherer communities continue to find expression in the context of associative bonds of solidarity foundational to the state-like institutions that have developed in the context of land claims.

Having considered one component of this concept of economic citizenship in so far as it relates to Indigenous peoples – even if in a back-to-front way – I wish now to turn to its other component.

Economies and Indigenous peoples

Economies involve "making, holding, using, sharing, exchanging, and accumulating valued things" (Gudeman 2001: 1). Economic practice thus focuses on the movement of value. Yet value does not inhere only in *things*. *Relationships* associated with the circulation of those things are also crucial in the composition of value. They serve not only to ensure the circulation of things, but more fundamentally, as the ground within which ideas about the value of those things take root, are nourished, grow, and are sustained. And these conditions vary.

In considering the ways in which Indigenous corporate institutions engage with economic processes, we need to understand that they are at once engaged with the values that inform market economies and with those generally foundational to Indigenous societies, which have variously been called sharing or gift economies (although the two are not synonymous, not only because the word 'sharing' has come increasingly to be used as an attractive substitute for 'renting', but also, as we shall see, because sharing economies have broader connotations than gift economies). So we are drawn into questions about the functioning of societies built on relationships of alienable and inalienable goods, about the degree to which the bonds that tie people to things and to one another might be objective or subjective, independent or interdependent, and about the extent to which, in the links between producer and consumer, the recipients of goods are passive consumers engaged in mercantile relationships or active participants engaged in the creation and maintenance of relationships.

Although there are debates about the degree to which it is achieved, sociality and the establishment and maintenance of relationships are central to the ideas of the gift. Distinctions between use and exchange values may partially help us to understand gift economies, but "bonding value" is what is really central to these economies (Godbout and Caillé 1998: 173). As objects, services, and acts are exchanged in gift economies, so people create and sustain bonding value whereby the relations between the individuals or collectivities concerned will be maintained in ongoing forms of exchange.

The term 'sharing' enlarges Mauss's formulation of the gift to include values and activities such as hospitality, land-people relations, and community self-awareness that encompass more than the mere exchange of goods and obligations (MacDonald 2000). Sharing is sustained by common expectations about correct social behaviour, which are grounded in moral imperatives associated with this behaviour. The nature of these imperatives varies according to different cultural beliefs, but generally they serve to establish and maintain relationships not only amongst people, but also between people and the larger environment. Taking the example of Inuit, the imperative to share is most strongly associated with food. Such sharing structures, and is structured by, a complex set of social relations that extend beyond humans to the animals who – and I use this pronoun intentionally – give themselves to hunters and fishers. Should the original gift offered by the animal not be respected by sharing with others thereafter, then people run the risk of the animals withholding themselves in the future (Gombay 2010). Value is thus created, extracted, maintained, and reproduced in the very act of sharing. Moreover, sharing can extend to other elements of the economy, such as money and equipment. The important point is that just as the structures that have customarily been part of Inuit 'citizenship' are essentially geared towards establishing and maintaining social relations, so too are their economic practices.

If a commitment to sharing is fundamental to many Indigenous economies, the question that arises repeatedly in the literature is the degree to which such values are maintained when they come into contact with market forces. Certainly this has been debated by academics who have argued, for example, that the individualizing relations of capitalism erode Indigenous peoples' commitments to the collectivity in the name of competition and profit, with the result that capitalism develops "by stealth" (Li 2014: 9; cf. Mitchell 1996). Others argue that Indigenous peoples develop their own brand of capitalism that reflects a commitment to the collective and discourages the private accumulation of wealth (Champagne 2010; Warriner 2007; Wuttunee 2004). In the case of Inuit, during interviews I have conducted over the years with individual entrepreneurs, they stressed that making money was a means to an end. As one person said, "I'm not a *business* business, you know. But more on relationship and helping out." His aim was not excessive profit.

> Because if I start to get a lot of money, then that's what I will be worried about, that's what I will be dealing with. And throwing aside a lot of things. [...] [I]t's not too good to be *too* business-minded [...]. Just enough to survive.

These are not the values of *Homo economicus*. Another Inuk businessman talked about how the profits from his venture, went right back into the community. "That's why we developed this business, to provide work for our people." Hence in her study of Indigenous enterprises Wuttunnee (2004: 23) states, "Growth for its own sake is not valued. From an early age children are taught to 'think for yourself and act for others.'"

Yet is life really as tidy as we make it out to be? Perhaps. Perhaps not. If we return to the case of Nunavik, not all Inuit were convinced that the values advanced in the claim that brought Nunavik into being were desirable. In fact, some settlements refused to sign the claim. A resident of one of the 'dissident' communities explained his position in a poem involving a conversation between an old man and a boy. The man says, "My greed for the White man's wealth has turned me from my ancient way," causing his generation to give up their land in exchange for cash. "For I am vanquished by my present greed. My eyes I close to the accusing finger of my kin and say I had no other choice" (Tulugak and Murdoch 2007: 247). The boy responds,

> You who thought that all would share the wealth. Oh, you! Among the many reaching for your share but finding it was only for the few.
>
> (Tulugak and Murdoch 2007: 248)

So money causes people to forget their relations and forget the requirement to share. From the perspective of the dissident communities the land claim was the embodiment of this forgetting. As a member of one of the communities put it,

> I wish Inuit to be free again, with nobody dictating to them what to do, so that they might live in their own lands according to their own laws, and according to their own ways that are appropriate for their culture. That will be their only way to protect themselves against the regulations created and imposed by others.
>
> (Qumaq 2010: 136; my translation)

So we come to the question of whether this assessment of what the institutions founded as a result of land claims actually succeed in doing. Do they represent fundamental impositions on Indigenous peoples, inevitably giving rise to institutions based on money and 'greed,' causing them to close their eyes to their kin's accusing finger, or have they managed to develop institutions compatible with their moral codes? More particularly, are the institutions that have been developed to represent this new collectivity known as 'beneficiaries' actually managed to incorporate the values of sharing that underpin their socioeconomic systems? Have land claims corporations managed to express in action the sets of values and relationships that are central to Indigenous conceptions of economic citizenship?

Debating economic citizenship

The literature examining questions of economic citizenship generally assumes that people are operating within a framework of principles associated with a market economy. For example, Cheshire and Woods (2009: 115) understand economic citizenship to be the "required conduct of citizens in the sphere of the market as responsible and informed consumers, capable of managing their lives in an entrepreneurial and prudential manner." Others focus on how, in the context of capitalism, economic rights and obligations, and the structures that serve to ensure them, have contributed to the configuration of citizenship (Kessler-Harris 2003; Turner 1986; White 2003; Woodiwiss 2002). Generally wage labour and Western capitalist relations are assumed to be the norm.

Implicit in various analyses of economic citizenship, particularly in those that stress the effects of neoliberalism on the workings of economic citizenship, is an underlying portrayal of the "little man" up against a powerful nexus of state and capital (cf. Cheshire and Woods 2009; Jeffrey et al. 2012; Mooers 2014; Turner 1986). And in this relationship there is a dialectical struggle where, periodically, the little man wins. What I am interested in here is the degree to which these dialectical struggles – in so far as they involve Indigenous corporations – yield material relations in which sharing is a core value. In examining this question, let us again focus our attention on Inuit in Nunavik.

In a recent iteration of settler colonial occupation of Inuit territories, the government of Quebec formally launched its *Plan Nord* in 2011, with resource extraction and infrastructure development being central to its agenda. Indigenous leadership has complied with this initiative partnering with the government of Quebec in the Plan's elaboration. Yet these same leaders also appear to have qualms about the anticipated developments. At root are questions about the coexistence of market and sharing economies in the region.

In response to *Plan Nord*, Inuit developed *Plan Nunavik*, in which they underscore the need to promote development that enables Inuit to be active participants in the market economy whilst preserving their capacity to pursue a subsistence lifestyle. Thus on the one hand they note:

> Nunavik Inuit are no longer simple traditional harvesters of wildlife pursuing a nomadic existence. [...] Today, the majority of Nunavik Inuit are part of the larger modern cash economy. [... So they] need employment and business opportunities.
>
> (Kativik Regional Government and Makivik Corporation, 2010: 357)

But on the other hand they recognise that their economy is founded on "values such as sharing, helping others in need and working collectively for the benefit of the community" (2010: 427), and they worry that the development projected under *Plan Nord*, "could have significant negative impacts on Nunavik Inuit culture, the traditional way of life and ultimately on Inuit identity" (2010: 434). Thus, *Plan Nunavik* contains various recommendations aimed at promoting Inuit participation in the market economy – for example, creating Inuit-owned mining companies – whilst also preserving Inuit values: for example, proposing that 50% of Nunavik's landmass be reserved for Inuit hunting and trapping.

The official institutions designated to play a leadership role for Inuit thus seem both amenable to extractive projects and protective of the interests of Indigenous economic practices that will be adversely affected by such projects. After releasing *Plan Nunavik*, Makivik consulted Inuit beneficiaries across the region. The consensus was that Inuit should determine the conditions under which development would be acceptable (Makivik Corporation et al. 2014). Moreover the Inuit of Nunavik have long been negotiating to gain increased self-government. In fact, in 2011, via popular referendum, they rejected the initial proposal for the Nunavik Regional Government, on the grounds that it did not sufficiently reflect or promote their cultural values, language, and identity (Papillon 2011). Consequently, during Makivik's Nunavik-wide process of community consultation about *Plan Nord*, published in a report called *Parnasimautik*, people expressed the desire to work towards a new autonomous governance structure in the region that would ensure that Inuit culture and practices – including economic ones – would be safeguarded (Makivik Corporation et al. 2014). Many Inuit residents of Nunavik wish to gain greater control over their region to develop according to principles that respect their own values. They feel that, as currently formulated, Nunavik's governance structures are not effectively meeting their expectations. Thus we return to this fundamental question asked by various critical Indigenous theorists: How might the institutions designated to promote and protect the (economic) interests of their Indigenous 'citizens' do so in ways that abrogate the capitalist, crisis-ridden relations that frame land claims, whilst pursuing futures in which notions of sharing foundational to their political economies are reinforced (Corntassel and Bryce 2012; Coulthard 2014)?

By way of a conclusion

In the murky daylight of December, in a village north of the 59th parallel, there is a knock at the door of the house where I am lodging. Opening it I find on the doorstep a box of frozen shrimp sent by Makivik Corporation as a Christmas present to the house of every beneficiary in Nunavik. They are produced by Unaaq Fisheries, one of Makivik's joint ventures. *Unaaq* is the Inuktitut word for 'harpoon'.

It may be tempting to draw absolute conclusions: that Indigenous land claims corporations are finding new practices of economic citizenship based on Indigenous values; or, conversely, that they are failing to do so, and are instead, co-opted by settler colonial systems. But both would be unjust oversimplifications.

There is no clean division between sharing and markets, between tradition and modernity, between non-capitalist and capitalist economies. Such binaries ignore complex realities and impose idealised images on Indigenous peoples. Despite the structural limitations shaping the outcomes of land claims, Indigenous peoples develop economic responses that reflect the specificities of their own geographies, histories, cultural beliefs, and social practices. These evolve relationally reflecting entanglements between local and global economies. In producing a third space of sovereignty, Indigenous peoples have the possibility of refusing to adopt binary choices of assimilation or secession (Bruyneel 2007).

Inevitably the structures that have given rise to Indigenous land claims corporations are entangled with the settler colonial project. But to understand what Indigenous land claims corporations such as Makivik ideally attempt to accomplish, we would do well to apprehend that economies contain different, but related, transactional spheres, each with varying temporal and moral orders (cf. Kopytoff 1986; Parry and Bloch 1989). Economic processes contain transactions concerned both with the long-term social and cosmic order associated with the collectivity and the short-term order associated with individual competition. The latter is morally acceptable only to the degree that it is subordinate to, and not in competition with, the former. In fact, the short-term transactional sphere is often pursued as a means of yielding goods that maintain the long-term order.

As recipients and managers of funds received in exchange for signing land claims, Indigenous land claims corporations are creatures of the world of money and markets. They are therefore inevitably bound to short-term economic cycles. But their mandate to reflect their beneficiaries equally requires that they adhere to the principles informing the longer-term transactional orders that are at the root of Indigenous peoples' economies. In their ideal form, when the division between each sphere remains distinct, the values and principles informing the short-term economic order are used to promote and sustain the long-term order. When this supporting position is not clear, and the short-term is perceived to threaten the moral order of the longer-term sphere, contradictions and contestations arise.

In analysing the workings of Indigenous land claims corporations we need to be aware of this juggling act. We need to question the degree to which these corporations' involvement in short-term transactional orders are, indeed, reflective of, and subordinate to, the values underpinning the longer-term order. We need to consider how their moral basis is symbolically constructed and sustained. We need to think about how new regimes of value may be emerging. We need particularly to consider the degree to which the enmeshment of realms of value reinforce those undergirding long-term moral structures, so that perhaps in being "*business* business[es]" Indigenous land claims corporations *can* serve as a means of promoting the value that people require "just enough to survive". Clearly, in *Plan Nunavik*, Makivik is grappling

with its responsibilities to engage with the market economy, but not to the detriment of its citizens' sharing economy. Clearly giving food at Christmas time is a symbolic material manifestation of its attempt to blend market and sharing economies.

Indigenous land claims corporations have the *potential* to express altermodernities in which the economic citizenship of Indigenous peoples might find expression, but as this chapter has shown, the means of doing so is debated, and requires carefully situated analysis. It is not a matter of one size fits all. In the case of Nunavik, the development projected for the region presents serious challenges to the social and environmental conditions that are intrinsic to the functioning of the sharing economy of Inuit. In light of the various debates I have considered in this chapter, it would be seeing the world through rose-tinted glasses to argue that corporations such as Makivik will succeed unwaveringly in creating a third space of sovereignty. *Plan Nunavik* and the broadly based discussions that happened in the region amongst Inuit, which resulted in *Parnasimautik*, suggest that both Indigenous 'citizens' and 'state' are determinedly debating how they might create this third space. As market economies continue to intersect with those predicated on sharing, the case of Indigenous economic citizenship underscores the need to consider the dynamics of interwoven realms of value and the need for overt discussions about the moral principles that bind people together as individuals, as collectivities, and as institutions of state.

References

Alfred, G. R. (2005) *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Peterborough, Ont. and Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press.

Altamirano-Jiménez, I. (2004) 'North American First Peoples: Slipping up into Market Citizenship?' *Citizenship Studies*, 8: 349–365.

Blackburn, C. (2009) 'Differentiating Indigenous Citizenship: Seeking Mulitiplicity in Rights, Identity, and Sovereignty in Canada' *American Ethnologist*, 36: 68–78.

Brown, N. A. (2014) 'The Logic of Settler Accumulation in a Landscape of Perpetual Vanishing' *Settler Colonial Studies* 4: 1–26.

Bruyneel, K. (2007) *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.–Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Cattelino, J.R. (2010) 'The Double Bind of American Indian Need-based Sovereignty' *Cultural Anthropology*, 25: 235–262.

Champagne, D. (2010) 'Tribal Capitalism and Native Capitalists: Multiple Pathways of Native Economy' in Hosmer B.C. [ed.] *Native Americans and the legacy of Harry S. Truman*. Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 308–329.

Cheshire, L. and Woods, M. (2009) 'Rural Citizenship and Governmentality' in Thrift, N. and Kitchin, R. [eds.] *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 114–118.

Corntassel, J. and Bryce, C. (2012) 'Practicing Sustainable Self-Determination: Indigenous Approaches to Cultural Restoration and Revitalisation' *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 18: 151–162.

Coulthard, G. S. (2014) *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Douglas, M. (1986) *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
Dean, K. (2003) *Capitalism and Citizenship: The Impossible Partnership*. London: New York, NY: Routledge.
Godbout, J. and Caillé, A. (1998). *The World of the Gift*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Gombay, N. (2010) 'Community, Obligation, and Food: Lessons from the Moral Geography of Inuit' *Geografiska Annaler B*, 92: 237–250.
Gudeman, S. (2001) *The Anthropology of Economy: Community, Market, and Culture*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.
Guemple, L. (1976) 'The Institutional Flexibility of Inuit Social Life' in Freeman, M. [ed.] *Inuit Land Use and Occupancy Project: A Report (Vol. 2)*. Ottawa: Dept. of Indian and Northern Affairs, 181–186.
Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2009) *Commonwealth*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Ingold, T. (1986) *The Appropriation of Nature*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Ingold, T. (2007) *Lines: A Brief History*. London and New York: Routledge.
Jeffrey, A., McFarlane, C. and Vasudevan, A (2012) 'Rethinking Enclosure: Space, Subjectivity and the Commons' *Antipode*, 44: 1247–1267.
Johnson, H. (2007). *Two Families: Treaties and Government*. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing.
Kativik Regional Government and Makivik Corporation. (2010) *Plan Nunavik*. Westmount, QC: Avataq Cultural Institute. Retrieved from: http://www.parnasimautik.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Plan_Nunavik_06_20.pdf. [Accessed 17 July 2015]
Kessler-Harris, A. (2003) 'In Pursuit of Economic Citizenship' *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 10: 157–175.
Kobayashi, A. and de Leeuw, S. (2010) 'Colonialism and the Tensioned Landscapes of Indigeneity' in Smith, S. J., Pain, R., Marston, S. A. and Jones, J. P. J. [eds.] *The SAGE Handbook of Social Geographies*. Los Angeles and London: SAGE, 118–139.
Kino-nda-niimi Collective (2014) *The Winter We Danced: Voices from the Past, the Future, and the Idle No More Movement*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
Kopytoff, I. (1986) 'The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditisation as Process' in Appadurai, A. [ed.] *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 64–91.
Kulchyski, P.K. and Bernauer, W. (2014) 'Modern Treaties, Extraction, and Imperialism in Canada's Indigenous North: Two Case Studies' *Studies in Political Economy*, 93: 3–23.
Kymlika, W. and Norman, W. (1994) 'Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory' *Ethics*, 104: 352–381.
Li, T. (2014) *Land's End: Capitalist Relations on an Indigenous Frontier*. Durham: Duke University Press.
MacDonald, G. (2000) 'Economies and Personhood: Demand Sharing among the Wiradjuri of New South Wales' *The Social Economy of Sharing: Resource Allocation and Modern Hunter-Gatherers, Senri Ethnological Studies*, 53: 87–111.
Makivik Corporation et al. (2014) *Parnasimautik Consultation Report: On the Consultation Carried Out with Inuit of Nunavik in 2013*. Retrieved from: http://www.parnasimautik.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Parnasimautik-consultation-report-v2014_12_15-eng_vf.pdf. Acessed 17 July 2015]
Marshall, T.H. (2009 [1950]) 'Citizenship and Social Class' in Manza, J. and Sauder, M. [eds.] *Inequality and Society*. New York: W.W. Norton, 148–154.
Marx, K. (1983) *Capital: Volume One*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Meltzer, J. (2013) '"Good citizenship" and the promotion of personal savings accounts in Peru' *Citizenship Studies*, 15: 641–652.
Mitchell, M. (1996) *From Talking Chiefs to a Native Corporate Élite: The Birth of Class and Nationalism among Canadian Inuit*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Mooers, C.P. (2014) *Imperial Subjects: Citizenship in an Age of Crisis and Empire*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
Nehme, M. and Juriansz, J. (2012) 'The Evolution of Indigenous Corporations: Where to Now?' *Adelaide Law Review*, 33: 101–135.
Norrgard, C. (2014) *Seasons of Change: Labor, Treaty Rights, and Ojibwe Nationhood*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Nuttall, M. (1992) *Arctic Homeland: Kinship, Community and Development in Northwest Greenland*. London: Belhaven Press.
Oswin, N. and Olund, E. (2010) 'Governing Intimacy' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28: 60–67.
Papillon, M. (2011) 'Le Référendum au Nunavik: un pas en arrière pour mieux avancer?' *Option Politiques/Policy Options*, 32: 10–14.
Parry, J. and Bloch, M. (1989) 'Introduction: Money and the Morality of Exchange' in Bloch, M. and Parry, J. [eds.] *Money and the Morality of Exchange*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–32.
Paulin, C. (2007) 'Ngai Tahu: The New Zealand Success Story in Indigenous Entrepreneurship' in Daman, L.P. and Anderson, R.B. [eds.] *International Handbook of Research on Indigenous Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 549–557.
Porter, R. O. (2005) 'Question 2: What Kind of Shared Citizenship Is Actually Possible in a World of Separate Nation-States? Two Rows, Two Peoples, Two Nations: The Meaning of Haudenosaunee Citizenship' *International Studies Review*, 7: 512–515.
Qumaq, T. (2010) *Je veux que les Inuit soient libres de nouveau: Autobiographie (1914–1993)*. Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.
Simpson, A. (2014) *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Duke University Press.
Thornburg, S.W. and Roberts, R.W. (2012) '"Incorporating" American Colonialism: Accounting and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act' *Behavioral Research in Accounting* 24: 203–214.
Tulugak, A. and Murdoch, P. (2007) *A New Way of Sharing: A Personal History of the Cooperative Movement in Nunavik*. Baie-d'Urfé: Fédération des Coopératives du Nouveau-Québec.
Turner, B.S. (1986) *Citizenship and Capitalism: The Debate over Reformism*. London and Boston: Allen and Unwin.
Valdivia, G. (2008) 'Governing Relations Between People and Things: Citizenship, Territory, and the Political Economy of Petroleum in Ecuador' *Political Geography*, 27: 456–477.
Warriner, V. (2007) 'The Importance of Traditional Maori Values for Necessity and Opportunity: Maori Entrepreneurs – Iwi-based and Individually' in Dana, L.P. and Anderson, R.B. [eds.] *International handbook of research on indigenous entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 558–565.
Weber, M. (1961) *General Economic History*. Translated by Frank H. Knight. New York: Collier Books.
White, S.G. (2003) *The Civic Minimum: On the Rights and Obligations of Economic Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wilson, G. N. and Alcantara, C. (2012) 'Mixing Politics and Business in the Canadian Arctic: Inuit Corporate Governance in Nunavik and the Inuvialuit Settlement Region' *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique*, 45: 781–804.

Wolfe, P. (2006) 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native' *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8: 387–409.
Woodiwiss, A. (2002) 'Economic Citizenship: Variations and the Threat of Globalisation' in Isin, E.F. and Turner, B.S. [eds.] *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: SAGE, 53–68.
Wuttunee, W. A. (2004) *Living Rhythms: Lessons in Aboriginal Economic Resilience and Vision*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

12 Crisis, capitalism, and the anarcho-geographies of community self-help

Richard White and Colin Williams

Introduction

> (T)hree decades of neoliberalism have failed to produce an economy that is not bubble-prone and that is capable of improving the living standards of most people in the world. Articulating an alternative to neoliberalism is therefore an urgent task.
>
> (Posey 2011: 299)

> (I)f we are to accept anarchism as the dismantling of unequal power relations and the pursuit of re-organizing the way we live in the world along more egalitarian, voluntary, altruistic, and cooperative lines, then it becomes necessary to appreciate anarchism as a geographical endeavor.
>
> (Springer 2013: 46)

One hundred years ago the anarchist geographer Peter Kropotkin (1998 [1912]: 197] wrote: "Such is the future – already possible, already realisable; such is the present – already condemned and about to disappear." These words act as both consolation and inspiration when held against our own epoch: a time of intersectional crisis (economic, political, social and environmental) which, as Shannon (2014) argues, may well result in the end of the world as we know it. We contend here that despite capitalism's uneven and variegated nature (Bruff and Hown 2012), crises do not exist beyond or outside it: they are – fundamentally – creatures of capitalism. In rejecting the oxymoronic notion of 'sustainable' capitalism, the chapter picks up the gauntlet laid down by Springer (2012: 136) when arguing:

> The point of our critiques should not be to temper neoliberalism with concessions and niceties, as capitalism of any sort is doomed to fail. The logics of creative destruction, uneven development and unlimited expansion – which stoke the fires of conflict and contradict the finite limitations of the earth – are capitalism's undoing regardless of the form it takes.

Certainly, there is no possibility of social, economic or environmental justice to be found in the toxic (economic) remedies administered by a neoliberal State.

First published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Ince, Anthony, editor. | Hall, Sarah Marie, editor.
Title: Sharing economies in times of crisis : practices, politics and possibilities / edited by Anthony Ince and Sarah Marie Hall.
Description: 1 Edition. | New York : Routledge, 2017. | Includes index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2017009586 | ISBN 9781138959415 (hardback) | ISBN 9781315660646 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Sharing—Social aspects. | Economic geography. | Social interaction.
Classification: LCC HM1033 .S483 2017 | DDC 302—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017009586

ISBN: 978-1-138-95941-5 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-315-66064-6 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by diacriTech, Chennai

Contents