City of Reconciliation? Planning, Settler Colonialism and Canadian Exceptionalism in Vancouver

by

Courtney Vance

B.A. (Sociology / GSWS) Simon Fraser University, 2020

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

in the
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

© Courtney Vance 2023
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
Summer 2023

Copyright in this work is held by the author. Please ensure that any reproduction
or re-use is done in accordance with the relevant national copyright legislation.

Declaration of Committee

Name:	**Courtney Vance**
Degree:	**Master of Arts**
Title:	**City of Reconciliation? Planning, Settler Colonialism and Canadian Exceptionalism in Vancouver**
Committee:	**Chair: Lindsey Freeman** Associate Professor, Sociology and Anthropology
	Kyle Willmott Supervisor Assistant Professor, Sociology and Anthropology
	Margaret Marietta Ramírez Committee Member Assistant Professor, Geography
	Julie Tomiak Examiner Associate Professor, Sociology Carleton University

Ethics Statement

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

c. as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

Abstract

This thesis critically examines Vancouver’s planning discourses in the context of settler colonialism. Drawing on theories of decolonization and grounded normativity, I consider the political context of reconciliation in Vancouver, and the implications of settler colonialism, settler colonial violence, and Canadian exceptionalism on the city’s planning practice. I argue that the planning ethos of Vancouverism supersedes respectful engagement with Indigenous Nations. The thesis is based on a document analysis and conversational interviews with three Indigenous planners and four non-Indigenous planners to examine their conceptualizations of Vancouverism, reconciliation, decolonization, and planning in Vancouver. Findings show damage-centered conceptions of Indigeneity and implications in settler colonialism are present in planning discourse, and reveal that Vancouverism’s values are incompatible with Vancouver as a ‘City of Reconciliation.’ Grounded in Indigenous planners’ assertions, I offer ways forward for new systems to uplift the xʷməθkwəyəm̓, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and Səlílwətaɬ First Nations, urban Indigenous peoples, and Indigenous planning in the city of Vancouver.

Keywords: settler colonialism; reconciliation; decolonization; Vancouverism; urban planning; Indigenous planning

Acknowledgements

This work would not have been possible without all the Indigenous peoples and scholars who gave me the tools to name my experience and work through it. It would also not have been possible without the professors who influenced me during my undergraduate degree like Lindsey Freeman, Coleman Nye, Tiffany Muller-Myrdahl, Alix Shield and Kamala Todd, and those during graduate studies like Cristina Moretti and Cynthia Patton. Thank you all for your support and guidance.

I would first like to thank all my interlocutors for their time and openness during interviews and conversations. I am incredibly grateful for the Indigenous planners who shared their experiences and stories of perseverance in a field intrinsically linked with settler colonialism. Thank you for sharing ways to continue the work required to move forward for uplifting Indigenous futurities.

This thesis would have not been possible without the support of my supervisor Dr. Kyle Willmott and committee member Dr. Margaret Ramírez who both consistently challenged me, celebrated my ideas, and taught me how to survive academia at the graduate level. Thank you for your support, honesty, and wisdom.

I would also like to thank Ashley Edwards who hired me as a research assistant before beginning my MA. Thank you for believing in me and for becoming a friend and confidant.

To the friends I made during this process, Asli, Hannah, and Steff, thank you for sharing this experience and making sure this thesis was completed. Without your support and our weekly working sessions it would have never been possible.

To my parents and family, thank you for supporting my work and studies even if you do not always understand it.

To Petrona, thank you for always giving your honest opinions and suggestions to make my writing, presentations, and work better. All these things would not be the same without your input and direction.

To Ferguson, thank you for always being the best support.

Table of Contents

Declaration of Committee ii
Ethics Statement iii
Abstract iv
Acknowledgements v
Table of Contents vi

Chapter 1. Introduction 1
1.1. Positionality & Land 1
1.2. Thesis Organization 1

Chapter 2. Background & Theory 4
2.1. Historical & Contemporary Context 4
2.1.1. A Brief History of Vancouverism: Progressive Planning or Canadian Exceptionalism? 4
2.1.2. Settler/Colonial Canada & Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation' 6
2.2. Literature Review 12
2.2.1. Indigenous Planning 12
2.2.2. Settler Colonialism & Settler Cities 15
2.2.3. Decolonial Urbanism 18
2.2.4. Reconciliation's Political Context in Vancouver 20
2.2.5. Conclusion 22
2.3. Overarching Research Questions 23
2.4. Theoretical Framework 23

Chapter 3. Methodology 27
3.1. Document Analysis 27
3.1.1. Guiding Questions 27
3.1.2. Process 27
3.2. Semi-Structured & Conversational Interviews 28
3.2.1. Guiding Questions 29
3.2.2. Process 30

Chapter 4. Document Analysis Findings 33
4.1. Damage-Centered Conceptions of Indigeneity 33
4.2. Complicity, Complacency, Ignorance or Privilege? 36

Chapter 5. Interview Findings 41
5.1. Non-Indigenous Planners 41
5.1.1. Conceptions of Indigeneity & Indigenous Planning 41
5.1.2. Reflections on Reconciliation & Decolonization 44
5.2. Indigenous Planners 48
5.2.1. Identity & Indigenous Planning 48
5.2.2. Reflections on Reconciliation & Decolonization 51

5.3. Comparing Non-Indigenous Planners & Indigenous Planners 53
5.3.1. What do Planners Think of Vancouverism? 53
5.3.2. Vancouverism's Underlying Foundations: Settler Colonialism, Settler Colonial Violence & Canadian Exceptionalism....................................... 57

Chapter 6. A Way Forward 63
6.1. Beyond Vancouverism 63
6.2. The Future of Indigenous Planning in Vancouver 64

Chapter 7. Conclusion 67
7.1. Review of Findings.. 67
7.2. Implications & Limitations 68
7.3. Research Contribution 68

References.. 70

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1. Positionality & Land

To situate myself and my investment in the research I conducted, I will first share my positionality as a related effort of Indigenous peoples' longstanding practices of positionality and beginning in a good way (Kovach 2000, 2010; Tuhiwai Smith 2013). I am Northern Tutchone, Tahltan and German. My band membership is with Selkirk First Nation, located in Pelly Crossing, Yukon. My great grandfather was a member of Tahltan First Nation, located in Telegraph Creek, BC and my great grandmother was a member of Selkirk First Nation. Northern Tutchone membership is passed down matrilineally, so my grandfather, father, and myself are members of Selkirk First Nation through my great grandmother. My father grew up in Whitehorse, Yukon, three hours outside of Pelly Crossing until he travelled to what is colonially known as Vancouver in search of work. In Vancouver, he met my mother who is a second-generation German immigrant whose parents immigrated to Vancouver in 1958. As a result, I have grown up a third-generation guest on the unceded, unsurrendered, and ancestral homelands of xʷməθkwəyəm̓, (Musqueam) Sḵwx̱wú7mesh (Squamish), and Səlílwətaɬ (Tseil-Waututh) First Nations. I have a complicated relationship with the city of Vancouver; one aspect is that I view these lands as my home, and the other aspect is a sense of unbelonging. As an urban Indigenous person who grew up outside of my traditional territories, I view this work as a personal responsibility to engage in a meaningful and respectful effort to offer ways forward for urban Indigeneity in planning grounded in Indigenous knowledges and worldviews.

1.2. Thesis Organization

In 2014, the City of Vancouver declared itself the world's first City of Reconciliation, outlining principles to reconcile with xʷməθkʷəy̓ əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, sə̓ lílwətaʔɬ Nations and urban Indigenous communities. These principles include cultural competency, strengthened relations, and effective decision-making to maintain mutually respectful relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Vancouver (City of Vancouver 2021). Contemporarily, the City of Vancouver advertises its specific kind of city living as Vancouverism, described as a combination of deep respect for nature, busy and

engaging streets, tall slim towers promoting density separated by low rise buildings for views, parks, walkable streets, and public spaces (City of Vancouver 2022). This thesis argues that (1) the planning ethos of Vancouverism supersedes respectful engagement with Indigenous Nations on whose unceded and unsurrendered territories have been developed much without their consent, (2) Vancouverism as a concept and practice is complicit in settler colonialism, settler colonial violence, and Canadian exceptionalism which is incompatible with Vancouver as a ‘City of Reconciliation,’ and that (3) despite Vancouver being a settler city, the xʷməθkwəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and Səlílwətaɬ First Nations, urban Indigenous peoples, and Indigenous planners offer ways forward to uplift Indigenous futurity in the city of Vancouver.

In Chapter 2, I will provide historical and contemporary context including a brief history of Vancouverism, colonialism and settler colonialism in Canada, and the implementation of Vancouver as a ‘City of Reconciliation.’ Second, I review literature which informed my methods, data collection, and analysis, share my overarching research questions, and finally, present my theoretical framework grounded in Frantz Fanon’s (1961) decolonization and extended by Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang’s (2012) decolonization and Glen Sean Coulthard’s (2014) grounded normativity. In Chapter 3, I will present my methodological choices and define them, first presenting the document analysis, its research questions, and the process of conducting it. Then I will present the semi-structured and conversational interviews related research questions, and the process of conducting them. In Chapter 4, I will present my analysis of Vancouverism (2019). In Chapter 5, I will highlight various understandings of Vancouverism from Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners within and/or with knowledge of Vancouver to illustrate the incompatibility between its value system and Vancouver as a city of reconciliation. I first analyze non-Indigenous planners’ conceptualizations of Indigeneity and planning to set a foundation for how they are thinking about these ideas, and their conceptions of decolonization and reconciliation. Second, I analyze Indigenous planners’ articulations of Indigenous identity and Indigenous planning, followed by their conceptualizations of decolonization and reconciliation. Lastly, I compare non-Indigenous and Indigenous planners’ thoughts on Vancouverism and address Vancouverism’s underlying foundations. In Chapter 7, as a way forward toward uplifting Indigenous value systems in planning within Vancouver beyond Vancouverism, I will share efforts of Indigenous planners through ideas they have shared during our conversations, as well as point to

three distinct examples of ways forward for Indigenous planning in Vancouver grounded in reconciliation, decolonization, and Indigenous sovereignty. Lastly, I will conclude with a review of key findings and analysis, discuss implications and limitations of the research, and offer my intended research contribution.

Chapter 2. Background & Theory

2.1. Historical & Contemporary Context

To begin, I will provide an overview of Vancouverism as a planning concept and what most say led to its inception (Beasley 2019; Dickinson 2016; Kataoka 2011; Logan 2021; Peck et al. 2014; Thomas 2021). My intention is to provide enough context to understand it in relation to Vancouver as a city made possible through colonial and settler colonial mechanisms (Dorries et al. 2019; Tomiak 2017). Additionally, I will define the myth of Canadian exceptionalism and how I contend that Vancouverism has only been made possible through this myth and the erasure of Indigenous peoples and worldviews. Then, I will identify some of the tools that the Canadian state has used to erase urban forms of Indigeneity and analyze varying views of reconciliation across the Canadian state, the City of Vancouver, and various Indigenous community members and scholars to critically examine the City of Vancouver's 'Reconciliation Framework.' Lastly, I will detail my theoretical framework and how it has shaped my understanding of Vancouverism and Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation.'

2.1.1. A Brief History of Vancouverism: Progressive Planning or Canadian Exceptionalism?

The city of Vancouver has been an early leader in facilitating the kinds of developments and use of land that have led to lower energy consumption, defining itself and seeking recognition as a global leader in environmental policy and green infrastructure (Boddy & Baird 2017; Boddy 2004; Punter 2004; Senbel & Stevens 2019; Walsh 2013). In doing so, the city has become well known for the "Vancouver model," which evolved into Vancouverism, among urbanists and others, as a slender residential tower design on top of street framing podiums, born out of the legislated constraint of having to avoid blocking predetermined view corridors in the city (Barnes 2011; Beasley 2019; Senbel & Stevens 2019; Dickinson 2016; Logan 2021; Thomas 2021). It is often referred to as the brand of the city of Vancouver (Beasley 2018; Dickinson 2016; Peck et al. 2014;). The specific inception of Vancouverism varies depending on who is asked; however, the general consensus is that as a practice it emerged in the 1980s and lasted until 2008 (Beasley 2019; Boddy & Baird 2017; Boddy 2004). As Beasley (2019) describes, the primary focus

at the outset of the Vancouverism era was the journey to work in relation to the neighbourhood. He explains that the trip from home to work determined the shape of the whole city and region of downtown, and that the target of Vancouverism at this time was to shorten this journey by encouraging active modes to commute and less reliance on the car (Beasley 2019). Due to a citizen's revolt in the 1960s, Vancouver is the only major city in North America without freeways in its boundaries (Boddy 2004). This impacted the desire to build homes in the downtown core closer to work without the need to drive, and ultimately resulted in the advocacy for densification and diversification, building taller buildings to house more people near amenities that would be useful to them resulting in an effort to merge the private and public sectors of design (Beasley 2019). Vancouverism as an idea was a means of reinventing Vancouver from a "typical mid-twentieth-century North American city" to a vanguard city of world stature and importance (ibid).

Despite the fact that some claim the specific Vancouverism timeframe was between the 1980s and early 2000s, the City of Vancouver still advertises the city today as immersed in Vancouverism (City of Vancouver 2023). The City defines Vancouverism as combining "deep respect for nature with enthusiasm for busy, engaging, active streets and dynamic urban life" (City of Vancouver 2022). The City of Vancouver's way of defining Vancouverism is what made me particularly interested in understanding different conceptualizations of the concept, and if there is a future for Vancouverism in the world's first 'City of Reconciliation' (City of Vancouver 2022). Even though other cities like San Francisco, San Diego, Dallas, Beijing and Abu Dhabi (Berelowitz 2005; Boddy 2004; Cormier 2010) often strive toward emulating Vancouverism as a practice, Vancouverism has been critiqued. According to writer and values based cultural critic Howard Rotberg (2008), Vancouver is an idea that is based on the geography of the mountains and the sea despite those things being outside of the actual Vancouver downtown core. He further describes that narcissism is a component part of Vancouverism, and that it obsesses about how it is admired by the rest of the world (Rotberg 2008). He states:

> "Falling in love with its self-image as the global city, with the best quality of life, attracting the rich and famous to its downtown of expensive child-free condo towers, masked the reality of a city council and a planning staff breaching its duty to its citizens, young and old, to create a livable city, livable for *all* its residents" (p. 44).

While written in 2008, the way that Rotberg calls attention to the self-image and brand of Vancouver aligns with many understandings of Vancouverism shared across Indigenous

and some non-Indigenous planners that I interviewed, which will be discussed further in Chapter 6. In addition, Rotberg (2008) asserts that the age of Vancouver as a city has national significance in relation to how cultural elites have manifested anti-Americanism as a central component of Canadian identity. To recognize the age of Vancouver calls attention to the mechanisms of colonialism that made Vancouver possible. Further, the contrast between Canada and the United States as a central component of Canadian identity is a necessary element of ongoing settler colonialism. As late Stó:lō scholar Lee Maracle states, Canadians are often shocked at the myriad of injustices towards Indigenous peoples, and that "to be a white Canadian is to be sunk in deep denial" (2017, p. 27). This purported idea of Canada is known as Canadian exceptionalism (Bryant 2017; Hamilton Spectator 2017), where the myth of Canada as either multicultural or raceless (Kwak 2020; Simpson 2016), fails to address Canada as a white settler society whose development has relied on racial and colonial hierarchies where laws and policies regulate the lives of Indigenous, Black and other racialized peoples (Kwak 2020). I contend that Vancouver as a city, specifically through the various facets of Vancouverism has only been made possible through the myth of Canadian exceptionalism. These facets include the ways in which diversity, inclusivity, and sustainability are touted as integral to Vancouverism as a concept and practice, as well as the self-image and brand of Vancouver as a city which has been made possible through Indigenous dispossession maintained through settler colonialism. As Beasley (2019) states, "Vancouverism is a truly Canadian expression" (p. 66). More detailed findings to support this will be discussed in both Chapters 4 and 5.

2.1.2. Settler/Colonial Canada & Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation'

"…A [colonial] past that we all presumably depart from… does not form a departure for Indigenous peoples because our present collapses the past, it calls up the past, as we contort still to make way for everyone else's present and future" (Simpson 2016).

Modern cities have often been shaped by processes of Indigenous dispossession and use narratives which erase Indigenous peoples in urban spaces (Mays 2022). In this way, "the settler city is premised on the ongoing displacement and containment of Indigenous bodies, peoples, ontologies, and rights" which is a self-serving fiction for the Canadian state that has real and harmful consequences for individual and collective wellbeing of Indigenous peoples (Tomiak 2017, p. 940). To date, minimal research has named

Vancouver as a settler city (Baloy 2015; Simpson & Hugill 2022; Yakashiro 2021). Thinking with various scholars who have defined and contributed to understandings of settler cities (Dorries et al. 2019; Dorries, Hugill & Tomiak 2022; Edmonds 2010; Mays 2022; Tomiak 2011, 2016, 2017, 2023) which will be further discussed in the literature review, I argue that Vancouver is a settler city which complicates its status as a 'City of Reconciliation' as well as complicates the role of planning in the city. As Blatman-Thomas and Porter (2019) assert, analyses of settler colonial cities that fail to make visible the underlying relations of race, power and space keep settler colonial relations intact. This thesis aims to make these underlying relations visible in the context of planning in Vancouver. To do this, I will first discuss various tools of erasure that have been conducted by the Canadian state, and varying conceptions of reconciliation.

The Canadian state continues to justify colonial and racial settler violence (Maracle 1988; Razack 2002) and erasure through ongoing representations of Indigenous people as inferior, savage, and uncivilized (McGregor 2018). As Simpson (2016) states, "nation-states'… ongoing political lies are predicated upon the elimination not only of Indigenous bodies, but the ongoing elimination of Indigenous political orders, governmental systems, and title to land" (11:05). In the 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP), the Canadian government acknowledged that the distorted relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples has destructive consequences for Indigenous peoples. In 1998, the Minister of Indian and Northern Development released the "Statement of Reconciliation: Learning from the Past," where the Canadian government explicitly recognized the harm caused by the Indian Residential School system. The subsequent 2006 Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement (IRSSA) announced an agreement between the Canadian government and Indigenous peoples affected by residential schools; while apparently directed toward the actual violence of this system, recapitulated the symbolic violence of settler colonialism by using payouts as an immediate solution without addressing ongoing effects. Two years later, in 2008, Prime Minister Stephen Harper presented an apology on behalf of the Canadian government for its role in residential schools, using language that shifted blame to the past Canadian government and not the current implications (McGregor 2018). Describing one of her interviews on the affects Harper's 2008 apology had on Indigenous peoples, Simpson (2016) shares that innocence and absolution from settlers is what the Canadian state was after, not absolution from Indigenous peoples. Simpson (2016) calls this

incommensurability of settler and Indigenous sovereignties market forces of sympathy: a new order of affective politics, and new modes of rendering injustice, or not. She asserts this was simply a spectacle of contrition (Simpson 2016). A year later in 2009, Harper stated that "Canada has no history of colonialism" (Shrubb 2014). Not only does this demonstrate Harper's deflection of responsibility of a 'past' event but is an example of how the Canadian government legitimizes the historical and ongoing atrocities against Indigenous peoples by dismissing colonialism and settler colonialism. In 2015, the IRRSA led to the release of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), which found Canada to remain structurally, systemically, and institutionally tied to the same racist and colonial practices of erasure, resulting in a new form of cultural genocide, defined by the TRC as the practice of destroying the political and social institutions of any group by seizing land, forcibly transferring populations, restricting their movement, banning languages, persecuting spiritual leaders, forbidding spiritual practices, stealing, and destroying objects of spiritual value to prevent cultural identities from passing through generations (2015). The intergenerational dimension of cultural genocide complicates the meaning of reconciliation.

Reconciliation in Canada is commonly understood as the federal government's relationship with Indigenous peoples, and as efforts made by individuals and institutions to raise awareness about colonization and its ongoing effects. Unlike the common definition, the TRC defines reconciliation as establishing and maintaining a mutually respectful relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and for this to be possible there must be awareness of the past, acknowledgement of the harm inflicted, atonement for what has caused these harms, and action to change behaviour (2015). Henderson and Wakeham (2009) warn that Canada's domestication of the TRC model poses risk for setting a precedent of the diluted potential of exposing human rights abuses and effects on social reform. They argue this is accomplished through a shift toward symbolic or nonperformative enactment of national reconciliation that risks obstructing redistributive justice for Indigenous peoples (Henderson & Wakeham 2009). Similarly, Vanthuyne (2021) asserts that most TRCs prioritize national reconciliation and state-building over true emancipation of victims of state-sponsored violence. She continues that promoting languages of trauma and healing renders Indigenous experiences as inevitably damaged and in turn, in need of Canada's tutelage (Vanthuyne 2021). This transfers the responsibility of addressing colonial harms from the settler state to the colonial subjects

themselves. In this way, injustice and reconciliation are framed and reduced to the issue of Indian Residential Schools which is made incomprehensible to the non-Indigenous population through the lens of personal injury rendering the creation of the Canadian political economy untethered to Indian Residential Schools (Henderson 2015; Million 2013; Simpson 2011). Contrary to neoliberal visions of reconciliation which aim to be inclusive of Indigenous peoples within Canadian polity as it is currently structured, decolonizing approaches require recognizing the reality that the Canadian state's political economy is founded on Indigenous dispossession (Simpson 2016; Wyile 2018). In comparison, recognition of decolonial approaches as integral to reconciliation is not shared by the City of Vancouver in its 'Reconciliation Framework.'

Like the TRC, the City of Vancouver states as a 'City of Reconciliation' they must acknowledge the stories of residential school survivors and recognize First Nations and Indigenous peoples' strengths and contributions to the social, economic, and cultural development of Canada (2021). Within cities, there is an urban Indigenous peoples population whose traditional homelands are elsewhere (Gosnell-Myers 2022; Peters & Andersen 2013). Even though urban Indigenous peoples are a significant part of people living in cities, knowledge of them have often been lacking within local governments who view Indigenous issues outside of their jurisdiction (Dorries 2022; Gosnell-Myers 2022; Mays 2022; Prager et al. 2023) and antithetical/absent within the city (Coulthard 2014; Edmonds 2010; Ellis-Young 2021; Gosnell-Myers 2022; Porter et al. 2017). To address this deficit approach, Nisga'a and Kwakwak'awakw planner and scholar Ginger Gosnell-Myers led the Environics Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study (UAPS) between 2008-2010 and collected voices of over 2,500 Indigenous participants to explore identities, values, experiences, and aspirations of Indigenous peoples living in 11 major cities in Canada (2022). The UAPS found that the urban Indigenous population considered the city to be their home, and that culture was a vital aspect of a healthy successful life for them (Gosnell-Myers 2022). This work led Gosnell-Myers to join the City of Vancouver in 2013, where she undertook the work of implementing the TRC and hosted the 'Walk for Reconciliation' by Reconciliation Canada. Gosnell-Myers led a city-wide policy and service review to create the 'City of Reconciliation Framework' which found new ways for the City of Vancouver to conduct work to acknowledge the unceded, unsurrendered, and ancestral lands of xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and səlilwətaɬ Nations as an effort to ensure reconciliation was reflected as a core value throughout the City (Gosnell-Myers 2022).

The City of Vancouver passed the motion to proclaim June 2013-2014 the 'Year of Reconciliation' as an effort to heal from the past and build new relationships between Indigenous peoples and all Vancouverites based on a foundation of openness, dignity, understanding and hope (2013). As its long-term goals, the City aimed to strengthen local First Nations and urban Indigenous relations, promote Indigenous peoples' arts, culture, awareness and understanding, and incorporate First Nations and urban Indigenous perspectives for effective City services (2021). While I agree that this work was crucial in making space for Indigeneity in the City of Vancouver, I also agree with Gosnell-Myer's (2022) assertion that "there is still much work and learning to do" (p. 90). While claiming to engage in ongoing work toward strengthening relationships, I contend that the City of Vancouver does not address ongoing processes of settler colonialism in the city by emphasizing that harms toward Indigenous peoples remain in the past. These ongoing processes of settler colonialism excludes the intricacies of varying Indigenous conceptions of reconciliation that exist.

For Gwawaenuk Elder Chief Dr. Robert Joseph, the leader of Reconciliation Canada, reconciliation is a process that begins with oneself, then extends in our families, relationships, workplaces and eventually our communities, emphasizing the revitalization of relationships through the use of multi-faith and multi-cultural conceptions of reconciliation in open and honest conversation (2021). In addition to this process, Chief Dr. Joseph directs our attention to reconciliation's goal as finding peace within, after acknowledging and recognizing the history of harm inflicted by Canada on Indigenous peoples in a film presentation on the language of reconciliation (Vimeo 2021). As formulations of reconciliation differ between the City of Vancouver and Indigenous peoples in Vancouver, it is imperative to recognize the varying recognitions of the term unceded.

For the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and səlilwətaɬ First Nations whose lands are what is now colonially known as Vancouver, recognizing their unceded traditional territory means recognizing that these lands were never surrendered or relinquished through treaties to the state of Canada (Atleo & Boron 2022), and that they hold the responsibility as stewards and caretakers of these territories since time immemorial. Treaties between European settlers and Indigenous peoples were varied and complex, but primarily used to secure alliances, define trading partnerships, and outline rules regarding access to lands and resources (Atleo & Boron 2022), not to forfeit Indigenous Nations' rights to their lands. Most of the territory in what is colonially known as British Columbia does not fall

under historic treaties or modern claims agreements (Atleo & Boron 2022). Various factors led to the lack of treaties in British Columbia, but Atleo and Boron (2022) contend that the treaties which solidified settler colonialism in the east of Canada made it possible for settlers to assume control without treaties in BC.

The City of Vancouver passed a motion in 2014 to formally acknowledge "the modern city of Vancouver was founded on the traditional territories of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tseil-Waututh First Nations and that these territories were never ceded through treaty, war or surrender" (City of Vancouver 2014). This recognition, though an important step, still maintains the juxtaposition between Vancouver's modernity and conceptions of Indigenous Nations' ties to the land as traditional, and neglects to recognize Vancouver as a settler-colonial city. Settler-colonial cities are founded on Indigenous dispossession and continue to reproduce the colonial relationship of displacement/replacement while purporting to care for Indigenous peoples and rights (Dorries et al. 2019; Mays 2022; Simpson 2015; Tomiak 2017). The perpetual representation of Indigenous peoples as absent and/or antithetical to urbanizing colonial environments is perpetuated by the symbolic purchase of the settler colonial city which acts as the culmination of colonial endeavors continuing to evince Indigenous presence in the city as nonexistent, incompatible, and anomalous (Coulthard 2014; Dorries 2022; Edmonds 2010; Ellis-Young 2021; Gosnell-Myers 2022; Mays 2022; Porter et al. 2017). In addition, the City's statement does not acknowledge the implications of colonization, settler colonialism and decolonization. To omit settler colonial implications is an example of purporting Canada's mythologized exceptionalism (Bryant 2017; Kwak 2020; Ladner 2019) which is a deliberate act of erasure for Indigenous histories. These varying conceptions of unceded allow for a more complicated understanding of reconciliation as it relates to the use of land, particularly through who is or is not afforded the ability to plan on the unceded territories of the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and səlilwətaɬ First Nations.

In 2013, the Urban Indigenous Peoples Advisory Committee (UIPAC) was formed to enhance access and inclusion for urban Indigenous peoples to participate in City services and civic life (City of Vancouver 2021). UIPAC consists of fifteen members deemed as representative of urban Indigenous peoples, living, or working in Vancouver, or having significant experience with issues of Vancouver (City of Vancouver 2021). In 2020, UIPAC stated that the City is failing on its 'City of Reconciliation' claim (The Tyee 2021). Soon after, UIPAC explained to the City that efforts to foster and deepen relationships committed

to reconciliation have come to a halt with anti-Indigenous racism on the rise and continued levels of systemic racism experienced across municipal institutions (2020). The UPIAC argued this shows a pattern of persistent and widespread colonial violence that impacts Indigenous peoples in Vancouver, resulting in efforts of reconciliation being disingenuous. To define a comprehensive notion of reconciliation, the distinction between urban and nonurban understandings must be recognized through acknowledging xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and səlilwətaɬ First Nations as unique in their cultures and protocols as self-determining and sovereign Nations. While the opinions of Chiefs of Musqueam and Tseil-Waututh First Nations are included, they do not encapsulate the views of each Nations' members. Chief of Tseil-Waututh Nation Jen Thomas describes reconciliation as a journey, and not simply the destination (North Shore News 2021). For Musqueam Chief Wayne Sparrow, reconciliation is impossible until the government and churches responsible for residential schools are held accountable, and this must move beyond mere apologies toward action releasing the records of those administrative bodies (Musqueam 2021).

Without specificity, it is not possible to have meaningful and lasting reconciliation in what many argue must be a continuous relationship changing over time as determined by those in the relationship being reconciled (Asch et al. 2018; Meierhenrich 2008; Reimer & Chrismas 2020; Wyile 2018). Corntassel et al. (2009) argue that the Canadian state's vision of reconciliation purports the status quo rather than rectifying Indigenous injustice, and clarify that reconciliation is a western concept with religious connotations, and as a result, Indigenous goals of reconciliation should not be to restore an asymmetrical relationship with the state but rather to restore Indigenous communities toward justice and self-determination.

2.2. Literature Review

2.2.1. Indigenous Planning

My research explores Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners' ideas of Vancouverism. In my research I use Indigenous planning to understand the differing planning methods that exist across Indigenous planners and non-Indigenous planners. The literature on Indigenous planning serves as a model through which to understand Indigenous planning

methods, Indigenous peoples place in planning, and how to make space for Indigeneity in cities.

Indigenous planning is defined as a process, approach and activity linking specific Indigenous communities to defined ancestral places, environments, and resources which uses Indigenous, as well as other, knowledges — both traditional and contemporary — contextual to whichever specific Indigenous community is planning (Matunga 2013, 2017; Walker et al. 2013). Indigenous planning has always existed despite only recently being considered an emerging paradigm in western planning contexts, and the aim of Indigenous planning broadly, “should be knowledge collaboration rather than competition, and alliance rather than combat” (Dorries 2020, 2022; Dorries et al. 2019; Matunga 2013, p. 17; Grant et al. 2019). This framing guided my decision to highlight the voices of Indigenous planners in relation to the concept of Vancouverism and how they define Indigenous planning alongside the communities of the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and səlilwətaɬ First Nations. This framing also informed me to be inclusive to non-Indigenous planners’ perspectives to remain open to possibilities of collaboration and alliance. With this in mind, Indigenous planning processes connect people, place, knowledge, values, and worldview to decisions and practices (Bouvier & Walker 2018; Matunga 2013). Overall, Indigenous planning is understood as an attempt to carve out a theoretical and practical space for Indigenous peoples and communities to do their own planning (Matunga 2013). This conceptualization aided my approach when speaking with Indigenous planners and inquiring how they carve out space for Indigenous peoples and communities to do their own planning. Additionally, Matunga (2013) contends that Indigenous planning has a place for non-Indigenous planners, and that having both Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners equipped with the “ethical fortitude, desire and skill to navigate the parallel planning worlds of Indigeneity and colonialism” is essential to Indigenous planning as an ongoing project (2013, p. 31). This important recognition that there is work for Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners in the context of Indigenous planning informed my decision to interview Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners to be open to the ways in which settler planners may or may not be forwarding decolonial approaches to planning through methods distinguished as Vancouverism or other methods.

Beyond basic recognition of acknowledging cities are on Indigenous traditional territories or homelands, municipalities still do a poor job of making space for Indigenous

sovereignty, worldview, processes, and protocols in the shared space of the city (Walker & Bouvier 2018). This understanding is of particular importance in my framing of the city of Vancouver as a settler city (Dorries et al. 2019; Tomiak 2017) which will be discussed in the following section. It led my inquiry of Vancouverism as a concept, and how the City of Vancouver naming itself as the world's first 'City of Reconciliation' complicates what the City purports as making space for Indigenous futurities. According to Walker and Bouvier (2018), future research must move beyond simple inquiries into the types of practices occurring that improve Indigenous inclusion in settler urbanism, and instead should be critical of how the rules of administrative logic are being set. Doing so offers opportunity to question whether Indigenous sovereignty is being advanced in urban governance processes, or if Indigenous inclusion is conditional upon adhering to colonial capitalism and settler authority (Walker & Bouvier 2018). This is what I aimed to accomplish in my research by critically analyzing Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation' and by investigating Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners' views of Vancouverism.

While Indigenous inclusion is often conditional to colonial capitalism and settler authority, Gosnell-Myers (2022) asserts that Indigenous urban planners and policy makers resist this contemporary colonization to create conditions for Indigenous cultural comeback in "every neighbourhood, bike path, and downtown core" (p. 80). Indigenous urban planners are making sure the next generation of city dwellers understand that they are on unceded, unsurrendered, and ancestral territories by building Indigenous knowledge into all aspects of city planning (Gosnell-Myers 2022). The work of Indigenous planners informed how I conducted my interviews and allowed me to identify positive actions toward change, rather than just focus on the negative lack of action from the City of Vancouver. To move toward positive actions between cities and Indigenous peoples, cities and their officials who want to create authentic urban identity through Indigenous culture and knowledge must recognize it is a collaborative process, co-created with Indigenous communities and led by Indigenous planners (Gosnell-Myers 2022). Gosnell-Myers (2022) asserts that urban Indigenous planning must be about creating opportunities for intergenerational cultural sharing for Indigenous self-determination to be expressed. This framing is of particular importance for my research as I aimed to critically analyze the ways in which Vancouverism deliberately excludes Indigenous conceptions of planning through mechanisms of settler colonialism, as well as identify the ways that Indigenous planners are leading positive action in Vancouver.

2.2.2. Settler Colonialism & Settler Cities

My research also explores Vancouverism and settler colonialism. To understand the ways in which settler colonialism operates in what is colonially known as Vancouver, I sought literature which defines settler colonialism, settler cities, and settler colonial violence. Tuck and Yang (2012) explain that settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism because settlers come with the intention of homemaking on land new to them which insists on settler sovereignty above all else. They continue that within settler colonialism, land is what is most contested, valued, and required because "settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital" and disrupt Indigenous relationships to land that represent an epistemological, ontological, and cosmological violence (ibid, 2012, p. 5). This conceptualization of settler colonialism relates to Coulthard's (2014) analysis of Marx's (1867) primitive accumulation, where Coulthard explains that Indigenous communities and land remain open for exploitation and capitalist development. Wolfe (2006) emphasizes, settler colonialism is a structure and not one singular event. In this way, settler colonialism is an inclusive, land-centered project with the goal of eliminating Indigenous societies (Tuck & Yang 2012; Wolfe 2006). The logic of settler colonialism produces a post-colonial society through the settlement of land and displacement of Indigenous peoples (Crosby & Monaghan 2018; Gregory 2004). Recognizing the intentional elimination and assimilation of Indigenous peoples through settler colonialism which made the state of Canada possible is integral to understanding the role of planning in settler colonialism. This recognition informed the way that I sought to identify the degree to which non-Indigenous planners are aware of this or not and allowed me to have a shared understanding of settler colonialism with Indigenous planners.

The historical and ongoing dispossession and displacement of Indigenous peoples in settler colonial contexts is foundational in understanding the production of urban space (Blatman-Thomas & Porter 2019; Mays 2022; Tomiak 2011, 2016, 2023) and that this exclusion has been by design (Gosnell-Myers 2022). If cities represent the identity of modern civilization and its power, the erasure of Indigenous peoples and knowledges from cities illustrates contemporary colonization in its modern form (Gosnell-Myers 2022). Thinking with these scholars led me toward the goal of addressing the exclusion of Indigenous peoples in planning in the city of Vancouver. Specifically, through what Tomiak (2011, 2016, 2023) terms the settler city, which is defined as varied and contested socio-spatial formations and types of urbanism that settler colonialisms have produced.

Similarly, Edmonds (2010) suggests that settler colonialism can be used as a specific analytical frame to understand the historical forces at work in the formation of settler cities as urbanizing polities. Further, Edmonds (2010) asserts that there is a distinct lack of historical scrutiny of nineteenth-century colonial cities as settler formations with distinctive political and racialized commerce that constructs Indigenous peoples in certain ways even though Indigenous histories are necessary urban histories. While Tomiak addresses Ottawa and Winnipeg as settler cities, and Edmonds addresses Victoria as a settler-colonial city, I utilize their analyses to understand Vancouver as a settler city. This framing in turn informed my document analysis and my conceptualization of urban Indigeneity in the context of Vancouver.

Both Tomiak (2011, 2016, 2023) and Edmonds' (2010) articulations of settler cities aid in understanding what Dorries et al. (2019) define as settler colonial violence, which is "the maintenance of a false distinction between urban and non-urban space, a distinction that in turn… obscure[s] linkages between urban and non-urban space through Indigenous geographies" (p. 3). This framing addresses the ways in which I hoped to highlight the varying ways that Indigeneity is not entirely recognized by non-Indigenous planners, whether intentionally or not. I distinguished recognition or not by non-Indigenous planners as whether they understood what Indigenous planning is, if they knew or worked with Indigenous planners, or if they understood Indigenous worldviews. Further, settler cities are founded on Indigenous dispossession and continue to reproduce the colonial relationship of displacement/replacement while purporting to care for Indigenous peoples and rights (Dorries et al. 2019; Dorries, Hugill & Tomiak 2022; Mays 2022; Simpson 2015; Tomiak 2023). This conceptualization of a settler city helped me understand Vancouver as a settler city specifically through the City's self-declaration as a 'City of Reconciliation' which attempts to address the history of colonization in Vancouver but does not address the city's implications in ongoing displacement and containment of Indigenous peoples, peoples, ontologies, and rights (Tomiak 2017). More broadly, settler states continue to pursue violent transformation of Indigenous land into settler property (Daigle & Ramírez 2019; Tomiak 2011). This transformation of Indigenous land into settler property has been ongoing since settlers arrived to what is now colonially known as Vancouver and continues to be justified in the name of Vancouver's self-image and brand. Additionally, settler states continue to police Indigenous placemaking and self-determination more aggressively in cities (Tomiak 2011), often purporting that urban spaces are devoid of Indigenous peoples

(Coulthard 2014; Edmonds 2010; Ellis-Young 2021; Gosnell-Myers 2022; Porter et al. 2017). Defining the ways that settler states attempt to exclude Indigenous peoples in cities informed the ways I conceptualized Indigenous planners' relationship with the concept of Vancouverism, specifically, that Vancouverism is yet another deliberate mechanism of settler colonial violence by purporting itself as an ethos of inclusivity while failing to address the unceded unsurrendered, and ancestral homelands xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and səlilwətaɬ Nations that made Vancouver possible through dispossession and displacement.

As Peters (2011) details, the conceptual and physical removal of Indigenous peoples from urban spaces as a result of colonialism perpetuates an imagined incommensurability between urban and Indigenous identities. This thesis aims to uncover whether non-Indigenous planners maintain this imagined incommensurability, and how Indigenous planners disprove this perception. According to Baloy (2016) non-Indigenous ideas of Indigenous alterity shape and are shaped by processes that render Indigeneity spectacular and/or spectral, and that settlers are implicated, whether through complicity, complacency, ignorance, or privilege, in settler colonialism. Further, Baloy (2016) explains that "Coast Salish Indigeneity was and is managed – circumscribed through policy, spatial allocation, racialization, representation practice, and conditions of inequality" (209). This assertion articulated the specific context of the First Nations in what is colonially known as Vancouver and shaped my framing of including non-Indigenous planners to delimit whether there is a clear understanding of the implications of settler colonialism in relation to Vancouverism. It is important to note that Indigenous peoples are not the only cultural community absent from the urban landscape (Gosnell-Myers 2022; Kwak 2020). In spite of this, the city is also a place where Indigenous peoples continue to make space for themselves and their relations (Gosnell-Myers 2022) and that cities are spaces where Indigenous peoples have consistently resisted and challenged normalizations of settler colonial violence (Dorries et al. 2019). These assertions are helpful to understand that efforts to dispossess and eliminate Indigenous presence in the city have not been successful, which I also sought to identify through my interviews with Indigenous planners.

2.2.3. Decolonial Urbanism

To understand ways forward for planning beyond methods that are entrenched in colonialism and settler colonialism, I sought literature which defines decolonization, decolonial planning, decolonial geography, and Indigenous urbanism. I primarily draw my understanding of decolonization from Fanon (1961) as an inherently violent process rooted in a binary between the colonized and colonizers, and that decolonization is a process that is only made clear by discerning "the movements which give it historical form and content" (p. 36). I will further discuss Fanon in the following section of this chapter which focuses on my theoretical framework. In addition, decolonization in a settler context must include the repatriation of land and relations to land that are grounded in Indigenous worldviews (Coulthard 2014; Tuck & Yang 2012). An important step towards this is recognizing that decolonizing approaches require recognizing the reality that the Canadian state's political economy is founded on Indigenous dispossession (Crosby & Monaghan 2018; Kovach 2010; Simpson 2016; Tuhiwai Smith 2013; Wyile 2018). Decolonization is unsettling and cannot be understood as a metaphor for social justice movements toward surface level inclusion of Indigenous topics, it is a process which never takes place unnoticed (Fanon 1961; Tuck & Yang 2012). These articulations are helpful for understanding the context of Vancouver as a settler city and for ways to move forward toward decolonial approaches to planning in the city. These conceptualizations informed how I sought to identify ways in which Indigenous planners are using decolonial and/or Indigenous approaches to planning. According to Dorries (2016), "a decolonized city would situate Indigenous sovereignty and resurgence at the normative centre of an anticolonial approach to planning, foregrounding Indigenous political authority" (p. 654). This framing supported my inquiry and data collection, specifically in identifying the disjuncture between Indigenous and non-Indigenous interlocutors in relation to planning in Vancouver.

I sought out literature to help contextualize decolonizing methodologies that would be applicable which I found to be within the discipline of geography. Despite good intentions, efforts at decolonizing geography are limited because colonization continues to structure the field of planning and the academy more broadly, and planning is complicit in the activities of colonization (de Leeuw & Hunt 2018; Porter et al. 2017). Decolonization demands acknowledging the diverse multitude of ways of knowing and being, undoing the privileging of non-Indigenous settler ways of knowing, however it is still often a domain of

non-Indigenous settlers (de Leeuw & Hunt 2018). In doing so, even though non-Indigenous settler planners are theorizing and enacting what they deem as decolonization, they hold a common thread of ideals that are often disconnected from actual Indigenous peoples, voices, and places (de Leeuw & Hunt 2018). Often, these planners might be locating themselves in an active colonial context but fail to cite Indigenous scholars engaged in this work. This recognition aided my approach when interviewing non-Indigenous planners in Vancouver to attempt to identify ways in which they might still be perpetuating settler colonial planning approaches. De Leeuw & Hunt (2018) contend that inside and outside of the academy, Indigenous peoples challenge planners' notions of settler colonialisms' spatiality and contemporary Indigeneity by insisting Indigenous agency, survivance, and futurity. This assertion was helpful for recognizing the ways that Indigenous planners spoke of decolonial planning during interviews.

Daigle and Ramírez (2019) understand decolonial geographies to be a diverse and interconnected landscape grounded in particularities of place that begin with Indigenous lands, waters, and peoples from which a geography emerges. They explain that these places are simultaneously shaped by radical traditions of resistance and liberation that are embodied by Black, Latinx, Asian and other racialized communities (Daigle & Ramírez 2019). Drawing on Simpson (2017), Daigle and Ramírez (2019) explain that decolonial geographies must be formed as place-based constellations in theory and practice to foreground Indigenous experiential knowledge and relations with humans and nonhumans (Coulthard 2014; Coulthard & Simpson 2016). The concept of decolonial geographies relates to the examples of Indigenous planning in Vancouver that illustrate Indigenous peoples place-based and culturally specific approaches to planning which will be discussed in Chapter 6. As Daigle and Ramírez (2019) reaffirm, urban spaces "are part of Indigenous geographies despite relentless reframing by white proprietary logics and practices" (p. 2). This reaffirmation is congruent with Dorries et al. (2019) who explain that Indigenous peoples continue to make space for themselves and their relations despite settler colonial violence which frames Indigenous peoples as non-urban.

Porter et al. (2017) state that without an honest account of the histories that shaped shared futures through colonialism, work toward decolonization cannot occur. The urban context is seen as a condition of Indigenous extermination (Porter et al. 2017). As Gosnell-Myers (2022) articulates, city planners have furthered these goals of elimination and cultural genocide in the name of urban progress. This framing guided the way I approached

learning about Vancouverism in relation to Indigeneity in Vancouver, and whether it excludes Indigenous peoples and Indigenous planning on the basis of Indigenous extermination. Additionally, subjecting Indigenous peoples merely as stakeholders, not actual contributors, is insufficient (Porter et al. 2017; Walker 2017). To combat this approach, Nejad et al. (2018) offer the concept of Indigenous urbanism. They explain that Indigenous urbanism expands the scope of spatial production to include the recognition of what Indigeneity brings to the social and cultural life of cities, as well as how room can be made for enacting Indigenous self-determination. They continue, “Indigenous urbanism includes creating a material and discursive sense of place for Indigenous inhabitants in the everyday lived experience of the city, as well as examining where authority to act resides in planning and policy-making processes” (Nejad et al. 2018, p. 417). The authors assert that prioritizing Indigenous inhabitants’ lived knowledge over often abstracted municipal officials’ knowledge has the capacity to shift spatial production processes toward the loved space of Indigenous peoples which ultimately challenges the structures of power over producing urban space and place. Overall, Indigenous inclusion in planning is contingent upon meaningful, respectful, and reciprocal relationships which relates to Fanon’s (1961) decolonization through restoring Indigenous dignity above all else, including repatriation of Indigenous land and life (Tuck & Yang 2012), as well as Coulthard’s (2014) notion of grounded normativity which reorients the struggle of Indigenous peoples as a struggle for the repatriation of land which is a reciprocal system of relations and obligation.

2.2.4. Reconciliation’s Political Context in Vancouver

To understand reconciliation’s political context in Vancouver, I sought literature to define reconciliation, which vary across Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars. This can render implementing reconciliation a difficult project but is necessary for reconciliation to be meaningful and specific to place, nation, and/or community. Without specificity, it is not possible to have meaningful and lasting reconciliation in what many argue must be a continuous relationship changing over time as determined by those in the relationship being reconciled (Asch et al. 2018; Meierhenrich 2008; Reimer & Chrismas 2020; Wyile 2018). Drawing from Indigenous scholars, O’Donnell & Perley (2016) state that if “decolonization is about land, then reconciliation is also about land” (p. 476). This relates to Fanon’s (1961) conceptualization of decolonization, Tuck and Yang’s (2012) extension

of decolonization, and Coulthard's (2014) notion of grounded normativity which I assert are both necessary concepts for understanding reconciliation in the following section. Additionally, Canada as a nation state must come to terms with the fact that the Canadian economy is maintained by resources taken from Indigenous lands (Coulthard 2014; O'Donnell & Perley 2016). To begin meaningful reconciliation (Asch et al. 2018) we must understand how to reconcile our conflicting desires which will determine our collective future (O'Donnell & Perley 2016). It is the responsibility of all people in Canada to educate themselves about the history of colonialism and its ongoing effects to begin reconciling relationships between Indigenous peoples and settlers. This assertion informed how I conducted my document analysis and interviews by highlighting the ways that non-Indigenous planners did not take responsibility to move toward meaningful reconciliation.

According to Short (2005), reconciliation processes should work without the assumption that settler and Indigenous communities should become one nation, or that Indigenous peoples wish to share in the settler state's worldviews. To recognize Indigenous communities and Nations' specific worldviews and reject the idea that Indigenous peoples wish to assimilate into Canadian worldviews relates to Fanon's (1961) phenomenon of mockery. In relation to decolonization Fanon's (1961) phenomenon of mockery is when colonized peoples insult and dismiss the values of the colonizers which can be regarded as an extension of Indigenous sovereignty and how it operates. The rejection of settler colonial worldviews is evidenced through understanding Indigenous sovereignty as an assertion of Indigenous communities and nations' ability and right to self-determination and self-governance that refuse settler colonial laws and policies involuntarily forced upon them. By asserting Indigenous sovereignty, the values of the colonizing population are scrutinized among communities and nations.

Comparatively, reconciliation between Indigenous peoples and the Crown requires collective reconciliation with the earth, which can be achieved through the resurgence of Indigenous peoples' own laws, governments, economies, education, relations to the living earth, ways of knowing and being, and treaty relationships (Alfred 2009; Asch et al. 2018; Corntassel et al. 2009; Ladner 2019; Simpson 2011). Reconciliation begins with an apology, rather than ending with one, extending beyond one act of forgiveness into an ongoing national project (Ladner 2019). In other words, reconciliation is a project that allows all peoples and nations to exist while determining how to live together on Indigenous lands. Ladner (2019) contends that this can only be achieved if a

transformation of consciousness occurs, wherein Canada not only confronts its past but also its mythologized exceptionalism. The concept of Canada's mythologized exceptionalism helps to understand ways that settler colonial mechanisms are present in planning in Vancouver and informed my ability to identify examples of Canadian exceptionalism in my document analysis and interview analysis.

Viswanathan (2017, 2018) asserts that rather than focusing on lost opportunities of reconciliation, there is value focusing on the liminal spaces where mutual relationships, responsibilities, and accountabilities to each other as settlers and Indigenous peoples are redefined. This notion guided my analysis of Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation' as a reminder to highlight positive actions toward change that continue to be implemented by Indigenous peoples and planners in Vancouver. As Moreton-Robinson (2015) states, contradictions that exist between different ways of knowing can dominate when state-based planning practices are founded on the premises that Indigenous peoples, cultures, and lands are reified as property. Thinking with this contradiction, Viswanathan (2017) asserts that "Counterhegemonic practices in critical thought and action that oppose a 'naturalization' of colonial power relations are vital to transforming planning pedagogy and the planning profession" (p. 645). These articulations informed my approach when speaking with planners in Vancouver to begin to identify whether planners I spoke with were opposed to the naturalization of colonial power relations, or whether they were complicit in these power relations. To guide my understanding of ways forward toward reconciliation in Vancouver, I drew on Gosnell-Myers (2022) and Nejad et al. (2018) assertion that the coexistence of settlers and Indigenous peoples in relation to reconciliation is dependent on enabling urban Indigenous peoples to guide urban governance, spatial planning, and the built environment of Canadian cities. In Chapter 7, I contribute concrete examples of Indigenous planning which illustrate Indigenous guidance on urban governance, spatial planning, and the built environment of Vancouver.

2.2.5. Conclusion

This literature review aimed to examine the existing body of literature across several specific themes on urban Indigenous planning of particular importance to my inquiries: Indigenous Planning, Settler Colonialism & Settler Cities, Decolonial Urbanism, and Reconciliation's Political Context in Vancouver. These themes informed my methods, data collection, and code themes for data analysis.

2.3. Overarching Research Questions

This thesis asks three key research questions: (1) In the context of naming itself as the world's first 'City of Reconciliation,' what does the globally recognized term Vancouverism mean for Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners?, (2) How do the actions and perspectives of Indigenous planners help rethink what Vancouverism means in the context of Vancouver, being named the world's first 'City of Reconciliation'?, and (3) What collaborations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners are possible, and what might they mean for Vancouverism?

2.4. Theoretical Framework

For my theoretical framework, I focused on Frantz Fanon's (1961) term decolonization in relation to Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation.' To extend Fanon's decolonization into the contemporary North American Indigenous context, I draw on Unangax̂ scholar Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang's (2012) continuation that decolonization is not a metaphor, and Yellowknives Dene scholar Glen Sean Coulthard's (2014) notion of grounded normativity to ensure recognition-based approaches to Indigenous self-determination in Canada informed my work. To think through how Vancouverism as a concept is incompatible with the City of Vancouver's reconciliation work, I first consider Fanon's decolonization.

Fanon (1961) posits that a structure of dominance is maintained through unforgiving forms of violence and defines decolonization as an always inherently violent process rooted in a binary between the colonized and colonizers. He delineates the first encounter between the native and the settler as marked by violence and exploitation of the native on the account of the settler. He explains that the settler is who has brought the native identity into existence. This is because the settler existence is only materialized through the stealing of native land and claiming it as settler property, which is otherwise known as the colonial system (1961). Not only achieved by forced removal of the native, but the settler also paints the native as evil and devoid of ethics and values, justifying settler claims to native land (1961). Additionally, Fanon sees the settler as describing the native as "bereft of all humanity" utilizing zoological terms (1961, p. 42). In the settler's perspective, this justifies the process of colonization by which the settler mobilizes as a natural phenomenon. Fanon understands decolonization as a violent revolutionary process that cannot be achieved without force. This allows for the ongoing and historical process of

colonization to be thwarted particularly in the sense that the most important element of decolonization for Fanon is native land being restored, resulting in the reclaiming of native dignity above all else.

As an extension of Fanon's decolonization into the settler colonial North American context, Tuck and Yang (2012) explain that decolonization is about the repatriation of Indigenous land and life. In the context of Vancouver, the exclusion of the repatriation of land in the City of Vancouver's 'Reconciliation Framework' renders reconciliation incomplete in relation to Indigenous conceptions of decolonization which assert that decolonization is a necessary element of reconciliation (Tuck & Yang 2012). In addition, Tuck and Yang (2012) explain that decolonization cannot be reduced to a metaphor for social justice struggles that do not relate to Indigenous struggles for self-determination. To metaphorize decolonization allows for what Tuck and Yang (2012) define as settler moves to innocence "that problematically attempt to reconcile settler guilt and complicity, and rescue settler futurity" (p. 1). Similarly, for Tuck and Yang (2012), reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy and futurity, concerning itself around what the consequences of decolonization are for the settler. Tuck and Yang (2012) assert that decolonization as a framework still exists without answers to these concerns. In this way, decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity, which should also be the goals of reconciliation. For the City of Vancouver's 'Reconciliation Framework,' these goals that should include decolonization are not addressed.

While Canada does describe reconciliation as a process tied to raising awareness about colonization and its ongoing effects, the City of Vancouver has failed to provide ongoing engagement of raising awareness of decolonization. I argue that like decolonization, reconciliation must at the very least be disruptive by unsettling what settlers use as moves to innocence, which Tuck and Yang (2012) describe as moves that attempt to deny and deflect complicity in settler colonialism and relieve guilt or responsibility without giving up land, power, or privilege. This unsettling, ultimately decolonization, can only be accomplished through settlers accepting the reality that they directly and indirectly benefit from the erasure and assimilation of Indigenous peoples (Tuck & Yang 2012). Failing to address the ongoing systematic oppression against Indigenous peoples in what is colonially known as Vancouver fails to reconcile or revitalize relationships between Indigenous peoples and Vancouverites. Not accounting for the violence of colonialism that is ongoing within the city of Vancouver is an unforgivable oversight in the City's efforts for

reconciliation. In his speech announcing Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation', Mayor Gregor Robertson asserted that reconciling will be achieved through "the work of healing from the past and finding a new pathway forward" (City of Vancouver 2013). This explicitly understands colonialism as an event of the past, rather than what it really is: ongoing. Further, failing to recognize the colonial system that has allowed for Vancouver to function, and the mechanisms of settler colonialism continuing to operate, discredits what the City defines as reconciliation.

To further varying conceptualizations of reconciliation in Vancouver and Vancouverism, Coulthard's (2014) notion of grounded normativity must be taken into consideration to extend and refine Fanon's (1961) decolonization to encapsulate contemporary Indigenous understandings of reconciliation. He defines grounded normativity as a place-based cultural foundation executed through reorienting the struggle of Indigenous peoples as a struggle for the land as a reciprocal system of relations and obligations. Grounded normativity encompasses decolonial thought and practice as Indigenous land-connected practices and longstanding experiential knowledge that inform ethical engagements with the world and relationships with human and nonhumans (Coulthard 2014). To elucidate grounded normativity, I will explain Karl Marx's thesis of primitive accumulation from Capital (1867) alongside his social process of proletarianization. On Coulthard's account, Marx's theory of primitive accumulation highlights the violent nature that occurs from transitioning from a feudal society to a capitalist society. Marx emphasized social relations in England and often illustrated primitive accumulation as an occurrence confined to a particular period. For Coulthard, Marx's primitive accumulation was a dual process: proletarianization as a result of accumulating capital through violent state possession (2014). The process of proletarianization describes the social process in which a class of workers enter the exploitative realm of wage labour for their survival produced by the dispossession of Indigenous land which were turned into private resources (2014). Coulthard explains that in Marx's Capital (1867), violent acts of dispossession were a precursor for proletarianization, however, Coulthard asserts that while primitive accumulation no longer requires the explicit dispossession of Indigenous communities and their land, it does still demand that both the communities and land remain open for exploitation and capitalist development (2014). While Coulthard contends that Marx's thesis of primitive accumulation still holds relevant in relation to state and industry forces that discipline Indigenous life, he expands Marx's thesis and argues that dispossession

has been the dominant structure shaping the historical relationship between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian state—not proletarianization (2014). Coulthard explains Indigenous struggles are primarily oriented around land and resisting dispossession, not only as a struggle for land materially, but also what the land can teach about living in relation to one another in non-dominating and non-exploitative terms as a system of reciprocal relations (2014). For Coulthard, grounded normativity stems from this place-based cultural foundation which represents the modalities of Indigenous land-connected practices, as well as enduring experiential knowledge which includes relations and obligations to the human and nonhuman world alike (Coulthard 2014; Coulthard & Simpson 2016).

As it is currently understood, Vancouverism never had to address issues of reconciliation due to the timing of its inception. This excuse of 'the past being of a different time' will be further addressed in Chapter 6, where I will draw on non-Indigenous planners' articulations of this justification. However, while these claims are maintained by some, the City of Vancouver itself claims to still be in an era of Vancouverism. If this is the case, it renders the City's status as a 'City of Reconciliation' incompatible with itself. I contend that Vancouverism perpetuates settler colonial modes of city making and governance premised on Indigenous erasure, and so too does the notion of a 'City of Reconciliation' which renders it an impossibility in relation to Indigenous conceptions of reconciliation and decolonization. Beyond optics, the City's self-declaration as the world's first 'City of Reconciliation' does not encompass repatriation of Indigenous land (Tuck & Yang 2012) which does not move toward decolonization. What the City of Vancouver contends as their attempt of reconciling Indigenous peoples and Vancouverites' relationships is impossible when they do not address the means of dispossession which allowed for the city's creation. This makes the City's attempt at reconciliation incomplete concerning Indigenous land-connected practices which are the foundation for Indigenous methods of reconciliation and decolonization that are not possible without one another.

Chapter 3. Methodology

In this chapter, I will first define the document analysis method, present the research questions that guided my document analysis, then discuss the process in which I conducted it and the themes that emerged. Second, I will define and explain why I chose to conduct conversational and semi-structured interviews, present the research questions that guided both styles of interviews, then discuss the process of conducting them and the themes that emerged from this analysis.

3.1. Document Analysis

I chose to analyze Larry Beasley's (2019) *Vancouverism* text as an artifact, which is defined as physical evidence (O'Leary 2014), in order to give voice and meaning to the understanding of Vancouverism as a planning term in relation to Indigeneity and Indigenous planning in "Vancouver." A document analysis is a form of qualitative research where documents are interpreted by the researcher to give voice and meaning in relation to an assessment topic (Bowen 2009). The intention of this method was to further my understanding of planning grounded in Vancouverism and if it explicitly or implicitly denies Indigenous knowledges and way of knowing and/or exclude the First Nations on whose unceded, unsurrendered and ancestral lands have been developed much without their consent or inclusion.

3.1.1. Guiding Questions

The questions I aimed to answer through the document analysis were: (1) What is the place of Indigenous peoples in the text, and how are they referred to? and (2) What is the role of settler colonialism in organizing the text?

3.1.2. Process

I conducted the document analysis to contextualize dominant understandings of Vancouverism before conducting interviews to be prepared to discuss these ideas with planners with or without knowledge of Vancouverism. While I view *Vancouverism* (2019) as an artefact which demonstrates a settler colonial worldview, this is something that I have perceived myself as the researcher without direct communication with the author.

With this in mind, it is important to understand that I am not critiquing the author specifically, rather I am calling attention to the dominant discourse of Vancouverism as a concept and practice in relation to the ways it did not, and as I argue currently does not, recognize Indigenous planning, Indigenous planners, or urban Indigenous peoples.

As an effort to avoid selectivity by relying solely on deriving data from my chosen document (Bowen 2009; Morgan 2022), I used the document analysis as a supplementary method for the semi-structured and conversational interviews. While I conducted the document analysis, I kept in mind my lived experience as an Indigenous person with the bias of viewing materials for the ways they often exclude Indigenous knowledges and worldviews to be aware of the ways I might interpret this when it is not occurring. Additionally, what I interpreted through my analysis, as well as the codes I created, might not align with others' interpretations.

To conduct the document analysis, I created themes using thematic analysis (Bowen 2009), first based on the literature review, and created the rest iteratively as I read the text and allowed new themes to emerge. Additionally, I used textual analysis by noting occurrences (O'Leary 2014) to be critical of the language used, the language missing, and the stories represented or unrepresented. To code the themes and occurrences, I used NViVo 12, which allowed me to create codes for each theme/occurence and organize the text by highlighting passages which I deemed fit under the codes I created. This allowed me to see how many passages fit under each theme and occurrence so that I could narrow them down. After narrowing the themes and occurrences, I created a master list of all passages under thematic analysis and occurrences and went through the quotes to deduce which I felt answered the research questions I initially posed. These findings will be discussed in Chapter 4.

3.2. Semi-Structured & Conversational Interviews

The goal of interviewing both Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners was to reach an understanding of any discrepancies between their conceptions of Vancouverism, and what implications this has for the disjuncture between Vancouver planning processes and addressing planning that takes place on the unceded, unsurrendered, and ancestral homelands xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and səlilwətaɬ Nations. I purposefully chose two different interview structures for Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners which is

informed by decolonizing methodologies (Tuhiwai Smith 2013). To begin decolonizing our methodologies as researchers, Tuhiwai Smith (2013) states that we must understand the deep implications that exist within the histories of research and knowledge production when conducting research with Indigenous peoples. This was a conscious recognition to ensure I did not conduct research in an extractive way, and to allow Indigenous interlocutors to guide the conversations we had so they were able to share what was relevant to them, as well as recognize the violent history of research on Indigenous peoples, rather than with/alongside then. Specifically, as an Indigenous researcher, it was imperative that I remained clear about my intentions with Indigenous interlocutors and maintained a critical analysis of my own processes during all stages of the research to uphold Indigenous methodologies (Tuhiwai Smith 2013; Kovach 2000, 2010).

To engage with Indigenous interlocutors, I grounded my method of interview in Kovach's (2010) conversational method which is defined as being linked to a particular Indigenous knowledge, situated within an Indigenous paradigm, relational, purposeful, often with a decolonizing aim, involving protocol determined by the epistemology and/or space, is informal and flexible, collaborative and dialogic, as well as reflexive. These principles informed how I created my interview guide for Indigenous interlocutors focusing on themes to help guide the conversation, but not being tied to following the guide allowing Indigenous interlocutors to shape the discussion. My goal was not to allow the discussion with non-Indigenous planners to be as flexible as with Indigenous planners to amplify Indigenous voices. I did allow the conversation to naturally progress, but it was not my interest to offer non-Indigenous planners the same platform as Indigenous planners.

3.2.1. Guiding Questions

The questions I aimed to answer through conversational and semi-structured interviews were: (1) What do Indigenous planners think of Vancouverism, in general, and in relation to Vancouver's status as a 'City of Reconciliation?,' (2) What do non-Indigenous planners think of Vancouverism, in general, and in relation to Vancouver's status as a 'City of Reconciliation?,' (3) Are there serious discrepancies between Indigenous planners and non-Indigenous planners' conceptualizations of Vancouverism, and if so, what are they?, (4) Do settler planners recognize decolonial approaches to planning in relation to the mechanisms of Vancouverism? How do they or how do they not?, and (5) Does

Vancouverism as an ethos exclude Indigenous conceptions of planning or not? What forms does this exclusion or inclusion take?

These questions help answer the overarching questions of this thesis first by identifying what Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners' think of Vancouverism generally and in the context of Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliaition.' Second, by addressing the discrepancies and/or parallels between Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners' conceptions and views of Vancouverism, it begins to answer how Indigenous planners help rethink or renew what Vancouverism could mean in a 'City of Reconciliation.' Third, discovering how, or how not, non-Indigenous planners recognize Indigenous and decolonial approaches to planning in general and in relation to Vancouverism helps identify possible collaborations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners. Finally, investigating whether or not Vancouverism as an ethos excludes Indigenous planning through settler colonialism and/or settler colonial violence addresses what is possible for the future of Indigenous planning in Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation.'

3.2.2. Process

I used my research questions to inform the kinds of questions I included in the interview guides, making separate guides for Indigenous and non-Indigenous interlocutors. They began with an introduction section for interlocutors to introduce themselves, their work, and their education and/or experience, followed by themes of planning in Vancouver, Vancouverism, and reconciliation and Indigenous planning. After the interview guides were completed and approved by the SFU Office of Research Ethics, I shared these themes when recruiting both Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners through email to clearly gauge interest. To find interlocutors, I researched planners in Vancouver through the City of Vancouver website, the Vancouver Parks Board website, LinkedIn, SFU Urban Studies and Geography directories, and through UBC's School of Community and Regional Planning directory. The criteria I looked for when choosing who to contact was those with experience or knowledge of planning in Vancouver, Indigenous planning, Indigenous planners, and/or experience with Vancouverism. All planners I contacted had their emails publicly available, and this is how I initially contacted them with an email explaining my position and project between September and November 2022. I shared my Indigenous identity with all potential Indigenous interlocutors in the initial email but chose to omit this information with non-Indigenous planners. This was a conscious choice to ensure

transparency with Indigenous interlocutors that I did not feel necessary to include for non-Indigenous interlocutors. I based this decision on my own lived experience as an Indigenous person who does not fit most people's conceptions of Indigeneity, which often results in non-Indigenous people sharing things they would not share if they knew I was Indigenous.

Once interlocutors responded with interest, I shared the consent form for which I required a digital signature, to ensure they were informed that the SFU Office of Research Ethics had designated this study minimal risk and of the ways in which I would anonymize their identity unless they stated desire to be named. I obtained their permission to record and transcribe their interviews, as well as explained that this data would be stored on my personal laptop in locked folders only I had access to. Participants were able to remove themselves and data derived from their interviews until the point that transcriptions were complete.

While I initially planned to interview five Indigenous and five non-Indigenous planners, due to scheduling and availability, I ended up interviewing four non-Indigenous planners and three Indigenous planners. Indigenous planners were fewer and more difficult to identify. The first interview was conducted in October 2022 and the last interview was conducted in January 2023. Most interviews were conducted over Zoom, except for one non-Indigenous and one Indigenous planner that were available to meet in person. Those conducted over Zoom were recorded through Zoom's recording tool, and those in person were recorded with a recording device. Interviews across both Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners varied from 40 minutes to 1 hour and 40 minutes, but the majority were around 1 hour. To transcribe the interviews, those conducted over Zoom were automatically transcribed using the closed-captions tool, however needed significant editing. The two interviews conducted in person were transcribed manually. Once transcriptions were completed, I offered both Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners the opportunity to view a copy of their transcripts and to remove anything should they choose as an effort to remain as collaborative and non-extractive as possible, and only one non-Indigenous interlocutor asked to remove a certain topic from their transcription.

After completing the transcriptions, I used NViVo 12 to code them thematically. For these themes I drew on themes I created initially and iteratively during the document analysis process, and iteratively added themes while analyzing the transcripts. After finalizing

coding on NVivo 12, I created a master list of interview quotes divided thematically and narrowed down the quotes I wanted to highlight by those I found most relevant to the overarching research questions. These findings will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4. Document Analysis Findings

In this chapter, I will first discuss the conceptions of Indigeneity present in the *Vancouverism* (2019) text to demonstrate a damage-centered (Tuck 2009) approach when discussing or mentioning Indigenous peoples. Second, I will discuss *Vancouverism's* (2019) complicity in settler colonialism through various occurrences present in the text. It is important to note that I am not offering critique of the author, I am highlighting the rhetoric that I have observed in this text which I argue is a relevant to Vancouverism as a concept and how it relates to settler colonialism, and non-Indigenous planners' views of the concept and practice and attests to the ignorance of Indigenous inclusion at many levels within the city historically and contemporaneously.

4.1. Damage-Centered Conceptions of Indigeneity

This theme addresses guiding question (1) What is the place of Indigenous peoples in the text, and how are they referred to? Damage-centered research is research that operates with a flawed theory of change, usually used to justify repartitions for marginalized communities while at the same time reinforcing a one-dimensional understanding of Indigenous peoples as depleted, ruined, and hopeless (Tuck 2009). Whether a damage-centered framework is intentional or not, it still has consequences, and the characterization of victim imposed on Indigenous communities frame them as sites of disinvestment and dispossession, and communities become spaces that are under resourced as a regular and reoccurring circumstance (Tuck 2009). I applied this understanding of damage-centered research to language within *Vancouverism* (2019) to highlight the ways in which Indigenous peoples are only mentioned within the framework of damage or deficit. I contend that this demonstrates the exclusion of Indigenous knowledges and worldviews within the conceptualization of Vancouverism rendering it, as it is currently understood, incompatible with Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation,' especially since the text was published after Vancouver declared itself a 'City of Reconciliation.'

In total, 'Indigenous' was mentioned in 8 different instances, and 'First Nations' mentioned in 3 instances where only one instance was not in the same statement as 'Indigenous'. The first mention of Indigenous peoples in the text was in relation to Vancouver's

Downtown Eastside (DTES), a neighborhood that has a long history as a site where researchers have exploited community members for their benefit using damage-centered research (Boilevin et al. 2021; Tuck 2009):

> [The DTES] had become a low-income district, home to poor families, older resource workers, Indigenous people, very modest-income service employees, and new immigrants. It was also home to residents whom social workers would describe as at risk due to mental illness, substance abuse, or other disabilities, and to people who were just “worked out” in the punishing labour jobs in the resource hinterland of the province (Beasley 2019, p. 190).

In this passage it is not only Indigenous peoples which are portrayed as defeated and broken (Tuck 2009), but the various other community members who make up the Downtown Eastside. This damage-centered language is congruent throughout the book when discussing the DTES and Indigenous peoples, evidenced by another statement further in the text:

> Adding to the population at risk in the Downtown Eastside were teens and young adults pulverized by drug addiction, along with the mentally tortured people that many analysts saw as self-medicating with those same drugs. This simply compounded the impacts of alcohol addiction that had long been a reality of the Downtown Eastside, particularly hitting older resource workers simply spent from hard labour and Indigenous people (Beasley 2019, p. 231).

As Tuck (2009) explains, the danger in damage-centered research is that it is pathologizing in the way that oppression is used to singularly define a community. This passage is also indicative of one of Tuck and Yang’s (2012) settler moves to innocence which they define as A(s)t(e)risk peoples, where Indigenous peoples are described as ‘at risk’ peoples “on the verge of extinction, culturally and economically bereft, [and] engaged or soon-to-be engaged in self-destructive behaviours” (p. 22). Additionally, Tuck and Yang (2012) explicate that Indigenous peoples also become asterisk peoples, where they are represented only on the margins of research which does not account for Indigenous politics, concerns, or epistemologies. In relation to damage-centered conceptions of Indigeneity in the text, there are many instances which further the rhetoric that Indigenous peoples are absent and/or antithetical to urbanizing colonial environments like Vancouver, evincing Indigenous presence in the city as nonexistent, incompatible, and anomalous (Coulthard 2014; Dorries 2022; Edmonds 2010; Ellis-Young 2021; Gosnell-Myers 2022; Mays 2022; Porter et al. 2017):

> Although long a site of Indigenous villages, little remains except what might be discovered by archaeologists (Beasley 2019, p. 259).

This statement perpetuates the logic of settler colonialism through Indigenous displacement (Crosby & Monaghan 2018; Gregory 2004) and the erasure of Indigeneity (Dorries et al. 2019) in Vancouver by stating that the only remaining evidence of Indigeneity in the city lies under the surface and is strictly in the past. Another telling statement of the exclusion of Indigenous knowledges and worldviews in the context of Vancouverism as a concept is when Beasley (2019) explains:

> …we continue to struggle with the place of Indigenous communities within the city, including redressing the undeniable wrongs of the past. But, generally speaking, except for the knotty issues for First Nations that remain a fundamental challenge, when you compare our day-to-day experience of cultural and ethnic diversity with that of many cities, Vancouver has found its footing, at least from the point of view of city planning and the urban issues I discuss in this book (p. 222).

Despite the "knotty issues for First Nations that remain a fundamental challenge," Vancouver has supposedly mediated its cultural and ethnic diversity in comparison to other cities. To describe Indigenous-settler relations in Vancouver as "knotty issues" is to imply in non-specific language that Indigenous peoples are a problem that is too difficult to solve. This statement also alleviates the responsibility and impact city planning and urban issues have on Indigenous peoples in relation to Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation'. If the City has declared itself as such, how is it that the struggle for Indigenous reconciliation is not explicitly mentioned in a text that is describing the globally recognized term Vancouverism and boasting its appealing features. Two instances further my interpretation of this exclusion:

> …no one felt it was necessary or appropriate to use civic planning policy to shape or diversify any kind of cultural or ethnic social mix — even though some people say that we could have done more to integrate Indigenous communities (Beasley 2019, p. 223).

> Another issue where we were lax in our planning agenda was in our relations with Indigenous communities, the First Nations that share this land with us. There was very little content in our work that tied in with Indigenous culture or current issues. We certainly did not pursue partnerships with First Nations… It was not that we were biased against this important sector. We simply didn't reach out, and nor did they. I regret that. Now, as these groups have found a positive way to position their interests in land and development, and as society becomes more sensitive, there are significant opportunities to work together (Beasley 2019, p. 371).

These statements demonstrate an ignorance of Indigenous peoples in the city, rendering Indigeneity nonexistent (Coulthard 2014; Dorries 2022; Edmonds 2010; Ellis-Young 2021; Gosnell-Myers 2022; Mays 2022; Porter et al. 2017) in relation to Vancouverism as a concept and practice. Stating that First Nations share this land with settlers is an assertion

of erasure and settler claims to Indigenous land (Daigle & Ramírez 2019; Tomiak 2017; Tuck & Yang 2012) which renders the implications of the unceded and unsurrendered territories of the xʷməθkwəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and Səlílwətaɬ First Nations who have stewarded these lands since time immemorial out of view. This furthers a settler colonial mindset which purports an inherent right to the lands which have never been ceded through treaty (Atleo & Boron 2022; Gosnell-Myers 2022), relating to the terra nullius mindset (Dorries et al. 2019) which will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

While there is exclusionary and damage-centered language, Beasley (2019) does offer that there are significant opportunities for Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners to work together which is congruent with Matunga's (2013) assertion that the future of Indigenous planning should be focused on possibilities of collaboration and alliance rather than competition and combat, despite being an afterthought which offers hope toward a future of Indigenous planning in Vancouver.

4.2. Complicity, Complacency, Ignorance or Privilege?

This theme addresses guiding question (2) What is the role of settler colonialism in organizing the text? In line with Baloy's (2016) assertion of settlers' implication in settler colonialism, whether through complicity, complacency, ignorance, or privilege, *Vancouverism* (2019) is implicated in settler colonialism which is illustrated in three occurrences throughout the text. The first being the few shortcomings mentioned by the author as instances where planners should have done better, the second being the boasting of diversity and inclusivity as a foundational facet of Vancouverism as a concept, the third occurrence which uses Canadian exceptionalism to boast Vancouver's multicultural diversity, and finally settler colonialism and settler colonial violence. These instances prove a certain ignorance of the time in the early 2000s Vancouverism era which relates to how Vancouverism as a practice is incompatible with Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation.' This incompatibility is made clear through the City of Vancouver's current assertion that it is still immersed in Vancouverism (2014), despite some planners' assertions that the Vancouverism era is over.

The following two passages highlight some of the mentioned shortcomings when Beasley (2019) discusses the neglect of the Downtown Eastside (DTES):

> The life tragedy of the mentally ill and addicted has not abated and is there every day for all to see. The poor are poorer, and their plight is in such harsh contrast to that of Vancouver's rich, who are richer. The whole social fabric and physical fabric of the Downtown Eastside seems more frayed than ever. And that is really not good enough in a city that prides itself in all its other city-building achievements. We should have done better (Beasley 2019, p. 232).

> The Downtown Eastside, regardless of city hall efforts and local advocacy efforts, remains the negative contrast to the progressive story of Vancouverism (Beasley 2019, p. 233).

To maintain that Vancouverism is progressive even though the planning practice created conditions which allowed for the DTES to be neglected is a demonstration of the ignorance of the time period in which the Vancouverism era was first being implemented. In doing so, the maintenance of Vancouverism as progressive also perpetuates a damage-centered (Tuck 2009) narrative of the DTES by focusing on the "tragedy of the mentally ill and addicted" (Beasley 2019, p. 230). This damage approach is linked to the maintenance of settler colonialism in the city of Vancouver.

Similar to these assertions, it is stated throughout the text that Vancouverism was implemented in a way to allow all kinds of people to live in the downtown core. It is never specified how this was achieved and what was meant by all kinds of people. What might seem diverse to the author and the planners of that time may not be reflective of what all planners or community members might expect in this statement, which renders this assertion incomplete.

A passage which demonstrates the diversity and inclusivity rhetoric that also relates to Canadian exceptionalism (Bryant 2017; Hamilton Spectator 2017; Kwak 2020) is when Beasley (2019) states:

> Canada is now one of the most multicultural nations in the world, and ethnic diversity is the norm in all of our urban regions. Vancouver and Toronto are the most identified multicultural cities in the country, and they enjoy their cultural diversity in relative harmony (p. 221).

This discussion of cultural and ethnic diversity fails to mention the many contentions that exist within the city of Vancouver when it comes to respectful and responsible inclusion of Indigenous peoples, however this is not exclusive to Indigenous peoples in the city as exclusion of many other cultures and ethnicities have been a part of Vancouver's history (Kwak 2020; Gosnell-Myers 2022).

Various facets of Vancouverism have only been made possible through the myth of Canadian exceptionalism. This myth of Canada as multicultural or raceless (Kwak 2020; Simpson 2016) has allowed for settler colonial logic to remain at the forefront through legitimized racism (Roberston 2015). Robertson (2015) explains that this legitimized racism is when multilayered, intersectional, and dynamic racism becomes normalized, institutionalized, internalized, and systemic while simultaneously becoming invisible in social norms and institutions. The first passage indicative of the myth of Canadian exceptionalism is when Beasley (2019) states:

> Modern Canadian culture is unique and distinct from those of our founding Indigenous, British, and French ancestors, and from that of our giant neighbour to the south (p. 67).

Maintaining opposition between Canada and the United States is integral to the myth of Canadian exceptionalism (Bryant 2017; Rotberg 2008). This distinction is used to sanitize the violence that Canada as a nation-state has inflicted on Indigenous peoples historically and contemporaneously which has allowed for the development of Vancouver through settler planning methods (Mays 2022). This relates to Fanon's (1961) delineation that the first encounter between the native and the settler is marked by violence and exploitation which brought the native identity into existence. This was achieved through materializing the settler existence through stealing native land and claiming it as settler property (Fanon 1961). The distinction made by Beasley (2019) between Canadians and Indigenous ancestors demonstrates the binary between colonizers and colonized peoples (Fanon 1961).

Thinking with Tuck and Yang's (2012) explication of settler colonialism as distinct to the ways that settlers come with the intention of homemaking on Indigenous land, a passage which demonstrates this and settler colonial violence (Dorries et al. 2019) is when Beasley (2019) states:

> Vancouver is a new city. Founded only in 1886, it has a very short history. It has almost no vested, long-in-control establishment. It has no conservative bedrock of attitudes that would quash new and independent thinking. It started out with very little great wealth that could wash out any proposal that did not suit the established interests. It is a city of new people — immigrants who think in their own way, who bring their own ideas with them, who are blind to social constraints, and who are naturally quite free thinkers… It is a city of new people (p. 84).

It is clear to delimit the maintenance of a false distinction between urban and non-urban space (Dorries et al. 2019) in this passage, which is not only a clear example of settler

colonial violence, but also entirely dismisses the Indigenous knowledges, worldviews, governance systems, and establishments of the xʷməθkwəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and Səlílwətaɬ First Nations which have stewarded these unceded lands since time immemorial. Thinking with Fanon (1961), in the settler's perspective, Indigenous peoples are seen as less than human which justifies the process of colonization as a natural phenomenon. In the passage above, the colonial history of Vancouver is glossed over, and Indigenous presence in the city is erased. As Dorries et al. (2019) state, "the narrative validating the fantasy of the settler city—that cities are new and modern and, by virtue of this logic, cannot be Indigenous places. This version of terra nullius is at the core of settler colonial urbanism and, by extension, the process of (re)producing a settler nation" (p. 98) that historically and contemporaneously continues to constitute itself as a white possession (Moreton-Robinson 2015). To claim Vancouver as a new city of new immigrants is a form of erasing Indigenous presence in the city, as well as other communities that were involved in developing and maintaining the area before 'becoming' a city. In this way, Vancouverism is implicated in validating the fantasy of the settler city, as well as through the false terra nullius narrative used to justify settler colonial possession of Indigenous land (Coulthard 2014; Tuck & Yang 2012). The terra nullius narrative was made possible through The Doctrine of Discovery that European settlers used to conclude that lands inhabited by Indigenous peoples were legally vacant despite Indigenous peoples who were organized according to their own societal norms (Dorries et al. 2019; Dorries, Hugill & Tomiak 2022; Miller et al. 2010; Prager et al. 2023).

Another passage which demonstrates the terra nullius argument and makes clear the conceptualization of Vancouver as a settler city (Dorries et al. 2017; Dorries, Hugill & Tomaik 2022; Tomiak 2017) is:

> We also now had a blank canvas, where we could bring this template to a greater level of specificity in completely new development (Beasley 2019, p. 111).

Whether through complicity, complacency, ignorance and/or privilege, this statement perpetuates white supremacy and Eurocentrism (Prager et al. 2023) which maintain settler colonialism and settler colonial violence. To refer to Vancouver as a blank canvas serves to erase Indigenous presence in the city, and maintain white possession of the land through claims of development and economic prosperity. While treaties were signed elsewhere in what was becoming colonially known as Canada, the lands on which Vancouver resides were never legally ceded through treaty to the Canadian state (Atleo

& Boron 2022). Describing these lands as a blank canvas excludes the xʷməθkwəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and Səlílwətaɬ First Nations, and is a clear articulation that their desires were not considered when planning the city of Vancouver. Additionally, the blank canvas rhetoric dismisses Indigenous conceptions of decolonization which require the repatriation of land (Coulthard 2014; Fanon 1961; Tuck & Yang 2012) by maintaining white possession over Indigenous land. This serves to ostracize Indigenous struggles for the land as a reciprocal system of relations and obligations through the lens of Coulthard's (2014) grounded normativity.

Chapter 5. Interview Findings

In this chapter I will first analyze non-Indigenous planners' conceptualizations of Indigeneity and planning to set a foundation for how they are thinking about these ideas, and their reflections on reconciliation and decolonization. Second, I will analyze Indigenous planners' articulations of Indigenous identity and Indigenous planning, followed by their reflections on reconciliation and decolonization. I am purposefully analyzing both non-Indigenous and Indigenous planners' understandings of decolonization and reconciliation separately as an effort to uplift Indigenous articulations of these ideas. Lastly, I will compare non-Indigenous and Indigenous planners by discussing what they think of Vancouverism, and identify their articulations which I attribute as Vancouverism's underlying foundations.

5.1. Non-Indigenous Planners

5.1.1. Conceptions of Indigeneity & Indigenous Planning

To primarily address guiding question (4) Do settler planners recognize decolonial approaches to planning in relation to the mechanisms of Vancouverism? How do they or how do they not? I will first analyze a variety of statements made by non-Indigenous planners during their interviews which demonstrate the ways they think about Indigenous peoples in general, in Vancouver, and whether they had thought about Indigenous planning before speaking with me. This will also briefly address guiding question (2) What do non-Indigenous planners think of Vancouverism, in general, and in relation to Vancouver's status as a 'City of Reconciliation?' in order to lead into non-Indigenous planners' understandings of decolonization and reconciliation.

Out of the four non-Indigenous interlocutors, two non-Indigenous planners did not have prior knowledge of Indigenous planning, and two-non-Indigenous planners did. NII1 did not know what Indigenous planning was and had never conceived that Indigenous peoples would be planners, much less have an interest in urban planning. Similarly, to this articulation, NII4 asserted that the Indigenous Nations were not interested in city planning during the Vancouverism era, specifically discussing Musqueam First Nation, because:

> They were much more concerned about the new charter of rights and what their role would be as a nation. And there was some reluctance… to deal with the city because that wasn't on their mind, being seen as nation to nation at the time was because they were still trying to set up that broader nation to nation feeling or set of roles and responsibilities.

This statement dismisses the idea that Indigenous sovereignty needed to be proved to the Canadian state during this time, which is reflective of the dispossession and elimination of Indigenous peoples by the Canadian state through colonialism that is maintained through settler colonialism (Mays 2022; Simpson 2015; Simpson 2016). Additionally, this conception of Indigenous peoples concerns over being recognized as a Nation, or politics of recognition (Coulthard 2014; Daigle 2016; Simpson 2014) relates to Fanon's (1961) explication that colonization is mobilized as a natural phenomenon in the settler's perspective. This renders Indigenous peoples need to prove their Nationhood to the Canadian state as a natural phenomenon despite the fact that the xʷməθkʷəy̓ əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and sə̓ lílwətaʔɬ First Nations had been stewarding their lands long before settlers came to what is now known as Vancouver. As Daigle (2016) describes, the 1969 Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (the White Paper), set a precedent for politics of recognition for Indigenous peoples in Canada. After Indigenous leaders expressed concerns about treaties, title to traditional territories, and self-determination, the government of Canada responded with a proposal to dismantle the Indian Act and make all Indigenous peoples Canadian citizens with the same rights and opportunities to achieve equality (Daigle 2016). In actuality, this would serve to render the diversity of Indigenous Nations and peoples invisible and assimilate them into the settler-colonial state (ibid). After Indigenous peoples asserted that this is not what they wanted, the Canadian government adjusted their proposal's language and moved toward self-government packages, land claims, and economic development initiatives (Coulthard 2014; Daigle 2016). However, Coulthard (2014) contends that these recognition-based approaches have been integral to the facilitation of capitalist accumulation on Indigenous lands. Coulthard (2014) and Simpson (2014) call for a rejection or refusal of a politics of recognition to combat further displacing Indigenous peoples from their homelands (Coulthard 2007).

Differently, NII2 and NII3 were aware of Indigenous planning methods, and stated they work with Indigenous planners forwarding these ideas and are both on board for adapting their planning approaches with ideas presented to them by Indigenous colleagues. While

reflecting on the first time it was necessary to do land acknowledgements at work, NII2 described that planning with consideration of Indigenous peoples at the time:

> …back in the day, right, we just weren't aware, and we really weren't in that way. This is before the declaration of a 'City of Reconciliation' and… before the Truth and Reconciliation Committee Commission …[It] was always coordinate and alright, liaise, but you know it varied… it wasn't central at all, not even close…

This is indicative of how planning in Vancouver has historically excluded Indigenous communities in their decision making, not to mention Indigenous planning methods and planners. This is also demonstrative of settler modes of planning and development as a natural phenomenon (Fanon 1961) in that inclusion of Indigenous peoples was an afterthought and that cities are shaped by processes of Indigenous dispossession that use narratives to erase Indigenous peoples in urban spaces (Blatman-Thomas & Porter 2019; Mays 2022). This also illustrates a settler colonial relationship within planning which relates to Coulthard's (2014) definition of this relationship as one characterized by a particular form of domination where state power has secured hierarchical social relationships that facilitate the dispossession of Indigenous peoples of their lands and self-determining authority. As described by NII2, planners were not aware of these hierarchical social relationships, and whether through complicity, complacency, ignorance or privilege, planners engage(d) in these forms of domination in relation to the creation and maintenance of urban space which were designed intentionally (Gosnell-Myers 2022) to maintain settler colonial authority over territory (Wolfe 2006).

When questioned about the state of planning in Vancouver, NII3 shared their perspective on whether Indigenous planning worldviews are currently included:

> I haven't seen any representation systems changing. Policies aren't really changing at all, and the built products are largely the same. So again, it seems to me right now at a kind of very early stage where I still don't know whether it will ultimately resolve as much as I would love for it to happen.

Despite their desire for change to occur, NII3 articulated that it is currently not happening at the level a 'City of Reconciliation' would seemingly encompass. This unknowing was shared across all non-Indigenous planners when reflecting on reconciliation and decolonization which will be addressed in the following section.

5.1.2. Reflections on Reconciliation & Decolonization

This theme addresses guiding question (2) What do non-Indigenous planners think of Vancouverism, in general, and in relation to Vancouver's status as a 'City of Reconciliation?' and guiding question (4) Do settler planners recognize decolonial approaches to planning in relation to the mechanisms of Vancouverism? How do they or how do they not? To analyze non-Indigenous planner's views of decolonization and reconciliation, I will first discuss the two participants who have some contentions with these ideas and who used a temporal justification when discussing their understandings of the Vancouverism era. Then, I will discuss the other two participants who express openness and support to the ideas of reconciliation and decolonization.

When discussing reconciliation, NII1 brought up decolonization and questioned it:

> Are you gonna take something away from me? Or reconciliation says: well, maybe some things will change, and that are good changes, but it will be a shared path, and we will have discussed it. I like reconciliation, because that's a shared path, and that's getting to know one another, and mutual respect, and we're gonna go down the path together and we're gonna end up in a better place. So, I like that metaphor for looking toward the First Nations.

The fear of decolonization by taking away something is clear in this quote, which attests to how those benefitting from settler colonialism do not want to change the system that works for them. Whether conscious or not, this statement upholds the validating narrative of a settler city: that it is new, modern and therefore cannot be an Indigenous place (Dorries et al. 2019) which in turn justifies the settler colonial logic of what is perceived to be settler property. What is most interesting about this articulation of preferring reconciliation over decolonization is that it uplifts the western concept of reconciliation while dismissing Indigenous conceptualizations of decolonization. NII1 fears decolonization because decolonization would mean that Indigenous communities and Nations' have the ability and right to self-determination and self-governance that reject settler colonial laws and policies which have been involuntarily forced upon them. The expectation of being on a shared path which has been discussed between non-Indigenous peoples and First Nations attests to the ways that dominant ideologies can only be altered if those in the dominant position have allowed it. Thinking with Coulthard's (2014) grounded normativity, this thinking is indicative of how politics of recognition lead to reconciliation that does not account for Indigenous land-connected practices and longstanding experiential knowledge that inform ethical engagements with the world and

relationships with human and nonhumans (Coulthard & Simpson 2016). Additionally, the use of the word metaphor is contradictory in this statement. A metaphor is a figure of speech where a word or phrase is applied to an action that is not literally applicable (Oxford Languages 2022). Naming reconciliation a metaphor for looking toward the First Nations contradicts the very statement this interlocutor makes of accepting reconciliation as a plausible action. This is also in opposition to Tuck & Yang's (2012) assertion that decolonization is not a metaphor when they state: "When metaphor invades decolonization, it kills the very possibility of decolonization; it recenters whiteness, it resettles theory, it extends innocence to the settler, it entertains a settler future" (p.3). This limits decolonization, and also limits reconciliation. All of this is indicative of the thinking during the Vancouverism era documented by Beasley (2019), as well as how it is understood as a concept and practice today.

Another example of this expectation of a shared path of reconciliation by NII4 is:

> I can understand that for a lot of the First Nations people, because they've been silent, they haven't had that opportunity. But I'm not yet sensing that reconciliation is sort of two ways trying to work in a whole new set of directions together… I think there's a growing resentment amongst people who may have either spent all their lives also trying to make Canada a livable place and a place to cherish, and that I'm seeing on a number of instances, well, how come so much money is going in one direction? And yes, we need to make up, but at the same time, there's other people who are equally in need and the louder voices are getting the funding.

This interlocutor shared that they see reconciliation as something that is excluding non-Indigenous peoples, downplaying the atonement of the past necessary to reconciliation by stating other people need funding. The same sentiment is present later in NII4's discussion:

> There needs to be more of a recognition that as Canadians, we have a right to housing. Not just white Canadians, not just First Nations Canadians, but all Canadians. And what does that entail? And there's limited funds. So how do you make those tough choices? And that's, I think, the challenge around reconciliation is we're only reconciling part of the Canadian population's challenges.

In non-specific language, NII4 speaks of a type of fiscalized racism by mentioning Canadians who have spent all their lives trying to make Canada a livable space. Fiscalized racism is when fiscal concerns are entangled in a conceptual network that involves property, colonialism, money, and racialization (Willmott 2022). As Willmott (2022) describes, fiscalized racism is an example of what Robertson (2015) describes as legitimized racism against Indigenous peoples, drawing on what Pasternak (2016) calls

fiscal warfare where settler states use accounting, budgeting, and fiscal processes to undermine Indigenous sovereignty. Specifically, Willmott (2022) addresses how settlers understand Indigenous-settler relationships through the misconception that Indigenous peoples do not pay taxes, rendering them unqualified to participate in self-determining and self-governing actions that settler taxpayers claim harm the nation-state of Canada. Ultimately, these “fiscal concerns are driven by racism (Denis 2015; Robertson 2015), false benevolence (Tuck & Yang 2012) or possessive colonial entitlement to control Indigenous lives (Goldstein 2008; Moreton-Robinson 2015)” (Willmott 2022, p. 20). Additionally, drawing on Harris (1993) who argues that whiteness is a form of property, Willmott (2022) asserts that tax functions as a form of white property that gives white settlers the means to eliminate Indigenous political claims, sovereignty, and territories. While never explicitly mentioning taxpayer imaginaries (Willmott 2022), NII4 justifies their claims of a growing resentment toward Indigenous peoples receiving funding over all other Canadians which is demonstrative of claiming whiteness as property, which in turn justifies a settler colonial logic (Crosby & Monaghan; Daigle & Ramírez 2019; Gregory 2004).

In contrast to NII4’s contention with too much funding being awarded to reconciliation, Women Transforming Cities report “The TRC Calls to Action in BC Municipalities: Progress, Barriers, and Opportunities to Accelerate Implementation” stated: “Reconciliation isn’t free. If municipalities are to make more progress on the Calls to Action in the coming years than they have since 2015, local, provincial, and federal governments must work together and invest in funding the Calls to Action” (Prager et al. 2023). This statement also demonstrates possessive language and infantilization of Indigenous peoples in Canada (Maracle 2017), by calling them First Nations Canadians furthering a colonial mentality. Also ingrained in a colonial mentality is the justification for Indigenous exclusion based on the era (1980s) where NII4 articulates:

> Vancouverism and the whole issue of reconciliation working directly with the Musqueam really didn't happen during that period… the issue of reconciliation just didn't emerge during that period of time, partly because so much of the focus was on the downtown.
>
> …because the issues are so much more complex now, we had complexity because the things we were dealing with were new. But the complexity now, when you're dealing with climate change in a real sense, when you're dealing with the financial issues amplified from what we dealt with, when you're dealing with a mixture of national and nationwide First Nations reconciliation, there are those kinds of issues which to me, it might be Vancouverism 2, or you might have another name. But it's much more complex than what we were dealing with.

> Certainly, I would never connect Vancouverism as sort of [Beasley's] book or my era with 'City of Reconciliation' because we never even touched that… What a city was doing at that point in time was almost a detour for them.

These passages demonstrate the temporal justification for Indigenous exclusion in planning during the Vancouverism era, and also assumes the priorities of the Nations at that time with no basis for this claim. While this participant asserted a particular possessiveness of Vancouverism as they were a lead planner at that time, when questioned about how the City of Vancouver states they are still in an era of Vancouverism, NII4 responded:

> I think that I would say that the Vancouverism as happened during that 30 years, really, we're into a different era now. And yes, it might be fine for the current council to pretend that they had any involvement in what happened.

In contrast, NII3 had a more specific articulation of reconciliation:

> To me reconciliation comes from a transformation of the value system. So, for someone to actually go and to reconcile some of the wrongdoings that have happened, one has to emphasize with the culture or culture of this question.

Reflecting on their own place in reconciliation and whether decolonization is a necessary part, NII3 said:

> …I think it must be done personally. The question of how is the main issue. So, I think, again, the structures that have evolved over the past century or so, thousands of years, millennia but let's just talk about the last century, are so ingrained in the ethos of city making that it's very difficult for people to imagine an alternative…

This questioning of how to go about reconciliation is consistent across all non-Indigenous planners I spoke with, whether they agreed on their conceptualizations of reconciliation or not there is a level of uncertainty that exists. For NII2, they described it as:

> …this anxiousness, and, you know, sense of urgency and the challenge of a lot of reconciliation, I'll say on the settlers' part like myself, who you know, believes in it fully is, it's hard because we're so keen!

They explained that their keenness to enact reconciliation values in planning was difficult because they had to slow down when working for the City, not only because at the time when this idea first emerged after Vancouver's declaration as a 'City of Reconciliation' in 2014 it was new, but also for fear of engaging in this work in the wrong way. Similar articulations of worry regarding engaging in reconciliation work was expressed when NII2 was asked whether decolonization is a necessary part:

> …it seems to me, [it] involves… totally changing our legal relationship to land, I don't know, is that asked for? I would not push back on it other than I'm just working through it… It's always tough in our fields of the ideal versus sort of okay, let's get messy with power… Reconciliation can still be rich and robust, and a really beneficial collaborative relationship across many people while maintaining some colonial structures and institutions… because you can't go back. You can only go forward, and we can unwind, recreate…

As Tuck and Yang (2012) articulate, an integral aspect of decolonization is the repatriation of land. Fanon (1961) also asserts that returning land returns Indigenous dignity, and for decolonization to occur this is a process that cannot go unnoticed. Ultimately, changing settlers' legal relationship to land would encompass Coulthard's (2014) notion of grounded normativity in that Indigenous articulations of land stewardship are not about property and ownership, rather they are about reciprocal and responsible relationships to the land (Coulthard & Simpson 2016). However, there is something beneficial to the sentiment of going forward and recreating which is shared with one Indigenous interlocutor I will discuss in the following section.

NII3 also shared a discussion of change, but reflected on how they did not see change at the level of planning in Vancouver in relation to Vancouverism:

> …the way that I see the reconciliation piece right now, the way that I've experienced it with the projects and the people, there's a lot of people talking about, like, reputation, there's a lot of arguably lip service, but there's no actual change in the built product or the representational systems that are used. If we're talking about reconciliation within the context of First Nations, that mode of thinking is completely different… it's a completely different value system…

This discussion makes clear the shared sentiment between NII2 and NII3 who ponder what meaningful change toward reconciliation and decolonization could look like. While they discuss the implications of respectful engagement, both NII2 and NII3 support efforts toward reconciliation and decolonization and expressed openness to learning how to properly engage these ideas.

5.2. Indigenous Planners

5.2.1. Identity & Indigenous Planning

To begin to address guiding questions (1) What do Indigenous planners think of Vancouverism, in general, and in relation to Vancouver's status as a 'City of Reconciliation?' And (5) How does Vancouverism as an ethos deliberately exclude

Indigenous conceptions of planning through mechanisms of settler colonialism and/or settler colonial violence? I will first analyze and present passages from Indigenous interlocutors reflecting on their identities and experiences as Indigenous planners and their reflections of Indigenous planning. I specifically rely on direct quotes more in this section to uplift the voices of the Indigenous interlocutors.

Reflecting on people in Vancouver as dominantly politically left leaning, II1 addressed the tensions of being an urban Indigenous person and how that is perceived:

> I find it interesting when talking to people who seem very progressive, but always make the assumption that because I'm in reconciliation, because we work with the Nations that those interests will always be environmental and I'm like, well, what about economic sovereignty? What about economic justice? Are they not allowed to make money in the system? If we were perfect Natives, we would be living off the land, disengaged entirely from these systems. No, you forced it on us and now, you're telling us we can't participate without somehow tainting our Indigeneity.

This tension that is discussed of trying to thrive in a built environment which was made possible through Indigenous dispossession and elimination (Mays 2022; Simpson 2015; Simpson 2016; Wyile 2018) but being met with pushback for attempting to thrive in this environment that was forced onto Indigenous people is particularly relevant when thinking about the economic facets of Vancouverism as a concept and practice. Thinking with Fanon's (1961) explication of settler existence, if Indigenous peoples attempt to thrive in the systems which settlers have created to maintain settler domination, settlers argue it is an act of violence toward them.

Additionally, II1 discussed the tension of doing planning work as an Indigenous person working for the City of Vancouver and stated:

> It's the perpetual struggle… that's been talked about for many, many, many years now, but between putting your energy towards… making yourself legible to those colonial structures versus the energy put towards renewing our own Indigenous structures.

For Fanon (1961), true decolonization cannot occur without rejecting the colonial structures. Further to this point, Coulthard (2014) attests to the complications of this in contemporary Canada when discussing politics of recognition grounded on coexistence of mutual recognition. He asserts that this form of recognition reproduces colonial, racist, and patriarchal state power that Indigenous peoples' have sought to transcend (Coulthard 2014). It is clear that as an Indigenous planner, the act of making oneself legible to colonial structures has been necessary but takes away from the renewal of Indigenous structures.

A similar experience when reflecting on their time working with the City as a planner and conducting commissions with Indigenous peoples was shared by II2:

> …unfortunately, the experience, particularly from an Indigenous perspective, is that how many commissions and inquiries and gatherings have we had where we've shared endlessly and nothing has happened? It's a very frustrating process.

When asked about their experience working with the City of Vancouver, II2 stated that there were political:

> …cycles where you have people in management positions, positions of authority, who are, like, wanting to do all this work and making it happen. And then you have another political cycle and the priority shifts and goes elsewhere, and then all this work is done. So, I think it's extremely frustrating… it's just not sustainable.

II2 also explained that in the work environment as an Indigenous planner:

> …you had people who are sympathetic, you had people who are understanding, and then you had the exact opposite. And this task was doing so much, which… I think eventually I don't know anybody from that time that stayed on, they've moved on to other positions because it becomes exhausting.

Sharing this sentiment of exhaustion and frustration, II3: stated:

> To be Indigenous in a space where there aren't a lot of Indigenous peoples… there's a lot of Tokenism, and there's a lot of decoration.

All these passages demonstrate a similar experience of working in conditions that do not celebrate or support Indigeneity systemically, which is congruent with scholars who argue that Indigeneity is made largely invisible in an urban context in city planning (Dorries et al. 2019; Dorries, Hugill & Tomiak 2022; Edmonds 2010; Mays 2022; Tomiak 2011, 2016, 2017, 2023). These passages are also indicative of how Vancouver is a settler city (Dorries et al. 2019; Dorries, Hugill & Tomiak 2022; Tomiak 2011, 2016, 2017, 2023) through the ways that little tangible change and action occur in relation to ongoing displacement of Indigenous bodies, peoples, ontologies, and rights (Tomiak 2017). Without an upheaval of these settler colonial systems, decolonization and reconciliation cannot occur.

Comparatively, when addressing how to have a city that looks and feels like it honours Indigenous knowledge, and to have it be visible and undeniable, II3 expressed:

> …we're all finally talking about the justice around giving the land back and bringing the land back into Indigenous governments. But then what? Then it's planning, because we can get the land back. But who's gonna plan it? White planners? They're a part of the problem… And we're the only ones who can do it… and the

> time is now… and nobody else is saying this right? And it's because we don't have too many Indigenous people that understand urban planning perspectives… because we don't see Indigenous peoples in these positions.

This sentiment is congruent with Coulthard's (2014) grounded normativity in that II3 expresses the cruciality of Indigenous planners having the ability to plan through Indigenous planning methods (Matunga 2013; Walker & Bouvier 2018) which encompass experiential knowledge grounded in reciprocal relations with the land. As II3 explained, there are not many Indigenous planners which I found to be the case when contacting possible interlocutors during the recruitment process. While there are fewer Indigenous planners than non-Indigenous planners, that is not to say that there are not Indigenous peoples putting action into their practices in relation to planning. Further discussion on these actions and way forward for Indigenous planning in Vancouver beyond Vancouverism will be discussed in Chapter 6.

5.2.2. Reflections on Reconciliation & Decolonization

To address guiding questions (1) What do Indigenous planners think of Vancouverism, in general, and in relation to Vancouver's status as a 'City of Reconciliation?', (3) Are there serious discrepancies between Indigenous planners and non-Indigenous planners' conceptualizations of Vancouverism, and if so, what are they? and (5) How does Vancouverism as an ethos deliberately exclude Indigenous conceptions of planning through mechanisms of settler colonialism and/or settler colonial violence? I will discuss various statements from all three Indigenous interlocutors in relation to their articulations of reconciliation and decolonization.

When asked about reconciliation and the role of decolonization, II1 stated:

> …we can totally change the system. We just have to build up some other support systems. Otherwise, I and, this is the one thing that I really don't want to do is harm people by tearing things down before ensuring that we can support… my contention is that with through decolonization, all we have to do is look around and go, but this current system isn't our only option, and our options aren't communism or capitalism. That's a false binary. We have so many systems, and the first one that we can look to are the ones that are still in operation right here with the local Nations. We don't even have to start over again. It's right here already, and we have options, and we don't have to be doing this this way.

This sentiment corresponds to Fanon's (1961) articulation of decolonization in that colonial systems must be upheaved in order for Indigenous systems to thrive. Similarly, as

Coulthard (2014) suggests through grounded normativity, decolonial thought and practice is using Indigenous land-connected practices and experiential knowledge that informs ethical engagement with human and nonhuman relations (Coulthard & Simpson 2016). II1's explication would also encompass Tuck and Yang's (2012) sentiment of decolonization by changing the current system to a system grounded in Indigenous worldviews.

A similar sentiment was shared by II2 in relation to reconciliation and the role of decolonization:

> I feel like decolonization is natural… we only have to step back and understand what to look for.
>
> Thinking about that kind of incremental change that comes from unlearning, then what would be the role of non-Indigenous folks in decolonizing a system from which they earn a lot of privilege… They gain a lot from that. So, without a process in place to do that, kind of I guess it's really antiracism work, it's a deep reflexivity that's needed.

These articulations are in line with how Fanon (1961) and Tuck and Yang (2012) define decolonization as unsettling, unable to take place unnoticed, and that it cannot be understood at a metaphorical level. There is also a crucial element of truth telling (Porter et al. 2017) required. Another similar expression related to these ideas was shared by II3:

> …when you look at the processes around decolonization, so much of it is around truth telling and truth learning, and when things actually need to decolonize because they are so screwed up and tangled up and spun for reasons that only benefit a few when you learn the truth of why things are the way they are, you're going to get incredibly angry because you've been misinformed, and you're being used, and a lot of opportunities had been taken away from you, and you probably were put in positions that you would not have chosen for yourself on both sides… So, decolonization really is a double-edged sword for folks, because we all feel hurt and betrayed when we finally learn the truth, but that anger of learning the truth is absolutely necessary because you can't have decolonization without the anger. That is an important step and I know a lot of people who feel that decolonization is only possible in connection with the violent uprising, and I think that's probably true for some places around the world, but we're so different here in Canada and our country is so broad and vast as well, or our landscape, that decolonization through a violent uprising probably is not possible.

Interestingly, II3 expressed opposition to Fanon's (1961) conceptualization of decolonization in relation to the necessity of violence. What I interpreted from this interlocutor was that they did not recognize physical violence as a necessary element of decolonization in Canada, however, I contend that intellectual violence is necessary for disruption and change to occur. I define intellectual violence as a critical element of

decolonization (Fanon 1961) which involves crucial truth telling (Porter et al. 2017), confronting past harms and injustices and mythologized exceptionalism (Ladner 2019), and the repatriation of land and relations to land that are grounded in Indigenous worldviews (Coulthard 2014; Coulthard & Simpson 2016; Tuck & Yang 2012). Intellectual violence would ensure that decolonization cannot go unnoticed (Fanon 1961; Tuck & Yang 2012) and rejects colonial systems that perpetuate the false narrative that Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination are threats to Canada's mythologized exceptionalism (Bryant 2017; Ladner 2019).

When asked about Vancouver's status as a 'City of Reconciliation,' II1 shared:

> It can be self-serving, and also a really useful tool, because the number of times I've been able to come back and say, well, we said, we're the 'City of Reconciliation' how are we backing that up and to do that, repeatedly to say no this is the expectation, we have a new set of expectations and circumstances now, because the City has declared itself such, so act like it, you're gonna say it then act like it.

This sentiment is particularly helpful as a reminder that despite frustrations in relation to the City of Vancouver's 'Reconciliation Framework' which I expressed in Chapter 2, there is a way to hold the City accountable to the declaration they made and that Indigenous planners are doing such in their own work. While conceptualizations of reconciliation and decolonization vary across Indigenous interlocutors, there is a shared expression for the necessity of these ideas in relation to planning in general, Indigenous planning, and planning in Vancouver. Despite experiences of exhaustion and frustration as Indigenous planners, all interlocutors expressed hope for the future and uplifted positive work that is happening in the city of Vancouver. I will discuss various examples in Chapter 6.

5.3. Comparing Non-Indigenous Planners & Indigenous Planners

5.3.1. What do Planners Think of Vancouverism?

This theme addresses guiding questions (1) What do Indigenous planners think of Vancouverism, in general, and in relation to Vancouver's status as a 'City of Reconciliation?', (2) What do non-Indigenous planners think of Vancouverism, in general, and in relation to Vancouver's status as a 'City of Reconciliation?' and (3) Are there serious discrepancies between Indigenous planners and non-Indigenous planners'

conceptualizations of Vancouverism, and if so, what are they? I will first present non-Indigenous planners' statements, followed by Indigenous planners' statements.

When asked about Vancouverism as a concept and practice, NII1 stated that:

> It was very much reflective of the aspirations of the dominant culture of the time.

This not only aligns with temporal justifications of exclusion of Indigenous peoples and worldviews which I have previously discussed, but this also demonstrates the ways in which white settlers benefitted from Indigenous dispossession and displacement and narratives used to erase Indigenous peoples in urban spaces (Mays 2022). Similarly, NII3 stated:

> …it is reflective of a very particular, a very specific location, specific context and time that again is passed that is not necessarily indicative of what's happening currently… Even though that label is used now, it's kind of blanket… it's been misused to just represent kind of a podium tower itself. And that is like, hey, you put the podium tower anywhere and it becomes Vancouverism. Anywhere in the city, it's Vancouverism. But really it had a very high degree of specificity in terms of tower spacing, et cetera, that was very hyper specific to the downtown core.

This articulation of Vancouverism as a concept and practice distinguishes its specificity which attests to similar explanations in Beasley's (2019) text. This congruency was shared across all non-Indigenous interlocutors, as well as most Indigenous interlocutors. Upon further reflection of the concept, NII2 questioned the applicability of Vancouverism in today's context:

> Is Vancouverism an idea that's elastic enough to include contemporary practices, or was it like this sort of moment in time?

Questioning the applicability of Vancouverism in today's context from non-Indigenous planners is something that makes the City of Vancouver's current assertion as being immersed in Vancouverism complicated. If there is discrepancy in understandings of Vancouverism, it renders thinking about it today difficult. What I delimit as a response to NII2's question, discussing Vancouverism in relation to Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation,' NII3 shared:

> …it seems to me that kind of a Vancouverism system is not bending at all.

Comparably, NII4 shared a similar statement:

> I think what's happening today is just a different circumstance. I wouldn't call it Vancouverism, and it's not because it's better or worse. They're dealing with different and more complex issues.

These statements from non-Indigenous planners demonstrate an important reflection on whether Vancouverism is compatible within a 'City of Reconciliation,' and opens dialogue for what might be possible beyond Vancouverism, and the future of Indigenous planning in Vancouver. Although not all non-Indigenous planners I spoke with agree on their conceptualizations of Vancouverism, decolonization or reconciliation, they are all open to a new way forward. As NII4 stated, during the initial Vancouverism era, planners were dealing with less complex circumstances and issues. While this is a sentiment that was shared amongst most non-Indigenous interlocutors, one Indigenous interlocutor (II3) addressed this more specifically when reflecting on their time as a planner during implementation of Vancouverism:

> I have a good sense of what it was like to be working to implement Vancouverism and you know there's a lot of factors that I think planners and city officials during [that] time, just didn't even consider because of public attitudes at the time, because white supremacy was still something that was largely invisible and not talked about or understood.

Like most non-Indigenous interlocutors, II3 discussed the temporal element of the Vancouverism era, but called attention to the invisibility of white supremacy which no non-Indigenous interlocutor articulated. Related to NII1's statement about the dominant culture of that time, this further proves that the dominant culture of the time was white settlers benefitting from the dispossession of Indigenous peoples (Mays 2022; Simpson 2015; Simpson 2016) which allowed for the development of the city of Vancouver on the unceded, unsurrendered, and ancestral homelands of xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and səlilwətaɬ Nations.

In contrast to the non-Indigenous planners' articulations of Vancouverism that were mostly congruent with Beasley's (2019) articulations, after discussing the *Vancouverism* (2019) text, II1 stated:

> I think Vancouverism, as it was defined… by that guy in his book, utterly fails to account for the place that it is, it seems to be upholding the things that are overlaid on this place, and then co-opting some of the nature parts of it without actually taking any active stewardship of it.

This statement reflects what I have argued in relation to how Vancouverism is incompatible with Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation' through the various ways

Vancouverism as a concept and practice boasts its own image without considering the Nations on whose lands were developed without their consent or inclusion. Additionally, II1 calls attention to the possessiveness of the natural landscape surrounding the downtown core which is a crucial element to Vancouverism for non-Indigenous planners, despite the fact that these elements are outside of the borders of Vancouver and also reflects a white possessiveness (Moreton-Robinson 2015) over Indigenous lands. In addition to responding to Beasley's (2019) text, II1 reflected on the City of Vancouver's definition of Vancouverism of combining "deep respect for nature with enthusiasm for busy, engaging, active streets and dynamic urban life" (City of Vancouver 2022):

> We've created dependent systems, not independent systems, not interdependent systems. Dependent on our constant maintenance, and especially when you're at downtown, and you look at like the street trees, and like we gotta put bags on them and ask people to water them and we've got like these little patches of grass that need constant maintenance, because they're not self-sustaining. We have no other systems to keep them growing without our intervention. That doesn't look like respect to nature for me.

In this passage, II1 contests the City of Vancouver's definition of the Vancouverism concept. While non-Indigenous planners value the natural elements of the city, this statement makes clear that the natural elements like trees that are valued have actually been carefully denaturalized. II1 further explained:

> It's not like the Indigenous folks here weren't stewarding things. They were right, like they didn't just let everything run wild and then, like they weren't dear… they interfered. They intervened with a lot of things too but also in… responsible stewardship.
>
> [Planners] make assumptions that about what we want… what the end goal is, without ever stating what those are… If you are telling me that you are comfortable, interrupting the intertidal zone by putting a seawall somewhere because you would rather be able to cycle and walk around without getting your feet wet, or without having to step on slippery rocks and stuff, then say that… Say what the… tradeoff is, say what you're prioritizing, and… just say it, but we don't.

This call for transparency was echoed across all Indigenous interlocutors I spoke with, and particularly by II2 when discussing the erasure of Indigeneity in the city setting through settler colonial logics of property and whiteness (Daigle & Ramírez 2019):

> It's a really dangerous erasure, actually, isn't it? Because I'd much rather have it be… very visible and present and surface.

The settler fantasy (Simpson 2016) of terra nullius continues to be used as a means of reproducing settler colonial violence (Dorries et al. 2019) through the dangerous erasure

that II2 describes. Instead, II2 asserted that these logics of elimination should be made visible to open space for Indigenous resurgence (Simpson 2011) that would allow for future collaborations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners (Matunga 2013) to forward new ways of planning in the city of Vancouver. Without doing so will only perpetuate colonial structures, settler colonialism, settler colonial violence, and Canada's mythologized exceptionalism.

5.3.2. Vancouverism's Underlying Foundations: Settler Colonialism, Settler Colonial Violence & Canadian Exceptionalism

This theme will address guiding questions (3) Are there serious discrepancies between Indigenous planners and non-Indigenous planners' conceptualizations of Vancouverism, and if so, what are they? and (5) How does Vancouverism as an ethos deliberately exclude Indigenous conceptions of planning through mechanisms of settler colonialism and/or settler colonial violence? I will first present passages from non-Indigenous interlocutors which are implicit in settler colonialism and/or settler colonial violence as none of them ever explicitly discussed these topics but made statements which echoed discourses of such. Second, I will present passages from Indigenous interlocutors who did explicitly name these topics in relation to Vancouverism, planning in Vancouver, and/or the city of Vancouver. Then I will discuss one passage from a non-Indigenous planner demonstrating Canada's mythologized exceptionalism, and then share one statement from an Indigenous interlocutor calling attention to this myth.

When reflecting on the history of Vancouver's development and settler colonialism, NII1 stated:

> …some good things… came when Canada was colonized and there were some really disappointing bad things…

NII1 continued to describe that there is nothing good with decolonization because it would mean to take away the good things that came when Canada was colonized. As settler colonialism is a land-centred project with the goal of eliminating Indigenous societies (Tuck & Yang 2012; Wolfe 2006), so too are the good colonial things that this interlocutor wants to maintain. Upon further reflection on the development of Vancouver and their family history, NII1 shared:

> I will admit my family are settlers here…. They arrived here in the 1870s, and my take on it is that these men… were like, why would… we even put energy into doing treaties?

First, it is interesting that this interlocutor phrased their identity as a settler as an admittance, perhaps a way to admit some sort of guilt while also deflecting personal implications as a settler benefitting from settler colonialism. Second, the assumption made of their settler ancestors when arriving to Vancouver in the 1870s not wanting to put in the energy of treaties is peculiar, but reflective of Fanon's (1961) explication of colonization seen as a natural phenomenon by settlers which is in line with Atleo & Boron's (2022) assertion that treaties in Eastern Canada made it possible for settler control in BC without the use of treaties. As Tomiak (2018) explains, cities in what is now called Canada are often located on unceded Indigenous territories, but this fact is rarely known in public discourse and policy. She continues that this is not an accident or oversight, but "a deliberate effort to keep Indigenous title, jurisdiction and rights distinct from urban areas, which are key sites of settler investment" (Tomiak 2018). Every municipality in British Columbia is on unceded territories (Gosnell-Myers 2023) which were never signed through treaty, which were land sharing agreements, with the Canadian state, but still developed without Indigenous consent, and I contend that this assumption attests to Vancouver as a settler city (Dorries et al. 2019; Dorries, Hugill & Tomiak 2022; Edmonds 2010; Mays 2022; Tomiak 2011, 2016, 2017, 2023).

Another interesting statement reflecting on the role of settlers in Vancouver in relation to Vancouverism's protected view corridors was shared by NII1:

> …if you ever go for a walk with a friend well, there's a protected view and that really goes back to if we look at you know with settlers being here, and so forth, is how important the setting was, and this was a really important part of the experience of living here.

As Dorries et al. (2019) state: "the city is often presented as a settler achievement, the product of visionary arrivistes who grasped the potential of a given locale" (p. 3). Attributing the importance of setting placed by settlers, NII1 is reproducing settler colonial violence by articulating original and ongoing dispossession of Indigenous peoples through the production of urban space (Dorries et al. 2019). This statement dismisses the Indigenous knowledges and worldviews of the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, and Səlílwətaɬ First Nations who have stewarded their unceded and unsurrendered territories since time immemorial, while commemorating the settlers' roles in protecting the surrounding natural

elements. This is indicative of Wolfe's (2006) sentiment that settler colonialism is about territoriality. Whether settlers had a part in the maintenance of the natural setting or not, this demonstrates a clear possessiveness of the natural landscape in Vancouver. This is also reflective of the value placed on the aesthetics of the city present in *Vancouverism* (2019) which in turn is linked to the economy of the city. This relates to Tuck and Yang's (2012) statement that settlers make Indigenous land their home and source of capital and disrupt Indigenous relations to land (Coulthard 2014; Dorries et al. 2019).

An example of Indigenous dismissal through settler ignorance (Baloy 2016) was expressed by NII4 when reflecting on their time growing up in the West End of Vancouver:

> It never really occurred to me that the classroom didn't have any Musqueam children and now I understand where they were [Residential Schools]. And yes, maybe it was intentioned to try and bring people along to their understanding of English and that was sufficient. They could operate in today's world. But it didn't work out for a variety of reasons. You know better than me, clearly we need to do some reconciliation, but we have to do it in the context of realizing there are a variety of Canadians who are getting left behind.

Not only does this passage demonstrate erasure of Indigenous knowledges and worldviews, it does so in a way that seems to justify the function Residential Schools and their methods of cultural genocide inflicted on Indigenous children by stating that learning English was a necessary skill for Indigenous peoples to operate in a colonial world. This interlocutor also alludes to how Residential Schools "didn't work out" (NII4) yet does not elaborate on what "successful" Residential Schooling might have looked like. Additionally, this interlocutor maintains that non-Indigenous Canadians are not prioritized the way Indigenous peoples in Canada are now that reconciliation is a current topic, congruent with their previous statement complicit in fiscalized racism (Willmott 2022). These examples illustrate Baloy's (2016) assertion that settlers are implicated, whether through complicity, complacency, ignorance, or privilege, in settler colonialism through complicit and complacent assumptions about Indigenous peoples, ignorance of the lived experiences of Indigenous peoples, and settler privilege that was made possible through Indigenous dispossession and elimination.

Comparatively, Indigenous interlocutors directly addressed the topics of settler colonialism in relation to Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation.' II1 explained that they do not see colonialism and settler colonialism as separate and explained:

> …if it weren't for colonialism, if it weren't for a desire to take that wealth from resource extraction, from just having control of the land, then people could have just immigrated here and become a part of the local Indigenous system, they would have been welcomed with open arms. As a matter of fact, they were welcomed with open arms, so for me, colonialism is the political project and… settlers are very useful. You can't actually have a system without people feeding into it… You can't be a king of something with nothing to be king of. You need to install all of those settler people, and you need to sell them something so that they will willingly buy into all of that. So, the settlers, and this is part of colonialism as well right as this myth of a new start, of something fresh, of something that isn't already complicated by people already being there.

Thinking with this, it is clear that Indigenous interlocutors understand that colonialism has been historically calculated and maintained through settler colonialism (Tuck & Yang 2012) in today's context. Another passage demonstrating this understanding was shared by II2:

> …From… day one, the history of settlement and of the City's involvement in dispossession of Indigenous people is… a profound role in colonization everywhere because they connected up with the federal government as part of that court case to dispossess the families at Xwayxway…

The court case mentioned by II2 is analyzed by Mawani (2005), where she considers how the Canadian government has constituted and managed First Nations peoples and their rights to land and resources by limiting their access to juridically defined identities. She explains that colonial categories underpin and shape debates about who constitutes an Indigenous person in Canada's legal context (Mawani 2005). These trials were between 1923 and 1925 where the City of Vancouver and Attorney General of Canada initiated actions to remove eight families from what is colonially known today as Stanley Park. Mawani (2005) describes that the central question of these trials was whether the families of mixed Indigenous and European ancestry were 'Indians' under the law able to enact land claims through Aboriginal Title, or whether they could be dismissed as 'squatters' due to their racial in betweenness. As a result, the courts regarded the families as illegal occupiers of government land and were subject to removal without compensation (Mawani 2005). Through this example, it is clear that the City of Vancouver has always been involved in the dispossession of Indigenous peoples which continues today. To this point, II1 continues:

> So, I think in some ways, we can look at this as a continuation. In some ways, it might seem a little bit cynical, but I think that the City has always pursued this… really careful legal and political strategy when considering the Indigenous peoples of these lands, rather than being an oversight or not being considered, there has been… very close and careful consideration, but in a way that ensures that the

> City, the settler authorities, maintain control over the narrative, over the lands, over all of those things. In a lot of ways, that persists and continues. It just… shifts.

Both II1 and II2 clearly articulated the ways that they see colonialism and settler colonialism in today's context, and that the City of Vancouver is complicit in these systems. II2 describes how the settler city of Vancouver is manufactured, governed, and perpetuated over time with changing politics and norms. This is illustrative of Robertson's (2015) legitimized racism, where the institutionalized norms that maintain racism are used to maintain settler control over the narrative and over Indigenous lands in strategic ways that render the maintenance of settler colonialism invisible.

As a look toward the future when reflecting on Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation', II3 stated:

> [Indigenous peoples are] finally going to be able to reap the economic benefit of these lands the same way that settlers have been benefiting from these lands.

This illustrates hope toward the future for Indigenous peoples and their rightful access to social and economic sovereignty. More examples of endeavours and actors working towards these goals within planning will be shared in Chapter 6.

To purport Canada as a multicultural or raceless nation (Kwak 2020; Simpson 2016) does not address the reality that Canada is a white settler society whose development has relied on racial and colonial hierarchies that regulate the lives of Indigenous, Black and other racialized peoples (Kwak 2020; Mays 2022). While never explicitly naming Canada's mythologized exceptionalism (Ladner 2019), one example of a non-Indigenous interlocutor perpetuating ideals of Canadian exceptionalism implicitly was when NII4 shared:

> …there's… a growing resentment amongst people who may have either spent all their lives… trying to make Canada a livable place and a place to cherish, and that I'm seeing on a number of instances, well, how come so much money is going in one direction? And yes, we need to make up, but at the same time, there's other people who are equally in need and the louder voices are getting the funding.

This statement attests to the various assertions made by settler Canadians that have apathetically trivialized the plight of Indigenous peoples in the Canadian state (Pandit 2020). By questioning the funding given to Indigenous peoples in Canada and asserting everyone else is being left behind, it demonstrates the value this interlocutor places on non-Indigenous people in Canada who made Canada a livable place through colonialism

and settler colonialism, congruent with the conceptual network of fiscalized racism which involves property, colonialism, money and racialization (Willmott 2022). In this assertion, NII4 demonstrates fiscal warfare (Pasternak 2016) against Indigenous peoples at the level of their everyday vernacular as a taxpayer subject (Willmott 2022). As Willmott (2022) theorizes, the taxpayer is a subject of settlement, possession, and property that has been maintained through white racial entitlement and tax imaginaries. The concerns expressed in NII4's statement about dealing with reconciliation and redress for Indigenous peoples in Canada must be read through the logics of possession, property, whiteness, and settler colonialism (Daigle & Ramírez 2019; Willmott 2022).

Differently, one Indigenous interlocutor called attention to Canadian exceptionalism when they stated:

> So, the settlers, and this is part of colonialism as well… is this myth of a new start, of something fresh, of something that isn't already complicated by people already being there… that was really important in reframing the overall narrative Indigenous peoples and cities, because not only were we up against the Canadian public's miseducation, but we are also up against the dominance of First Nations reserve narratives (II1).

By calling attention to Canada's miseducation and First Nations reserve narratives, II1's statement is in line with Ladner's (2019) contention that for reconciliation to be achieved, a transformation of consciousness must occur where Canada not only confronts its past but also its mythologized exceptionalism (Simpson 2016). This passage identifies the dominance of First Nations reserve narratives, where the general Canadian population, and specifically municipalities do not recognize urban Indigenous peoples living in cities (Gosnell-Myers 2022). These narratives assume that Indigenous peoples are nonurban peoples living only on reserves.

While non-Indigenous interlocutors were not aware of their own complicity in Canadian exceptionalism, Indigenous interlocutors called direct attention to the ways this exceptionalism interplays with colonialism, settler colonialism, and settler colonial violence in relation to Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation.' To begin to address moves beyond these systemic conditions working against Indigenous peoples, particularly in cities, I will discuss visions beyond Vancouverism and the future of Indigenous planning in Vancouver in the following chapter.

Chapter 6. A Way Forward

In this chapter, I will share Indigenous planners' articulations of moving beyond Vancouverism shared during the interview process, as well as present examples of endeavours currently underway by these planners and others in the city of Vancouver. It is intentional to end on a note of positivity, as well as uplift the resilient work that has been done by Indigenous peoples in relation to planning, and the possibilities that exist for making more space for Indigenous planners, Indigenous Nations, and urban Indigenous peoples to thrive, contribute, and create cities which honour their knowledges and worldviews.

6.1. Beyond Vancouverism

While all Indigenous interlocutors were critical of the history of colonialism and contemporary context of settler colonialism in the city of Vancouver, and even though it was expressed by Indigenous interlocutors, and half of non-Indigenous interlocutors that Vancouverism as it is currently understood is incompatible with Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation,' they shared hope toward the future. All Indigenous interlocutors expressed there is room for Vancouverism to adapt, and if it does not adapt, new structures will evolve. When reflecting on their experience working in the City of Vancouver, II1 shared:

> I work with all of these people who are starting to grapple with what they've been charged to do, and who their perceived audience is, and I also work kind of cross departmentally with a lot of other Indigenous planners at the City… it's kind of grown organically that the City of Vancouver has started to recognize the need for additional capacity building and internal capacity building.

This relates to one of II1's previous quotes where they explained that since the City of Vancouver's declaration as a 'City of Reconciliation,' they are able to hold this status up as a means of ensuring actionable change occurs. On the topic of change, II3 reflected on their mindset:

> …there's a reason for incrementalism and it used to frustrate me when I would hear that things couldn't change fast… I thought things needed to change super super fast, but now I know why… Only when you have appropriate people planning that incremental change… if it's all white planners making the decisions, then it's a waste of time…. there's a way to do it, and there's a way to not do it.

Similar to my frustrations at the outset of this research, as well as the Urban Indigenous Peoples Advisory Committee's frustrations in relation to Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation,' not being able to identify tangible actions toward change immediately can make it feel as if nothing is changing at all. However, II3 shared the planning concept of incrementalism, known as a way of implementing smaller achievable plans within a larger plan (Tillner 2013). This interlocutor has interpreted the concept to understand how reconciliation and decolonization can be made possible by Indigenous planners doing meaningful and respectful work toward change through an incremental process that cannot, and should not, be rushed. Echoing previous statements, II3 stresses the importance that Indigenous planners should be the leaders of this work:

> …finding other Indigenous peoples in in these fields, and being able to have Indigenous teams… it feels so liberating and… that's the other important thing is… why we need mentorship opportunities.

6.2. The Future of Indigenous Planning in Vancouver

Andersen (2014) asserts that Indigenous presence remains in urban settings despite state attempts at complete erasure and elimination. For Andersen (2014), the city has become a cultural hub for Indigenous peoples and provides opportunity for people to engage with and to reclaim spaces that were once Indigenous through various ways, including culture (Mays 2022). As Dorries et al. (2019) explain, Indigenous peoples disrupt settler colonial city-making, and produce urban space in their own right by making space for themselves and their relations. The following examples show a future of Indigenous planning in Vancouver from my perspective, as well as the perspectives of my Indigenous interlocutors, however it is important to recognize this is not an extensive or complete list. Indigenous planning in Vancouver is wide ranging, and new things will develop as times passes.

Having Indigenous peoples interested in planning is something II3 strives toward in their work. The difficulty of ensuring Indigenous peoples are in these roles is ensuring access to the education and skills that go with planning. The Black + Indigenous Design Collective (BDIC), in collaboration with MST Futurism is launching the MST Mentorship Project in Fall 2023 for xʷməθkʷəy̓əm Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Úxumixw and/or səlilwətaɬ young professionals to learn how to use design and community planning as a tool for sovereignty, stewardship, and Land Back BDIC 2023). The BDIC's mission and mandate is to build

capacity, celebrate and advance Black and Indigenous voices in design fields and public art through place-making (BDIC 2023). Their team includes Divine Ndemeye (Co-Founder + Co-Director) who is a landscape designer with ancestral roots from Burundi, Justin-Benjamin Taylor (Co-Founder + Co-Director) who is a landscape architect and first generation guest on unceded MST territory of Guyanese and Lebanese heritage, Indigequeer urban design consultant Sierra Tasi Baker, K̓esugwilakw (Co-Founder + Co-Director), of Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Úxwumixw and is also Kwakwa̱ka̱'wakw/Musga̱mgw Dzawada̱'enuxw, Łingít (Tlingit), and Magyar/Hungarian, and curator, art historian, writer, and community builder Krystal Paraboo (Co-Director) of Afro and Indo Caribbean descent, as well as Indigenous program leads (Dionne Paul: Nuxalk and shíshálh Nations, Corey Douglas: Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Úxwumixw, Ginger Gosnell-Myers: Nisga'a and Kwakwak'awakw, and various Black and/or Indigenous board members (BDIC 2023). This MST Futurism Project is led by Sierra Tasi Baker, Corey Douglas, and Ginger Gosnell-Myers. It will introduce principles and processes in design, architecture, landscape architecture, urban planning, public art, environmental design, and public policy, with the goal to empower MST Host Nation peoples to be self-determined on their territories (BDIC 2023).

Another example of Indigenous planning and economic sovereignty in what is colonially known as Vancouver is the MST Development Corporation. MST Development Co. was created to oversee properties owned by the MST Partnership (Musqueam Indian Band, Squamish Nation, and Tseil-Waututh Nation), who co-own six properties in Vancouver totaling more than 160 acres of developable land including the Marine Drive Lands, Jericho Lands (West), Jericho Lands (East), Heather Street Lands, former Liquor Distribution Branch Site on East Broadway, and Willingdon Lands (MST Development 2023). After beginning a partnership with Canada Lands Company in 2014 establishing equal ownership of 4165-4195 Marine Drive West Vancouver, MST Partnership acquired 100% ownership in 2018 (MST Development 2023). They propose three townhouse buildings to express MST's connection to land while bringing forward new opportunities for economic sovereignty of future generations (MST Development 2023). MST began consultation with MST Nation members and members of West Vancouver in 2021, and further feedback from MST Nation members in 2022. The future of this development is a crucial example of Indigenous planning and economic sovereignty made possible through

unique cultural knowledges and worldviews of the xwməθkwəyə̓m, Sḵwxw̱ú7mesh Úxwumixw, and səlilwətaɬ peoples.

The last example I will discuss is Seṅáḵw developed by the economic development arm of Squamish Nation, Nch'kay Development Corporation and Westbank Projects Corp who formed the Nch'kaỷ West partnership (Seṅáḵw 2023). Located on Sḵwxw̱ú7mesh Úxwumixw reserve land, the Seṅáḵw development aims to provide more than 6,000 rental homes, more than 12,000 affordable homes for purchase, will be Canada's first largest net zero carbon residential project, the largest First Nations economic development in Canada, and offer planning opportunities for the Sḵwxw̱ú7mesh Úxwumixw (Seṅáḵw 2023). Preparation for construction has begun in March 2023, and it is estimated that development will take approximately five years to complete. While Seṅáḵw will provide economic sovereignty for Sḵwxw̱ú7mesh Úxwumixw, it is also designed to house all Vancouverites. This can be seen as an active example of reconciliation put into practice in Vancouver that is Indigenous led.

Though there are other examples, these three projects and developments have been highlighted as an effort to echo articulations made by Indigenous interlocutors in relation to Indigeneity in Vancouver and the future of Indigenous planning. All three projects are grounded in Indigenous knowledges and worldviews, and as they progress will be vital models for Indigenous planning in Vancouver.

Drawing on my theoretical frameworks of decolonization (Fanon 1961; Tuck & Yang 2012) and grounded normativity (Coulthard 2014), articulations of Indigenous planning offer new ways forward for planning practices in Vancouver. By ensuring inclusion of the xʷməθkʷəỷ əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, sə̓ lílwətaʔɬ First Nations and urban Indigenous peoples' connection to land and community (Coulthard 2014), planning in Vancouver can begin to reconcile and decolonize the settler colonial practices that uphold settler futurity (Fanon 1961; Tuck & Yang 2012) and instead focus on Indigenous futurity. Planning should not only include Indigenous peoples as collaborators but should focus on how Indigenous Nations and peoples can lead planning practices through cultural based land-connected practices (Coulthard 2014) which focus on reasserting Indigeneity in colonial spaces.

Chapter 7. Conclusion

7.1. Review of Findings

I found that Beasley's (2019) *Vancouverism* relied on damage-centered (Tuck 2009) conceptions of Indigeneity, and implications of settler colonialism, settler colonial violence, and Canadian exceptionalism which demonstrate dominant discourse in Vancouver. These findings echoed my argument that Vancouverism as a concept and practice was only made possible through settler colonialism and violence, and through the myth of Canadian exceptionalism.

In interviews with non-Indigenous planners, I found that half of their conceptualizations of Indigeneity and Indigenous planning, reconciliation and decolonization were incomplete and complicit in settler ignorance, while the other half were aware and actively learning themselves and from Indigenous colleagues. For Indigenous planners, their reflections of Indigenous identity and Indigenous planning illustrated their experiences of exhaustion and frustration, but also their resilience and commitment to continue the important work of reconciliation and decolonization despite the obstacles they face.

When comparing non-Indigenous and Indigenous planners, significant findings illustrated the discrepancies between planners' conceptions of Vancouverism. Most non-Indigenous planners shared the same understanding of Vancouverism present within Beasley's (2019) text, as well as used temporal justifications of the past being less complex than current conditions. I found that non-Indigenous planners never explicitly discussed settler colonialism which attests to their complicity, ignorance, and/or privilege (Baloy 2016) in settler colonialism. In contrast, Indigenous planners directly addressed these topics because they clearly see them as active conditions in Vancouver. Additionally, non-Indigenous planners demonstrated the dominant discourse of settler Canadians that have apathetically trivialized Indigenous peoples' experiences in Canadian state (Pandit 2020). Differently, Indigenous planners explicitly called attention to Canada's mythologized exceptionalism, and asserted that the only way to move past this is to address Canada's history of colonialism and ongoing mechanisms of settler colonialism.

As a way forward, I highlighted the ways that Indigenous planners see a future beyond Vancouverism, as well as three examples of Indigenous planning projects in Vancouver.

First, the Black + Indigenous Design Collective (BDIC), in collaboration with MST Futurism is launching the MST Mentorship Project. Second, the MST Development Corporation who co-own six properties in Vancouver totaling more than 160 acres of developable land, and their plans for 4165-4195 Marine Drive West Vancouver. Finally, the Seṅáḵw development led by the economic development arm of Squamish Nation, Nch'kay Development Corporation and Westbank Projects Corp who formed the Nch'kaỷ West partnership. All three projects are grounded in Indigenous knowledges and worldviews, and as they progress will be vital models for Indigenous planning in Vancouver.

7.2. Implications & Limitations

This research does not seek to contend that the discourse of *Vancouverism's* (2019) author has not evolved since its publication. Nor does it seek to represent all Indigenous and non-Indigenous planners' conceptualizations of Vancouverism, Vancouver as a 'City of Reconciliation' and Indigenous planning. Key limitations of the research include time constraints of the MA program and availability of interlocutors rendering the sample size of 4 non-Indigenous and 3 Indigenous planners small in comparison to the amount of non-Indigenous and Indigenous planners within or with knowledge of planning in Vancouver. Additionally, both methods accumulated an overwhelming amount of rich data for which I made difficult decisions on what to include and exclude.

7.3. Research Contribution

My intended contribution was to demonstrate the ways in which Vancouverism, and Vancouver as a settler city more generally, historically, and contemporarily works to exclude Indigenous peoples, knowledges, ways of being, and planning processes. I sought to demonstrate this through highlighting the foundations of Vancouverism which I argue are settler colonialism, settler colonial violence, and Canadian exceptionalism rooted in the exclusion of Indigenous peoples in Vancouver, and the City of Vancouver's ongoing failure on various promises it makes at implementing reconciliation. My aim was to offer insight on this to further understand the ongoing ways Indigeneity is not planned into the city of Vancouver, and identified the many ways which Indigenous peoples and planners are working toward this. Overall, I hope this work offers a small step toward understanding the city of Vancouver differently than the mainstream narrative it boasts of

itself globally and demonstrate the many ways that Indigenous presence remains despite the many historical and ongoing attempts of erasure of Indigeneity across the city and Canada more broadly.

References

Alfred, Gerald Taiaiake. 2009. “Restitution Is the Real Pathway to Justice for Indigenous Peoples.” *In Response, Responsibility and Renewal: Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Journey, eds.* Gregory Younging, Jonathan Dewar and Mike Gagné, Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.179–187.

Andersen, Chris. 2014. “Urban Landscapes of North America.” In R. Warrior, The World of Indigenous North America, 175–96. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203122280-18.

Atleo, Clifford, and Jonathan Boron. 2022. “Land Is Life: Indigenous Relationships to Territory and Navigating Settler Colonial Property Regimes in Canada.” Land (Basel) 11 (5): 609. https://doi.org/10.3390/land11050609.

Asch, M., Tully, J., & Borrows, J. 2018*. Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and earth teachings.* University of Toronto Press.

Baloy, Natalie J.K. “Spectacles and Spectres: Settler Colonial Spaces in Vancouver.” Settler Colonial Studies 6, no. 3 (2015): 209–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473x.2015.1018101.

Barnes, T., T. Hutton, D. Ley, and M. Moos. 2011. “Vancouver: Restructuring Narratives in the Transnational Metropolis.” In Canadian Urban Regions: Trajectories of Growth and Change, edited by L. Bourne, T. Hutton, R. G. Shearmur, and J. Simmons.

Beasley, Larry, and Frances Bula. 2019. Vancouverism. Vancouver, BC: On Point Press, an imprint of UBC Press.

Berelowitz, Lance. 2009. Dream City. Madeira Park, CA: D & M Publishers.

Black Indigenous Design Collective. Accessed March 30, 2023. https://www.bidc.ca/.

Biin, D., Hodgson, C., & Wilson, K. (2018, September 5). *Acknowledging traditional territories*. Pulling Together Foundations Guide. Retrieved November 27, 2021, from https://opentextbc.ca/indigenizationfoundations/chapter/acknowledging-traditional-territories/.

Boddy, Trevor, and George. Baird. 2017. City-Builder : the Architecture of James K.M. Cheng / Trevor Boddy. Images Publishing Group Pty Ltd.

Boddy, Trevor. 2004. “New Urbanism: ‘The Vancouver Model.’” Places 16 (2): 14–21.

Bowen, G. A. 2009. Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27-40.

Boilevin, Louise, Jules Chapman, Lindsay Deane, Caroline Doerksen, Greg Fresz, DJ Joe, Nicolas Leech-Crier, et al. 2019. “Research 101 : A Manifesto for Ethical Research in the Downtown Eastside.” O. UBC Community and Partner Publications. March 15.doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.14288/1.0377565.

Bouvier, Noelle, and Ryan Walker. 2018. “Indigenous Planning and Municipal Governance: Lessons from the Transformative Frontier.” Canadian Public Administration 61, no. 1:130–34. https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12249.

Bryant, Rachel. 2017. “Canadian Exceptionalism Is about Land and Resources.” Borealia, July 23, 2022. https://earlycanadianhistory.ca/2017/04/10/canadian exceptionalism-is-aboutand-and-resources/.

City of Vancouver. *Protecting Vancouver's views*. City of Vancouver. Retrieved May 27, 2022, from https://vancouver.ca/home-property-development/protecting vancouvers-views.aspx

Cheung, C. 2019, April 23. *Vancouverism - good urban planning, or platitudes?* The Tyee. Retrieved April 8, 2022, from https://thetyee.ca/Culture/2019/04/23/VancouverismGood Urban-Planning-Or Platitudes/.

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. Red Skin, White Masks. University of Minnesota Press.

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2007. Subjects of empire: Indigenous peoples and the ‘politics of recognition’ in Canada. Contemporary Political Theory 6(4): 437–460.

Coulthard, Glen Sean, and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson. 2016. “Grounded Normativity / Place Based Solidarity.” American Quarterly 68 (2): 249–55.

Call for meaningful action on anti-racism and reconciliation. (n.d.). Retrieved November 27, 2021, from https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/call-for-meaningful-action-on-anti-racism-and-reconciliation.pdf.

Cormier, Brendan. “Vancouverism Is Everywhere.” Brendan Cormier works, 2010. https://cargocollective.com/brendancormier/Vancouverism-is-Everywhere.

Corntassel, Jeff, Chaw-win-is, & T’lakwadzi. 2009. *Indigenous storytelling, truth-telling, and community approaches to reconciliation.* ESC: English Studies in Canada, 35(1), 137-159.

Crosby, Andrew, and Monaghan, Jeffrey. 2018. Policing Indigenous Movements : Dissent and the Security State / Andrew Crosby and Jeffrey Monaghan. Fernwood Publishing.

Daigle, M. and Ramírez, M.M. 2019. Decolonial Geographies. *Keywords in Radical Geography: Antipode at 50*, 78-84. DOI: 10.1111/anti.12455

Dickinson, Peter. 2016. “Vancouverism and Its Cultural Amenities: The View from Here.” Canadian Theatre Review 167: 40–47. https://doi.org/10.3138/ctr.167.009.

Dorries, Heather, David Hugill, and Julie Tomiak. 2022. “Racial Capitalism and the Production of Settler Colonial Cities.” Geoforum 132: 263–70.

Dorries, Heather, Robert Henry, David Hugill, Tyler McCreary, and Julie Tomiak. 2019.Settler City Limits: Indigenous Resurgence and Colonial Violence in the Urban Prairie West. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Dorries, Heather. 2023. “INDIGENOUS URBANISM AS AN ANALYTIC: Towards Indigenous Urban Theory.” International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 47 (1): 110–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.13129.

Edmonds, Penelope. 2010. “Unpacking Settler Colonialism’s Urban Strategies: Indigenous Peoples in Victoria, British Columbia, and the Transition to a Settler Colonial City.” Urban History Review 38, no. 2: 4–20. https://doi.org/10.7202/039671ar.

Ellis-Young, Margaret. 2021. “Gentrification as (Settler) Colonialism? Moving beyond Metaphorical Linkages.” Geography Compass 16, no. 1.

Fanon, Frantz. 1961. The Wretched of the Earth. New York: Grove Press.

Gosnell-Myers, Ginger. 2022. “Co-Creating the Cities We Deserve through Indigenous Knowledge.” In Sacred Civics, 1st ed., 1:80–90. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003199816-8.

Grant, Howard., Sparrow, Leona., Grant, Larrisa., and Scoble, Jemma in *Planning on the Edge: Vancouver and the Challenges of Reconciliation, Social Justice, and Sustainable Development*. 2019. UBC Press.

Hamilton Spectator. “Time to End the Myth of Canadian Exceptionalism.” thespec.com. TheSpec.com, February 16, 2017. https://www.thespec.com/opinion/contributors/2017/02/16/time-to-end-themyth-of canadian-exceptionalism.html.

Hutton, T. A., and Penny Gurstein. *Planning on the Edge: Vancouver and the Challenges of Reconciliation, Social Justice, and Sustainable Development*. UBC Press, 2019.

Henderson, Jennifer. 2015. “Residential Schools and Opinion-Making in the Era of Traumatized Subjects and Taxpayer-Citizens.” Journal of Canadian Studies 49 (1): 5–43. https://doi.org/10.3138/jcs.49.1.5.

Henderson, Jennifer & Wakeham, Pauline. 2009*. Colonial Reckoning, national reconciliation?: Aboriginal peoples and the culture of redress in Canada.* ESC: English Studies in Canada, 35(1), 1–26.

Hyslop, K. 2020. *Vancouver is failing on 'City of Reconciliation' claim, says its Indigenous Committee*. The Tyee. Retrieved November 27, 2021, from https://thetyee.ca/News/2020/07/10/Vancouver-Fails-Reconciliation-Claim/.

Kataoka, Serena. 2011. “Vancouverism: Actualizing the Livable City Paradox.” Berkeley Planning Journal 22 (1). https://doi.org/10.5070/BP322112717.

Kovach, Margaret Elizabeth. 2000. Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations and Contexts. University of Toronto Press.

Kovach, M. 2010. Conversation Method in Indigenous Research. First Peoples Child & Family Review, 5(1), 40–48.

Kwak, Laura J. 2020. “Problematizing Canadian Exceptionalism: A Study of Right Populism, White Nationalism and Conservative Political Parties.” Oñati Socio Legal Series 10 (6): 1166–92. https://doi.org/10.35295/osls.iisl/0000-0000-0000 1127.

Ladner, Kiera. 2019. “Proceed with Caution: Reflections on Resurgence and Reconciliation.” In Resurgence and Reconciliation, 245–64. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487519926-010.

Leeuw, Sarah, and Sarah Hunt. 2018. “Unsettling Decolonizing Geographies.” Geography Compass 12 (7): e12376–n/a. https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12376.

Logan, Katharine. 2021. “Vancouverism.” Architectural Record 209 (5): 62–67.

Maracle, Lee. 1996. I Am Woman : a Native Perspective on Sociology and Feminism / Lee Maracle. Second edition. Press Gang Publishers.

Maracle, Lee. 2017. My conversations with Canadians. BookThug.

Marx, K. 1867. Capital: A critique of political economy. Volume 1, Part 1: The process of capitalist production. New York, NY: Cosimo.

Mawani, Renisa. 2005. “Genealogies of the Land: Aboriginality, Law, and Territory in Vancouver’s Stanley Park.” Social & Legal Studies 14 (3): 315–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663905054907.

Mays, Kyle T. 2023. “THE CITIES WE CALL HOME: Indigeneity, Race and Settler Colonial Urbanisms.” International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 47 (1): 155–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.13133.\

McGregor, Deborah. 2018. From ‘Decolonized’ To Reconciliation Research in Canada: Drawing From Indigenous Research Paradigms. ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies, 17(3), 810-831.

Meierhenrich, Jens. 2008. *“Varieties of Reconciliation.”* Law and Social Inquiry, vol. 33, no. 1, 195-231.

Million, Diane. 2013. Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights. U of Arizona P.

Miller, and Miller, Robert J. 2010. Discovering Indigenous Lands : the Doctrine of Discovery in the English Colonies / Robert J. Miller [and Others]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Motion 6. protocol to acknowledge first ... - vancouver. (n.d.). Retrieved November 27, 2021, from https://council.vancouver.ca/20140625/documents/ptec6.pdf.

Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. 2015. The White Possessive. University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt155jmpf.

Morgan, Hani. 2022. “Conducting a Qualitative Document Analysis.” Qualitative Report 27 (1): 64–77. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5044.

MST Development Corporation. Accessed March 30, 2023. http://mstdevelopment.ca/.

Musqueam acknowledges day for truth and reconciliation. Musqueam. (2021, October 4). Retrieved December 7, 2021, from https://www.musqueam.bc.ca/day-for-truth-and-reconciliation-2021/.

Nejad, Sarem, Ryan Walker, Brenda Macdougall, Yale Belanger, and David Newhouse. 2019. “‘This Is an Indigenous City; Why Don't We See It?’ Indigenous Urbanism and Spatial Production in Winnipeg.” The Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien 63, no. 3, 413–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/cag.12520.

O'Donnell, Susan, and David Perley. 2016. “Toward a Sociology of the Reconciliation of Conflicting Desires.” The Canadian Review of Sociology 53 (4): 474–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/cars.12129.

O’Leary, Z. (2014). The essential guide to doing your research project (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Opinion: Reconciliation is about a journey, not the destination. North Shore News. (n.d.). Retrieved December 7, 2021, from https://www.nsnews.com/opinion/opinion-reconciliation-is-about-a-journey-not-the-destination-tsleil-waututh-nation-chief-jen-thomas-north-vancouver-4464164.

Pandit, Ankur. “Canadian Exceptionalism.” Medium. Medium, April 6, 2020. https://medium.com/@apandit/canadian-exceptionalism-16999f446455.

Peck, Jamie, Elliot Siemiatycki, and Elvin Wyly. 2014. “Vancouver's Suburban Involution.” City (London, England) 18 (4-5): 386–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2014.939464.

Peters, Evelyn J. 2011. “Emerging Themes in Academic Research in Urban Aboriginal Identities in Canada, 1996-2010.” Aboriginal Policy Studies (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada) 1 (1). https://doi.org/10.5663/aps.v1i1.9242.

Peters, Evelyn J., and Andersen, Chris. 2013. Indigenous in the City : Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation / Edited by Evelyn Peters and Chris Andersen. UBC Press.

Porter, Libby, Hirini Matunga, Leela Viswanathan, Lyana Patrick, Ryan Walker, Leonie Sandercock, Dana Moraes, et al. 2017. "Indigenous Planning: From Principles to Practice/a Revolutionary Pedagogy of/for Indigenous Planning/Settler-Indigenous Relationships as Liminal Spaces in Planning Education and Practice/Indigenist Planning/What Is the Work of Non-Indigenous People in the Service of a Decolonizing Agenda?/Supporting Indigenous Planning in the City/Film as a Catalyst for Indigenous Community Development/Being Ourselves and Seeing Ourselves in the City: Enabling the Conceptual Space for Indigenous Urban Planning/Universities Can Empower the next Generation of Architects, Planners, and Landscape Architects in Indigenous Design and Planning." Planning Theory & Practice 18, no. 4: 639–66.

Punter, John. 2004. The Vancouver Achievement: Urban Planning and Design. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Prager, Clara, Ash Peplow, Terri Brown, Trudi Goels, and Ginger Gosnell-Myers. 2023. Rep. Edited by Victoria Barclay and Monique Nicholas. *THE TRC CALLS TO ACTION IN BC MUNICIPALITIES Progress, Barriers, and Opportunities to Accelerate Implementation*. Vancouver, BC: Women Transforming Cities.

Razack, Sherene. 2002. Race, Space, and the Law. Toronto, CA: Between the Lines.

Reconciliation Canada. "The Canadian Reconciliation Landscape." Reconciliation Canada, 2017. https://reconciliationcanada.ca/staging/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/NationalNarrativeReport-ReconciliationCanada-ReleasedMay2017_3.pdf.

Reconciliation Canada. (n.d.). Retrieved November 27, 2021, from https://reconciliationcanada.ca/.

Reconciliation in Canada. The Canadian Encyclopedia. (n.d.). Retrieved November 27, 2021, from https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/reconciliation-in-canada#:~:text=done%20by%20colonization.-,In%20Canada%2C%20the%20process%20of%20reconciliation%20is%20tied%20to%20the,ongoing%20effects%20on%20Indigenous%20peoples.

Rec_Can. (2021, November 27). *The language of reconciliation: Elders' circle*. Vimeo. Retrieved November 27, 2021, from https://vimeo.com/208585660.

Reimer, Chrismas, Reimer, Laura E., & Chrismas, Robert. 2020. *Our shared future : windows into Canada's reconciliation journey* / edited by Laura E. Reimer and Robert Chrismas ; foreword by David Barnard. Lexington Books.

Robertson, Dwanna L. 2015. "Invisibility in the Color-Blind Era: Examining Legitimized Racism Against Indigenous Peoples." American Indian Quarterly 39 (2): 113–53. https://doi.org/10.5250/amerindiquar.39.2.0113.

Rotberg, Howard. 2008. Exploring Vancouverism : the Political Culture of Canada's Lotus Land / Howard Rotberg. CanadianValuesPress.

Seṅáḵw. Accessed March 30, 2023. https://senakw.com/.

Senbel, Maged., and Stevens, Mark. 2019. "Vancouverism and Sustainable Urban Design: Past Its Prime and Needing to Evolve" in *Planning on the Edge: Vancouver and the Challenges of Reconciliation, Social Justice, and Sustainable Development*. UBC Press.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2013. Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples, 1st Edition. Moorpark, CA: Cram101 Inc..

Short, Damien. 2005*. Reconciliation and the Problem of Internal Colonialism,* Journal of Intercultural Studies, 26:3, 267-282, DOI: 10.1080/07256860500153534

Shrubb, R. 2014. *"Canada has no history of colonialism": Historical amnesia: The erasure of Indigenous peoples from Canada's history* (thesis).

Simpson, Audra. 2014. *Mohawk interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Simpson, Audra. 2016. "Reconciliation and its Discontents: Settler Governance in an Age of Sorrow." Paper presented to the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK, Canada. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vGl9HkzQsGg

Simpson, Leanne. 2017. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Simpson, Leanne. 2011. *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re Creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence.* ARP Books.

Simpson, M., & Hugill, D. W. (2022). The settler colonial city in three movements. Progress in Human Geography, 46(6), 1311–1330. https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325221114115

Tillner, Silja. 2013. Incremental Planning – Cooperative Scenario and/or Masterplan? Long- and Short-Term Planning Horizon of Urban Design Projects within the Existing Urban Fabric. Analysis of Projects in Vienna and Switzerland with Regard to the Factors Triggering Varying Planning Times. Real Corp 2013: Planning Times. 419-428.

Thomas, Louis L. 2021. "From Childless Tower to Child-Full Density: Families and the Evolution of Vancouverism." Planning Perspectives 36 (3): 559–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/02665433.2020.1815568.

Tomiak, Julie. 2011. Indigeneity and the city: Representations, resistance, and the right to the city. In A Bourke, T Dafnos and M Kip (eds) Lumpen-City: Discourses of Marginality / Marginalizing Discourses (pp 163–192). Ottawa: Red Quill Books.

Tomiak, Julie. 2016. "Unsettling Ottawa: Settler colonialism, Indigenous resistance, and the politics of scale." Canadian Journal of Urban Research 25 (1): 8–21.

Tomiak, Julie. 2017. “Contesting the Settler City: Indigenous Self-Determination, New Urban Reserves, and the Neoliberalization of Colonialism.” Antipode 49, no. 4: 928–45.

Tomiak, Julie. 2018. “What about Cities? Containing Urban Self-Determination through the Indigenous Rights Framework.” *Yellowhead Institute.*

Tomiak, Julie. 2023. “Land Back / Cities Back.” Urban Geography 44 (2): 292–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2022.2126610.

Tuck, Eve. 2009. Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities. Harvard Educational Review.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, education & society*, *1*(1).

Vancouver, C. of. (n.d.). *City of reconciliation*. City of Vancouver. Retrieved November 27, 2021, from https://vancouver.ca/people-programs/city-of-reconciliation.aspx.

Vancouver, C. of. (n.d.). *Year of reconciliation: June, 2013 – June, 2014*. City of Vancouver. Retrieved November 27, 2021, from https://vancouver.ca/people-programs/year-of-reconciliation.aspx.

Vanthuyne, K. 2021. "I want to move forward. you can move forward too*." Articulating indigenous self-determination at the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.* Human Rights Quarterly, 43(2), 355–377.

Viswanathan, Leela. 2018. “Decolonization, Recognition, and Reconciliation in Reforming Land Use Policy and Planning With First Nations in Southern Ontario.” In Dialogues in Urban and Regional Planning 6, 1st ed., 157–73. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315628127-8.

Walker, Ryan Christopher, Theodore S. Jojola, David C. Natcher, and Hirini Matunga. 2013. “Theorizing Indigenous Planning.” Essay. In Reclaiming Indigenous Planning. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Walsh, Robert M. 2013. “The Origins of Vancouverism: A Historical Inquiry into the Architecture and Urban Form of Vancouver, British Columbia.” PhD dissertation, University of Michigan.

Willmott, Kyle. 2022. “Taxes, Taxpayers, and Settler Colonialism: Toward a Critical Fiscal Sociology of Tax as White Property.” Law & Society Review 56 (1): 6–27.

Wolfe, P. 2006. Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. Journal of Genocide Research, 8(4), 387–409.

Wyile, H. 2018. “The Currency That Is Reconciliation Discourse in Canada”: Contesting Neoliberal Reconciliation. Studies in Canadian Literature / Études en littérature canadienne, 43(2).

Yakashiro, Nicole. 2021. ""Powell Street Is Dead": Nikkei Loss, Commemoration, and Representations of Place in the Settler Colonial City." Urban History Review 48 (2): 32–55. https://doi.org/10.3138/uhr.48.2.03.

"Metaphor." Oxford Reference. Accessed March 30, 2023.