

## CANADA

### Acadians

Activity: 1972-1986

#### **General notes**

- The important cultural center for the Acadians is Moncton in New Brunswick. Some Acadians see themselves as Quebecois but most maintain a separate identity. They have a different French dialect (Minahan 2002: 19-20).

#### **Movement start and end dates**

- The revival of Acadian culture in the 1970s set off a cultural and political movement. The cultural movement, represented by the Société Acadienne du Nouveau-Brunswick (SANB), primarily focused on French-language education in New Brunswick. Organized demands for more political autonomy surfaced with the formation of the Parti Acadien in 1972. The Parti Acadien called for a “decentralization of government offices and the eventual creation of an Acadian province by splitting New Brunswick from northeast to southwest” (Magocsi 1999: 134).
- Given the linguistic proximity and the fact that Acadians have a large community in southeastern Quebec, the Parti Acadien was supported by the Parti Québécois in its pursuit of an own province.
- After an unsuccessful performance in the 1974 elections, the party won 7.9% in the 1978 elections in the province of New Brunswick. Following a defeat in the 1982 elections, the party officially disbanded in 1986 (Magord 2009).
- The SANB is still active but given that its purpose is restricted to cultural goals, we code an end to the movement with the dissolution of the Parti Acadien in 1986.
- In 2005 Acadian groups held events in memory of the 1755 displacement. These groups used the events as a platform to seek apologies for the displacement (MRGI 2008). However, we found no evidence to suggest that SD claims were made in this context. [start date: 1972; end date: 1986]

#### **Dominant claim**

- The Parti Acadien was founded in 1972, with the aim to make the Francophone northern part of New Brunswick the 11<sup>th</sup> province of Canada, named Acadia (Acadie) (Roth, 2015: 521). Magocsi (1999: 134) describes the demands as the “decentralization of government offices and the eventual creation of an Acadian province by splitting New Brunswick from northeast to southwest”. Due to cultural closeness to Quebec, the Parti Quebecois also supported this claim. [1972-1986: sub-state secession claim]

#### **Independence claims**

NA

#### **Irredentist claims**

NA

## **Claimed territory**

- The Parti Acadien has called for the creation of a new province, whereby the New Brunswick Province would be split from north-east to south-west. We code this claim based on Roth (2015: 516).

## **Sovereignty declarations**

NA

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- No violence was found; hence the entire movement is coded with NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- The first Acadian settlement was founded in 1604 by French settlers mostly from Brittany and Normandy. The Acadians region changed hands between English/ British and French multiple times. The main settlement was Port Royal, which was destroyed by the English in 1613. The Acadians came under control of the English/ Scottish colony of Nova Scotia in 1621, but was returned to the French in 1632 (Minahan, 2002: 20-21; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). A short civil war between Acadians followed, which weakened the region. Acadia came under English control again from 1654-1670, after which it reverted to French control (Minahan, 2002: 21; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online).
- Port Royal was captured by the British in 1710 and was brought under the Nova Scotia colony. The Acadians were asked to swear fealty to Britain, but they refused. However, the Acadians were largely left alone until 1755 and the beginning of the French and Indian War (part of the Seven Years war). Between 1755 and 1763 6-10,000 Acadians were deported. They were allowed to return in 1763 but by then, much of the land was occupied by British settlers, pushing Acadians to coastal areas. The Acadian region was also divided when Madawaska was sold to Quebec region in 1763, dividing Acadia between Quebec and Nova Scotia (later New Brunswick, which became its own region in 1783) (Minahan, 2002: 21; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online).
- One of the main issues for the Acadians in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century was language and education when education became anglicized in 1864 (Minahan, 2002: 22). However, Canada was founded in 1867 with both English and French recognized as an official language. Provinces received autonomy, but there was no Acadian province established (Cameron, 2020: 100-103). The first Acadian newspaper was founded in 1867, with the first national congress of the Acadians seeing the adoption of national symbols and a flag in 1884 (Roth, 2015: 521; Minahan, 2002: 22; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). In 1890 the first French language school for Acadians opened in Nova Scotia. However, in 1912 Rule XVII abolished French in schools outside Quebec, a rule not reversed until 1968 (Minahan, 2002: 22; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online).
- The Great Depression and mechanized farming pushed many Acadians to the cities with many assimilating with English-speaking Canadians. The first elected Acadian premier of New Brunswick, Louis Joseph Robichaud, was elected in 1960 (Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). Around this time, awareness of French/Acadian identity started to grow.
- Rule XVII was reversed in 1968, giving Acadians outside of Quebec region access to secondary education in French (Minahan, 2002: 22). [1968: cultural rights concession]
- In 1969, the newly elected Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau set out to make Canada a bilingual country. The federal parliament passed the 1969 Official Languages Act, which implemented the official use of both languages in all federal institutions (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 102; Minahan, 2002: 22). Another reason to code a concession in 1969 is that New Brunswick

adopted the New Brunswick Official Languages Act in 1969, leading to New Brunswick officially becoming bilingual in 1970 (Esman, 1982: 236; Ottawa, nd: Online). New Brunswick became the first province to publish statutes in English and French in 1974 (Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). [1969: cultural rights concession]

### **Concessions and restrictions**

- In 1981, New Brunswick recognized French and English as equal languages (Minahan, 2002: 20; Cardinal and Leger, 2022: Online). [1981: cultural rights concession]
- The Constitution Act of 1982 amended Canada's 1867 Constitution Act, and was approved by New Brunswick. Articles relating to equality of language were implemented, with special articles referencing New Brunswick (Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). However, we found no evidence for a new concession; instead, this change seemed to only confirm the existing protection of the French language at the federal level (Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). Relevant articles include:
  - o "English and French are the official languages of New Brunswick and have equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all institutions of the legislature and government of New Brunswick" (Article 16.2)
  - o "Everyone has the right to use English or French in any debates and other proceedings of the legislature of New Brunswick" (Article 17.2)
  - o "The statutes, records and journals of the legislature of New Brunswick shall be printed and published in English and French and both language versions are equally authoritative" (Article 18.2)
  - o "Either English or French may be used by any person in, or in any pleading in or process issuing from, any court of New Brunswick" (Article 19.2)
  - o "Any member of the public in New Brunswick has the right to communicate with, and to receive available services from, any office of an institution of the legislature or government of New Brunswick in English or French." (Article 20.2)

### **Regional autonomy**

- The Acadians do not have their own autonomous territory. However, the province of New Brunswick enjoys regional autonomy within Canada, and the Acadians have had representation. Notably, the New Brunswick's premier from 1960-1970, Louis Robichaud, was Acadian. Another Acadian represented in the regional government was Fernand Dube, who had major roles in cabinets between 1974-1987. On this basis, we code the Acadians with regional autonomy, though it is notably shared with New Brunswick's English-speakers. [1972-1986: regional autonomy]

### **De facto independence**

NA

### **Major territorial changes**

NA

## EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Acadians
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	French speakers
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2002000

### Power access

- The Acadians form part of the ‘French Speakers’ EPR group, which is coded as junior partner throughout. However, the Acadians make up only a small minority of French speakers in Canada, the majority of whom are Quebecois. It is established practice in Canada to guarantee regional representation in the assignment of ministerial posts (Bakvis 1988) and we have found evidence for several French-speaking ministers from New Brunswick and, therefore, presumed Acadians. This includes Hédard Robichaud (Fisheries minister 1963-68), Roméo LeBlanc (various roles 1974-84), Ginette Petitpas Taylor (various roles 2017-22), and Dominic LeBlanc (various roles 2016-19). [1972-1986: junior partner]

### Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 19) there were around 385,000 Acadians in Canada in 2002. According to the World Bank, Canada’s population in 2002 was 31.4 million. [0.0012]

### Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 19f), around 250,000 of all 385,000 Acadians in Canada lived in New Brunswick in 2002. While we could not find concrete evidence that the Acadians make up the majority in their regional base, various sources including Minahan (2002) and the 2016 Canadian census confirm that the Acadians today live predominantly in the northern and eastern parts of Brunswick while English speakers dominate in the remaining parts of New Brunswick. [regional concentration]

### Kin

- The Quebecois form part of the EPR group ‘French speakers’. EPR codes several kin groups. These are the French (France), Walloon (Belgium), Swiss French (Switzerland), Aostans (Italy), and Franco-Mauritians (Mauritius). We follow EPR and code ethnic kin in non-neighboring countries. [kin in non-adjointing country]

### Sources

- Bakvis, Herman (1988). “Regional Ministers, National Policies and the Administrative State in Canada: The Regional Dimension in Cabinet Decision-Making, 1980-1984.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 21(3): 539-567.
- Cameron, D. (2020) Canada: Two Languages, 10 Provinces, 3 Territories and Indigenous Peoples. In: Griffiths, A., Chattopadhyay, R., Light, J., Stieren, C. (Eds.) *The Forum of Federations Handbook of Federal Countries*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, 97-110.
- Canadian Encyclopedia. <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/timeline/acadian-history> [February 7, 2022]

- Cardinal, L. and Leger, R. (2022) Strengthening French Language Laws in Canada: Three Major Legislative Initiatives, *Policy Options Politiques* [Online]. Available at: <https://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/three-new-french-language-laws/> [Accessed: 24/07/2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Esman, M.J. (1982) The Politics of Official Bilingualism in Canada, *Political Science Quarterly*, 92, (2), 233-253.
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Magocsi, Paul R. (1999). *Encyclopedia of Canada's peoples*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Magord, André (2009). *The Quest for Autonomy in Acadia*. Brussels: Peter Lang.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 19-24.
- Minority Rights Group International (2008) World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples - Canada : French Canadians [Online]. Available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/49749d41c.html> [Accessed: 05/11/2022]
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Société de l'Acadie du Nouveau-Brunswick. "Historique." <http://www.sanb.ca/au-sujet-de-la-sanb/historique.aspx> [March 17, 2015].
- uOttawa (nd) New Brunswick Official Languages Act (1969) [Online]. Available at: <https://www.uottawa.ca/clmc/new-brunswick-official-languages-act-1969#> [Accessed: 24/07/2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

## **Albertans**

Activity: 1999-2020

### **General notes**

NA

### **Movement start and end dates**

- Albertans have mobilized along with other Western Canadians for an independent Western Canada consisting of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan (see Westerners). However, there has also been separate mobilization for an independent (or at least more autonomous) Alberta. A key driver of Albertan separatism is its oil wealth (Roth 2015: 527).
- The first evidence we could find for organized separatist claims tied specifically to Alberta (and not Western Canada as a whole) is the formation of the Alberta First Party (AFP) in 1999, which made claims for an independent Alberta.
- In 2001, the Alberta Independence Party (AIP) was formed. According to reports from CBC News: “About 200 people took part in the founding convention of the Alberta Independence Party” and “made passionate pleas for separation arguing that the regional divisions within Canada are already too wide to bridge any longer” (CBC News 1/22/2001). AIP appears to have had limited success.
- Roth (2015: 527) describes the movement as small but visible and ongoing. According to Roth, the movement was spearheaded by the Separation Party of Alberta, a successor to the Alberta First Party (AFP) which first emerged in 2004, at the time of his writing.
- The fact that an Albertan “oil man”, Steven Harper, was Canada’s PM between 2006-2015 cooled separatist sentiments. The election of Justin Trudeau as PM reinvigorated the movement (Vice 2016). Several parties made separatist claims as of 2020 including the Alberta Freedom Party and the Independence Party of Alberta (registered 2019) (Elections Alberta n.d.). [start date: 1999; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- Alberta First ran from 1999-2004 when it was renamed the West Separation Party from 2004-2018 when it disbanded (Roth 2015: 527). These parties maintained an independence claim.
- The Albertan Independence Party made claims for both autonomy and independence.
- There is also the Freedom Conservative Party of Alberta, which supported independence from 2018-2020 when they merged with the Wexit movement to form the Wildrose Independence Party (Wildrose, nd: Online). Overall, the dominant claim appears to be for independence, though more limited claims for more internal autonomy have also been made. [1999-2020: independence claim]

### **Independence claims**

- See above. [start date: 1999; end date: ongoing]

### **Irredentist claims**

NA

## **Claimed territory**

- Albertan self-determination claims concern the current administrative region of Alberta. We code this territory based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

## **Sovereignty declarations**

NA

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- No violence was found, hence a NVIOLSD coding. [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- Europeans entered Alberta in the 1700's, with the first trading post established in 1778 (Minahan, 2016: 19; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). Two companies, the Hudson Bay Company and the North West Company, held competing trade posts until the Hudson Bay Company gained full control in 1821 (Minahan, 2016: 19; 2002: 2061; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). The company dominated Alberta until 1870, when the Canadian government took control of Alberta and incorporated it into the Northwest Territories of Canada. The district of Alberta was created in 1882, and when the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed in 1886 a slow trickle of migration occurred, with larger migrations in the 1890's and 1900's onto prairie lands. In 1905, Alberta became a full province of Canada (Minahan, 2016: 19; 2002: 2061; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online).
- In 1930, after a long campaign all crown lands and natural resources were granted to the Province of Alberta (Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). The Great Depression in the 1930's saw mass emigration from Alberta's prairie lands (Minahan, 2002: 2061). The discovery of oil in Alberta in 1947 saw the industrial base shift from agriculture to oil industries. The revenues transformed the urban centers and made Alberta a net contributor to the federal budget. This was particularly stark during the 1973 oil crisis which sustained the state until the recessions of the 1980's (Minahan, 2016: 19; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online).
- In October 1980, three months after the Quebecois independence referendum, Trudeau announced plans to repatriate the constitution – that is, write a new document that would be entirely Canadian and thus cut links with the UK. After initial reservations, nine of ten provinces agreed to the repatriation in 1981 – all except for Quebec (Meadwell 1993: 235). This had been possible because the constitutional amendment formula was changed beforehand. Until 1981, there was an implicit agreement that constitutional changes require unanimous provincial consent. Many Quebecois had furthermore even been under the impression that Quebec enjoys a special veto, though this belief was not widely shared outside of Quebec. In 1981, Canada's Supreme Court ruled that only a “substantial degree of provincial consent” was necessary for constitutional changes (Dunsmuir & O'Neal 1992).
- The fact that Quebec did not sign Canada's 1982 constitution initiated a constitutional crisis. The 1987 Meech Lake Accord set out to resolve the situation. The proposal included major concessions to Quebec; however, also other provinces would have profited from increased autonomy rights, including a constitutional veto, increased competencies with regard to immigration, and the right to opt out of certain national programs. All provincial first ministers promised ratification (Meadwell 1993: 236). However, in June 1990, the three-year deadline for ratification of the Meech Lake Accord ended without ratification of all provinces (Manitoba and Newfoundland did not ratify; Minorities at Risk Project).
- The failed Meech Lake Accord was followed by a similar Accord, the Charlottetown Accord. Again, Quebec would have gained the most, but also other provinces were promised increased autonomy, including competencies in forestry, mining, natural resources, and cultural policy.

(Minorities at Risk Project). The Charlottetown Accord goes even beyond Meech Lake in terms of devolved competencies. It was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992. However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. Alberta voted no by 60.2%. We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide.

- After the narrow loss of the sovereigntists in the 1995 independence referendum, in 1996, the constitutional amendments formula was changed so that Quebec regained a veto over constitutional amendments. The formula that had been introduced in 1982 treated all provinces equally in that it required the consent of two thirds of the provinces that together have at least 50% of Canada's population (Heard & Swartz 1997: 340). The 1996 formula required the consent of a majority of the provinces that includes Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, two or more of the Atlantic provinces that in combination have at least 50% of the region's population. This gave Alberta a de-facto veto (Heard & Swartz 1997: 342). While this was first and foremost a concession for the Quebecois, it also increased Alberta's stake in constitutional amendments (see Heard & Swartz 1997: 342). [1996: autonomy concession]
- One of the issues for Alberta relates to the selection of federal Senators (Minahan, 2002: 2063). Senators in Canada are appointed rather than elected (Cameron, 2020: 104). In 1989 the Alberta government passed the Senatorial Selection Act, which enabled direct elections of Senate nominees from Alberta who are then presented to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is not legally bound to select from the elected nominees but according to the Canadian Encyclopedia senators have traditionally been selected from this elected group (nd: Online). Alberta is the only province to have this system. We do not code a concession because the move to election was not initiated by the central government, which is under no obligation to respect Albertans' choices.

### **Concessions and restrictions**

NA

### **Regional autonomy**

- Alberta is a full province of a federal Canada and so enjoys regional autonomy [regional autonomy: 1999-2020]

### **De facto independence**

NA

### **Major territorial changes**

NA

### **EPR2SDM**

<i>Movement</i>	Albertans
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	English speakers
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2001000



## Power access

- Alberta is mainly English-speaking, thus the Albertans constitute part of the Canadian English speakers. EPR codes English speakers in Canada as senior partner (and French speakers as junior partner). Generally, Quebec and Ontario have the most important role in Canada's federal government (Minahan 2002: 2063), but Western Canadians including Albertans should not be considered powerless. It is established practice in Canada to guarantee regional representation in the assignment of ministerial posts (Bakvis 1988). Albertans regularly had representation in the federal cabinet, including Harvie Andre (1984-90), Joyce Fairbairn (1993-1997), Jason Kenney (various roles 2013-15), and Randy Boissonnault (2021-22). [1999-2020: junior partner]

## Group size

- According to Minahan (2016: 18), there were between 3.5-4.1 mio Albertans in Canada in 2015 (we use 3.8 mio). Canada's population was about 36 mio in 2015 (Statistics Canada 2015). [0.1056]

## Regional concentration

- We found no concrete data on Albertans' demographic distribution within Canada, but the movement's regional identity character strongly suggests a regional concentration code. In support of this, Canada Encyclopedia suggests that "minorities" make up only 23.5% of Alberta's population (this includes South Asians, Chinese, Black, and Filipino) while indigenous make up 6.5%. Therefore, Canadians of European descent make up 70% of the remaining population. Approx 75% of Alberta's population are native English speakers according to the 2016 census. The data in Minahan (2002: 2059) also suggests a regional concentration code, though it refers to Western Canadians as a whole, which also includes British Columbians and Saskatchewaners. [regionally concentrated]

## Kin

- Minahan (2002: 2059) reports smaller Westerner communities in the rest of Canada and the United States. These are not significant enough to be considered here. Note: While the Albertans are also English speakers, we do not code English speakers in other countries (e.g. in the United States) as kin because this movement is directed against a government dominated by English speakers. [no kin]

## Sources

Alberta (nd) Alberta Senate Election Act (Online). Available at: <https://www.alberta.ca/alberta-senate-election-act.aspx> [Accessed: 05/08/2022].

Bakvis, Herman (1988). "Regional Ministers, National Policies and the Administrative State in Canada: The Regional Dimension in Cabinet Decision-Making, 1980-1984." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 21(3): 539-567.

Cameron, D. (2020) Canada: Two Languages, 10 Provinces, 3 Territories and Indigenous Peoples. In: Griffiths, A., Chattopadhyay, R., Light, J., Stieren, C. (Eds.) *The Forum of Federations Handbook of Federal Countries*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, 97-110.

Canada Encyclopedia. <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/alberta> [February 7, 2022].

CBC News (2001). "Separatists Form New Party in Alberta." January 22.

<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/separatists-form-new-party-in-alberta-1.269437/> [June 19, 2014].

- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Dunsmuir, Mollie, and Brian O'Neal (1992). "Quebec's Constitutional Veto: The Legal and Historical Context." [www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/researchpublications/bp295-e.htm](http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/researchpublications/bp295-e.htm) [April 11, 2015].
- Elections Alberta (nd) Parties (Online). Available at: <https://www.elections.ab.ca/political-participants/parties/> [Accessed: 05/11/2022].
- Free Alberta . "For an Independent Alberta." [http://www.freealberta.com/current\\_issues.html](http://www.freealberta.com/current_issues.html) [October 25, 2013].
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 189-190, 319.
- Meadwell, Hudson (1993). "The Politics of Nationalism in Quebec". *World Politics* 45(2): 203-241.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Minahan, James (2016). *Encyclopedia of Stateless Nations. Second Edition*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.
- Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Separation Party of Alberta "Separation Party of Alberta." <http://www.separationalberta.com> [October 25, 2013].
- Vice (2016) The Last Best West: Meet Alberta's New Separatists (Online). Available at: <https://www.vice.com/en/article/yvx8jy/the-last-best-west-meet-albertas-new-separatists> [Accessed: 05/11/2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- WestCan – Western Canada Concept (nd) A Brief History of the Western Canada Concept (Online). Available at: [https://www.westcan.org/history\\_of\\_the\\_wcc.htm](https://www.westcan.org/history_of_the_wcc.htm) [Accessed: 27/08/2022].
- Wildrose Independence Party of Alberta (nd) About Us (Online). Available at: <https://wildrose.party/about-us/> [Accessed: 27/08/2022].

## **Anishinabe**

Activity: 1949-2020

### **General notes**

- The Anishinabe are an indigenous group from the Great Lakes region of Canada and the USA. Alternative names/sub-groups/bands include Anishnabeg, Anishinabek, Nishnaabe, Chippewa, Chippeway, Otchipwa, Odawa, Ojibwe, Ojibway, Ojibwa, and Potawatomi (Minahan 2016: 28).

### **Movement start and end dates**

- An Anishinabe organization called the Union of Ontario Indians (UOI) was established in 1949. The UOI's objectives included claims related to political representation, hunting and fishing rights, land rights, and crucially the full respect of treaty rights initiated under the Indian Act (Anishinabek Nation, nd-a: Online). 1949 is coded as the start date.
- In 1969, the Trudeau government released the Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (The White Paper), which acknowledged state misconduct vis-à-vis indigenous communities. The White Paper was rejected by indigenous communities because it failed to address salient concerns and was withdrawn in 1970 (Daigle 2016). In reaction to the white paper, "the UOI was reorganized to reflect the wider scope of Indian politics across the province. By 1972, three other Provincial Territorial Organizations were formed: The Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians, Nishnawbe Aski Nation, and Grand Council Treaty 3" (Anishinabek nation, nd-a: Online).
- Minahan (2016: 28) suggests that the movement remained ongoing, with the group's claims focused on autonomy and the reunification of tribal lands. [start date: 1949; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- An Anishinabe organization called the Union of Ontario Indians (UOI) was established in 1949. The UOI's objectives include claims related to political representation, the Indian Act, hunting and fishing rights, and land rights (Anishinabek Nation, nd-a: Online). In addition to land rights, the Anishianbe have made claims for increased autonomy and self-government (Anishinabek Nation, nd-b; Ontario n.d.). [1949-2020: autonomy claim]

### **Independence claims**

NA

### **Irredentist claims**

NA

### **Claimed territory**

- The Anishinabe seek to protect land claims and titles on existing reservations across their homeland of Anishinaabenaang. The Anishinabe reservations are largely represented in the Great Lakes region, particularly in southern Ontario but they are also present across southern Manitoba and south-east Saskatchewan (Danver 2015: 420; Minahan 2016: 1451; Anishinabek Nation n.d.). Other organizations, such as the Nishnawbe Aski Nation and the Grand Council Treaty #3 make

claims overlapping with historical treaties numbers 9 and 3 respectively (Nishnawbe Aski Nation, nd: Online; Grand Council Treaty 3, nd: Online). It is likely that there are further claims. Therefore, we code this claim as ambiguous and code the claimed territory based on settlement patterns as per GREG (Weidmann et al. 2010).

### **Sovereignty declarations**

NA

### **Separatist armed conflict**

- No violence was found; hence the entire movement is coded with NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

### **Historical context**

- The Anishinabe settled in the Great Lakes region and splintered into three main groups: the Ojibwes (or Chippewas), the Odawa (or Ottawa), and the Potawatomi. These bands remained united under the long-standing Council of the Three Fires, which has continuously existed in one form or another for centuries, including as the Union of Ontario Indians (Minahan 2002: 1453, 2016: 28; Danver 2015: 467; Anishinabek Nation, nd-a: Online).
- First contact with Europeans came with the arrival of French fur trappers and traders in the 1600's leading to a loose alliance with the French and conflict/ expansion into neighboring first nation territory (Iroquois, Sioux, etc) over the fur trade. After siding with the defeated French during the Seven Years War, many bands switched to the British to resist expansion of the USA (the Treaty of Niagara of 1764 marked "the formal beginning of the peaceful relations with Great Britain"), leading to the Anishinabe become split between Canada and the USA (Minahan 2002: 1453, 2016: 28; Danver 2015; Canadian Encyclopedia, 2020: Online; Anishinabek Nation, nd-a: Online).
- In the 1830s the Anishinabe began to negotiate treaties and ceded land for goods and reserves (Danver 2015). Relevant treaties included "the 1850 Robinson Treaties, the Manitoulin Island Treaties, Numbered Treaties 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 as well as the 1923 Williams Treaties" (Canadian Encyclopedia 2020).
- From Canadian independence in 1867 onwards, there was a policy of assimilation. The highly repressive Indian Act and other aspects of the Canadian government's Aboriginal policy have had substantial and devastating impacts on First Nations societies, and limited both the autonomy and cultural rights of Canada's First Nations (Minority Rights Group International).
- No concession could be found in the 10 years before the movement start date.

### **Concessions and restrictions**

- The Indian Act was revised in 1951. The act removed certain restrictions on indigenous ceremonial activities and also lifted a restriction on indigenous land claims. However, the act continued and further strengthened Canada's long-standing assimilation policy by giving local authorities jurisdiction over indigenous child welfare, thus allowing local governments to remove indigenous children from their indigenous parents (Canadian Encyclopedia 2022). We do not code a concession.
- The 1982 Constitution Act recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). This represented a formal recognition of indigenous rights that should have been implemented in previous treaties (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010). This is a significant autonomy concession recognizing autonomy of indigenous communities. [1982: autonomy concession]

- In 1985, the Canadian Parliament amended the Indian Act. The act lifted many discriminatory practices, including that Aboriginal women who marry a non-Aboriginal automatically lose their Aboriginal status. Moreover, indigenous communities were allowed to regulate membership in their communities themselves (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010; MRGI: Online). [1985: cultural rights concession]
- In 1985 the Peterson administration in Ontario adopted a corporate native affairs policy. Crucially, this committed the province to “Supporting the constitutional entrenchment of Aboriginal rights to self-government; Entering into Aboriginal self-government negotiations; Assisting Aboriginal peoples in becoming more self-reliant; and Providing services to Aboriginal peoples in a non-discriminatory and culturally sensitive manner.” (Cameron et al, 1995: 20). This brought about specific initiatives for indigenous self-government following the 1982 Constitution Act. One of these initiatives saw negotiation with the Nishnawbe Aski Nation (associated with the UOI). Overall, this represents a provincial effort to implement the 1982 Constitution Act autonomy concessions – hence, we do not code another concession.
- In 1990 the Supreme Court set a precedent with the ruling in the Sparrow case by setting out criteria “to determine whether governmental infringement on Aboriginal rights was justifiable, providing that these rights were in existence at the time of the Constitution Act, 1982” (Salomons and Hanson 2009). The Court hereby restricted the possibility to limit aboriginal rights, such as fishing, that were in existence in 1982. The government can no longer infringe upon these rights without justification. The Sparrow case is recognized by many as “a significant victory for those interested in the affirmation of Aboriginal rights” (Kulchyski 1994: 212). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- In 1990, Prime Minister Mulroney announced a new federal aboriginal agenda including the acceleration of land claims and the improvement of the Aborigine’s socio-economic conditions. More importantly, in 1992 a constitutional conference presents a new proposal for constitutional amendments called the Charlottetown Accord. The agreement foresaw unprecedented self-government for Canada’s Aborigine population, including the right to raise taxes. Essentially, the Accord would have created three levels of government, a federal, a provincial, and a Native. The Charlottetown Accord was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992 (Minorities at Risk Project). However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide, giving indigenous peoples relatively little say.
- In 1997, the Canadian Supreme Court (Delgamuukw Decision) fleshed out and extended the Aborigine’s land rights, ruling that, among other things, the Aboriginal title to land is a communal right protected under the 1982 constitution. Critically, the Court ruled that oral histories and traditions constitute sufficient evidence for land claims. It also stated that Aborigines are entitled to activities beyond traditional activities like hunting and fishing (Minority Rights Group International; Minorities at Risk Project; Cunningham, 2014: 204). [1997: autonomy concession]
- Danver (2015: 422) notes that in 2000 and 2005, a series of negotiated agreements between the Ontario government and the Saugeen First Nation (a Chippewa band) led to co-management of fisheries and fishing rights in Lake Huron. We code a single concession in 2000 as the agreements were part of one process. [2000: autonomy concession]
- According to Cunningham (2014: 204), there was a court ruling in 2003 “in Native favor over the residential schools program” which “resulted in restitution paid to the Natives and establishment of programs to promote Native languages and cultures.” [2003: cultural rights concession]
- In 1995 the Anishinabek Nation and Canadian governments began negotiating an education agreement. A non-binding agreement-in-principle was articulated in 2002, but the final agreement was not signed between the parties (plus government of Ontario) until 2017. This agreement enables the Anishinabek Nation to set up an Anishinabek education system, recognizing law making power over education on reserves as well as control over education funding (Canada 2017; Anishinabek Nation nd-b). [2017: autonomy concession]
- In 2015, the Chiefs in Assembly (including the UOI) and the government of Ontario signed a First Nations Political Accord, affirming right to self-government in Ontario. This led to a 2017 agreement between the government of Ontario and the Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians

(which includes some Ojibwe, see Batchewana, nd: Online). This affirmed government-to-government relationships and gave this organization greater control over child welfare decisions, healthcare, and housing (Ontario, 2018: Online). [2015: autonomy concession]

- The Anishinabek Nation has been negotiating with Canada for greater autonomy since 1995 (alongside the education agreement). A non-binding agreement-in-principle was articulated in 2002, but negotiations did not complete until 2019 when a provisional agreement was signed (Anishinabek Nation, nd-b: Online). The final agreement, the Anishinabek Nation Governance Agreement, was signed in 2022. According to the agreement, the Anishinabe: “will pass their own laws on how they select their Chiefs and Councils; determine who their citizens are without interference from external governments; create laws dedicated to the restoration and preservation of their language and culture; and manage their First Nation government operations.” (Anishinabek News 2022). In line with coding rules about coding concessions and restrictions as early as possible, we code the concession in 2019. [2019: autonomy concession]
- In 2019 a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the Government of Canada, government of Quebec, and the Assembly of First Nations of Quebec and Labrador agreeing to work together towards greater autonomy for indigenous control over healthcare. The aim is to give control over choice of healthcare models. The negotiations include Anishinabe, Cree, and Iroquois communities. The negotiations were ongoing as of 2020, so no concession is coded.

### Regional autonomy

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations’ right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs in areas such as culture, education, language, health and social services, as well as economic development (Minority Rights Group International). Based on this, we code autonomy from 1983 onward. [1983-2020: regional autonomy]

### De facto independence

NA

### Major territorial changes

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations’ right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). [1982: establishment of regional autonomy]

### EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Anishinabe
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Indigenous peoples
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2004000

### Power access

- EPR codes the indigenous peoples as powerless throughout the duration of this movement. In line with EPR we did not find evidence of active discrimination as defined in EPR. First Nations enjoy the right to vote since 1960. At the same time, again in alignment with EPR, we found no evidence for Anishinabe representation in the national government. In Canada there is a ministry for Aboriginal affairs (up to 2011 called the ministry for Indian affairs), but this is consistently

filled by non-Aborigines. In 2008, Leona Aglukkaq became the first Aboriginal (yet Inuit) cabinet member. Between 2015 and 2019, Jody Wilson Raybould, a member of the We Wai Kai Nation) served in various ministerial roles including Minister of Justice. According to EPR, representation of the indigenous peoples nevertheless overall remained rather token. [1949-2020: powerless]

### **Group size**

- We found conflict information:
  - o According to Minahan (2016: 28), there were ca. 200-300,000 Anishinabe in Canada and the U.S. in 2015.
  - o According to Minahan (2002: 1451), there were 147,000 Ojibwe in the U.S. and 78,000 in Canada. Minahan reports an additional 45,000 Ottawa and Potawatomi, which are closely related Anishinabe bands. This would suggest a population of 100-125,000.
  - o Canadian Encyclopedia estimate that there were 160,000 Ojibwe in 2014 (Canadian Encyclopedia 2008). The Ojibwe are the largest Anishinabe band, but this statistic may also refer to all Anishinabe.
- Based on this, we estimate the Anishinabe population at ca. 180,000 as of ca. 2010. Canada's population in 2010 was ca. 34 million. [0.0053]

### **Regional concentration**

- We could not find precise data. However, according to Minahan (2016: 28), the Anishinabe homeland of Anishinaabenaang occupies the area around the Great Lakes. Other sources note that the region spreads from south-eastern Ontario, across to southern Manitoba, and to south eastern Saskatchewan (Danver 2015: 420; Minahan 2002: 1451; Canadian Encyclopedia 2020). The size of this area makes regional concentration unlikely. Notably, Minahan (2002: 1451) also reports that most Ojibwe live outside of their reservations. [not concentrated]

### **Kin**

- The Anishinabe are split across the US-Canadian border. Minahan notes that there are approximately 147,000 Ojibwe in the U.S.. There are an additional approximate 10,000 Odawa and 21,000 Potawatomi in the U.S. [kin in neighboring country]

### **Sources**

Anishinabek Nation (nd-a) Who We Are (Online). Available at: <https://www.anishinabek.ca/who-we-are-and-what-we-do/> [Accessed: 12/09/2022].

Anishinabek Nation (nd-b) Restoration of Jurisdiction (Online). Available at: <https://www.anishinabek.ca/governance/governanceactivities/overview/> [Accessed: 01/10/2022].

Anishinabek News (2022) About the Anishinabe Nation Governance Agreement (Online). Available at: <https://anishinabeknews.ca/2022/06/24/about-the-anishinabek-nation-governance-agreement/> [Accessed: 12/09/2022].

Batchewana First Nation of Ojibways (nd) (Online). Available at: <https://www.aiai.on.ca/member-nations/batchewana/> [Accessed: 01/10/2022].

Cameron, David., Wherrett, Jill., Brascoupe, Ann. (1995) New Relationship, New Challenges: Aboriginal peoples and the province of Ontario (Online). Available at: <https://data2.archives.ca/rcap/pdf/rcap-26.pdf>.

- Canada (2017) Anishinabek Nation Education Agreement (Online). Available at: [https://www.canada.ca/en/indigenous-northern-affairs/news/2017/12/anishinabek\\_nationeducationagreement.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/indigenous-northern-affairs/news/2017/12/anishinabek_nationeducationagreement.html) [Accessed: 01/10/2022].
- Canadian Encyclopedia (2008) Ojibwe (Online). Available at: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/ojibwa> [Accessed: 18/09/2022].
- Canadian Encyclopedia (2020) Anishinaabe (Online). Available at: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/anishinaabe> [Accessed: 12/09/2022].
- Canadian Encyclopedia (2022) Indian Act (Online). Available at: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/indian-act> [Accessed: 01/10/2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Cunningham, Kathleen Gallagher (2014). *Inside the Politics of Self-Determination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daigle, M. (2016) Awawanenitakik: The Spatial Politics of Recognition and Relational Geographies of Indigenous Self Determination, *The Canadian Geographer*, 60, (2), 259-269.
- Danver, Steven (2015) *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures, and Contemporary Issues*. Routledge, London.
- Grand Council Treaty 3 (nd) (Online). Available at: <https://gct3.ca/> [Accessed: 03/10/2022].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Minahan, James (2016). *Encyclopedia of Stateless Nations. Second Edition*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.
- Minahan, James (2016). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations: Second Edition*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [November 9, 2021].
- Nishnawbe Aski Nation (nd) About (Online). Available at: <https://www.nan.ca/about/history/> [Accessed: 03/10/2022].
- Ontario (2018) Building Stronger Relationships: Agreements and Action (Online). Available at: <https://www.ontario.ca/document/spirit-reconciliation-ministry-indigenous-relations-and-reconciliation-first-10-years/building-stronger-relationships-agreements-and-action> [Accessed: 01/10/2022]
- Ontarion (nd) Current land claims (Online). Available at: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/current-land-claims#section-1> [Accessed: 03/10/2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- Weidmann, Nils B., Jan Ketil Rød, and Lars-Erik Cederman (2010). "Representing Ethnic Groups in Space: A New Dataset." *Journal of Peace Research* 47(4): 491-499.



## **Cree**

Activity: 1971-2020

### **General notes**

NA

### **Movement start and end dates**

- In 1969 the Trudeau government released the Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (The White Paper), acknowledging a failure of the state to indigenous communities. The White Paper was rejected by indigenous communities because it was viewed as a tool for greater assimilation. In this context, a Cree leader from the Misikew Cree First Nation put forward a land claim in Alberta in 1971 (Slowey, 2008: 33-34). This is the first evidence of relevant SD mobilization we could find.
- Other Cree political organizations emerged, primarily the Grand Council of the Crees in 1974, who made land claims in the context of the James Bay hydro-electric project.
- The Crees in Quebec have actively opposed Quebecois separatism based on the argument the argument that the independence of Quebec would be a violation of their right to self-determination. (Quebecois separatists do not want to give up the Indian territory, largely because it includes Quebec's hydro-electric power plant.) The Cree have stated that if Quebec were allowed to secede, they would declare their own independence. For example, in July 1991 Chief Ted Moses, a leader of the Grand Council of the Crees, told a UN commission that if Quebec were to declare sovereignty, the Cree would in turn declare themselves an independent nation.
- On other occasions the Cree have sought formal arrangements to remain part of Canada in the event of Quebec's independence. For example, in February 1998 the Grand Council of Crees filed suit in the Supreme Court of Canada to try to remain part of Canada should Quebec try to secede (Canadian Geographic Magazine; Grand Council of the Crees; Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 202f; Keesing's; Lexis Nexis; Minahan 1996: 398ff, 2002: 493ff; MAR).
- In 2002, the Cree and the Canadian government signed an agreement (the "Agreement Concerning a New Relationship") addressing hydroelectric development. In 2005, the Mikisew Cree First Nation formally took to court an appeal regarding land rights (Supreme Court of Canada).
- In 2012-2013, organized protests – Idle No More – involved many indigenous tribes and have become a global movement. The grievances include infringement of land rights and environmental pollution on tribal lands. The movement aims to "help build sovereignty and resurgence of nationhood." In addition, the Grand Council of the Cree continued to negotiate with the Canadian government for self-government. Therefore, the movement is coded as ongoing as of 2020. [start date: 1971; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- The Grand Council of the Crees was founded in 1974 to protect the land rights, i.e., autonomy, of the indigenous Cree in the context of the James Bay hydroelectric project. Furthermore, the Cree also oppose Quebecois separatism. They perceive it as a violation of their right to self-determination, given that the Quebecois do not want to give up the Indian territory, which includes Quebec's hydroelectric power plant. Claims for independence would only be made in the case of a secession of Quebec, in which case the Cree nation would be divided between two sovereign states (Minahan 2002: 496). [1971-2020: autonomy claim]

## **Independence claims**

NA

## **Irredentist claims**

NA

## **Claimed territory**

- The indigenous Cree have sought to protect their land rights and political autonomy in Canada, in particular within Quebec and the James Bay area. Beyond this, we could not find more detailed information on the territory to which the Cree's political demands are tied. We therefore flag this claim as ambiguous and code it based on the group's settlement areas around James Bay in Quebec and Ontario based on the World Language Mapping System, which serves as an approximation.

## **Sovereignty declarations**

NA

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- We found no reports of deaths resulting from separatist violence, hence a NVIOLSD classification. The MAR rebellion score of Canada's indigenous peoples is three in 1990. This relates to an event involving the Iroquois and, furthermore, is considered too minimal to constitute armed rebellion (just a single casualty; for more details see the entry of the Iroquois). [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- The Cree are believed to have inhabited parts of modern Canada for around 5000 years. They were first contacted by Europeans around 1650 by French Jesuits, maintaining good relations with both English and French. Trading posts established in Cree regions in the 1670's supplied them with firearms, easing expansion into westward prairie lands and leading to a system of militarized 'bands' (Minahan, 2002: 493-4). In 1783, the British confirmed a common title to Cree lands, so it could only be obtained through the crown. However, this has been frequently amended and violated through various treaties (Minahan, 2002: 493; MRGI, nd: Online). The Cree have also faced demographic shocks through smallpox outbreaks in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, as well as through war with other indigenous groups (Minahan, 2002: 494).
- Since 1867 Canadian-Indigenous relations were managed by the Indian Act (still in force, with amendments) which formalized some recognition of who was considered indigenous and placed restrictions on indigenous life (MRGI, nd: Online). Cree lands were mostly under the Hudson Bay Company until 1870 when they were bought by the Canadian government (Minahan, 2002: 495). Increased tensions led to the Riel rebellion in 1885, led by Cree and Métis and creating a shortlived de-facto nation (Roth, 2015: 525; Minahan, 2002: 494; Danver, 2015: 429). The Cree region of Ungava was absorbed into the borders of Quebec region in 1898 and 1912 without the consent of the local Cree, seeing greater interference in indigenous affairs by provincial governments (Minahan, 2002: 495; Coon-Come, 1992).
- The Indian Act and historical legacy of the treaties discriminated indigenous groups. Indigenous groups could not raise funds for political groups until 1953 (MAR), and those classified as

indigenous could not vote federally, hire land, or make land claims until 1960 (MRGI, nd: Online; EPR). The right of indigenous people to vote in the province of Quebec was not granted until 1969 (Canadian Encyclopedia, nd.A: Online). No concession is coded as this increased political rights but not autonomy/cultural rights.

- Into the 1960s indigenous education continued to dislocate Cree children from their communities and often subjected them to abuse (Minahan, 2002: 495; MRGI, nd: Online). In 1969 the Trudeau government released the Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (The White Paper), acknowledging a failure of the state to indigenous communities as agreed in the Indian Act and other treaties. There were some recommended provisions for land rights transfers and indigenous governance, but the White Paper was rejected by indigenous communities because it failed to rectify salient issues and view that it was a tool for greater assimilation. The White Paper was withdrawn in 1970 (Daigle, 2016).
- No concession or restriction on autonomy was found 10 years before the SDM start date.

### **Concessions and restrictions**

- In the face of backlash from the White Paper, leading Cree put forward a land claim in Alberta in 1971 and reached an agreement with the federal government in 1973 to receive nearly 100,000 acres in the Wood Buffalo National Park. This included rights over its resources, which composed of Tar Sands. However, the Albertan government subsequently watered down the agreement and negotiations ultimately failed in 1985 (Slowey, 2008: 33-34).
- The James Bay Hydroelectric dam project began construction in 1974 on what is traditional Cree lands in northern Quebec province. The Cree were told in court that they had no rights to the land or any share of the proceeds from the project (Minahan, 2002: 496; Arctic Portal, 2011: Online). [1974: autonomy restriction]
- In 1975, the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement was signed between the Cree and Quebec government. This was the first comprehensive land claims agreement in Canada. It involved a resource management agreement and for provision of water and sanitation systems (Minahan, 2002: 495; Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010). The agreement also included provisions for the Cree to take control of their own education in Quebec province (Danver, 2015: 428-429; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd.B: Online). There has been contention over the implementation of the agreement (Coon-Come, 1992), with implementation only beginning after 1981 following the presentation of the case to the UN (Minahan, 2002: 495). [1975: autonomy concession]
- The 1982 Constitution Act recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). This represented a formal recognition of indigenous rights that should have been implemented in previous treaties (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010). In 1983, the Quebec National Assembly also recognized the autonomy of aboriginal nations (Resolution of February 9, 1983). The resolution included self-governance, land ownership rights, competencies of self-rule in areas of culture, education, language, health and social services as well as economic development. It also included some tax exemptions. This expands on the previous rights granted to the Cree. Subsequently, in 1984, self-government for the Cree in Quebec was established through the Cree-Naskapi (of Quebec) Act (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010). This was Canada's first legislation for indigenous self-government (MRGI: Online). We only code the national recognition of self-rule in 1982 because the national recognition seems more significant, and the sub-national recognition appears to be an outflow of the national legislation. [1982: autonomy concession]
- In 1985, the Canadian Parliament amended the Indian Act. The act lifted many discriminatory practices, including that Aboriginal women who marry a non-Aboriginal automatically lose their Aboriginal status. Moreover, indigenous communities were allowed to regulate membership in their communities themselves (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010; MRGI: Online). [1985: cultural rights concession]
- In 1990 the Supreme Court set a precedent with the ruling in the Sparrow case by setting out criteria "to determine whether governmental infringement on Aboriginal rights was justifiable, providing that these rights were in existence at the time of the Constitution Act, 1982" (Salomons

and Hanson 2009). The Court hereby restricted the possibility to limit aboriginal rights, such as fishing, that were in existence in 1982. The government can no longer infringe upon these rights without justification. The Sparrow case is recognized by many as “a significant victory for those interested in the affirmation of Aboriginal rights” (Kulchyski 1994: 212). [1990: cultural rights concession]

- In 1990, Prime Minister Mulroney announced a new federal aboriginal agenda dealing including the acceleration of land claims and the improvement of the Aborigine’s socio-economic conditions. More importantly, in 1992 a constitutional conference presents a new proposal for constitutional amendments called the Charlottetown Accord. The agreement foresaw unprecedented self-government for Canada’s Aborigine population, including the right to raise taxes. Essentially, the Accord would have created three levels of government, a federal, a provincial, and a Native. The Charlottetown Accord was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992 (Minorities at Risk Project). However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide, giving indigenous peoples relatively little say.
- In 1997, the Canadian Supreme Court (Delgamuukw Decision) fleshed out and extended the Aborigine’s land rights, ruling that, among other things, the Aboriginal title to land is a communal right protected under the 1982 constitution. Critically, the Court ruled that oral histories and traditions constitute sufficient evidence for land claims. It also stated that Aborigines are entitled to activities beyond traditional activities like hunting and fishing (Minority Rights Group International; Minorities at Risk Project). [1997: autonomy concession]
- Minahan (2002: 497) notes that in 1998 the “Quebec government invited Cree and others to define structure of self-government, including sending representatives to legislature, some taxation powers, revenue sharing from new projects”. The “Agreement Respecting a New Relationship Between the Cree Nation and the Government of Quebec” was signed on February 7<sup>th</sup> 2002. Due to the concession on taxation and revenue sharing from the James Bay project, this marks an increase on the autonomy already provided by earlier agreements. [2002: autonomy concession]
- According to Cunningham (2014: 204), there was a court ruling in 2003 “in Native favor over the residential schools program” which “resulted in restitution paid to the Natives and establishment of programs to promote Native languages and cultures.” [2003: cultural rights concession]
- In 2008, the “Agreement concerning a New Relationship between the Government of Canada and the Cree of Eeyou Istchee”, or the Federal New Relationship Agreement was signed between the Cree of Northern Quebec and the government of Canada. This 20-year agreement was designed to improve implementation of the 1975 agreement and give some oversight to the James Bay project. It also granted the Cree Nation Government with by-law making powers and developed a framework for Cree governance (Cree Nation, nd: Online). [2008: autonomy concession]
- Signed in 2010 and coming into force in 2012, the “Agreement between the Crees of Eeyou Istchee and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada concerning the Eeyou Marine Region”, or the Cree Offshore Agreement increased territorial and cultural rights of the Cree in Northern Quebec. It granted the Cree ownership of most islands in the Eastern James Bay and Southern Hudson Bay areas, ownership of subsurface minerals, agreed revenue sharing for natural resource extraction, and agreed right to self-governance (Cree Nation, nd: Online). [2010: autonomy concession]
- In 2012 the Agreement on Governance in the Eeyou Istchee James Bay Territory between the Crees of Eeyou Istchee and the gouvernement du Québec (2012) was signed. This established greater Cree autonomy over around 70,000 Sq KM giving the Cree Nation Government the right to exercise limited jurisdiction over this land. It also established an alternative regional government elsewhere for joint management between Cree and Jamesians, forming an area of around 275,000 Sq KM and replacing the former Municipalité de Baie-James (Cree Nation, nd: Online). [2012: autonomy concession]
- In 2016 the Chapleau Cree Treaty Land Entitlement was signed between the Chapleau Cree, Canada, and Ontario. This transferred approximately 4,000 hectares to First Nation reserve land, thus fulfilling an existing entitlement from Treaty No 9 from 1906. It was also the first agreement between the Cree and Ontario (Ontario n.d.). [2016: autonomy concession]

- Both the “Agreement on Cree Nation Governance between the Crees of Eeyou Istchee and the Government of Canada” and the Constitution of the Cree Nation of Eeyou Istchee” were signed in 2017. “This sets out the power of the Cree First Nations to make laws (instead of by-laws) on a variety of local governance matters on Cree lands under federal jurisdiction, including environmental protection, public order and safety, land and resource use and planning. The Agreement also sets out the power of Cree Nation Government to make laws on regional governance matters on Cree lands concerning, for example, standards for essential sanitation and fire protection (Cree Nation, nd: Online) [2017: autonomy concession]
- In 2019 after negotiation between oil companies, the Alberta government, and Mikisew Cree, three oil companies gave up land in the Wood Buffalo National Park to facilitate the creation of the Kitaskino Nuwené Wildland Provincial Park. This park is managed by the Cree and is reserved for use for traditional activities, although existing oil wells can continue to function. This area amounts to around 1500 sq km. [2019: autonomy concession]
- In 2019 a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the Government of Canada, government of Quebec, and the Assembly of First Nations of Quebec and Labrador agreeing to work together towards greater autonomy for indigenous control over healthcare. The aim is to give control over choice of healthcare models. The negotiations include Anishinabe, Cree, and Iroquois communities. The negotiations were ongoing as of 2020, so no concession is coded.
- On April 6, 2022, the Ahtahkakoop Cree Nation, Canada, and province of Saskatchewan reached a settlement agreement on a land claim that had initially been made in 2001 and accepted in principle in 2010. This agreement gives the first nation the option to add over 40,000 acres to existing reserve lands as well as setting aside compensation for failure to fulfil previous treaties (Canada 2022: Online). We would code a concession in 2022, but this is after our temporal coverage.

### Regional autonomy

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations’ right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs in areas such as culture, education, language, health and social services, as well as economic development (Minority Rights Group International). Based on this, we code autonomy from 1983 onward. [1983-2020: regional autonomy]
  - o Cree in northern Quebec were granted autonomy already before that (see above), but there are also Crees in many other areas of Canada including Alberta and Manitoba.

### De facto independence

NA

### Major territorial changes

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations’ right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). [1982: establishment of regional autonomy]

### EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Cree
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Indigenous peoples
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2004000

## Power access

- The Cree are an indigenous people mainly located in the northern part of the Quebec province. EPR codes the indigenous peoples as powerless throughout the duration of this movement. In line with EPR we did not find evidence of active discrimination as defined in EPR. First Nations enjoy the right to vote since 1960. At the same time, again in alignment with EPR, we found no evidence for Cree representation in the national government (cf. Cairns 2011). In Canada there is a ministry for Aboriginal affairs (up to 2011 called the ministry for Indian affairs), but this is consistently filled by non-Aborigines. In 2008, Leona Aglukkaq became the first Aboriginal (yet Inuit) cabinet member. Between 2015 and 2019, Jody Wilson Raybould, a member of the We Wai Kai Nation) served in various ministerial roles including Minister of Justice. According to EPR, representation of the indigenous peoples nevertheless overall remained rather token. [1974-2020: powerless]

## Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 493), there were about 140,000 Crees in Canada in 2002. The WB pegs Canada's population at 31.36 mio in that year. [0.0045]

## Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 493), the Cree inhabit a relatively large area in eastern and central Canada. The small number of Crees and their large, relatively scattered settlement pattern makes it unlikely that the criteria for a regional concentration code are met in a spatially contiguous territory. According to the 2016 census, Cree make up small minorities in several provinces including Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, BC, and Quebec. [not concentrated]

## Kin

- According to Minahan (2002: 493), there are ca 9,000 Cree in the U.S. This is below the numeric threshold required (100k). [no kin]

## Sources

- Arctic Portal (2001) The Cree in James Bay (Online). Available at: <https://arcticportal.org/ap-library/news/503-the-cree-in-james-bay#:~:text=The%20James%20Bay%20Cree%20count,the%20Cree%2C%20especially%20regarding%20food.> [Accessed: 15/08/2022].
- Cairns, Alan (2011). *Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Canada (2022) Ahtahkakoop Cree Nation, Canada and Saskatchewan settle Treaty Land Entitlement Claim (Online). Available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/crown-indigenous-relations-northern-affairs/news/2022/04/ahtahkakoop-cree-nation-canada-and-saskatchewan-settle-treaty-land-entitlement-claim.html> [Accessed: 05/11/2022].
- Canadian Encyclopedia (nd.B) Education of Indigenous Peoples in Canada (Online). Available at: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/aboriginal-people-education> [Accessed: 15/08/2022].
- Canadian Geographic Magazine . “A Brief History of Cree.” <http://www.canadiangeographic.ca/magazine/nd05/indepth/history.asp> [December 11, 2013].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). “Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis.” *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.

- Coon-Come, M. (1992) The Right to Self-Determination of Native and Indigenous Peoples: The Case of the Cree Nation, *Rethinking Culture Conference* (2).
- Cree Nation (nd) Agreements (Online). Available at: <https://cngov.ca/governance-structure/legislation/agreements/> [Accessed: 18/08/2022].
- Cree-Naskapi Commission (nd) Abridged Version. Available at: [https://www.creenaskapicommission.net/text/plain.htm#:~:text=The%20Cree%2DNaskapi%20\(o%20Quebec\)%20Act%20establishes%20Cree%20and, and%20the%20Inuit\)%3B%20and](https://www.creenaskapicommission.net/text/plain.htm#:~:text=The%20Cree%2DNaskapi%20(o%20Quebec)%20Act%20establishes%20Cree%20and, and%20the%20Inuit)%3B%20and) [Accessed: 15/08/2022].
- Cunningham, Kathleen Gallagher (2014). *Inside the Politics of Self-Determination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daigle, M. (2016) Awawanenitakik: The Spatial Politics of Recognition and Relational Geographies of Indigenous Self Determination, *The Canadian Geographer*, 60, (2), 259-269.
- Expert-Eye (nd) The Great Whale Project (Online). Available at: <http://www.expert-eyes.org/whale.html> [Accessed: 18/08/2022].
- Global Mapping International (2015). *World Language Mapping System*.
- Grand Council of the Crees. <http://www.gcc.ca> [June 2, 2003].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 202-203.
- Idle No More. "The Manifesto." <http://www.idlenomore.ca/manifesto> [December 11, 2013].
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [June 2, 2003].
- Kulchyski, Peter K. (1994). *Unjust Relations: Aboriginal Rights in Canadian Courts*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lexis Nexis. <http://www.lexis-nexis.com> [June 2, 2003].
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 398-400.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 493-498.
- Minorities at Risk Project (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [November 9, 2021].
- Ontario (nd) Current Land Claims (Online). Available at: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/current-land-claims> [Accessed: 05/11/2022].
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Salomons, Tanisha and Erin Hanson (2009). "Sparrow Case." <http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/land-rights/sparrow-case.html> [April 22, 2015].
- Slowey, G. (2008) *Navigating Neoliberalism: Self-Determination and the Mikisew Cree First Nation*. UBC Press, Vancouver.
- Supreme Court of Canada. "Mikisew Cree First Nation v. Canada (Minister of Canadian Heritage)," SCC 69 2005. <http://portal.usask.ca/docs/ICC/MikEnglish.pdf> [June 19, 2014].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rügger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

## **Dene**

Activity: 1973-2020

### **General notes**

NA

### **Movement start and end dates**

- The Dene speak Northern Athabaskan languages and are the largest tribe in what remained of the Northwest Territories after the establishment of Nunavut in 1999. The Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories (now Dene Nation) was established in 1970 to protect the rights and interests of the Dene (Dene Nation). The foundation charter, however, does not contain any reference to self-determination.
- The first clear-cut evidence for separatist mobilization we could find is in 1973, when the Dene made a claim to a total of 450,000 sq miles of land in the Northwestern Territories' Supreme Court (Dene Nation, nd: Online; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). 1973 is thus coded as start date.
- The 1975 Dene Declaration of 1975 stated that the "Dene of the NWT insist upon the right to be regarded by ourselves and the world as a nation" and that they "seek independence and self-determination within Canada" (Papillon 2014: 41). More specifically, the Dene demanded the establishment of a separate Dene-controlled government within the Mackenzie Valley. The declaration was approved by more than 300 delegates from all Denendeh communities representing the Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories.
- According to Hewitt and Cheetham (2000: 203), the Dene movement lost some of its popularity in the late 1990s. However, the movement remained active. Several Dene tribes were engaged in negotiations over land rights with the Canadian government as of 2020 (Canadian Encyclopedia; EIA-NWT). Furthermore, the Dene Nation "continues to work towards self-government and recognition of Indigenous rights and territory in Canada" (Canadian Encyclopedia 2010 [2017]). [start date: 1973; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- The Dene made their first land rights claim in 1973 (see above) and also made demands for increased self-determination with the Dene Declaration of 1975 where they stated that the "Dene of the NWT insist upon the right to be regarded by ourselves and the world as a nation" and that they "seek independence and self-determination within Canada" (Papillon 2014: 41). Furthermore, several Dene tribes located in NWT and Yukon were engaged in negotiations over land rights with the Canadian government in the 1990s and beyond (Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online; EIA-NWT, nd: Online). [1973-2020: autonomy claim]

### **Independence claims**

NA

### **Irredentist claims**

NA



## **Claimed territory**

- A key claim concerns the Mackenzie Valley. This area is situated in the lower part of the Northwest Territories in Canada. However, Dene tribes also made claims elsewhere, including in Yukon (Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online; EIA-NWT, nd: Online). We could not find exact information on all of the territories claimed, and therefore use the group's settlement area according to the World Language Mapping System as an approximation. We note that this coding decision is ambiguous.

## **Sovereignty declarations**

NA

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- We found no reports of separatist violence, hence a NVIOLSD classification. [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- The Dene are an aboriginal people located in the northern regions of Canada. As an indigenous group they were covered by the 1763 Royal Proclamation forbidding encroachment of settlers (Dene Nation, nd: Online). However, this has been breached and amended multiple times (MRGI, nd: Online). Since 1867 Canadian-Indigenous relations were managed by the Indian Act (still in force, with amendments) which formalized some recognition of who was considered indigenous and placed restrictions on indigenous life (MRGI, nd: Online; Dene Nation, nd: Online). This included enfranchisement to encourage integration (Hewitt and Cheetham, 2000: 202).
- In 1870 Ruperts Land (covering much of Northern Canada) was bought by the Canadian government from the Hudson Bay Company (Dene Nation, nd: Online). In 1899 the southern Dene entered into Treaty Eight with the Canadian government, which was supposed to protect indigenous livelihoods in exchange for ceding some land for resource extraction (Dene Nation, nd: Online). In 1898 the Yukon Territory was carved out of the North West Territory (NWT), with the boundaries of the NWT redefined in 1905 (Roth, 2015: 536).
- In 1937 the Dene in Fort Resolution boycotted Treaty Eight, with other Dene suspending treaty payments, in protest of Aboriginal rights being infringed on by Game Laws, which restricted hunting rights (Dene Nation, nd: Online). The Indian Act and historical legacy of the treaties discriminated indigenous groups. Indigenous groups could not raise funds for political groups until 1953 (MAR), and those classified as indigenous could not vote federally, hire land, or make land claims until 1960 (MRGI, nd: Online; EPR). This was amended in 1960 (Dene Nation, nd: Online).
- In 1969 the Trudeau government released the Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (The White Paper), acknowledging a failure of the state to indigenous communities as agreed in the Indian Act and other treaties. There were some recommended provisions for land rights transfers and indigenous governance, but the White Paper was rejected by indigenous communities because it failed to rectify salient issues and view that it was a tool for greater assimilation. The White Paper was withdrawn in 1970 (Daigle 2016).
- No concessions or restrictions were found in the 10 years before the SDM start date.

## **Concessions and restrictions**

- The Dene made a claim to a total of 450,000 sq miles of land in the Northwestern Territories' Supreme Court in 1973 (Dene Nation, nd: Online; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). In 1976, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled against the Dene's claim (Dene Nation, nd: Online). As there

was no change in land rights or recognition of Dene claims by Canada, no concession or restriction is coded.

- In 1978, the federal government made a proposal regarding land rights entitled “Dene and Métis Claims in the Mackenzie Valley”, which was rejected by both groups (Dene Nation, nd: Online).
- The 1982 Constitution Act recognized the First Nations’ right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). This represented a formal recognition of indigenous rights that should have been implemented in previous treaties (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010). This is a significant autonomy concession recognizing autonomy of indigenous communities. [1982: autonomy concession]
- In 1984, the NWT Official Languages Act recognized aboriginal languages typically spoken in the NWT. This was designed to give a degree of cultural protection to these languages, which includes multiple Dene languages (OLC-NWT, nd: Online). [1984: cultural rights concession]
- In 1985, the Canadian Parliament amended the Indian Act. The act lifted many discriminatory practices, including that Aboriginal women who marry a non-Aboriginal automatically lose their Aboriginal status. Moreover, indigenous communities were allowed to regulate membership in their communities themselves (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010; MRGI: Online). [1985: cultural rights concession]
- In 1988 Federal, Dene, and Métis negotiators reached an agreement in principle on land claims (Dene Nation, nd: Online). The agreement covered 450,000 sq miles of land, transfer payments, harvesting rights, and social programs. However, in November 1990, the Canadian government pulled out of the agreement (Tlicho History, nd: Online). As the agreement was never implemented and then withdrawn, no concession is coded.
- We code a cultural rights concession in 1990 for two reasons:
  - o First, in 1990 the Supreme Court set a precedent with the ruling in the Sparrow case by setting out criteria “to determine whether governmental infringement on Aboriginal rights was justifiable, providing that these rights were in existence at the time of the Constitution Act, 1982” (Salomons and Hanson 2009). The Court hereby restricted the possibility to limit aboriginal rights, such as fishing, that were in existence in 1982. The government can no longer infringe upon these rights without justification. The Sparrow case is recognized by many as “a significant victory for those interested in the affirmation of Aboriginal rights” (Kulchyski 1994: 212).
  - o Second, in 1990, Dene languages became official languages in the NWT (Dene Nation, nd: Online). Aboriginal languages were given equal status within all institutions of the Legislative Assembly and the Government of the NWT (OLC-NWT, nd: Online). [1990: cultural rights concession].
- In 1990, Prime Minister Mulroney announced a new federal aboriginal agenda including the acceleration of land claims and the improvement of the Aborigine’s socio-economic conditions. More importantly, in 1992 a constitutional conference presents a new proposal for constitutional amendments called the Charlottetown Accord. The agreement foresaw unprecedented self-government for Canada’s Aborigine population, including the right to raise taxes. Essentially, the Accord would have created three levels of government, a federal, a provincial, and a Native. The Charlottetown Accord was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992 (Minorities at Risk Project). However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide, giving indigenous peoples relatively little say.
- The Gwich’in Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement was signed in 1992. This provides the Gwich’in Tribal Council with over 22,000 sq miles of land in NWT and 1,500 sq miles in Yukon, capital transfers, land use royalties, representation on land use governance bodies, and an agreement for regional indigenous self-government (EIA-NWT, nd: Online). As the Gwich’in form part of the Dene nation (although represented outside of the Dene Nation organization), this is coded as an autonomy concession for the Dene. [1992: autonomy concession]
- In July 1993 the Dene and Métis voted to approve the Sahtu Dene and Métis Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement (SDMCLCA). This agreement came into effect in 1994, issuing a land title for over 41,000 sq miles in NWT, nearly 2,000 sq mile subsurface rights, right to traditional hunting activities, participation in institutions governing land and water use, capital transfers and

revenue sharing, and community-based self-government (EIA-NWT, nd: Online). [1993: autonomy concession]

- In 1997, the Canadian Supreme Court (Delgamuukw Decision) fleshed out and extended the Aborigine's land rights, ruling that, among other things, the Aboriginal title to land is a communal right protected under the 1982 constitution. Critically, the Court ruled that oral histories and traditions constitute sufficient evidence for land claims. It also stated that Aborigines are entitled to activities beyond traditional activities like hunting and fishing (Minority Rights Group International; Minorities at Risk Project; Cunningham, 2014: 204). [1997: autonomy concession]
- In 1999 the province of Nunavut was created from NWT's Keewatin District, giving self-government for the Inuit peoples. This shifted the indigenous demographic dynamics of the NWT and is seen to reduce the possibility of a similar outcome for the Dene (Roth, 2015: 536; Hewitt and Cheetham, 2000: 202; Dene Nation, nd: Online).
- The Salt River First Nation Treaty Settlement Agreement was signed in 2002, giving this Dene first nation capital transfers, over 400 sq km of reserve land (the first parcel of land implemented in 2008) (EIA-NWT, nd: Online). [2002: autonomy concession]
- According to Cunningham (2014: 204), there was a court ruling in 2003 "in Native favor over the residential schools program" which "resulted in restitution paid to the Natives and establishment of programs to promote Native languages and cultures." [2003: cultural rights concession]
- The Tlicho Land Claims and Self Government Agreement was signed in 2003 and came into effect in 2005. It was the first combined land, resources, and self-government agreement in the NWT. It gave the Tlicho (a Dene first nation) 39,000 sq miles of land and subsurface resources, capital transfers, and resource royalties. The agreement also set up the Tłı̨chǫ Government with law making authority, including aspects of education, adoption, child and family services, training, income support, social housing, and Tłı̨chǫ language and culture (EIA-NWT, nd: Online). This is coded as an autonomy concession from the date of signature as meaningful implementation followed. [2003: autonomy concession]
- The Délı̨nę Final Self-government Agreement was signed in 2015 and came into effect in 2016. The Deline is a first nation of the Dene. This agreement provides for aboriginal public government equal to a municipal government with the same law-making powers as the government of the NWT, including managing land rights and assets (EIA-NWT, nd: Online; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). [2015: autonomy concession]
- In 2018 an Agreement in Principle was signed between the Sahtu Dene, Metis of Norman Wells, government of Canada, and government of NWT. The aim is to give "the authority to make their own decisions on matters internal and integral to their community and beneficiaries", advancing the self-government provisions in the 1993 agreement (Canada 2018: Online). Note: the final agreement had not been signed by late 2020, thus we do not code a concession, but note this for a future update.

### **Regional autonomy**

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs in areas such as culture, education, language, health and social services, as well as economic development (Minority Rights Group International). Based on this, we code autonomy from 1983 onward. [1983-2020: regional autonomy]

### **De facto independence**

NA

## Major territorial changes

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). [1982: establishment of regional autonomy]

## EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Dene
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Indigenous peoples
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2004000

## Power access

- The Dene are an indigenous people residing mainly in the Northwest Territories. EPR codes the indigenous peoples as powerless throughout the duration of this movement. In line with EPR we did not find evidence of active discrimination as defined in EPR. First Nations enjoy the right to vote since 1960. At the same time, again in alignment with EPR, we found no evidence for Dene representation in the national government (cf. Cairns 2011). In Canada there is a ministry for Aboriginal affairs (up to 2011 called the ministry for Indian affairs), but this is consistently filled by non-Aborigines. In 2008, Leona Aglukkaq became the first Aboriginal (Inuit) cabinet member. Between 2015 and 2019, Jody Wilson Raybould, a member of the We Wai Kai Nation) served in various ministerial roles including Minister of Justice. According to EPR, representation of the indigenous peoples nevertheless overall remained rather token. [1974-2020: powerless]

## Group size

- The Dene's ethnic population is difficult to get by as the group is not represented in Minahan (2002), but it is likely to be around two thirds of the size of the Inuits given that there are about two thirds the number of Athabaskan languages (in particular Dene) speakers compared to Inuit speakers (the Dene speak Dene and other Athabaskan languages) (Statistics Canada 2015). [0.0008]

## Regional concentration

- Exact information on spatial Dene demography is difficult to get by, however, it seems unlikely that the Dene can be considered regionally concentrated. There are several different Dene territories in the Northwestern Territories (Dene Nation 2022). Dene can also be found in other provinces including Saskatchewan and Alberta (Canada Encyclopedia). [not concentrated]

## Kin

- We found no evidence for transnational kin. [no kin]

## Sources

- Cairns, Alan (2011). *Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Canada (2018) One More Step on the Journey of Reconciliation in the Northwest Territories (Online). Available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/crown-indigenous-relations-northern-affairs/news/2018/08/one-more-step-on-the-journey-of-reconciliation-in-the-northwest-territories.html> [Accessed: 05/11/2022].
- Canada Encyclopedia. <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/dene> [February 7, 2022].
- Canadian Encyclopedia (2010 [2017]) Dene Nation – Organization (Online). Available at: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/dene-nation> [Accessed: 05/11/2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). “Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis.” *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Cunningham, Kathleen Gallagher (2014). *Inside the Politics of Self-Determination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daigle, M. (2016) Awawenitakik: The Spatial Politics of Recognition and Relational Geographies of Indigenous Self Determination, *The Canadian Geographer*, 60, (2), 259-269.
- Danver, Steven (2015) *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures, and Contemporary Issues*. Routledge, London.
- Dene Nation. *History* [Online]. <https://denenation.com/about/history/> [21/08/2022].
- Dene Nation. <https://denenation.com/chiefs-council/> [February 7, 2022].
- EIA-NWT (dn) Existing Agreements [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eia.gov.nt.ca/en/priorities/concluding-and-implementing-land-claim-and-self-government-agreements/existing-agreements> [Accessed: 21/08/2022].
- Global Mapping International (2015). *World Language Mapping System*.
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 202-203, 213.
- Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories (1970). “Information Package.” [http://capekrusenstern.org/docs/brotherhoodpk\\_1973.pdf](http://capekrusenstern.org/docs/brotherhoodpk_1973.pdf) [April 14, 2015].
- Kulchyski, Peter K. (1994). *Unjust Relations: Aboriginal Rights in Canadian Courts*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [November 9, 2021].
- Office of the Languages Commissioner – NWT (nd) *History* [Online]. Available at: <https://olc-nt.ca/about/history/>.
- Papillon, Martin (2014). “Framing Self-Determination. The Politics of Indigenous Rights in Canada and the United States.” In: Turgeon, Luc, Martin Papillon, Jennifer Wallner and Stephen White (eds.), *Comparing Canada: Methods and Perspectives on Canadian Politics*, pp. 27-49. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Salomons, Tanisha and Erin Hanson (2009). “Sparrow Case.” <http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/land-rights/sparrow-case.html> [April 22, 2015].
- Statistics Canada (2015). “Aboriginal Languages.” [https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/98-314-x/98-314-x2011003\\_3-eng.cfm](https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/98-314-x/98-314-x2011003_3-eng.cfm) [February 24, 2017].
- Tlich History (nd) The Dene Métis Negotiations [Online]. Available at: <https://tlichohistory.ca/en/stories/dene-m%C3%A9tis-negotiations> [Accessed: 21/08/2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). “Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power

Relations Data Set Family.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

## **Haida & Other BC First Nations**

Activity: 1980-2020

### **General notes**

- The Haida in Canada occupy the islands on the Northwest coast of British Columbia, part of the Haida homeland called Haida Gwaii. These islands were formerly known as the Queen Charlotte Islands (Danver, 2015: 431). Other BC First Nations include the Gitksan, Wetsuweten, Nuxalk, and Tsimshian.

### **Movement start and end dates**

- A post WWII boom in the fishing industry stabilized the economy of the Haida regions. According to Minahan (1996: 216, 2002: 711), this increased stability led to some pressing land claims in the 1950s. However, we could not find evidence for any organization pursuing land claims. In 1969, the Union of BC Indian Chiefs was established (UBCIC n.d.: Online). According to the evidence we found, the purpose of the UBCIC was to resolve land claims but not to press for self-rule.
- The first clear evidence for organized self-rule claims we could find is in 1980, when the Council of the Haida Nation was founded and began a legal battle to claim sovereignty over the Queen Charlotte Islands and the Pacific Ocean waters around the islands. The Council continues to fight for “full independence, sovereignty, and self-sufficiency of the Haida Nation.” Accordingly, 1980 is coded as the start date.
- Another BC First Nation, the Gitksan and Wetsuweten sought recognition and jurisdiction over their territories in 1987 via the courts (*Delgamuukw v the Queen*) (Roth 2015: 529). Another BC First Nation that has made self-rule claims are the Nuxalk (Nuxalk Nation n.d.). A third group, the Tsimshian, began land rights negotiations in 1983 (New World Encyclopedia n.d.).
- From 2012-2013, the Haida have also taken part in organized protests – Idle No More – involving many indigenous tribes and have become a global movement. The grievances include infringement of land rights and environmental pollution on tribal lands. It aims to “help build sovereignty and resurgence of nationhood.” (Council of the Haida Nation; Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 202f; Idle No More; Lexis Nexis; Minahan 1996: 214ff, 2002: 708ff; MAR).
- The Haida and other BC First Nations continue to negotiate for land and title rights, with Tsimshian communities signing final agreements in 2015 (BC n.d.; KTIS n.d) and the Council of the Haida Nation signing framework agreements for recognition of the Haida nation’s inherent title and rights to self determination on its historic territory (Council of the Haida Nation 2021a: Online). [start date: 1980; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- The Haida first made organized claims for increased self-determination in 1980, when the Council of the Haida Nation was founded. The exact claim is ambiguous. The Council of the Haida Nation made demands for sovereignty over the Queen Charlotte Islands and the Pacific Ocean waters around the islands. Generally speaking, claims are focused on autonomy within Canada. However, the Haida constitution (from 2003) claimed that it “shall strive for full independence, sovereignty and self-sufficiency of the Haida Nation” (Institute of Canadian and Aboriginal Studies 2013; CHN, nd: Online). Other first nations in BC are more concerned with land claims and self-government on these lands, with the Union of BC Indian Chiefs concerned with coordinating and assisting groups achieve this. It therefore becomes a question of whether the smaller BC first nation claims outweigh the Haida. From a population standpoint, other BC first nations outnumber the Haida (UBCIC, nd: Online). Overall, the evidence we collected suggests that the dominant claim is for internal autonomy. [1980-2020: autonomy claim]

## **Independence claims**

- Some BC First Nations appear to make calls for independence, but the intention behind such claims/their political significance is not entirely clear. For example, the Council of the Haida Nation stated in their 2003 constitution that they: “strive for full independence, sovereignty and self-sufficiency of the Haida Nation” (Institute of Canadian and Aboriginal Studies 2013; CHN, nd: Online). This could refer to internationally recognized independence, but also maximal internal autonomy. Similarly, the Nuxalk reject the treaty process and “want recognition and acceptance of their Aboriginal Title and Rights within the international world community” (Nuxalk Nation n.d.). Again, this could refer to international recognition as an independent state, but the claim is not sufficiently unambiguous for us to code. [no independence claims]

## **Irredentist claims**

NA

## **Claimed territory**

- This movement includes claims by the Haida, but also other indigenous groups in British Columbia.
  - o The Council of the Haida Nation has demanded greater sovereignty for the Queen Charlotte Islands in the Pacific Ocean. We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.
  - o In addition, we draw on GIS data on the legislative boundaries of aboriginal lands in British Columbia by Canadian Geospatial Platform Services ArcGIS Online (2019).

## **Sovereignty declarations**

NA

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- We found no reports of deaths resulting from separatist violence, hence a NVIOLSD classification. The MAR rebellion score of Canada’s indigenous peoples is three in 1990, but this relates to an event involving the Iroquois. [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- The Haida’s first contact with Europeans came in 1774-75 with a Spanish expedition under Juan Perez Hernandez. Russian and other European trade posts were established soon after (Minahan, 2002: 710), focusing on Sea Otter pelts, but the trade dried up by 1820 (Danver, 2015: 431; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). The area attracted explorers after Juan Perez, including George Vancouver’s survey from 1792-95. Russian influence in the region extended to Haida lands by 1802, beginning a European rivalry. Russia claimed the whole region in 1821, but a compromise with the British in 1824 established the current Alaskan-British Columbia border. This divided Haida lands between the two powers (Minahan 1996: 215-6, 2002: 710-11).
- From Canadian independence in 1867 onwards, there was a policy of assimilation. The highly repressive Indian Act and other aspects of the Canadian government’s Aboriginal policy have had substantial and devastating impacts on First Nations societies, and limited both the autonomy and cultural rights of Canada’s First Nations (Minority Rights Group International).



- In 1976, the BC government began a comprehensive land claims policy to settle the “land question” (KTIS n.d.). This led to negotiations with some first nation groups over land claims and titles.

### **Concessions and restrictions**

- The 1982 Constitution Act recognized the First Nations’ right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). This represented a formal recognition of indigenous rights that should have been implemented in previous treaties (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010). This is a significant autonomy concession recognizing autonomy of indigenous communities. [1982: autonomy concession]
- The 1985 Pacific Salmon Treaty between the USA and Canada regulated salmon fishing, a traditional activity of the Haida. The Haida viewed the treaty as an infringement on traditional activities, but the treaty did not have a meaningful impact on the Haida (Minahan, 2002: 711). Therefore, no restriction is coded.
- In 1985, the Canadian Parliament amended the Indian Act. The act lifted many discriminatory practices, including that Aboriginal women who marry a non-Aboriginal automatically lose their Aboriginal status. Moreover, indigenous communities were allowed to regulate membership in their communities themselves (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010; MRGI: Online). [1985: cultural rights concession]
- In 1986 the Shishalh First Nation (or Sechelt) were given land title on traditional territories and self-government. This gave the new district the same law-making power as other municipalities in Canada have as well as the ability to raise taxes (KTIS n.d.; Shishalh Nation n.d.). [1986: autonomy concession]
- In 1990 the Supreme Court set a precedent with the ruling in the Sparrow case by setting out criteria “to determine whether governmental infringement on Aboriginal rights was justifiable, providing that these rights were in existence at the time of the Constitution Act, 1982” (Salomons and Hanson 2009). The Court hereby restricted the possibility to limit aboriginal rights, such as fishing, that were in existence in 1982. The government can no longer infringe upon these rights without justification. The Sparrow case is recognized by many as “a significant victory for those interested in the affirmation of Aboriginal rights” (Kulchyski 1994: 212). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- In 1990, Prime Minister Mulroney announced a new federal aboriginal agenda dealing including the acceleration of land claims and the improvement of the Aborigine’s socio-economic conditions. More importantly, in 1992 a constitutional conference presents a new proposal for constitutional amendments called the Charlottetown Accord. The agreement foresaw unprecedented self-government for Canada’s Aborigine population, including the right to raise taxes. Essentially, the Accord would have created three levels of government, a federal, a provincial, and a Native. The Charlottetown Accord was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992 (Minorities at Risk Project). However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide, giving indigenous peoples relatively little say.
- In 1991 a BC claims task force noted that the 1982 constitution could not be applied to unilaterally grant autonomy to first nations, but each claim must be renegotiated on an individual basis (BC 1991: Online [8]). The following year the BC government officially recognized the right of first nations to self-government and implemented a six-stage treaty-making process set up under the BC Treaty Commission (KTIS n.d.). However, as this was a provincial effort to implement the 1982 constitution, no concession is coded.
  - o As a result of this, in 1993, the Tsimshian presented a statement of intent and begin stage one of treaty process with BC. This entered subsequent stages in 1994 and 1996, with the later seeing a framework agreement signed in 1997 (New World Encyclopedia, nd: Online). However, negotiations did not go any further than the framework agreement and they collapsed in 2004 when the Tsimshian Council disbanded (KTIS, nd: Online). Due

- to this collapse, no concession is coded here. However, treaty negotiations renewed with the Tsimshian communities on an individual basis.
- Under the Treaty Commission process, both the Gitxan and Wet'suwet'en first nations entered the fourth stage of negotiations in 1995 (BC Treaty Commission, nd-a: Online, nd-b: Online). However, this is short of an agreement in principle, and there was no change in level of autonomy, so no concession is coded.
  - In 1993 the Haida and Canadian Government signed the Gwaii Haanas Agreement (CHN, nd: Online). This established Gwaii Haanas national park under cooperative management under the Archipelago Management Board, which included members from the Haida nation (Coast Funds, 2018: Online). [1993: autonomy concession]
  - In 1996 the Nisga'a and the BC government reached an agreement in principle on a treaty for land, cash, and self-government (KTIS, nd: Online). Outside of the BC Treaty Commission's policies, this individual agreement did see a change in autonomy for this group, even if used as an example by others of an undesirable outcome (Nuxalk Nation, nd: Online). [1996: autonomy concession]
  - In 1997, the Canadian Supreme Court (Delgamuukw Decision) fleshed out and extended the Aborigine's land rights, ruling that, among other things, the Aboriginal title to land is a communal right protected under the 1982 constitution. This process began in 1984 when the Gitxan and Wet'suwet'en filed the claim against the BC government (KTIS, nd: Online). The Court ruled that oral histories and traditions constitute sufficient evidence for land claims. It also stated that Aborigines are entitled to activities beyond traditional activities like hunting and fishing (Minority Rights Group International; Minorities at Risk Project; Cunningham, 2014: 204). [1997: autonomy concession]
  - According to Cunningham (2014: 204), there was a court ruling in 2003 "in Native favor over the residential schools program" which "resulted in restitution paid to the Natives and establishment of programs to promote Native languages and cultures." [2003: cultural rights concession]
  - The Constitution of the Haida Nation was formally adopted in 2003, giving the Council of the Haida Nation the right to settle title and land rights (CHN, nd: Online). It is unclear whether this occurred with agreement of either the provincial or central governments and appears to be a unilateral move. Therefore, no concession is coded.
  - In 2004 Canada's Supreme Court ruled that states' obligation to protect indigenous claims goes beyond recognized treaties and also applies to unproven claims (MRGI, nd: Online). The case was part of a legal battle that had been ongoing since 1981 related to logging rights. British Columbia did not fully implement the ruling and some logging without consultation continued (CHN, nd: Online). However, MRGI notes that activity has slowed down by stalling oil drilling plans through the ruling. An autonomy concession is coded as the Supreme Court of Canada provided a legal foundation for the protection of Haida lands. [2004: autonomy concession]
  - In 2005 the Naa-nulth First Nation accepted a final agreement under the Treaty Commission process. This was finally ratified in 2007, and included the provision of self-government (BC n.d.; KTIS n.d.). [2005: autonomy concession]
  - In 2010 the Haida and the government of British Columbia created a joint management council as part of The Haida Gwaii Reconciliation Act. This allows the Haida to share in decision making over the management of the island's resources. Furthermore, the name of the island was officially changed to Haida Gwaii (Britannica, nd: Online). [2010: autonomy concession]
  - In 2012 the Tla'amin Nation final agreement was signed as part of the BC Treaty Commission process. As with the Naa-multh, this agreement includes provisions for self-government (BC n.d.; KTIS n.d.). [2012: autonomy concession]
  - In 2015 both the Kitsumkalum and Kitselas (both Tsimshian) signed final treaties as part of the BC Treaty Commission. As with other final agreements, this includes provisions for self-government (BC n.d.; KTIS n.d.). [2015: autonomy concession]
  - In 2021, the Haida Nation signed a framework agreement with the Canadian and BC governments (the GayGahlda "Changing Tide" framework agreement) which commit to discussions on "forestry measures, resources for governance capacity, social and cultural measures, business opportunities and fisheries and marine matters. It also describes a path forward based on a series of agreements that build on each other over time to implement Title and Rights" (Council of the Haida Nation 2021: Online).

## Regional autonomy

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs in areas such as culture, education, language, health and social services, as well as economic development (Minority Rights Group International). Based on this, we code autonomy from 1983 onward. [1983-2020: regional autonomy]

## De facto independence

NA

## Major territorial changes

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). [1982: establishment of regional autonomy]

## EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Haida
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Indigenous peoples
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2004000

## Power access

- The Haida and other First Nations are indigenous people residing mainly in coastal parts of Western Canada. EPR codes the indigenous peoples as powerless throughout the duration of this movement. In line with EPR we did not find evidence of active discrimination as defined in EPR. First Nations enjoy the right to vote since 1960. At the same time, again in alignment with EPR, we found no evidence for Haida or BC First Nation representation in the national government (cf. Cairns 2011). In Canada there is a ministry for Aboriginal affairs (up to 2011 called the ministry for Indian affairs), but this is consistently filled by non-Aborigines. In 2008, Leona Aglukkaq became the first Aboriginal (Inuit) cabinet member. Between 2015 and 2019, Jody Wilson Raybould, a member of the We Wai Kai Nation) served in various ministerial roles including Minister of Justice. According to EPR, representation of the indigenous peoples nevertheless overall remained rather token. [1980-2020: powerless]

## Group size

- We rely on the 2001 Canadian census, according to which there were 118,295 people in BC who were part of a single treaty Indian First Nation (excluding Métis and Inuit) in BC (Canada 2001). The 2001 census pegged Canada's population at 30 million. [0.0039]
  - o Note: According to Minahan (2002: 708), there were about 35,000 Haida in Canada in 2002.

## Regional concentration

- Exact information on the Haida's ethnography is difficult to get by, but according to Minahan (2002: 708) the Haida homeland spans a large coastal area including parts of Western Canada and the U.S. Regional concentration seems unlikely (also see Canada Encyclopedia). Other First Nations are highly dispersed across the province. [not concentrated]

## Kin

- There are some Haida in the U.S., but the 100k numerical threshold is clearly not met (Minahan 2002: 708). The same applies to another BC First Nation, Tsimshian (New World Encyclopedia, nd: Online). [no kin]

## Sources

- BC (nd) Tsimshian First Nation Treaty Society (Online). Available at:  
<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/consulting-with-first-nations/first-nations-negotiations/first-nations-a-z-listing/tsimshian-first-nations-treaty-society> [Accessed: 18/09/2022].
- British Columbia (1991) The Report of the British Columbia Claims Task Force (Online). Available at:  
[https://bctreaty.ca/sites/default/files/BC\\_Claims\\_Task\\_Force\\_Report\\_1991.pdf](https://bctreaty.ca/sites/default/files/BC_Claims_Task_Force_Report_1991.pdf) [Accessed: 05/11/2022].
- British Columbia (nd) Gitksan Nation (Online). Available at:  
<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/consulting-with-first-nations/first-nations-negotiations/first-nations-a-z-listing/gitksan-hereditary-chiefs-treaty-society> [Accessed: 16/09/2022].
- British Columbia (nd-b) Maa-nulth First Nations (Online) Available at:  
<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/consulting-with-first-nations/first-nations-negotiations/first-nations-a-z-listing/maa-nulth-first-nations> [Accessed: 16/10/2022].
- British Columbia (nd-c) Tla-amin Nation (Online). Available at:  
<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/consulting-with-first-nations/first-nations-negotiations/first-nations-a-z-listing/tla-amin-nation-sliammon-first-nation> [Accessed: 16/10/2022].
- British Columbia Treaty Commission (nd-a) Gitksan Hereditary Chiefs (Online). Available at:  
<https://www.bctreaty.ca/gitksan-hereditary-chiefs> [Accessed: 16/09/2022].
- British Columbia Treaty Commission (nd-b) Wet'suwet'en Hereditary Chiefs (Online). Available at:  
<https://www.bctreaty.ca/wetsuweten-hereditary-chiefs> [Accessed: 16/10/2022].
- Cairns, Alan (2011). *Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Canada Encyclopedia. <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/haida-native-group> [7 February, 2022].
- Canada Statistics (2001) 2001 Census – British Columbia (Online). Available at:  
<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/english/profil01/AP01/Details/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=PR&Code1=59&Geo2=PR&Code2=01&Data=Count&SearchText=British%20Columbia&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&GeoLevel=&GeoCode=59> [Accessed: 16/10/2022].
- Canadian Geospatial Platform Services ArcGIS Online (2019). "Aboriginal Lands of Canada Legislative Boundaries." <https://hub.arcgis.com/datasets/aeb69a40403f4e259eb7b19aff7ff52/explore>
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.

- CHN – Council of the Haida Nation (nd) CHN and SHN (Online). Available at: <https://www.haidanation.ca/secretariat-of-the-haida-nation/> [Accessed: 27/08/2022].
- Coast Funds (2018) 25 Years of Co-Management in Gwaii Haanas (Online). Available at: <https://coastfunds.ca/news/25-years-of-co-management-of-gwaii-haanas/> [Accessed: 27/08/2022].
- Council of the Haida Nation (2021a) New agreement lays foundation for reconciliation of Haida Title and Rights (Online). Available at: <https://www.haidanation.ca/news/for-immediate-release-august-13-2021-new-agreement-lays-foundation-for-reconciliation-of-haida-title-and-rights/> [Accessed: 05/11/2022].
- Council of the Haida Nation (2021b) Haida Constitution (Online). Available at: <https://www.haidanation.ca/haida-constitution/> [Accessed: 05/11/2022].
- Council of the Haida Nation. <http://www.ualberta.ca/~esimpson/claims/councilhaida.htm> [July 2, 2003].
- Council of the Haida Nations “Mandates and Responsibilities.” <http://www.haidanation.ca/Pages/governance/mandate.html> [December 11, 2013].
- Cunningham, Kathleen Gallagher (2014). *Inside the Politics of Self-Determination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Danver, Steven (2015) *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures, and Contemporary Issues*. Routledge, London.
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Gitxsan Huwilt Government (nd) About (Online). Available at: <https://gitxsan.ca/about/> [Accessed: 16/09/2022].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 202-203.
- Idle No More. “The Manifesto.” <http://www.idlenomore.ca/manifesto> [December 11, 2013].
- Institute of Canadian and Aboriginal Studies (2013). “Community Profile – Haida.” <https://arts.uottawa.ca/canada/en/community-profile-breanne-austin-haida> [July 10, 2017].
- Kitsumkalum Treaty Information Source (nd) History and Timeline (Online). Available at: <https://www.kitsumkalumtreaty.ca/our-treaty/history-timeline/> [Accessed: 18/09/2022].
- Kulchyski, Peter K. (1994). *Unjust Relations: Aboriginal Rights in Canadian Courts*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lexis Nexis. <http://www.lexis-nexis.com> [July 2, 2003].
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 214-216.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 708-712.
- Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (1997) Tsimshian Nation Framework Agreement (Online). Available at: [https://www.bctreaty.ca/sites/default/files/tsimshia\\_framework.pdf](https://www.bctreaty.ca/sites/default/files/tsimshia_framework.pdf) [Accessed: 18/09/2022].
- Minorities at Risk Project (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [November 9, 2021].
- New World Encyclopedia (nd) Tsimshian (Online). Available at: [https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Tsimshian#cite\\_note-treatyinfo-2](https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Tsimshian#cite_note-treatyinfo-2) [Accessed: 18/09/2022].
- Nuxalk Nation (nd) Our Sovereignty (Online). Available at: <http://www.nuxalk.net/html/sovereignty.htm> [Accessed: 17/09/2022].
- Office of the Wet’suwet’en (nd) About our organization (online). Available at: <http://www.wetsuweten.com/office/about-us/> [Accessed: 16/09/2022].

- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Salomons, Tanisha and Erin Hanson (2009). "Sparrow Case."  
<http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/land-rights/sparrow-case.html> [April 22, 2015].
- Shishalh Nation (nd) (Online). Available at: <https://shishalh.com/> [Accessed: 16/10/2022].
- Tsimshian First Nation Treat Society (nd) <https://www.tfntreaty.ca/about-us.html> (Online). [Accessed: 18/09/2022].
- Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs (nd) About (Online). Available at: <https://www.ubcic.bc.ca/about> [Accessed: 16/10/2022].
- UNPO (2018) Tsimshian (Online). Available at: <https://unpo.org/members/20859> [Accessed: 18/09/2022].
- UNPO (nd) Nuxalk (Online). Available at: <https://unpo.org/members/20832> [Accessed: 17/09/2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

## **Innu**

Activity: 1976-2020

### **General notes**

- The Innu are made of three regional groups: the Montagnais, the Naskapis, and the Attikamek (Minahan, 2002: 789).

### **Movement start and end dates**

- The main Innu self-determination movement, the Innu Nation, was formed as the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association (NMIA) in 1976 (Innu Nation 2008: Online). We therefore peg the start date of the movement at 1976. Since then, the movement has been actively seeking to resolve land claims and win greater autonomy for the Innu in Newfoundland and Labrador, who inhabit a region known as Nitassinan. There are two Innu Councils in Quebec, Le Conseil Tribal Mamuitun (incorporated in 1991) and Mamit Innuat (founded in 1982, incorporated in 1988) who also seek to resolve land claims and win greater autonomy for the Innu (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2021: Online; Mamit Innuat, 2011: Online). From 2012-2013, the Innu have also taken part in organized protests – Idle No More – involving many indigenous tribes. The grievances include infringement of land rights and environmental pollution on tribal lands. It aims to “help build sovereignty and resurgence of nationhood” (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 202f; Idle No More; Innu Nation; Lexis Nexis; Minahan 1996: 398ff, 2002: 789ff; MAR). [start date: 1976; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- Claims are focused on autonomy and land rights for the Innu in both Quebec and NL (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2021: Online; Mamit Innuat, 2011: Online). [1976-2020: autonomy claim]

### **Independence claims**

NA

### **Irredentist claims**

NA

### **Claimed territory**

- The exact territory claimed by the Innu is ambiguous. The most specific definition of the Innu homeland we found is an agreement between the First Nations of Mamuitun, the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada. We code this claim based on the following map from Wikipedia, which covers land in Quebec and Newfoundland-Labrador:  
[https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=File:Innu\\_map.jpg&oldid=475559502#metadata](https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=File:Innu_map.jpg&oldid=475559502#metadata). We rely on this map but, because it is not clear whether this territory was claimed already in the movement’s early phase, we flag this claim as ambiguous.

## **Sovereignty declarations**

NA

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- We found no reports of deaths resulting from separatist violence, hence a NVIOLSD classification. The MAR rebellion score of Canada's indigenous peoples is three in 1990. This relates to an event involving the Iroquois and, furthermore, is considered too minimal to constitute armed rebellion (just a single casualty; for more details see the entry of the Iroquois). [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- Records of the Innu's first contact with Europeans vary, with some encountering fishers and whalers in the 1400's (Danver, 2015: 458) or as late as the early 1600's along the Hudson Bay coast (Minahan, 2002: 790). This helped create a cultural divide between the Southern Innu (Montagnais) and Northern Innu (Naskapis). The French forged an alliance with the Innu in 1603, founded Quebec in 1608 with claims on Innu land, and sent missionaries to Innu communities from 1615 (Minahan, 2002: 791; Canadian Encyclopedia, 2021: Online; Danver, 2015: 458). This led to strong French contact with the southern Montagnais Innu. The northern Naskapis had more contact with the British Hudson Bay Company, leading to the Innu being in the middle of European competition (Minahan, 2002: 791; Canadian Encyclopedia, 2021: Online). After the French and Indian War in 1763, all Innu peoples came under the British (Minahan, 2002: 791). The fur trade that sustained the Innu economy from the 1500's began to dry up by the early 1800's, which was slowly replaced by logging conducted by European colonists who brought smallpox etc to Innu communities.
- With Canadian independence, the Innu heartland became a part of the Northwest Territories. It then became part of a separate Ungava territory in 1895 and was split between Quebec and the British governed Newfoundland and Labrador (NL) in 1927, creating an administrative split between the different Innu communities (Minahan, 2002: 791). This meant that the Innu in Quebec were covered by the Indian Act of 1876 and subsequently classified as a first nation, whilst the Innu in NL were not covered by the Act. The Indian Act and historical legacy of the treaties discriminated against indigenous groups. Indigenous groups could not raise funds for political groups until 1953 (MAR), and those classified as indigenous could not vote federally, hire land, or make land claims until 1960 (MRGI, nd: Online; EPR). This included the Innu in Quebec. At NL's confederation into Canada in 1949, NL and Canada did not extend the Act in order to prevent disenfranchising the Innu on NL. Instead, the government agreed to provide economic assistance to NL for indigenous governance, which led to a series of subsidy policies to settle Innu peoples, many who had limited contact or were traditionally governed through the Hudson Bay Company and the Church (Innu Nation, 2008: Online). The last of the Northern Innu were settled in the 1950's (Danver, 2015: 458; Canadian Encyclopedia, 2021: Online).
- In 1969 the Trudeau government released the Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (The White Paper), acknowledging a failure of the state to indigenous communities as agreed in the Indian Act and other treaties. There were some recommended provisions for land rights transfers and indigenous governance, but the White Paper was rejected by indigenous communities because it failed to rectify salient issues and view that it was a tool for greater assimilation. This would have covered the Innu in Quebec (Minahan, 2002: 791; Danver, 2015: 458).
- No concessions or restriction were found in the 10 years before the SDM start date.



## Concessions and restrictions

- The Innu of Quebec were originally excluded from the James Bay Agreement of 1975, with the Agreement's provisions for control of resources and education reserved for the Cree. A separate agreement for the affected Innu (Naskapi Band) was negotiated in 1978, the Northeastern Quebec Agreement, which provided some self-government concessions and resource management provisions (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2021: Online). [1978: autonomy concession]
- The 1982 Constitution Act recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). This represented a formal recognition of indigenous rights that should have been implemented in previous treaties (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010). This is a significant autonomy concession recognizing autonomy of indigenous communities. The Innu are split between Quebec and NL, with the concession only covering Innu in Quebec. However, the latter group makes up the majority of the SDM. In 1984, self-government for the Naskapi in Quebec was established through the Cree-Naskapi (of Quebec) Act (Quebec, 2021: Online). This was Canada's first legislation for indigenous self-government (MRGI: Online). We only code the national recognition of self-rule in 1982 because the national recognition seems more significant, and the sub-national recognition appears to be an outflow of the national legislation. [1982: autonomy concession]
- In 1985, the Canadian Parliament amended the Indian Act. The act lifted many discriminatory practices, including that Aboriginal women who marry a non-Aboriginal automatically lose their Aboriginal status. Moreover, indigenous communities were allowed to regulate membership in their communities themselves (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010; MRGI: Online). Again, because the Innu on Labrador were not recognized as a First Nation, this concession only covers the Innu recognized as a First Nation, i.e., those in Quebec. [1985: cultural rights concession]
- In 1990 the Supreme Court set a precedent with the ruling in the Sparrow case by setting out criteria "to determine whether governmental infringement on Aboriginal rights was justifiable, providing that these rights were in existence at the time of the Constitution Act, 1982" (Salomons and Hanson 2009). The Court hereby restricted the possibility to limit aboriginal rights, such as fishing, that were in existence in 1982. The government can no longer infringe upon these rights without justification. The Sparrow case is recognized by many as "a significant victory for those interested in the affirmation of Aboriginal rights" (Kulchyski 1994: 212). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- In 1990, Prime Minister Mulroney announced a new federal aboriginal agenda dealing including the acceleration of land claims and the improvement of the Aborigine's socio-economic conditions. More importantly, in 1992 a constitutional conference presents a new proposal for constitutional amendments called the Charlottetown Accord. The agreement foresaw unprecedented self-government for Canada's Aborigine population, including the right to raise taxes. Essentially, the Accord would have created three levels of government, a federal, a provincial, and a Native. The Charlottetown Accord was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992 (Minorities at Risk Project). However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. In response, the Innu community on Davis Inlet in Labrador evicted a judge, setting off demands for Innu justice system based on traditional law (Minahan, 2002: 792). We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide, giving indigenous peoples relatively little say.
- The Innu Nation filed land claims in 1978. Formal negotiations in 1990/91. This led to a framework-agreements for land claims (1996) and self-government (1997) (Innu Nation, 2008: Online). These are not coded as autonomy concessions as negotiations continued after. Negotiators switched to focusing on establishing the NL Innu as "Status Indians" in 2002 (see below).
- In 1997, the Canadian Supreme Court (Delgamuukw Decision) fleshed out and extended the Aborigine's land rights, ruling that, among other things, the Aboriginal title to land is a communal right protected under the 1982 constitution. Critically, the Court ruled that oral histories and traditions constitute sufficient evidence for land claims. It also stated that Aborigines are entitled to activities beyond traditional activities like hunting and fishing

(Minority Rights Group International; Minorities at Risk Project; Cunningham, 2014: 204).

Again, because the Innu on Labrador were not recognized as a First Nation, this concession only covers the Innu recognized as a First Nation, i.e., those in Quebec. [1997: autonomy concession]

- In 2001, the NL Government and Innu Nation signed a Forest Process Agreement. This allowed for full Innu participation in forestry planning in central Labrador (Innu Nation, 2008: Online; Newfoundland and Labrador, nd-b: Online). [2001: autonomy concession]
- In 2002 the Innu of NL successfully negotiated for federal recognition as “Status Indians”, which meant that they became covered by the Indian Act. This entitled the Innu Nation on NL to the same government programs and concessions offered to other First Nations (Danver, 2015: 459; Innu Nation, 2008: Online; Canadian Encyclopedia, 2021: Online). It also represents the equal status and rights across the whole Innu peoples (providing status equality between Quebec and NL Innu). [2002: autonomy concession]
- According to Cunningham (2014: 204), there was a court ruling in 2003 “in Native favor over the residential schools program” which “resulted in restitution paid to the Natives and establishment of programs to promote Native languages and cultures.” [2003: cultural rights concession].
- The Land Claim and Self-Government agreement in principle was signed in 2011. This established land governed or comanaged by the Innu as well as a financial package, but it is not legally binding. Still, many provisions were effective from the date of the agreement (Government of Canada, nd: Online). [2011: autonomy concession]
- In 2018, the Canadian government announced that it would enter land rights negotiations with the NunatuKavut Community. This was protested by the Innu, who have overlapping land claims. The negotiations are ongoing, so no restriction is coded.
- In 2019, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the governments of Canada and Quebec with the Assembly of First Nations of Quebec and Labrador. The parties agreed to work together towards greater autonomy for indigenous control over healthcare. The aim is to give control over choice of healthcare models. This is noted because it could lead to a concession further down the line. The agreement includes Cree, Anishinabe, and Iroquois (Mohawk) communities.
- In 2020, the Supreme Court ruled that the Quebec courts can decide whether mining harmed Innu people in traditional territory that straddles the Quebec-NL border, without having to go to the NL court. This develops from a 2013 claim by the Innu against a mining project, asking for the project to end, pay damages, and for a declaration of aboriginal title over traditional land (Supreme Court of Canada 2020: Online). Although not a concession, it paves way for future recognition of land rights.
- In 2004 the Mamuitun mak Nutashkuan Tribal Council (now the Regroupement Petapan Inc) signed an Agreement in Principle with the Governments of Canada and Quebec. This set out provisions for self-government for three Innu communities. Negotiations on the final agreement are ongoing as of 2022, so we do not code a concession (Regroupement Petapan Inc, nd: Online; CIRNAC, nd: Online), but note this for future updates.

### **Regional autonomy**

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations’ right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs in areas such as culture, education, language, health and social services, as well as economic development (Minority Rights Group International). At this point in time, only the Innu in Quebec profited from the constitutional recognition as only they were recognized as a First Nation while the Innu in NL were not. That said, approx. 80% of all Innus live in Quebec, so we code autonomy from 1983 onward in line with the 1<sup>st</sup> of January rule. [1983-2020: regional autonomy]

### **De facto independence**

NA

## Major territorial changes

- See above. [1982: establishment of regional autonomy]

## EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Innu
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Indigenous peoples
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2004000

## Power access

- The Innu are one of the aboriginal peoples of Canada, located mainly in Quebec and Labrador. EPR codes the indigenous peoples as powerless throughout the duration of this movement. In line with EPR we did not find evidence of active discrimination as defined in EPR. First Nations enjoy the right to vote since 1960. At the same time, again in alignment with EPR, we found no evidence for Innu representation in the national government (cf. Cairns 2011). In Canada there is a ministry for Aboriginal affairs (up to 2011 called the ministry for Indian affairs), but this is consistently filled by non-Aborigines. In 2008, Leona Aglukkaq became the first Aboriginal (Inuit) cabinet member. Between 2015 and 2019, Jody Wilson Raybould, a member of the We Wai Kai Nation) served in various ministerial roles including Minister of Justice. According to EPR, representation of the indigenous peoples nevertheless overall remained rather token. [1976-2020: powerless]

## Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 789), there were about 23,000 Innu in Canada in 2002. The WB pegs Canada's population at 31.36 mio in that year. [0.0007]

## Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 789), approx. 40% of Innus live in their homeland, Nitassinan, where they make up 40% of the local population. [not concentrated]

## Kin

- We found no evidence for numerically significant kin. [no kin]

## Sources

Cairns, Alan (2011). *Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Canadian Encyclopedia (2021) Innu (Montagnais- Naskapi) (Online). Available at: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/innu-montagnais-naskapi> [Accessed: 03/09/2022].

Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.

- Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC) (nd) General Briefing Note on Canada's Self-government and Comprehensive Land Claims Policies and the Status of Negotiations (Online). Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1373385502190/1542727338550> [Accessed: 03/09/2022].
- Cunningham, Kathleen Gallagher (2014). *Inside the Politics of Self-Determination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Danver, Steven (2015) *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures, and Contemporary Issues*. Routledge, London.
- Government of Canada (2002). "Nitassinan of the First Nation of Mashteuiatsh (Land Regime)." <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100031951/1539797054964> [November 22, 2021]
- Government of Canada (nd) Backgrounder - Highlights: Land Claims and Self-Government Agreement- Principle with the Innu of Labrador (Online). Available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/news/archive/2011/11/backgrounder-highlights-land-claims-self-government-agreement-principle-innu-labrador.html> [Accessed: 03/09/2022].
- Government of Quebec (2021) Naskapis (Online). Available at: <https://www.quebec.ca/en/government/quebec-at-a-glance/first-nations-and-inuit/profile-of-the-nations/naskapis> [Accessed: 26/09/2022].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 202-203.
- Idle No More. "The Manifesto." <http://www.idlenomore.ca/manifesto> [December 11, 2013].
- Innu Nation (2008) Innu Rights and Governance (Online). Available at: [http://www.innu.ca/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=10&Itemid=7&lang=en](http://www.innu.ca/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10&Itemid=7&lang=en) [Accessed: 03/09/2022].
- Innu Nation. "Innu Rights & Government." [http://www.innu.ca/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=10&Itemid=7&lang=en](http://www.innu.ca/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10&Itemid=7&lang=en) [December 11, 2013].
- Innu Nation. [http://www.innu.ca/the\\_innu.html](http://www.innu.ca/the_innu.html) [July 2, 2003].
- Kulchyski, Peter K. (1994). *Unjust Relations: Aboriginal Rights in Canadian Courts*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lexis Nexis (2018) Canada moves to recognize NunatuKavut in southern Labrador (Online). Available at: <https://advance.lexis.com/api/permalink/4fbf3e19-f7a6-4305-98d7-45848bad22e8/?context=1519360&federationidp=7R8KD759624> [Accessed: 12/11/2022].
- Lexis Nexis (2019) Signing of a Tripartite Memorandum of Understanding on Health and Social Services Governance for Quebec First Nations (Online). Available at: <https://advance.lexis.com/api/permalink/f9497a2c-244b-4d6e-ac1e-0cb180e2a98c/?context=1519360&federationidp=7R8KD759624> [Accessed: 12/11/2022].
- Mamit Innuat (2011) (Online). Available at: <http://www.mamit-innuat.com/> [Accessed: 03/09/2022].
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 398-400.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 789-973.
- Minorities at Risk Project (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [November 9, 2021].
- Newfoundland and Labrador (nd-a) News Releases: Innu Nation Cooperate on Forestry Management (Online). Available at: <https://www.releases.gov.nl.ca/releases/2001/forest/0131n03.htm> [Accessed: 03/09/2022].
- Newfoundland and Labrador (nd-b) Innu Nation of Labrador (Online). Available at: <https://www.gov.nl.ca/exec/iar/overview/land-claims/innu-nation-of-labrador/> [Accessed: 03/09/2022].
- Regroupement Petapan Inc (nd) Trading History (Online). Available at: <https://www.petapan.ca/page/historique-de-la-negociation> [Accessed: 03/09/2022].
- Salomons, Tanisha and Erin Hanson (2009). "Sparrow Case." <http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/land-rights/sparrow-case.html> [April 22, 2015].

- Supreme Court of Canada (2020) Newfoundland and Labrador (Attorney General) v. Uashaunnuat (Innu of Uashat and of Mani-Utenam) (Online). Available at:  
<https://www.scc-csc.ca/case-dossier/cb/2020/37912-eng.aspx> [Accessed: 12/11/2022].
- Tanner, Adrian (2011). "The Double Bind of Aboriginal Self-Determination." In: Scott, Colin (ed.), *Aboriginal Autonomy and Development in Northern Quebec and Labrador*, p. 396-416. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

## **Inuit**

Activity: 1963-2020

### **General notes**

- The Inuit are recognized as distinct from other Indigenous groups, such as the Status Indians whose rights are recognized under the Indian Act (MAR, 2009). Therefore, many concessions to Indigenous groups in Canada connected to the Indian Act do not extend to the Inuit. The Inuit are dispersed across northern Canada, meaning that some groups have attained autonomy whilst others continue working towards this goal.

### **Movement start and end dates**

- Minahan (2002: 796) reports that Inuit nationalists put forward a plan to divide the Northwest Territories and create a self-governing Inuit homeland in 1963. It is not fully clear whether this should be read as separatist mobilization. Noting that this decision is ambiguous, we peg the start date of the movement at 1963.
- Hewitt & Cheetham (2000: 213) report that Tapirisat, a national Inuit organization, began to advocate partition in 1977. Tapirisat was notably formed earlier, in 1971. News reports indicate that the movement was active throughout 1963-99. In 1999 Nunavut became an autonomous Inuit state within Canada, which ended Inuit claims for separation from the Northwest Territories. However, not all Inuit in Nunavut are satisfied with the extent of self-rule given to them and, in 2018, calls for the exploration of alternative models of self-government arose. The call was made by an organization called the Nunavut Tunngavik Inc (Nunatsiaq News 2018: Online).
- Furthermore, we found evidence for subsequent activity by other Inuit groups located outside of Nunavut, which have campaigned for self-government. This includes the Labrador Inuit Association (LIA), which campaigned for an autonomous Inuit region in Labrador (Heritage, 2008: Online). This also includes the NunatuKavut of southern Labrador and the Nunavik of northern Quebec (Roth 2015: 537; Canadian Encyclopedia 2010). On this basis, the movement is coded as ongoing as of 2020. [start date: 1963; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- From 1963 onward, the movement's main claim was for the creation of an Inuit state, to be carved out of the North-West Territories (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 213; Minahan 2002: 796).
- Nunavut was established in 1999. However, some Inuit groups have continued to make claims for increased autonomy for Nunavut (see above). There are also Inuit outside of Nunavut, whose main claim is for increased autonomy though a minority wants to join Nunavut (Minahan 2002: 798; Roth 2015: 537; Canadian Encyclopedia 2010; NunatuKavut 2019). [1963-1999: sub-state secession claim; 2000-2020: autonomy claim]

### **Independence claims**

NA

### **Irredentist claims**

NA

## **Claimed territory**

- The territory claimed by the Inuit roughly matches the Nunavut state in Canada. However, it should be noted that the exact boundaries of this territory remained disputed until its creation (Minahan 2002: 797). However, we were unable to find a specific definition of the territorial claim that preceded Nunavut state.
- Since the establishment of Nunavut in 1999, some groups have made claims for increased autonomy for Nunavut. In addition, Inuit groups outside of Nunavut have also made self-determination claims, including the Nunavik in Quebec and parts of Labrador (Roth, 2015: 537; ITK, nd: Online). However, the legitimacy of these latter claims has been disputed by several Inuit and First Nations groups (CBC News 2022). Therefore, we treat Nunavut as the dominant claimed territory throughout. We use data from the Global Administrative Areas database for polygon definition. We code this claim as ambiguous since the territorial claims were not clearly defined in the early years.

## **Sovereignty declarations**

NA

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- We found no reports of deaths resulting from separatist violence, hence a NVIOLSD classification. The MAR rebellion score of Canada's indigenous peoples is three in 1990. This relates to an event involving the Iroquois and, furthermore, is considered too minimal to constitute armed rebellion (just a single casualty; for more details see the entry of the Iroquois). [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- The Inuit first contact with Europeans came in 1576 with Sir Mark Frobisher. However, most contact only occurred from the 1770's with substantive exploration by British, Spanish, and Russian explorers (Minahan, 2002: 796). European whaling activities contributed to a decline in Inuit population (MRGI, 2015: Online). Territories inhabited by the Inuit were part of the Northwest Territories (NWT), which was leased to the Hudson Bay Company between 1821-1869. In 1876 the Keewatin District was established, which covers the current province of Nunavut, but the southern borders were partly transferred to Ontario and Manitoba. In 1895 the Franklin District was established covering the northern islands now part of Nunavut (Minahan, 2002: 796). The Inuit in Northern Quebec lived in the Ungava district, which was partitioned in 1912 (MRGI, 2015: Online).
- The Inuit were largely ignored by the Canadian government until 1939 when the courts decided that the federal government was responsible for the Inuit (although not in the same way as first nations covered by the Indian Act). This meant that the Inuit became subject to assimilation policies, such as sending children to residential schools, forced relocation and settlement, and changing Inuit naming conventions (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2010: Online). This policy was particularly prominent in the 1950's (Minahan, 2002: 796).
- No concessions or restrictions were found in the 10 years before the SDM start date.

## **Concessions and restrictions**

- In 1971, the Quebec government announced plans to develop a hydroelectric project called the James Bay Project. This covered land inhabited by Nunavik Inuit and Cree. This project was halted by an injunction in 1973, and the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement was signed

in 1975 between the Inuit, Cree, and Quebec government (ITK, nd: Online: MRGI, 2015: Online). This was the first comprehensive land claims agreement in Canada. It involved a resource management agreement, provision of water and sanitation systems (Minahan, 2002: 495; Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010), land ownership transfers, and permission for traditional activities (MRGI, 2015: Online). The agreement also included provisions for indigenous control of their own education in Quebec province (Danver, 2015: 428-429; Canadian Encyclopedia, nd: Online). [1975: autonomy concession]

- The 1982 Constitution Act recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). This represented a formal recognition of indigenous rights and included the Inuit, even though they were not covered by the Indian Act (a decision emerging from the 1939 court decision making the Canadian government responsible for the Inuit) (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010). This is a significant autonomy concession recognizing autonomy of indigenous communities. [1982: autonomy concession].
- In 1984, the NWT Official Languages Act recognized aboriginal languages typically spoken in the NWT. This was designed to give a degree of cultural protection to these languages, which included Inuit languages Inuinnaqtun, Inuktitut, and Inuvialuktun (MRGI, 2015: Online: OLC-NWT, nd: Online). [1984: cultural rights concession]
- According to ITK: "In 1984, the Inuvialuit, federal and territorial governments settled a comprehensive land claims agreement, giving Inuvialuit surface and subsurface (mining) rights to most of the region. The Agreement ensures environmental protection, harvesting rights and Inuvialuit participation and support in many economic development initiatives." (ITK, nd: Online). [1984: autonomy concession]
- In 1985, the Canadian Parliament amended the Indian Act. The act lifted many discriminatory practices, including that Aboriginal women who marry a non-Aboriginal automatically lose their Aboriginal status. Moreover, indigenous communities were allowed to regulate membership in their communities themselves (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010; MRGI: Online). [1985: cultural rights concession]
- In 1990, several Inuit languages became official languages in the NWT (MRGI, 2015: Online). Aboriginal languages were given equal status within all institutions of the Legislative Assembly and the Government of the NWT (OLC-NWT, nd: Online). [1990: cultural rights concession]
  - o A second reason cultural rights concession in 1990: In 1990 the Supreme Court set a precedent with the ruling in the Sparrow case by setting out criteria "to determine whether governmental infringement on Aboriginal rights was justifiable, providing that these rights were in existence at the time of the Constitution Act, 1982" (Salomons and Hanson 2009). The Court hereby restricted the possibility to limit aboriginal rights, such as fishing, that were in existence in 1982. The government can no longer infringe upon these rights without justification. The Sparrow case is recognized by many as "a significant victory for those interested in the affirmation of Aboriginal rights" (Kulchyski 1994: 212).
- On 14<sup>th</sup> April 1982, inhabitants of the NWT had voted in favor of dividing the territory across ethnic lines. This was initially proposed in 1960 by the Canadian government and pushed for by the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK) from the 1970s (Minahan, 2002: 797; Roth, 2015: 536; Canadian Encyclopedia, 2010: Online). In 1990, the Nunavut territory was agreed in principle. The Nunavut Agreement was voted through in a referendum in 1992, giving the Inuit ownership of 18% of the territory and shared control over the rest of the territory. This was formalized in the Nunavut Act in 1993 (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2010: Online; Minahan, 2002: 797; Hewitt and Cheetham, 2000: 213). On 1<sup>st</sup> April 1999, Nunavut became an autonomous Inuit territory within Canada. Nunavut was carved out of the NWT, mainly as the former Keewatin district. This territory is administered by a commissioner appointed by the Canadian Federal Minister of Indian Affairs but governed by an elected Premier. The territory also has one set on both the Canadian parliament and senate (Minahan, 2002: 797; Danver, 2015: 437; Roth, 536; MAR, 2009; Canadian Encyclopedia, 2010: Online). We code a single concession in 1992 as this is when the key referendum on Nunavut's borders was held. [1992: autonomy concession]
  - o Note: Minahan reports that "In September 1989 the Canadian government finally passed the long-delayed Nunavut settlement, the biggest land transfer since the Alaska



and Louisiana purchases of the nineteenth century. The agreement gave the Inuit considerable control over mineral development and set aside lands for traditional activities, such as trapping and hunting” (2002: 797). It is not clear what Minahan is referring to here as the final agreement was reached only years later.

- In 1997, the Canadian Supreme Court (Delgamuukw Decision) fleshed out and extended the Aborigine’s land rights, ruling that, among other things, the Aboriginal title to land is a communal right protected under the 1982 constitution. Critically, the Court ruled that oral histories and traditions constitute sufficient evidence for land claims. It also stated that Aborigines are entitled to activities beyond traditional activities like hunting and fishing (Minority Rights Group International; Minorities at Risk Project). [1997: autonomy concession]
- According to Cunningham (2014: 204), there was a court ruling in 2003 “in Native favor over the residential schools program” which “resulted in restitution paid to the Natives and establishment of programs to promote Native languages and cultures.” [2003: cultural rights concession].
- On 1<sup>st</sup> December 2005, the Inuit living in northern Newfoundland and Labrador established the autonomous territory of Nunatsiavut. This was a result of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement in January 2005 and the Labrador Inuit Constitution. The Labrador Inuit Association (LIA) had filed its original land claim in 1977. The autonomous territory has resource rights and control over health, education, and justice (Roth, 2015: 537; Canadian Encyclopedia, 2010). [2005: autonomy concession]
- The government of Canada and the NunatuKavut community council signed a memorandum of understanding of self determination on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2019 (LexisNexis 2019: Online). The memorandum lays out the foundations for future discussions on self-determination. This could lead to concessions further down the line.

## Regional autonomy

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations’ right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs in areas such as culture, education, language, health and social services, as well as economic development (Minority Rights Group International). This represented a formal recognition of indigenous rights and included the Inuit, even though they were not covered by the Indian Act (a decision emerging from the 1939 court decision making the Canadian government responsible for the Inuit) (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010).
- From 1999 onward, Nunavut was an autonomous province of Canada as well. [1983-2020: regional autonomy]

## De facto independence

NA

## Major territorial changes

- See regional autonomy. [1982: establishment of regional autonomy] [1999: sub-state secession]

## EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Inuit
<i>Scenario</i>	n: 1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Indigenous peoples
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2004000

## Power access

- The Inuit are one of the larger aboriginal peoples of Canada, located mainly in today's Nunavut region. EPR codes the indigenous peoples as powerless throughout the duration of this movement. In line with EPR we did not find evidence of active discrimination as defined in EPR. First Nations enjoy the right to vote since 1960. At the same time, again in alignment with EPR, we found no evidence for Inuit representation in the national government (cf. Cairns 2011). In Canada there is a ministry for Aboriginal affairs (up to 2011 called the ministry for Indian affairs), but this is consistently filled by non-Aborigines. In 2008, Leona Aglukkaq became the first Aboriginal (Inuit) cabinet member. Between 2015 and 2019, Jody Wilson Raybould, a member of the We Wai Kai Nation) served in various ministerial roles including Minister of Justice. According to EPR, representation of the indigenous peoples nevertheless overall remained rather token. [1963-2020: powerless]

## Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 794), there were about 42,000 Inuit in Canada in 2002. The WB pegs Canada's population at 31.36 mio in that year. [0.0013]

## Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 794), approx. 60% of the Inuit live in Nunavut, where they make up 85% of the local population. [regionally concentrated]

## Kin

- There are Inuit also in the U.S., but their number is below the 100k threshold (see Minahan 2002: 794). [no kin]

## Sources

Cairns, Alan (2011). *Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Canadian Encyclopedia (2010) Inuit (Online). Available at:

<https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/inuit> [Accessed: 10/09/2022].

Canadian Encyclopedia (nd) Education of Indigenous Peoples in Canada (Online). Available at:

<https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/aboriginal-people-education> [Accessed: 15/08/2022].

CBC News (2022). "NunatuKavut Inuit Identity Dispute Has Long History."

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/newfoundland-labrador/nunatukavut-inuit-identity-dispute-has-long-history-1.6369649> [October 6, 2022].

Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.

Cunningham, Kathleen Gallagher (2014). *Inside the Politics of Self-Determination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].

Heritage (2008) Inuit Organisations and Land Claims (Online). Available at:

<https://www.heritage.nf.ca/articles/aboriginal/inuit-land-claims.php> [Accessed: 26/09/2022].

Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa

- Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 129, 202-203, 213.
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (nd) About Canadian Inuit (Online). Available at: <https://www.itk.ca/about-canadian-inuit/> [Accessed: 10/09/2022].
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [February 24, 2002 May 28, 2003].
- Kulchyski, Peter K. (1994). *Unjust Relations: Aboriginal Rights in Canadian Courts*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lexis Nexis (2019) Signing of a Tripartite Memorandum of Understanding on Health and Social Services Governance for Quebec First Nations (Online). Available at: <https://advance.lexis.com/api/permalink/f9497a2c-244b-4d6e-ac1e-0cb180e2a98c/?context=1519360&federationidp=7R8KD759624> [Accessed: 12/11/2022].
- LexisNexis (2019) Moving Forward on Self-Determination: MOU between Canada and the NunatuKavut Community Council (Online). Available at: <https://advance.lexis.com/document/?pdmfid=1519360&crd=cd41ce77-a947-4cb6-82f1-b103413f2ea5&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A5X0T-C1J1-JCBF-S30J-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=8058&pdteaserkey=sr7&pdtab=allpods&ecomp=zbzyk&earg=sr7&prid=457b4096-cae4-4308-9f50-98fada723bb2> [Accessed: 12/11/2022].
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 419-421.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 794-798.
- Minorities at Risk Project (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International (2015) Inuit (Online). Available at: <https://minorityrights.org/minorities/inuit/> [Accessed: 10/09/2022].
- Nunatsiaq News (2018) Nunavut Inuit to explore self-government (Online). Available at: [https://nunatsiaq.com/stories/article/65674nunavut\\_inuit\\_to\\_explore\\_self-government/](https://nunatsiaq.com/stories/article/65674nunavut_inuit_to_explore_self-government/) [Accessed: 12/11/2022].
- NunatuKavut (2019) Constitution (Online). Available at: <https://nunatukavut.ca/site/uploads/2019/05/Revised-Constitution-November-2019-clean-copy.pdf> [Accessed: 10/09/2022].
- Office of the Languages Commissioner – NWT (nd) *History* [Online]. Available at: <https://olc-nt.ca/about/history/>.
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Salomons, Tanisha and Erin Hanson (2009). "Sparrow Case." <http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/land-rights/sparrow-case.html> [April 22, 2015].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

## **Iroquois**

Activity: 1977-2020

### **General notes**

NA

### **Movement start and end dates**

- The first evidence for separatist mobilization we could find is in 1977, when Iroquois representatives presented a petition seeking that the Iroquois Confederacy, a political unit that predates both Canada and the US, be recognized as a sovereign nation.
- The Haudenosaunee government continues to operate and, notably, has issued its own passports (Haudenosaunee Confederacy; Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 202f; Keesing's; Lexis Nexis; Minahan 1996: 220ff, 2002: 799ff).
- From 2012-2013, the Iroquois have also taken part in organized protests – Idle No More – involving many indigenous tribes. The grievances include infringement of land rights and environmental pollution on tribal lands. The movement aims to “help build sovereignty and resurgence of nationhood.” [start date: 1977; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- The Iroquois movement is split on the issue of the degree of sovereignty that is sought. Some advocates consider the Iroquois a sovereign nation and seek outright independence (e.g., the Iroquois confederacy issues its own passports), while others seek more autonomy within Canada and increased land rights – consider, for instance, the Idle No More movement (Minahan 2002: 799, 803-804; Carlson 2011; Idle No More). Since it is unclear what claim is dominant, we code an independence claim throughout. [1977-2020: independence claim]

### **Independence claims**

- The continuous issuing of passports for the Iroquois confederacy (Roth 2015: 465) indicates a persistent claim for independence. [start date: 1977; end date: ongoing]

### **Irredentist claims**

NA

### **Claimed territory**

- The exact extent of the territory claimed is unclear, but they appear to be derived from the historic Iroquois Confederacy. We flag this claim as ambiguous and code it based on a historical map of the aboriginal population in Canada by Nicholson & Comtois (1958).

## **Sovereignty declarations**

- In 1977 Iroquois representatives presented a petition to the United Nations seeking that the Iroquois Confederacy, a political unit that predates both Canada and the US, be recognized as a sovereign nation (Minahan 2002: 803). [1977: independence declaration]

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- The MAR rebellion score of Canada's indigenous peoples is 3 in 1990. The MAR chronology makes clear that this is due to a local rebellion by the Mohawks, a member of the Iroquois confederacy (see Jul 11 – Sep 26, 1990); however, the incident involves a single death and thus we do not code LVIOLSD.
  - o More detailed notes from MAR: "The Surete de Quebec launches an unsuccessful raid on a 4-month blockade (which began on March 11) of a road leading to some disputed land at Oka municipal golf course. In sympathy the Kahnawake Mohawks blockade a main arterial bridge into Montreal sparking protests and racial confrontations by enraged commuters. Police failure to dismantle a barricade erected by warriors and Mohawk sympathizers at Oka result in a 78-day armed standoff. During this period: up to 3,700 Army personnel are involved at a time; a policeman is killed; up to 7,000 angry Canadian demonstrators clash with police, throw Molotov cocktails and burn Native effigies; the Canadian federal Deputy Indian Affairs minister accuses the Indians at Oka of being "criminals" and engaging in "armed insurrection"; and white protestors hurl rocks and debris at fleeing Mohawk elders, women and children while police and soldiers look on with apparent disinterest. Mohawk demands include: that the government turn over all disputed lands at the Kanesatake reserve to the Mohawks; that the government legalize the operation of an existing high-stakes bingo parlor on the Kahnawake reserve; and the government make a commitment to the creation – within 3 years – of an autonomous domain that would encompass 6 Mohawk communities. The government does agree to purchase the disputed land. Most of the protesters flee on September 1 when army troops raid the barricade but about two dozen members of the paramilitary Mohawk Warrior Society, together with about 30 women and children, hold out until September 26 when they surrender because they prefer to surrender to the federal troops rather than the Quebec provincial police."
- We found no reports of separatist violence in other years, thus the entire movement is coded as NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- The Iroquois have a history of autonomy. A confederacy of the Iroquois tribes was formed around 1570. The confederacy managed to survive until the late eighteenth century, when the tribes gradually lost their traditional lands and the Iroquois people were forced to adapt to White culture (Minahan 2002:802-803). From Canadian independence in 1867 onwards, there was a policy of assimilation. The highly repressive Indian Act and other aspects of the Canadian government's Aboriginal policy have had substantial and devastating impacts on First Nations societies, and limited both the autonomy and cultural rights of Canada's First Nations (Minority Rights Group International).
- No concessions or restrictions were found in the ten years before movement onset.

## **Concessions and restrictions**

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). In 1983 the Quebec National Assembly also recognized the autonomy of aboriginal nations (Resolution of February

9, 1983). The resolution included self-governance, land ownership rights, competencies of self-rule in areas of culture, education, language, health and social services as well as economic development. It also included some tax exemptions. A significant share of the Iroquois is located in Quebec (Minahan 2002). We only code the national recognition of self-rule in 1982 because the national recognition seems more significant, and the sub-national recognition appears to be an outflow of the national legislation. [1982: autonomy concession]

- In 1985, the Canadian Parliament amended the Indian Act. The act lifted many discriminatory practices, including that Aboriginal women who marry a non-Aboriginal automatically lose their Aboriginal status. Moreover, indigenous communities were allowed to regulate membership in their communities themselves. [1985: cultural rights concession]
- After the Oka Crisis in 1990, when a local dispute over land rights between the Mohawk and the town of Oka escalated and resulted in the killing of one police officer, the Mohawk settlement of Kanesatake (Quebec) was granted the right to run its own police force (McMilland and Yellowhorn 2004: 101; Milward 2012: 159). This concerned a rather small share of the Iroquois group, namely approx. 17% of the Mohawk community. The Mohawks, in turn, make up only 25% of the Iroquois. In other words, this concerned only approx. 4% of the Iroquois. Thus we do not code a concession. However, we still code a concession in 1990:
  - o In 1990 the Supreme Court set a precedent with the ruling in the Sparrow case by setting out criteria “to determine whether governmental infringement on Aboriginal rights was justifiable, providing that these rights were in existence at the time of the Constitution Act, 1982” (Salomons and Hanson 2009). The Court hereby restricted the possibility to limit aboriginal rights, such as fishing, that were in existence in 1982. The government can no longer infringe upon these rights without justification. The Sparrow case is recognized by many as “a significant victory for those interested in the affirmation of Aboriginal rights” (Kulchyski 1994: 212). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- In 1990, Prime Minister Mulroney announced a new federal aboriginal agenda including the acceleration of land claims and the improvement of the Aborigine’s socio-economic conditions. More importantly, in 1992 a constitutional conference presents a new proposal for constitutional amendments called the Charlottetown Accord. The agreement foresaw unprecedented self-government for Canada’s Aborigine population, including the right to raise taxes. Essentially, the Accord would have created three levels of government, a federal, a provincial, and a Native. The Charlottetown Accord was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992 (Minorities at Risk Project). However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide, giving indigenous peoples relatively little say.
- In 1997, the Canadian Supreme Court fleshed out and extended the Aborigine’s land rights, ruling that, among other things, the Aboriginal title to land is a communal right protected under the 1982 constitution. Critically, the Court ruled that oral histories and traditions constitute sufficient evidence for land claims. It also stated that Aborigines are entitled to activities beyond traditional activities like hunting and fishing (Minority Rights Group International; Minorities at Risk Project). [1997: autonomy concession]
- According to Cunningham (2014: 204), there was a court ruling in 2003 “in Native favor over the residential schools program” which “resulted in restitution paid to the Natives and establishment of programs to promote Native languages and cultures.” [2003: cultural rights concession]
- The Mohawk Council of Awkesasne and the Government of Canada signed schedule agreements in 2005 and 2011 which sought to identify jurisdictional arrangements for the Council’s governance. An agreement-in-principle was signed in 2013, which led to increased autonomy (Government of Canada nd: Online). [2013: autonomy concession]
- In 2015, the Chiefs in Assembly (including the UOI) and the government of Ontario signed a First Nations Political Accord, affirming right to self-government in Ontario. This led to a 2017 agreement between the government of Ontario and the Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians (which includes some Ojibwe, see Batchewana, nd: Online). This affirmed government-to-government relationships and gave this organization greater control over child welfare decisions, healthcare, and housing (Ontario, 2018: Online). [2015: autonomy concession]

- In 2019 a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the Government of Canada, government of Quebec, and the Assembly of First Nations of Quebec and Labrador agreeing to work together towards greater autonomy for indigenous control over healthcare. The aim is to give control over choice of healthcare models. The negotiations include Anishinabe, Cree, and Iroquois communities. The negotiations were ongoing as of 2020, so no concession is coded.

### Regional autonomy

- See below. [1983-2020: regional autonomy]

### De facto independence

- The Haudenosaunee government that was declared in 1977, according to Minahan (2002: 803), issues its own passports, but they do not appear to exercise de-facto control over a significant territory.

### Major territorial change

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). [1982: establishment of regional autonomy]

### EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Iroquois
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Indigenous peoples
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2004000

### Power access

- The Iroquois are part of EPR's umbrella group of the Aboriginal peoples. Aboriginal peoples are considered powerless throughout. In line with EPR we did not find evidence of active discrimination as defined in EPR. First Nations enjoy the right to vote since 1960. At least since the early 1980s the Canadian government has made significant concessions to several Aboriginal peoples (significant steps include the recognition of Aboriginal rights in the 1982 Constitutional Act, the (defeated) Charlottetown Accord, and the creation of the (Inuit) Nunavut state in 1999). Also in line with EPR we did not find evidence of substantial representation (of either Aboriginal peoples as a whole or Iroquois in particular) in the national executive (Cairns 2011). In Canada there is a ministry for Aboriginal affairs (up to 2011 called the ministry for Indian affairs), but this is consistently filled by non-Aborigines. In 2008, Leona Aglukkaq became the first Aboriginal (yet Inuit) cabinet member. Thus, we code the Iroquois as powerless throughout the movement's existence. [1977-2020: powerless]

### Group size

- The information in Minahan (2002: 799) is inconclusive because it counts Iroquois in both Canada and the U.S. (in total about 150,000). According to the 1996 census there are 50,000

Iroquois living in Canada (see the Canadian Encyclopedia), which in combination with Canada's total population of 28,846,761 yields a group size of .0017333. [0.0017]

### Regional concentration

- The Iroquois are scattered on the fringes of their original homeland and are “concentrated in about 20 towns and eight reservations in New York, Ontario, and Quebec” (Minahan 2002: 799). Given the non-contiguous Iroquois settlement, we code them as not regionally concentrated. [not concentrated]

### Kin

- According to Minahan (2002: 799), there are Iroquois in the United States; however, they number below 100,000 (see Iroquois in U.S.). [no kin]

### Sources

- Batchewana First Nation of Ojibways (nd) (Online). Available at: <https://www.aiai.on.ca/member-nations/batchewana/> [Accessed: 01/10/2022].
- Cairns, Alan (2011). *Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Canadian Encyclopedia. <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/en/article/iroquois/> [March 22, 2014].
- Carlson, Kathryn B. (2011). “Canada, Natives Locked in Uneasy Dance over Self-Governance.” *National Post*. July 24. <http://news.nationalpost.com/2011/07/24/canada-natives-locked-in-uneasy-dance-over-self-governance/> [July 22, 2014].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). “Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis.” *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Council of the Haida Nations. “Mandates and Responsibilities.” <http://www.haidanation.ca/Pages/governance/mandate.html> [December 11, 2013].
- Cunningham, Kathleen Gallagher (2014). *Inside the Politics of Self-Determination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Government of Canada (nd) General Briefing Note on Canada's Self-government and Comprehensive Land Claims Policies and the Status of Negotiations (Online). Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1373385502190/1542727338550> [Accessed: 12/11/2022].
- Haudenosaunee Confederacy. <http://www.haudenosauneeconfederacy.com/greatlawofpeace.html> [December 11, 2013].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 202-203.
- Idle No More. <http://www.idlenomore.ca/> [July 22, 2014].
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [February 24, 2002].
- Kulchyski, Peter K. (1994). *Unjust Relations: Aboriginal Rights in Canadian Courts*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lexis Nexis (2019) Signing of a Tripartite Memorandum of Understanding on Health and Social Services Governance for Quebec First Nations (Online). Available at: <https://advance.lexis.com/api/permalink/f9497a2c-244b-4d6e-ac1e-0cb180e2a98c/?context=1519360&federationidp=7R8KD759624> [Accessed: 12/11/2022].
- Lexis Nexis. <http://www.lexis-nexis.com> [July 2, 2003].
- McMillan, Alan and Eldon Yellowhorn (2009). *First Peoples in Canada*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre Publishers.



- Milward, David (2012). *Aboriginal Justice and the Charter: Realizing a Culturally Sensitive Interpretation of Legal Rights*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 220-222.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 799-805.
- Minorities at Risk Project (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://www.minorityrights.org/2627/canada/first-nations.html> [July 11, 2014].
- Nicholson, N., and P. Comtois (1958). "Aboriginal Population." Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, Geographical Branch.
- Ontario (2018) Building Stronger Relationships: Agreements and Action (Online). Available at: <https://www.ontario.ca/document/spirit-reconciliation-ministry-indigenous-relations-and-reconciliation-first-10-years/building-stronger-relationships-agreements-and-action> [ Accessed: 01/10/2022]
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Salomons, Tanisha and Erin Hanson (2009). "Sparrow Case." <http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/land-rights/sparrow-case.html> [April 22, 2015].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

## **Metis**

Activity: 1967-2020

### **General notes**

- The Métis are of mixed European and Indigenous ancestry, and have a unique status in Canada because of their historic non-recognition as an indigenous group, which among other things meant the group was never denied voting rights (Vogt et al 2015; Cederman et al. 2010).

### **Movement start and end dates**

- The origins of the Métis national movement can be traced back to the 1885 Métis rebellion. The first national-cultural organization, Union National Métisse St-Joseph du Manitoba, was established in 1887. The Union unsuccessfully demanded a territorial base for the Métis and self-government in the 1930s. We could not find evidence for further organized SD claims until the 1960s when, inspired by the civil rights movement, younger and more radical leaders took over the movement and began to make claims for autonomy (Minahan 2002: 1247; Danver 2015: 451).
- The first evidence we could find for an organized claim during the period we look at is the formation of the Manitoba Métis Federation (MMF) in 1967. The MMF sought to revive the Métis' historic autonomy over the Red River colony area and protect the rights of Metis beyond the historic border of the colony (MMF n.d.). Another organization that made claims for Métis self-government is the Native Council of Canada, which was formed in 1971 and is now split into the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples (formed in 1993) and the Métis National Council (1983) (Danver 2015: 451; Nitotemtik 2020; Sawchuk 2001).
- The Métis were recognized as Aboriginal in 1982, which conferred upon them the same rights to self-government as other indigenous groups. The Métis National Council (MNC) was formed subsequently to oversee the negotiation and implementation of land and self-government rights on a nation-to-nation basis (MNC n.d.).
- The movement was ongoing as of 2020 (Minahan 2002: 1247f; MNC n.d.; Roth 2015: 525). [start date: 1967; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- The dominant claim of the Metis has been the recognition of indigenous and treaty rights across Canada. This demand is articulated by multiple groups representing Métis. For example, the MMF, formed in 1967, aims to revive governance of Manitoba Metis from historical legacy of the Red River Metis colony (also known as Assiniboia) (MMF, nd: Online). Other groups, including “the Native Council of Canada (1971)—now split into the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples (1993) and the Métis National Council (1983)—formed to raise public awareness of Canada’s failure to honor its treaty-based obligations to the Métis” (Danver, 2015: 451; Nitotemtik, 2020: Online; Sawchuk, 2001).
- The Métis National Council (MNC) was formed in 1983 as an umbrella to regional Métis councils. The organization oversaw the negotiation and implementation of treaty rights “on a nation-to-nation basis” (MNC, nd: Online), thus aiming to obtain internal self-government. [1967-2020: autonomy claim]

### **Independence claims**

NA

## **Irredentist claims**

NA

## **Claimed territory**

- Generally, the MNC defines Metis settlement as follows: “Distinct Métis communities developed along the routes of the fur trade and across the Northwest within the Métis Nation Homeland. This Homeland includes the Prairie provinces (Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta), as well as parts of Ontario, British Columbia, the Northwest Territories, and the northern United States. Today, many of these historic Métis communities continue to exist along rivers and lakes where forts and posts were hubs for fur trade activity. Many Métis Nation citizens live in urban centres within the Métis Nation Homeland” (MNC nd: Online).
- This broadly matches with the description in Minahan (2002: 1243), who notes that the Métis homeland is in the vast Mackenzie Delta, across modern day Ontario, British Columbia, NWT, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba.
- The most prominent claim made by this movement concerns the Red River Colony (also known as Assiniboia), where there is a strong historical legacy of Metis self-government (Roth 2015: 525). We code this claim based on a map of the Red River Colony from 1812 to 1869 (Lean 1914). In line with the coding rules, we only include the part of the Red River Colony in today’s Canada, thus cutting out the part in today’s U.S.

## **Sovereignty declarations**

NA

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- We found no reports of separatist violence, hence a NVIOLSD classification. [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- The Métis are of mixed indigenous/European heritage. Historically, people with mixed heritage often found roles in trade posts and forts as traders, translators, guides, etc. (Minahan 2002: 1244-45; Danver 2015: 450).
- As the Hudson Bay Company expanded into the prairies from 1811, clashes occurred between Hudson and the Northwest Company (the Métis largely worked for the Northwest Company). To resolve the clashes between the groups at this time, the companies merged in 1825 (Canadian Encyclopedia 2019; Minahan 2002: 1246).
- In 1869, the Hudson Bay Company proposed to transfer Ruperts Land, which included the Métis colony, to the Crown. This move was resisted by the Métis who organized a provisional government and rebelled (Red River Rebellion). This resulted in the Manitoba Act in 1870, which promised Métis land rights in Manitoba. These were not fully implemented, however (Minahan, 2002: 1246; Canadian Encyclopedia, 2019: Online). Further rebellions of Métis in 1885 in Saskatchewan (Riel Rebellion) led to a provisional Métis government but this was crushed by the Canadian government (Minahan 2002: 1246-46; Canadian Encyclopedia 2019; Danver 2015: 451).
- No concessions or restrictions were found 10 years before the SDM start date.

## Concessions and restrictions

- The 1982 Constitution Act recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). The Métis were for the first time recognized as an aboriginal group with the same rights as other aboriginal groups (Danver 2015: 451; Minahan 2002: 1247). [1982: autonomy concession]
- In 1985, the Canadian Parliament amended the Indian Act. The act lifted many discriminatory practices, including that Aboriginal women who marry a non-Aboriginal automatically lose their Aboriginal status. Moreover, indigenous communities were allowed to regulate membership in their communities themselves (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010; MRGI: Online). [1985: cultural rights concession]
- In 1990 the Supreme Court set a precedent with the ruling in the Sparrow case by setting out criteria "to determine whether governmental infringement on Aboriginal rights was justifiable, providing that these rights were in existence at the time of the Constitution Act, 1982" (Salomons and Hanson 2009). The Court hereby restricted the possibility to limit aboriginal rights, such as fishing, that were in existence in 1982. The government can no longer infringe upon these rights without justification. The Sparrow case is recognized by many as "a significant victory for those interested in the affirmation of Aboriginal rights" (Kulchyski 1994: 212). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- In 1990, Prime Minister Mulroney announced a new federal aboriginal agenda including the acceleration of land claims and the improvement of the Aborigine's socio-economic conditions. More importantly, in 1992 a constitutional conference presents a new proposal for constitutional amendments called the Charlottetown Accord. The agreement foresaw unprecedented self-government for Canada's Aborigine population, including the right to raise taxes. Essentially, the Accord would have created three levels of government, a federal, a provincial, and a Native. The Charlottetown Accord was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992 (Minorities at Risk Project). However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide, giving indigenous peoples relatively little say.
- In 1997, the Canadian Supreme Court (Delgamuukw Decision) fleshed out and extended the Aborigine's land rights, ruling that, among other things, the Aboriginal title to land is a communal right protected under the 1982 constitution. Critically, the Court ruled that oral histories and traditions constitute sufficient evidence for land claims. It also stated that Aborigines are entitled to activities beyond traditional activities like hunting and fishing (Minority Rights Group International; Minorities at Risk Project; Cunningham, 2014: 204). [1997: autonomy concession]
- According to Cunningham (2014: 204), there was a court ruling in 2003 "in Native favor over the residential schools program" which "resulted in restitution paid to the Natives and establishment of programs to promote Native languages and cultures." [2003: cultural rights concession]
  - o There was also a second cultural rights concession in 1993. In 1993, Steve and Roddy Powley had shot and killed a moose without a license. In 1998 the Powleys were acquitted after the judge ruled that their right to hunt was protected under the 1982 constitution (Indigenous Foundations, nd: Online; Minahan, 2002: 1248). This case eventually made it to the Supreme Court, which ruled in 2003 that the Métis had an aboriginal right to harvest game (Danver 2015: 451; Canadian Encyclopedia 2019: Online). Notably, according to a 2010 court ruling, this does not extend to fishing, however (Canadian Encyclopedia 2019; ECE Law n.d.).
- In 2013, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled in *MMF v. Canada* that the government had failed to fulfil its obligations under the 1870 Manitoba Act. The Canadian government subsequently compensated the Métis for lost lands (Canadian Encyclopedia 2019: Online). Financial settlements do not constitute concessions as defined here.
- In 2016, the Canadian Supreme Court ruled in *Daniels v. Canada* that the Métis Nation and Non-Status Indians are considered "Indians" under the Constitution Act 1867. This built on the 1982 constitutional amendment by placing responsibility for the Métis with the federal rather than the

provincial governments, as had been the case since 1982. This increased the Métis' negotiating power, but is not a concession as defined here (Canadian Encyclopedia 2019).

- In 2019, the Métis Nation of Alberta (MNA), Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO), and Métis Nation-Saskatchewan (MN-S) signed self-government agreements with the Government of Canada. The agreements "deal with the recognition of Métis jurisdiction in core governance areas (citizenship, leadership selection and government operations)" (Canada 2019: Online). The agreement with the MNO, in particular, "provides a clear path for the MNO to transform into a recognized public Indigenous government. After this transition, the new Métis Government will have recognized law-making powers in the areas of citizenship, leadership selection, and internal operations" (Métis Nation). [2019: autonomy concession]
- In 2021 the Canadian government recognized "the Manitoba Métis Federation (MMF) as the existing democratically elected government of the Manitoba Métis. This agreement ensures that the MMF will continue to provide responsible and accountable self-government." (MMF 2021: Online).

### Regional autonomy

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs in areas such as culture, education, language, health and social services, as well as economic development (Minority Rights Group International). This extended to the Métis, who were for the first time recognized as an aboriginal group with the same rights to autonomy as First Nations and Inuit (Vogt et al 2015; Cederman et al 2010; Minahan 2002: 1247). [1983-2020: regional autonomy]

### De facto independence

NA

### Major territorial changes

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). [1982: establishment of regional autonomy]

### EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Métis
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Indigenous peoples
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2004000

### Power access

- EPR codes the indigenous peoples (which includes the Métis) as powerless throughout the duration of this movement. In line with EPR we did not find evidence of active discrimination as defined in EPR. In Canada there is a ministry for Aboriginal affairs (up to 2011 called the ministry for Indian affairs), but this is consistently filled by non-Aborigines. Minahan identifies one Métis Lieutenant Governor of Canada, Yvon Dumont, appointed in 1993 (2002: 1248). In 2008, Leona Aglukkaq became the first Aboriginal (Inuit) cabinet member. Between 2015 and 2019, Jody Wilson Raybould, a member of the We Wai Kai Nation) served in various ministerial

roles including Minister of Justice. According to EPR, representation of the indigenous peoples nevertheless overall remained rather token. [1963-2020: powerless]

### Group size

- We found various different estimates.
  - o Minahan (2002: 1243) reports an estimate of 310,000 Métis in North America.
  - o Roth (2015: 525) reports 400,000 (2015: 525).
  - o The 2001 Canadian census reported 292,310 Métis in Canada.
  - o The 2016 census reported a population of 587,545. The reason for the much higher estimate is likely owed to changes in self-identification and the legal definition of Métis.
- We rely on the 2016 census, which estimated Canada's total population at 35.2 million. [0.0167]

### Regional concentration

- Minahan (2002: 1243) notes that the Métis homeland is in the vast Mackenzie Delta, across modern day Ontario, British Columbia, NWT, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba. As the Métis are spread across a large area, regional concentration is unlikely. We were not able to find more precise data. [non concentrated]

### Kin

- There are Métis in the northern U.S., but they number less than 20,000 (Minahan 2002 1243; Canada 2001). [no kin]

### Sources

- Canada (2001) Census (Online). Available at:  
<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/english/profil01/AP01/Details/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=PR&Code1=46&Geo2=PR&Code2=01&Data=Count&SearchText=manitoba&SearchType=Contains&SearchPR=46&B1=All&Custom=> [Accessed: 24/10/2022].
- Canada (2018) First Nations People, Métis and Inuit in Canada: Diverse and Growing Populations (Online). Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/89-659-x/89-659-x2018001-eng.htm> [Accessed: 24/10/2022].
- Canada (2019) Historic self-government agreements signed with the Métis Nation of Alberta, the Métis Nation of Ontario and the Métis Nation-Saskatchewan (Online). Available at:  
<https://www.canada.ca/en/crown-indigenous-relations-northern-affairs/news/2019/06/historic-self-government-agreements-signed-with-the-metis-nation-of-alberta-the-metis-nation-of-ontario-and-the-metis-nation-saskatchewan.html> [Accessed: 12/11/2022].
- Canadian Encyclopedia (2019) Métis (Online). Available at:  
<https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/métis> [Accessed: 19/10/2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Daigle, M. (2016) Awawenitakik: The Spatial Politics of Recognition and Relational Geographies of Indigenous Self Determination, *The Canadian Geographer*, 60, (2), 259-269.
- Dubois, Janique, and Saunders, Kelly (2013) "Just Do it!": Carving Out a Space for the Métis in Canadian Federalism, *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 46, (1), 187-214.
- East Coast Environmental Law (nd) R v Vautour, 2010 NBPC 39 (CanLII) (Online). Available at:  
<https://www.ecelaw.ca/aboriginal-and-indigenous-law/case-law/r-v-vautour-2010-nbpc-39-canlii.html> [Accessed: 24/10/2022].

- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Indigenous Foundations (nd) Powley Case (Online). Available at: [https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/powley\\_case/#:~:text=Because%20the%20M%C3%A9tis%20right%20to,was%20protected%20under%20Section%2035](https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/powley_case/#:~:text=Because%20the%20M%C3%A9tis%20right%20to,was%20protected%20under%20Section%2035). [Accessed: 24/10/2022].
- Lean, Alex (1914). “(Red River Colony) Map of the District of Assiniboia, 1811.” Barry Lawrence Ruderman Antique Maps. <https://www.raremaps.com/gallery/detail/55494mb/red-river-colony-map-of-the-district-of-assiniboia-1811-anonymous> [July 10, 2023].
- Manitoba Metis Federation (2019) Manitoba Métis Self-Government Recognition and Implementation Agreement (Online). Available at: <https://www.mmf.mb.ca/self-government-agreement> [Accessed: 12/11/2022].
- Manitoba Métis Federation (nd) The National Government of the Red River Métis (Online). Available at: <https://www.mmf.mb.ca/manitoba-métis-federation-the-national-government-of-the-red-river-métis> [Accessed: 24/10/2022].
- Métis Nation. <https://www.metisnation.org/governance/self-government/> [November 17, 2022].
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [November 9, 2021].
- MNA (nd) (Online) <https://albertamétisgov.com/> [Accessed: 27/09/2022].
- MNC (nd) <https://www.métisnation.ca/> (Online) [Accessed: 17.09/2022].
- MNO (2019) First-ever National Conference on Métis Self-Government concludes with a commitment to progress (Online). Available at: <https://www.métisnation.org/news/otipemisiwak-recap/> [Accessed: 27/09/2022].
- Nitotemtik, Tansi (2020) A Brief History of Métis Governance and Political Organization (Online). Available at: <https://ualbertalaw.typepad.com/faculty/2020/02/a-brief-history-of-m%C3%A9tis-governance-and-political-organization.html> [Accessed: 17/09/2022].
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Sawchuk, Joe (2001) Negotiating an Identity: Métis Political Organizations, the Canadian Government, and Competing Concepts of Aboriginality, *American Indian Quarterly*, 25, (1), 73-92.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). “Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

## **Mikmaqs**

Activity: 1976-2020

### **General notes**

- Micmacs is the French spelling. However, the group prefers Mi'kmaqs (Minahan 2002: 1250).

### **Movement start and end dates**

- The Mikmaqs are represented by the Mi'kmaq Grand Council and the main political organization is the Mi'kmaq Rights Initiative who campaign for recognition and implementation of treaty rights (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2022: Online). This latter organization notes that the first land claim for the Mikmaq was filed in 1976 by the Grand Council, indicating a movement start date of 1976.
- The Mikmaqs filed their first land rights claim in 1976, hence the start date of this movement (KMK, nd: Online). In the 1980s, the Mikmaq's continued to make claims related to cultural and land rights, which led to various legal battles in the 1990s including over fishing rights (Minahan 2002: 1252). The most important organization representing the Mikmas SDM today seems to be the Mi'kmaq Rights Initiative (KMK, nd: Online). The movement was ongoing as of 2020 (CBC 1999, 2019: Online). [start date: 1976; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- The movement's focus is on land rights and increased self-government (Canadian Encyclopedia 2022; Minahan 2002: 1252; KMK 2010). There was some mention of tough decisions on sovereignty should Quebec become independent, but no clear evidence of a claim for outright secession (Minahan 2002: 1253). [1976-2020: autonomy claim]

### **Independence claims**

NA

### **Irredentist claims**

NA

### **Claimed territory**

- The Mikmaqs seek recognition and implementation of treaty rights that cover "traditional Mi'kmaq lands" (KMK, 2010: Online). This is an ill-defined area that covers the Mikmaq homeland (around the Gulf of St Lawrence, in the Gaspé region of Quebec, and coastal regions of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island (Minahan 2002: 1249). We flag this claim as ambiguous and code a rough approximation based on this map: <https://naig2023.com/about/mikmaki/>. We use GADM for polygon definition.



## **Sovereignty declarations**

- In 2010, Mikmaq chiefs of Nova Scotia asserted the “nationhood of the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia over our traditional lands and waters” (KMK 2010). However, this was not a unilateral declaration of sovereignty but a reaffirmation of treaty rights that had been guaranteed to the Mikmaqs in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- There was some tension between Mikmaqs and non-indigenous fishermen in 2000 over unchecked fishing known as the Burnt Church Crisis. Again, in 2020 tensions escalated, seeing a lobster pound in Middle West Pubnico being burnt down. However, tensions eased before any casualties (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2020: Online). No other incidents were identified; therefore, the entire movement is coded with NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- As a largely coastal people, the Mikmaqs had the first contact with Europeans as early as 1497. This early contact exposed the Mikmaqs to European disease, alcohol, and goods, decimating the population and disrupting traditional ways of life (Minahan 2002: 1251; Canadian Encyclopedia 2020). The Mikmaqs were allied to the French and converted to Roman Catholicism from 1610 (Canadian Encyclopedia 2020; Minahan 2002: 1251; Danver 2015: 453).
- The Mikmaq homeland steadily came under British control and the Mikmaqs formally submitted to British rule in 1761 under a treaty which guaranteed land use rights (Danver 2015: 453).
- Following the Indian Act of 1876, the Canadian government established reserves for the Mikmaqs. The Mikmaqs were subjected to the residential school system and in the 1940s, thousands of Mikmaqs were forcibly relocated to their reserves (Minahan 2002: 1252; Canadian Encyclopedia 2020).
- No concessions or restrictions were found in the ten years before movement onset.

## **Concessions and restrictions**

- The 1982 Constitution Act recognized the First Nations’ right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). This represented a formal recognition of indigenous rights that should have been implemented in previous treaties (Vogt et al, 2015; Cederman et al, 2010). This is a significant autonomy concession recognizing autonomy of indigenous communities. [1982: autonomy concession]
- In 1985, the Canadian Parliament amended the Indian Act. The act lifted many discriminatory practices, including that Aboriginal women who marry a non-Aboriginal automatically lose their Aboriginal status. Moreover, indigenous communities were allowed to regulate membership in their communities themselves (Vogt et al. 2015; Cederman et al. 2010; MRGI: Online). [1985: cultural rights concession]
  - o Also in 1985, the Supreme Court of Canada recognized the treaty of 1752 as an existing treaty in R. vs Simon (KMK n.d.). This confirmed that the Mikmaqs had indigenous rights to the lands described in those treaties (Canadian Encyclopedia: Online). We consider this to be part of the 1982 concession.
- In 1990 the Supreme Court set a precedent with the ruling in the Sparrow case by setting out criteria “to determine whether governmental infringement on Aboriginal rights was justifiable, providing that these rights were in existence at the time of the Constitution Act, 1982” (Salomons and Hanson 2009). The Court hereby restricted the possibility to limit aboriginal rights, such as fishing, that were in existence in 1982. The government can no longer infringe upon these rights without justification. The Sparrow case is recognized by many as “a significant victory for those

interested in the affirmation of Aboriginal rights” (Kulchyski 1994: 212). [1990: cultural rights concession]

- In 1990, Prime Minister Mulroney announced a new federal aboriginal agenda including the acceleration of land claims and the improvement of the Aborigine’s socio-economic conditions. More importantly, in 1992 a constitutional conference presents a new proposal for constitutional amendments called the Charlottetown Accord. The agreement foresaw unprecedented self-government for Canada’s Aborigine population, including the right to raise taxes. Essentially, the Accord would have created three levels of government, a federal, a provincial, and a Native. The Charlottetown Accord was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992 (Minorities at Risk Project). However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide, giving indigenous peoples relatively little say.
- In 1997, the Canadian Supreme Court (Delgamuukw Decision) fleshed out and extended the Aborigine’s land rights, ruling that, among other things, the Aboriginal title to land is a communal right protected under the 1982 constitution. Critically, the Court ruled that oral histories and traditions constitute sufficient evidence for land claims. It also stated that Aborigines are entitled to activities beyond traditional activities like hunting and fishing (Minority Rights Group International; Minorities at Risk Project). [1997: autonomy concession]
- In 1998, Nova Scotia passed the Mi’kmaq Education Act. This gave Mi’kmaq reserves in Nova Scotia jurisdiction over primary, elementary, and secondary education (Nova Scotia 1998: Online). This act has continued to be extended, with the latest 10-year extension coming into force in 2019 (LexisNexis 2019: Online). [1998: autonomy concession]
- In 1998 Mikmaq activists blocked a highway to Quebec to press for unlimited logging rights in the Gespeg region of Quebec. This was followed by an agreement between the Quebec Mikmaq, Quebec, and Canada for unlimited logging rights in 1999 (Minahan, 2002: 1253). We treat this as a land rights concession. [1999: autonomy concession]
- In 1999, the Supreme Court of Canada reaffirmed the Mikmaqs’ right to traditional activities, including fishing also “out of season” (Canadian Encyclopedia 2020; Danver 2015: 453; Minahan 2002: 1253). [1999: cultural rights concession]
- According to Cunningham (2014: 204), there was a court ruling in 2003 “in Native favor over the residential schools program” which “resulted in restitution paid to the Natives and establishment of programs to promote Native languages and cultures.” [2003: cultural rights concession]
- In 1998, the Minister for Indian Affairs announced on Treaty Day that Canada was committed to the “Made in Nova Scotia Process”, which emerged from discussions over gas pipelines in Mikmaq areas of Nova Scotia (KMK, nd: Online). Spurred by the Marshall Decision, in 2002 an Umbrella Agreement was signed by Mikmaq Chiefs, Nova Scotia, and Canada to outline the work towards recognizing and respecting treaty rights (Canada, 2010: Online). In 2007 the parties signed the Framework Agreement, establishing mechanisms for discussing issues related to treaty rights and aboriginal land, in particular “Enhanced legal clarity on rights issues; Improved and stable relations; and Reduced social and economic disparity” (Nova Scotia, 2018: Online). This could be coded as an autonomy concession due to the focus on land titles. However, it is more of a process required to negotiate land issues rather than providing autonomy or cultural rights in and of itself (due to the exclusion of the Mikmaq from the 1763 Royal Proclamation). Therefore, no concession is coded.
- In 2008, the Mikmaq of Quebec and the government of Quebec and Canada signed the Niganita’suatas’gl Ilsutaqann Agreement, which was followed by a Framework Agreement in 2012. The agreements established mechanisms for managing “issues of mutual concern” (Canada 2014). We found no evidence for a concession as defined here, though (e.g., re land rights or cultural rights).
- In 2011, the Mikmaqs in New Brunswick and the governments of New Brunswick and Canada signed the Mi’gmaq Wolastoqiyik Umbrella Agreement, which established “an effective and orderly process to help guide discussions among the parties towards the conclusion of a Framework Agreement on Aboriginal and treaty rights and self-government and a Consultation Agreement” (Canada, 2014: Online). Again, we found no evidence for a concession as defined here, though (e.g., re land rights or cultural rights).

- In 2019 negotiations began for self-government of Mikmaq on Prince Edward Island (CBC 2019). The process was ongoing by the end of 2020, but the process could lead to concessions further down the line.
- In April 2022, Nova Scotia enshrined the Mi'kmaq language as the province's first language. The legislation also supported efforts to protect and revitalize the language. This would constitute a concession, but is after 2020, the last year we cover (Canadian Encyclopedia 2022).

### Regional autonomy

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs in areas such as culture, education, language, health and social services, as well as economic development (Minority Rights Group International). Based on this, we code autonomy from 1983 onward. [1983-2020: regional autonomy]

### De facto independence

NA

### Major territorial changes

- The 1982 constitution recognized the First Nations' right to land and self-government, that is, a right to manage their own affairs (Minority Rights Group International). [1982: establishment of regional autonomy]

### EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Mikmaqs
<i>Scenario</i>	n: 1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Indigenous peoples
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2004000

### Power access

- EPR codes the indigenous peoples as powerless throughout the duration of this movement. In line with EPR we did not find evidence of active discrimination as defined in EPR. First Nations enjoy the right to vote since 1960. At the same time, again in alignment with EPR, we found no evidence for Mikmaq representation in the national government. In Canada there is a ministry for Aboriginal affairs (up to 2011 called the ministry for Indian affairs), but this is consistently filled by non-Aborigines. In 2008, Leona Aglukkaq became the first Aboriginal (yet Inuit) cabinet member. Between 2015 and 2019, Jody Wilson Raybould, a member of the We Wai Kai Nation) served in various ministerial roles including Minister of Justice. According to EPR, representation of the indigenous peoples nevertheless overall remained rather token. [powerless]

### Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 1249) there were 31,000 Mikmaqs in Canada in 2002. The WB pegs the Canadian population in that year at 31.36 million. [0.0010].

## Regional concentration

- The Mikmaq homeland is eastern Canada and northeastern USA. Most live around the Gulf of St. Lawrence in Quebec's Gaspé region, coastal regions of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island (Minahan 2002: 1249). Due to the relatively small size of their population and the large settlement area, the Mikmaqs are coded as non-concentrated. We could not find more precise data. [non concentrated]

## Kin

- Canadian Encyclopedia reports that one of 30 Mikmaq nations lives in the USA. The estimated population of that nation is 1,200, which is below the threshold. [no kin]

## Sources

- Blaustein, A.P. (1993) Self-government for the aboriginal peoples of Canada; the Mi'kmaq Nation starts constitution-making, *International Journal on Group Rights*, 1, (3), 225-236.
- Canadian Encyclopedia (2022) Mi'kmaq (Online). Available at: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/micmac-mikmaq> [Accessed: 27/09/2022].
- CBC (1999) Landless Micmac sign deal for self-government (Online). Available at: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/landless-micmac-sign-deal-for-self-government-1.170555> [Accessed: 17/09/2022]
- CBC (2019) Mi'kmaq beginning move towards self-governance on P.E.I. (Online). Available at: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/prince-edward-island/pei-mikmaq-rights-self-government-oct-2019-1.5340627> [Accessed: 17/09/2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Cunningham, Kathleen Gallagher (2014). *Inside the Politics of Self-Determination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Government of Canada (1999) Framework Agreement Signed Between the Micmac Nation of Gespeg, Quebec and Canada (Online). Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100031948/1539795992606> [Accessed: 09/10/2022].
- Government of Canada (2010) FAQ: Made in Nova Scotia Process (Online). Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100028638/1539610616753?wbdisable=true> [Accessed: 09/10/2022].
- Government of Canada (2014) Negotiations in Atlantic Canada | Negotiation Tables Update (Online). Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100028632/1539609657854> [Accessed: 09/10/2022].
- Government of Canada (2019) Mi'kmaq, Prince Edward Island and Canada Framework Agreement (Online). Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1548858268881/1548858560122> [Accessed: 09/10/2022].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- KMK (2010) Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia Nationhood Proclamation (Online). Available at: <https://mikmaqrights.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/NationhoodProclamation.pdf> [Accessed: 09/10/2022].
- KMK (nd) Our History (Online)> Available at: [https://mikmaqrights.com/?page\\_id=7#ourhistory](https://mikmaqrights.com/?page_id=7#ourhistory) [Accessed: 27/09/2022].
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [November 9, 2021].
- NexisLexis (2019) Road to Academic Success: Canada Supports Mi'kmaq Nova Scotia First Nations (Online). Available at: <https://advance.lexis.com/document/?pdmfid=1519360&crd=749133b7-81c2-4d88-b061-90cc31ee10ac&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A5VN1-36M1-DXCW-D1FS-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=400331&pdteaserkey=sr4&pdtab=allpods&ecomp=zbzyk&earg=sr4&prid=571aa9f6-0498-4804-a02f-3824bda42a08> [Accessed: 14/11/2022].
- Nova Scotia (1998) Mi'kmaq Education Act (Online). Available at: <https://nslegislature.ca/sites/default/files/legc/statutes/mi'kmaq%20education.pdf> [Accessed: 14/11/2022].
- Nova Scotia (2018) Negotiations (Online). Available at: <https://novascotia.ca/abor/office/what-we-do/negotiations/#:~:text=The%20Made%2Din%2DNova%20Scotia,%2C%20and%20Mi'kmaq%20governance.> [Accessed: 09/10/2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

## **Quebecois**

Activity: 1945-2020

### **General notes**

NA

### **Movement start and end dates**

- The evidence we collected suggests at least more or less uninterrupted separatist activity since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Linguistic conflict has been an enduring feature of Canadian history ever since the British conquest of Quebec in 1759 (Fenwick 1981: 196). The first evidence we found for organized mobilization that could be termed as separatist is the formation of the Canadian Party in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, which among other things demanded full responsible government – a form of internal autonomy (Encyclopedia Britannica). We were unable to uncover an exact date of formation, though the party was active since at least 1806, when it launched its own newspaper, *Le Canadien* (Canadian Encyclopedia).
- In the 1830s, the secessionist Patriot Party sought an independent Quebec; the agitation culminated in an unsuccessful rebellion in 1837-1838 (Encyclopedia Britannica). According to Britannica, the “British military forces crushed the rebels” and “a few were hanged and others exiled in Australia.” Overall, the rebellion cost about 250 lives (Greer 1993: 3). According to an 1839 report, the source of the rebellion was “two nations warring in the bosom of a single state” (Encyclopedia Britannica).
- Responsible government was granted in 1848. Encyclopedia Britannica suggests that agitation for increased self-determination continued, as the Quebecois political elite “pushed hard for and won the right to use their own language in the assembly and gained full control over educational, social, and municipal institutions in Canada East” (Encyclopedia Britannica).
- In 1867, the Canadian Dominion was created; Quebec received far-reaching autonomy (Encyclopedia Britannica).
- According to Minahan (2002: 1546), other Quebecois nationalist organizations pressing for political and linguistic autonomy were formed in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, including the Sons of Liberty and the Association of St. Jean Baptiste. Encyclopedia Britannica, too, suggests some activity in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, led by nationalists such as Henri Bourassa and Lionel-Adolphe Groulx.
- In 1935, the conservative-nationalist Union Nationale (UN) was formed, a major, yet now defunct political party advocating more autonomy for francophone Quebec (Quinn 1949). The Union Nationale often dominated the provincial government between 1936 and 1970. Quebec’s other major party at the time, the liberal party, PLQ, was also federalist (which in the Quebecois context means they want Quebec to gain in competencies but also stay in Canada, see Meadwell 1993: 203-204). The UN lost in significance after the PQ’s founding and was finally dissolved in the 1980s. The PLQ continued to advocate federalist positions, i.e., more autonomy but not secession, as of 2020.
- In the 1960s parts of the self-determination movement radicalized, and an independence movement emerged. One of the first significant independentist groups was the Front for the Liberation of Quebec (FLQ), founded in 1963. Then, in 1968, the Parti Quebecois (PQ) was founded, the major political party advocating independence for Quebec. The PQ formed the (regional) government three times (including the current minority government), and continues to advocate sovereignty to date.
- Other parties making claims for independence have emerged. The Bloc Quebecois was formed in 1990 to participate in federal elections (the 2019 federal election seeing them get 4.66% of the popular vote). Quebec Soudaire, another separatist organization, was formed in 2006.
- Based on this narrative, we code the Quebecois as of 1945, the first year covered in our data set, but note prior activity that was nonviolent immediately before the first year we code. The

evidence we collected suggests a more or less continually active movement since the formation of the Canadian Party in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. The party's date of formation is unclear, but it has been active since at least 1806 (see above). Thus 1806 is coded as start date. The movement is coded as ongoing as of 2020. [start date: 1806; end date: ongoing]

### **Dominant claim**

- In the initial post-war period, the dominant self-determination claim is unambiguous. The Union Nationale (UN) and, to a lesser extent, the Quebecois Liberals (PQL) both advocated increased autonomy within Canada. There was no major faction demanding independence yet. However, the situation becomes trickier with the rise of the independence movement in the early 1960s. In 1963 the FLQ was founded (employing terrorist strategies), and somewhat later in 1968 the Parti Québécois (PQ), the major organization associated with the independentist view (Minorities at Risk Project). From the early 1960s onwards there are thus different factions within the self-determination movement, with some advocating (different shades of) autonomy within Canada (the federalist position) and others advocating independence, possibly with some sort of continual association with the remaining Canada (the separatist or sovereigntist position). The Parti Québécois quickly had electoral success, receiving 23.5 per cent of the vote in 1970 and 30.8 per cent in 1973 (though this translated into a minimal number of seats; see Canadian Encyclopedia: section "Parti Québécois"). In 1976 the PQ won 41 per cent of the vote, enough to form the government (Minahan 2002; Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 233-234). The independentist PQ has played an important role in Quebecois politics ever since, even if it was out of government from 1986 to 1994 and from 2003 to 2012. It is strongly associated with the Quebecois self-determination movement. Upon the PQ's initiative, an independence referendum was organized in Quebec in 1980. The referendum turned out a 60 per cent majority against independence, causing the PQ to put back the independence issue. However, it did not give up the independence claim or moderate its position to autonomy within Canada. In the early 1990s, the independence option gained significantly in popularity over the failed Meech Lake Accord, as documented by extensive polling. The PQ retook power in 1994, and organized another independence referendum in 1995 (which turned out an even closer no-majority of 50.58 per cent). Subsequently support for independence decreased (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 244), but the PQ remained the most important organization associated with the movement and continued to make claims for independence.
- Other parties making claims for independence have emerged. The Bloc Québécois was formed in 1990 to participate in federal elections (the 2019 federal election seeing them get 4.66% of the popular vote). Quebec Soudaire, another separatist organization, was formed in 2006.
- Based on this, we code an independence claim from the foundation of the PQ onwards (thus 1969 onwards, following the first of January rule), and an autonomy claim prior to this. While independence was twice rejected in referendums, it seems the dominant claim raised by the self-determination movement. [1945-1968: autonomy claim; 1969-2020: independence claim]

### **Independence claims**

- There were claims for outright secession made in the 19<sup>th</sup> century; however, the earliest evidence for a politically significant claim for independence in the post-WWII phase we could find is in 1963, when the FLQ was formed. The main bearer of the Quebecois secessionist movement, the PQ, was formed in 1968 and has maintained its independence claim to this date (MAR). [start date: 1963; end date: ongoing]

### **Irredentist claims**

NA

## **Claimed territory**

- Quebecois claims concern the current province of Quebec. We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

## **Sovereignty declarations**

- There were two independence referendums, one in 1980 and the other in 1995 (Minahan 2002: 1547-1548), but we have not come across evidence for a sovereignty declaration. In 1995 a bill was tabled that included a declaration of sovereignty, but the bill was not passed because the government planned to wait for the result of the 1995 referendum (which returned a thin no majority) (Smith 2013: 12).

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- There was a violent uprising in 1837/1838 (see above), but we found no evidence of separatist violence above the threshold thereafter. Minahan (2002: 1546) reports two “short-lived rebellions” in 1870 and 1884. The 1870 rebellion was fought by the Métis, an aboriginal people, though half French and half Indian. It led to the establishment of Manitoba Province. The 1884 rebellion referred to by Minahan likely corresponds to the Métis rebellion noted by Fenwick (1981: 202), in which the Métis attempted to gain independence. The rebellion was quickly suppressed after government troops were sent in. Since the Métis are an aboriginal people and not located in Quebec, the Métis’ rebellions should not be associated with the Quebecois.
- Quebecois separatists engaged in violent activity in 1970, namely the kidnapping of several Canadian politicians and the murder of one of these. In 2012, PQ leader Pauline Marois was delivering a speech when a gunman tried to assassinate her. A technician was killed (National Post 2016: Online). Since fewer than 25 persons were killed and the MAR rebellion score for 1970-75 is less than 3 (i.e. 2), we nevertheless code the entire movement as NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- Quebec has been a federal province throughout Canada’s existence (Meadwell 1993). Initially, the Canadian provinces did have very little powers, but by the 1880s they had become at least as powerful as their US counterparts, if not more so. There was a short interlude of centralization during the First World War and immediately after, when the central government levied an income tax. The centralist tendencies were largely reversed after 1921. A second wave of centralization began in the context of the Second World War. There were constitutional amendments in 1940 which gave the Parliament the power to establish employment insurance and universal pensions. And in 1941, the central government started to monopolize income taxes (Canadian Encyclopedia: section “Federalism”). Since these are both instances of centralization, we code autonomy restrictions in the respective years. [1940: autonomy restriction] [1941: autonomy restriction]

## **Concessions and restrictions**

- In 1949, the ultimate judicial appellant competence was transferred from the (British) Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to Canada. The Privy Council was widely regarded as favorable to provincial autonomy (Canadian Encyclopedia: section “Judicial Committee of the Privy Council”), but we consider this too ambiguous to be coded as a restriction.
- In 1951, the constitution was amended to allow for a federal pension fund, but at the same time provinces were also allowed to set-up pension funds (Canadian Encyclopedia: section



“Federalism”), hence the autonomy of the regions remained unaffected and we do not code a restriction.

- After the war Ottawa sought to perpetuate the income tax monopolization that had been introduced in 1941. Until about 1960 the tax system had remained highly centralized. However, in the 1960s, mainly due to Quebec leader Jean Lesage, the centralist tendency was reverted. Between 1960 and 1980, the center made several concessions with regard to provincial taxation (Canadian Encyclopedia: section “Federalism”). The two most significant concessions appear to have been made in 1962 and 1965. In 1962 far-reaching tax competencies were given back to the provinces. [1962: autonomy concession]
- In 1965 the provinces were allowed to opt out of shared cost programs. This was mainly directed at Quebec, which is the only province which chose to opt out of all shared cost programs (Fenwick 1981: 210). This allowed Quebec to have its own contributory pension plan (Canadian Encyclopedia: section “Federalism”), while the central government established a joint pension scheme for all other provinces. [1965: autonomy concession]
- In 1969, the newly elected Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau set out to make Canada a bilingual country. The federal parliament passed the 1969 Official Languages Act, which implemented the official use of both languages in all federal institutions (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 102). [1969: cultural rights concession]
- In the wake of the October crisis (Quebec terrorism), federal troops assisted the Quebecois under the War measures act (Canadian Encyclopedia: section “October Crisis”). It was the Quebecois government itself that called for the federal help, and no restriction as we define it seems to have been involved. Hence, we do not code a restriction.
- In 1974, the Quebec National Assembly adopted the official languages act, which made French the official language in a number of areas, including labor relations and education (Canadian Encyclopedia: section “Québec Language Policy”). This is not coded since it is the Quebecois region which legislated. In other words, this was not a concession granted by the central government. Furthermore, in 1974, the federal level required bilingual packaging and labeling throughout the country, which appears too minimal to be coded as a concession (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 102).
- In 1977, Quebec’s Parti Québécois (PQ) government enacted the French Language Charter, a yet stricter and more nationalist language law. The French Charter restricted education in English to children of English-speaking parents born in Quebec, declared bilingual signs illegal, and renamed English town names (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 102). This is not coded since it is the Quebecois region which legislated. In other words, this was not a concession granted by the central government. The Language Charter was repeatedly challenged with the courts. Quebec’s courts stroke down a number of its provisions; these decisions were upheld by the Canadian Supreme Court when challenged. The first challenge came in 1979. In 1979 the Canadian Supreme Court ruled that Quebec legislation had to be issued in both French and English, thereby declaring Chapter III of the French Language Charter unconstitutional. In 1981 this was extended to any governmental regulation (Keesing’s Record of World Events: May 1980). We do not code the 1979 ruling as a restriction because this is not an instance where the central government revokes a previously granted concession. Quebec unilaterally grabbed cultural rights and the center/the courts intervened to restore the constitutional status quo. The repatriation of the Canadian constitution in 1982 opened the door to further challenges (see below).
- The Parti Québécois (PQ), a Quebecois separatist outfit, came to power in Quebec in 1976 on a platform that included a promise for a referendum on independence. The PQ government pushed back the date for the referendum several times. Eventually, it was held in May 1980. Upon a turnout of 86%, 59.5% of Quebecois voters voted against independence (Thompson 1989: 197). Note: while the origins of the 1980 Quebec referendum are unilateral (the referendum was called for by Quebec’s PQ government and Canada’s federal government “never viewed the referendum as binding. The referendum, instead, was unilaterally called for by the Quebec province” (Rourke et al. 1992: 118). However, the federal government did not dispute the legality of the referendum (see e.g. Leslie 1999: 136, though Leslie does not explicitly refer to the 1980 referendum but only to the 1995 referendum). Moreover, the federal government was actively involved in the no campaign. In fact, the federal Prime Minister, Jean-Pierre Trudeau (himself a Quebecois), was the de-facto leader of the no campaign. Thus, it could be argued that the central government had

conceded a referendum on independence. However, given the referendum's unilateral origins, we consider this too ambiguous to be coded.

- Before the independence referendum in 1980, PM Trudeau made promises for “renewed federalism” if the Quebecois were to reject the referendum (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000: 189). Given the vagueness of this promise, we do not code this as a concession.
- In October 1980, three months after the Quebecois independence referendum, Trudeau announced plans to repatriate the constitution – that is, write a new document that would be entirely Canadian and thus cut links with the UK. After initial reservations, nine of ten provinces agreed to the repatriation in 1981 – all except for Quebec (Meadwell 1993: 235). This had been possible because the constitutional amendment formula was changed beforehand. Until 1981, there was an implicit agreement that constitutional changes require unanimous provincial consent. Many Quebecois had even been under the impression that Quebec enjoys a special veto, though this belief was not widely shared outside of Quebec. In 1981, Canada's Supreme Court ruled that only a “substantial degree of provincial consent” was necessary for constitutional changes. In 1982, the Quebec Court of Appeal in a decision that was later confirmed by the Canadian Supreme Court furthermore ruled that had neither a legal nor conventional right to veto constitutional changes (Dunsmuir & O'Neal 1992). We code an autonomy restriction in 1981 because the provinces, including in particular Quebec, effectively lost their traditional right to veto constitutional amendments by way of the 1981 Supreme Court ruling. [1981: autonomy restriction]
- Given Quebec's opposition to repatriation, the 1982 Constitution Act (Canada Act) was signed by all provinces except for Quebec, even if it applies to Quebec as well (Meadwell 1993: 235). The new constitution confirmed the provinces' loss of the right to veto constitutional amendments as it introduced a formula that treats each province equally. From now on, the consent of only two thirds of the provinces that have at least 50% of Canada's population was required (note: this still gave Quebec in combination with Ontario a de-facto veto because they together make up more than 50% of Canada's population; see Heard & Swartz 1997: 340). The 1982 constitution introduced new restrictions for Quebec: the associated Charter of Rights was widely seen as an infringement of Quebec's autonomy (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000: 189). In particular, Section 2 of the Charter guarantees freedom of expression, which opens the door to challenges to laws which restrict an individual's ability to use a particular language, while section 23 introduced the notion of “minority language education rights”, an obvious response to Quebec's nationalist language law. Overall, the repatriation limited Quebec's autonomy, and it is coded as an autonomy restriction. [1982: autonomy restriction]
  - o Note: the 1982 Charter of Rights opened the floodgates for further challenges of Quebec's 1977 French Language Charter. A number of provisions were declared invalid as a result. We do not code separate restrictions because these rulings were a direct result of the 1982 repatriation. Below is a list of such rulings that we have come across.
    - In 1984, the Canadian Supreme Court scrapped another part of the 1977 French Charter, this time the chapter prohibiting education in English for kids of immigrated English-speakers (Keesing's Record of World Events: April 1985).
    - In 1985, the Quebec's Superior Court scrapped another part of the 1977 French Charter. The Quebec Superior Court on January 2, 1985, ruled against Article 58 banning the use of languages other than French in exterior commercial signs (Keesing's Record of World Events: April 1985).
    - In 1986, Quebec's Court of Appeal upheld the right to display publicly signs in English and other languages apart from French, and rejected as unconstitutional a clause in the Quebec French Language Charter which restricted the language of public signs to French, the official language of the province (Keesing's Record of World Events: February 1987).
    - In 1988, the Canadian Supreme Court ruled that the sections of the French Language Charter enforcing the exclusive use of French on outdoor commercial signs were unconstitutional (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 103).
- The fact that Quebec did not sign Canada's constitution initiated a constitutional crisis. In 1987, the Quebecois were offered significant concessions by way of the Meech Lake Accord in return for Quebec signing the constitution: recognition of Quebec as a distinct society, guaranteed

disproportionate representation on the Supreme Court and in the Senate, limited veto rights over constitutional amendments, and the right to opt out of certain national programs. All provincial first ministers promised ratification (Meadwell 1993: 236). However, in June 1990, the three-year deadline for ratification of the Meech Lake Accord ended without ratification of all provinces (Manitoba and Newfoundland did not ratify; Minorities at Risk Project). We do not code a concession or restriction.

- In June 1991, Quebec's PQL administration approves a bill that gives the Quebec government the right to call an independence referendum if an acceptable constitutional reform offer is not devised by October 1992 (Minorities at Risk Project). This is not coded as a concession since it was the region itself which legislated.
- The failed Meech Lake Accord was followed by a similar Accord, the Charlottetown Accord. Again, Quebec would have gained the most, but also other provinces were promised increased autonomy, including competencies in forestry, mining, natural resources, and cultural policy. (Minorities at Risk Project). The Charlottetown Accord goes even beyond Meech Lake in terms of devolved competencies. It was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992. However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide.
- Support for independence surged again after the failure of the Meech Lake Accord in 1990. The PQ regained power in 1994 on a campaign including a referendum pledge. After the elections the PQ moved quickly to a second referendum in 1995. "The 1995 referendum question was shorter and still proposed a negotiated agreement with the rest of Canada. But it put a one-year limit on any such talks, after which Quebec would become sovereign regardless of their outcome" (LeDuc 2003: 105). Moreover, this time there was no promise of a second referendum after the negotiations. Upon a turnout of 93.5%, a very narrow majority of 50.8% of the Quebecois voted no. Note: while the origins of the 1995 Quebec referendum are unilateral (the referendum was called for by Quebec's PQ government without consent by the federal government), the federal government did not dispute the legality of the referendum (see e.g. Leslie 1999: 136). Moreover, the federal government was actively involved in the no campaign. In fact, just like in 1980, the no campaign was de-facto led by the federal Prime Minister, Jean Chrétien. Thus, it could be argued that the central government had conceded a referendum on independence. However, given the referendum's unilateral origins, we consider this too ambiguous to be coded.
- After the narrow loss of the sovereigntists in the 1995 independence referendum, the center initiated a number of concessions. In 1996, the constitutional amendments formula was changed so that Quebec regained a veto over constitutional amendments. The formula that had been introduced in 1982 treated all provinces equally in that it required the consent of two thirds of the provinces that together have at least 50% of Canada's population (Heard & Swartz 1997: 340). The 1996 formula required the consent of a majority of the provinces that includes Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, two or more of the Atlantic provinces that in combination have at least 50% of the region's population (thus giving Alberta a de-facto veto) and two or more of the Prairie provinces that have at least 50% of the region's population (Heard & Swartz 1997: 342). [1996: autonomy concession]
- By the 1997 Calgary declaration, Quebec was recognized as a unique (rather than a distinct, see above) society. While this appears mostly symbolic, in the same year the Canadian constitution was changed to allow Quebec to replace the denominational school boards with ones organized on linguistic ones (Minorities at Risk Project). [1997: cultural rights concession]
- In 1998 the Canadian Supreme Court ruled on the validity of Quebec's 1995 referendum, stating that unilateral secession was not permitted, that separation requires a 'clear' majority in a referendum, after which there had to be negotiations with the center (Minorities at Risk Project). In 1999, the court ruling was converted into law (Clarity Act). Quebec was not granted the right to initiate an independence referendum at any time; hence, we do not code a concession.
- In 2002, the Quebec National Assembly re-introduced the earlier legislation that kids from newcomer English-speakers and Francophones cannot use the English language education system. This is not coded since it constitutes a unilateral power grab. In 2009, the Canadian Supreme Court ruled against the so-called Bill 104, declaring as unconstitutional that certain

students are barred from attending English-language schools (CBC News 2009). We do not code a restriction because this simply restored the status quo.

- In 2006, the Canadian House of Commons recognized Quebec as a nation within Canada (Minorities at Risk Project). This appears as a largely symbolic step. Hence, we do not code a concession.
- In 2013, Canadian PM Stephen Harper weighed into the debate over Quebecois independence by challenging Bill 99, a PQ initiative to counter the Clarity Act. Bill 99 states that “Quebec people have the inalienable right to choose the political system and the legal status of Quebec”. However, a grass roots attempt to dispute this bill by the Equality Party was underway, with Harper sending the Attorney General of Canada to ask the Quebec Superior Court to strike down the bill (CTV News 2013: Online). In 2018, the courts upheld the Bill but ruled that Quebec does not have the right to unilaterally secede (National Post 2018: Online). Overall, the status quo was therefore maintained (Quebec does not have the right to unilaterally secede according to the Clarity Act).
- In 2021, the Canadian parliament re-affirmed the right of Quebec to declare French as the province’s sole official language (Montreal Gazette 2021: Online). It does not seem that any new rights were conferred.

### **Regional autonomy**

- Quebec has been a federal province throughout Canada’s existence (Meadwell 1993). [1945-2020: regional autonomy]

### **De facto independence**

NA

### **Major territorial changes**

NA

### **EPR2SDM**

<i>Movement</i>	Quebecois
<i>Scenario</i>	No match/n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	French speakers
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2002000

### **Power access**

- The Quebecois form part of the EPR group of the French speakers. EPR codes French speakers in Canada as junior partner (and English speakers as senior partner). Generally, Quebec and Ontario have the most important role in Canada’s federal government, and several of Canada’s prime ministers were Quebecois (in particular, Pierre Trudeau and Jean Chrétien). Hence, it appears appropriate to retain the junior partner coding (there might even be a case to code the Quebecois as senior partner). [1945-2020: junior partner]

## Group size

- According to EPR, the share of French speakers decreased over time, which is reflected in a group size estimate of .28 for the French Canadians in 1946-1981, and an estimate of .23 for 1982-2013. This is also true in the case of the Quebecois, though the decrease is less drastic. According to Statistics Canada (2007: 23) the number of French-speakers in Quebec was 4.2697 million in the 1961 census and 5.802 million in the 2001 census. The latter figure matches well with Minahan's (2002: 1544) figure of 5.75 million Quebecois. Canada's total population was 18.238 million in the 1961 census and 30.007 million in the 2001 census, which yields group sizes of .2341 and .1934, respectively. We use the EPR time thresholds (1945-1981 vs 1982-2012). [1945-1981: 0.2341; 1982-2020: 0.1934]

## Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 1544), there are 78% Quebecois in the Province of Quebec. This amounts to around 5,844,000 people (in 2002), which is more than 50% of all Quebecois in the whole country in that same year. [regionally concentrated]

## Kin

- The Quebecois form part of the EPR group 'French speakers'. EPR codes several kin groups. These are the French (France), Walloon (Belgium), Swiss French (Switzerland), Aostans (Italy), and Franco-Mauritians (Mauritius). We follow EPR and code ethnic kin in non-neighboring countries. [kin in non-adjointing country]

## Sources

- Bloc Québécois. <http://www.blocquebecois.org/horizon2015/accueil.php> [December 11, 2013].
- Canadian Encyclopedia. "Parti canadien." <http://www.encyclopediecanadienne.ca/fr/article/parti-canadien/> [April 29, 2015].
- Canadian Encyclopedia. <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/federalism> & <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/judicial-committee-of-the-privy-council> & <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/parti-quebecois/> & <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/quebec-language-policy/> & <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/october-crisis/> [July 9, 2014].
- CBC News (2009). "Top Court Strikes Down Quebec English School Law." October 22. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/top-court-strikes-down-quebec-english-school-law-1.843314> [July 9, 2014].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- CTV News (2013) Harper government joins fight against Quebec's anti-Clarity Act legislation (Online). Available at: <https://montreal.ctvnews.ca/harper-government-joins-fight-against-quebec-s-anti-clarity-act-legislation-1.1504540?cache=yesclipId104062%3FclipId%3D104066> [Accessed: 14/11/2022].
- Degenhardt, Henry W. (ed.) (1988). *Revolutionary and Dissident Movements*. London: Longman Publishers, p. 40.
- Dunsmuir, Mollie, and Brian O'Neal (1992). "Quebec's Constitutional Veto: The Legal and Historical Context." [www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/researchpublications/bp295-e.htm](http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/researchpublications/bp295-e.htm) [April 11, 2015].
- Encyclopedia Britannica . "Bloc Quebecois (Political Party, Canada)." <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/69489/Bloc-Quebecois> & "Quebec."

- <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/486652/Quebec/271980/The-Great-Depression-to-the-1950s> [April 29, 2015].
- Fenwick, Rudy (1981). "Social Change and Ethnic Nationalism: An Historical Analysis of the Separatist Movement in Quebec." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23(2): 196-216.
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Greer, Allan (1993). *The Patriots and the People: The Rebellion of 1837 in Rural Lower Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Heard, Andrew, and Tim Swartz (1997). "The Regional Veto Formula and Its Effects on Canada's Constitutional Amendment Process." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 30(2): 339-356.
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 102-103, 105, 173, 189-190, 233-234, 243-245, 313.
- Keating, Michael (1996). *Nations against the State: The New Politics of Nationalism in Quebec, Catalonia and Scotland*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, p. 78.
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [June 26, 2003].
- LeDuc, Lawrence (2003). *The Politics of Direct Democracy: Referendums in Global Perspective*. Peterborough and Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press.
- Leslie, Peter (1999). "Canada: The Supreme Court Sets Rules for the Secession of Quebec." *Publius* 29(2): 135-151.
- Marshall, Monty G., and Ted R. Gurr (2003). *Peace and Conflict 2003: A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements and Democracy*. College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, p. 63.
- Meadwell, Hudson (1993). "The Politics of Nationalism in Quebec". *World Politics* 45 (2): 203-241.
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 453-455.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 1544-1550.
- Minorities at Risk Project (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Montreal Gazette (2021) Bloc Québécois motion acknowledging Quebec's Bill 96 passes 281-2 (Online). Available at: <https://montrealgazette.com/news/quebec/bloc-quebecois-motion-acknowledging-quebecs-bill-96-passes-281-2> [Accessed: 14/11/2022].
- National Post (2015) Quebec election-night shooter Richard Bain found guilty of second-degree murder in death of stagehand (Online). Available at: <https://nationalpost.com/news/canada/quebec-election-night-shooter-richard-bain-found-guilty-of-second-degree-murder> [Accessed: 14/11/2022].
- National Post (2018) Court upholds Quebec law on self-determination but says it doesn't give unilateral right to secede (Online). Available at: <https://nationalpost.com/news/canada/court-upholds-quebec-law-on-self-determination> [Accessed: 14/11/2022].
- Quinn, Herbert F. (1949). "The Role of the Union Nationale Party in Quebec Politics, 1935-1948." *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 15(4): 523-532.
- Rourke, John T., Hiskes, Richard P., and Cyrus E. Zirakzadeh (1992). *Direct Democracy and International Politics: Deciding International Issues through Referendums*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Smith, Ben (2013). "The Quebec Referendums." *House of Commons Research Paper* 13/47.
- Statistics Canada (2007). "Languages in Canada: 2001 Census." <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/96-326-x/96-326-x2001001-eng.pdf> [April 18, 2015].
- Thompson, Robert J. (1989). "Referendums and Ethnoterritorial Movements: The Policy Consequences and Political Ramifications." In: Joseph R. Rudolph, Jr., and Robert J. Thompson, *Ethnoterritorial Politics, Policy, and the Western World*, pp. 181-220. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rügger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and

Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

## **Westerners**

Activity: 1974-2001

### **General notes**

- The term Westerners, as employed here, relates to English-speaking Canadians in British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan; some also include English-speakers in Manitoba and the Northwest and Yukon Territories (Minahan 2002: 2059).

### **Movement start and end dates**

- The term Westerners as employed here relates to English-speaking Canadians in British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan; some also include English-speakers in Manitoba and the Northwest and Yukon Territories.
- In 1974, the Committee for Western independence was founded (Minahan 2002: 2062), the first evidence of separatist activity we came across. In 1980, the Western Canada Concept (WCC) was registered as a political party, advocating independence for the above-mentioned four western provinces and the Northwest and Yukon Territories. However, the WCC ceased to exist as a movement in 2001 after losing elections. Also the Western Independence party, which split from the WCC in 1987, appears to have ceased its activities by then (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 189f, 319; Keesing's; Minahan 2002: 2059ff).
- Those supporting independence for Western Canada seem to have mainly readjusted their goals to fighting for the independence of individual provinces since around 2000; however, the only visible movement which is also coded are the Albertans.
- That said, there were some claims made after 2001. First, a new Western party emerged in 2005, the Western Block Party. Yet, this party never got any significant support and ceased to exist in 2014 after not being able to muster 250 signatures to register for an election. Another separatist party that had a short resurgence in the mid-2000s is the Western Canada Independence Party, but again, this party had very limited success. Roth (2015: 527) describes the movement as dormant.
- In 2019, the Wexit party was formed, which in 2020 was renamed as the Maverick Party. The Maverick Party did have some limited electoral success as it gained 35,178 votes across Canada in the 2021 federal elections (0.21% popular vote across Canada, 1.4% in Saskatchewan, 1.3% in Alberta, 0.1% in BC). The Wexit/Maverick party's official party platform suggests that it wants Western independence. However, according to its interim leader "[the party] was totally devoted to Alberta separatism, not even western separatism, but Alberta separatism and that left a certain degree of discomfort with most westerners who aren't prepared at this point to go that far" (Global News). As such, this movement is covered by the Albertan movement. [start date: 1974; end date: 2001]

### **Dominant claim**

- In 1974, the Committee for Western independence was founded (Minahan 2002: 2062), and also the Western Canada Concept founded in 1980 advocated independence for the western Provinces (Minahan 2002: 2063; Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 319). Also the Western Independence party, which split from the WCC in 1987, favored independence. Based on this, we code an independence claim throughout. [1974-2001: independence claim]
  - o There was also a party that called for union with the U.S., the Saskatchewan Unionist Party (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 319).



## **Independence claims**

- See above. [start date: 1974; end date: 2001]

## **Irredentist claims**

NA

## **Claimed territory**

- The territory claimed by the Westerners consists of the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and the Northwest and Yukon Territories. We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

## **Sovereignty declarations**

NA

## **Separatist armed conflict**

- We found no reports of separatist violence. [NVIOLSD]

## **Historical context**

- In 1867 Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick united to become independent Canada. The Northwest Territories became part of Canada in 1870. Manitoba, then part of the Northwest Territories, was allowed separate province status. A former British colony, British Columbia joined the Canadian confederation in 1871. Alberta and Saskatchewan followed suit in 1905. All received province status, implying significant autonomy. Yukon Territory was split from Northwest Territories in 1898. There was a short interlude of centralization during the First World War and immediately after, when the central government levied an income tax. The centralist tendencies were largely reversed after 1921. A second wave of centralization began in the context of the Second World War. There were constitutional amendments in 1940 which gave the Parliament the power to establish employment insurance and universal pensions. And in 1941, the central government started to monopolize income taxes (Canadian Encyclopedia: section "Federalism"). In the 1960s, mainly due to Quebec leader Jean Lesage, the centralist tendency was reverted. Between 1960 and 1980, the center made several concessions with regard to provincial taxation (Canadian Encyclopedia: section "Federalism"). The two most significant concessions appear to have been made in 1962 and 1965. In 1962 far-reaching tax competencies were given back to the provinces. In 1965 the provinces were allowed to opt out of shared cost programs. This was mainly directed at Quebec, which is the only province which chose to opt out of all shared cost programs (Fenwick 1981: 210), but considers a concession for the other provinces, too. [1965: autonomy concession]

## **Concessions and restrictions**

- In October 1980, three months after the Quebecois independence referendum, Trudeau announced plans to repatriate the constitution – that is, write a new document that would be entirely Canadian and thus cut links with the UK. After initial reservations, nine of ten provinces agreed to the repatriation in 1981 – all except for Quebec (Meadwell 1993: 235). This had been

possible because the constitutional amendment formula was changed beforehand. Until 1981, there was an implicit agreement that constitutional changes require unanimous provincial consent. Many Quebecois had furthermore even been under the impression that Quebec enjoys a special veto, though this belief was not widely shared outside of Quebec. In 1981, Canada's Supreme Court ruled that only a "substantial degree of provincial consent" was necessary for constitutional changes (Dunsmuir & O'Neal 1992). We code an autonomy restriction in 1981 because the provinces, including in particular Quebec but also the Westerner provinces, effectively lost their traditional right to veto constitutional amendments by way of the 1981 Supreme Court ruling. [1981: autonomy restriction]

- Given Quebec's opposition to repatriation, the 1982 Constitution Act (Canada Act) was signed by all provinces except for Quebec, even if it applies to Quebec as well (Meadwell 1993: 235). The new constitution confirmed the provinces' loss of the right to veto constitutional amendments as it introduced a formula that treats each province equally. From now on, the consent of only two thirds of the provinces that have at least 50% of Canada's population was required (note: this still gave Quebec in combination with Ontario a de-facto veto because they together make up more than 50% of Canada's population; see Heard & Swartz 1997: 340). The 1982 constitution introduced new restrictions for Quebec (see Quebecois) but does not appear to have implied similar restrictions for the English-speaking provinces. Thus, we do not code a restriction.
- The fact that Quebec did not sign Canada's 1982 constitution initiated a constitutional crisis. The 1987 Meech Lake Accord set out to resolve the situation. The proposal included major concessions to Quebec; however, also other provinces would have profited from increased autonomy rights, including a constitutional veto, increased competencies with regard to immigration, and the right to opt out of certain national programs. All provincial first ministers promised ratification (Meadwell 1993: 236). However, in June 1990, the three-year deadline for ratification of the Meech Lake Accord ended without ratification of all provinces (Manitoba and Newfoundland did not ratify; Minorities at Risk Project). We do not code a concession or restriction.
- The failed Meech Lake Accord was followed by a similar Accord, the Charlottetown Accord. Again, Quebec would have gained the most, but also other provinces were promised increased autonomy, including competencies in forestry, mining, natural resources, and cultural policy. (Minorities at Risk Project). The Charlottetown Accord goes even beyond Meech Lake in terms of devolved competencies. It was accepted by all major national parties and (later) by all provincial leaders in 1992. However, the Charlottetown Accord was subjected to a referendum. The proposal was rejected in October 1992. All four Western provinces had voted against the proposal, with no-majorities ranging from 55.3 per cent (Saskatchewan) to 68.3 per cent (British Columbia). One of the two Territories associated with the movement voted against the accord too (Yukon Territory with 56.3 per cent no). The remaining Territory, the Northwest Territory, voted in favor with 61.3 per cent yes. We do not code a concession because while there was a referendum, the referendum was nation-wide.
- After the narrow loss of the sovereigntists in the 1995 independence referendum, in 1996, the constitutional amendments formula was changed so that Quebec regained a veto over constitutional amendments. The formula that had been introduced in 1982 treated all provinces equally in that it required the consent of two thirds of the provinces that together have at least 50% of Canada's population (Heard & Swartz 1997: 340). The 1996 formula required the consent of a majority of the provinces that includes Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, two or more of the Atlantic provinces that in combination have at least 50% of the region's population (thus giving Alberta a de-facto veto) and two or more of the Prairie provinces that have at least 50% of the region's population (Heard & Swartz 1997: 342). While this was first and foremost a concession for the Quebecois, it also increased the Westerner provinces' stake in constitutional amendments (see Heard & Swartz 1997: 342). British Columbia gained an outright veto and Alberta a de-facto veto. The other, smaller Westerner provinces lost some of their influence because provinces were no longer treated equally, but on balance the Westerners' stake in constitutional questions increased. [1996: autonomy concession]
- In 1999, Nunavut was separated from the Northwest Territories to become the first majority-indigenous Canadian territory. The separation was endorsed by the residents of the Northwest

Territory, as evidenced by referendums in 1982 and 1992 (c2d). Thus we do not code a restriction.

### **Regional autonomy**

- British Columbia, Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan are Canadian provinces, and territories have a degree of autonomy too. [1974-2001: regional autonomy]

### **De facto independence**

NA

### **Major territorial changes**

NA

### **EPR2SDM**

<i>Movement</i>	Westerners
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	English speakers
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	2001000

### **Power access**

- The term Westerners, as employed here, relates to English-speaking Canadians in British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan; some also include English-speakers in Manitoba and the Northwest and Yukon Territories (Minahan 2002: 2059). EPR codes English speakers in Canada as senior partner (and French speakers as junior partner). Generally, Quebec and Ontario have the most important role in Canada's federal government (Minahan 2002: 2063), but Western Canadians should not be considered powerless. It is established practice in Canada to guarantee regional representation in the assignment of ministerial posts (Bakvis 1988). Hence, Western representatives regularly held ministerial posts (e.g., Dufferin Roblin served from 1984-1986 under Brian Mulroney), even if prime ministers during the movement's existence consistently were non-Westerners (except for the interim prime minister Kim Campbell from British Columbia, who served for a mere five months in 1993). A junior partner coding appears most adequate. [1974-2001: junior partner]

### **Group size**

- According to Minahan (2002: 2059) there are 7.92 million Western Canadians in Canada in 2002. Combined with the 2002 World Bank estimate of Canada's population (31.36 million), this yields a group size of .2526. [0.2526]

### **Regional concentration**

- According to Minahan (2002: 2059), Western Canadians make up 84% of the population in their three heartland provinces. This amounts to around 7,026,600 people (in 2002), which is more

than 50% of the around 7,920,000 Western Canadians in the whole country in that same year (see Minahan). [regionally concentrated]

## Kin

- Minahan (2002: 2059) reports smaller Westerner communities in the rest of Canada and the United States. These are not significant enough to be considered here. Note: While the Westerners are also English speakers, we do not code English speakers in other countries (e.g. in the United States) as kin because this movement is directed against a government dominated by English speakers. [no kin]

## Sources

- Bakvis, Herman (1988). "Regional Ministers, National Policies and the Administrative State in Canada: The Regional Dimension in Cabinet Decision-Making, 1980-1984." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 21(3): 539-567.
- Canadian Encyclopedia. <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/federalism> [July 22, 2014].
- CBC News (2001). "Separatists Form New Party in Alberta." January 22. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/separatists-form-new-party-in-alberta-1.269437/> [June 19, 2014].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Centre for Direct Democracy (c2d). "Direct Democracy Database." <http://www.c2d.ch/votes.php?table=votes> [July 21, 2014].
- Decision Canada (2021) Maverick Party planning to up its game after poor election results (Online). Available at: <https://globalnews.ca/news/8238936/maverick-party-canada-election/> [Accessed: 14/11/2022]
- Dunsmuir, Mollie, and Brian O'Neal (1992). "Quebec's Constitutional Veto: The Legal and Historical Context." [www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/researchpublications/bp295-e.htm](http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/researchpublications/bp295-e.htm) [April 11, 2015].
- Fenwick, Rudy (1981). "Social Change and Ethnic Nationalism: An Historical Analysis of the Separatist Movement in Quebec." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23(2): 196-216.
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Global News (2021). "Maverick Party planning to up its game after poor election results." <https://globalnews.ca/news/8238936/maverick-party-canada-election/> [November 15, 2022].
- Heard, Andrew, and Tim Swartz (1997). "The Regional Veto Formula and Its Effects on Canada's Constitutional Amendment Process." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 30(2): 339-356.
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 189-190, 319.
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [July 19, 2003].
- Meadwell, Hudson (1993). "The Politics of Nationalism in Quebec". *World Politics* 45(2): 203-241.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 2059-2065.
- Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Separation Party of Alberta. <http://www.separationalberta.com> [October 25, 2013].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

Wexit (nd) About Us (Online). Available at: [https://www.wexitmovement.com/about\\_us](https://www.wexitmovement.com/about_us) [Accessed: 14/11/2022].

Wildrose Independence Party of Alberta (nd) About Us (Online). Available at: <https://wildrose.party/about-us/> [Accessed: 27/08/2022].